

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Governor Brian Sandoval
Lieutenant Governor Mark Hutchison
Controller Ron Knecht
Frank Martin
Tom Skancke
Len Savage
Rudy Malfabon
Bill Hoffman
Dennis Gallagher

Sandoval: So, we'll commence. Good morning everyone and welcome to the Board Meeting. I'll call the meeting to order. I believe we have enough members here, sufficient to conduct a meeting.

Gallagher: Yes, Governor, you do have a quorum.

Sandoval: We'll begin with Agenda Item No. 1, which is the Director's Report.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor and welcome back from a successful trade mission to Europe. I know that that was quite an effort and you bring back good news to the State of Nevada. I wanted to acknowledge someone in the audience first. He doesn't know it, but Paul Saucedo, could you stand up? Paul is our Chief Right-of-Way Agent and he's lost three top-level managers recently and so, a lot has fallen on his shoulders and his staff. I just wanted to thank Paul and his staff in Right-of-Way Division at NDOT, for their efforts in keeping the ball rolling on several projects. Paul, thank you.

Governor, one of the things that we are working on is setting up the Autonomous Vehicles Summit. We changed the date recently in coordination with the Las Vegas Convention and Visitor's Authority. They were very gracious in accommodating us with space for the Summit and they suggested and we agree, after checking with your schedule that during CES, get a hotel room right now if you can, but it's the same people that are in the autonomous vehicle manufacturing and regulation issues are the same people that are going to be at CES. So, it will be a good fit. It's the full first week in January, next year at the Las Vegas Convention Center. We're looking at setting up a possible workshop on regulations. That's kind of—the issue of regulations has been on the forefront

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

with a lot of State DOTs, although Nevada was the first to have those laws passed in our State, but there's other issues that are being recognized as regulatory issues that have to be tackled by states. So, it'd be a good workshop.

Sandoval: And, if I may Rudy, because I don't want to wait until the end. When we were in Germany, I had the opportunity to ride in an autonomous vehicle, in Berlin; and that was one of the suggestions, why we should push that back, because the vehicle I rode in, they want to bring that to Nevada, but we have a real good opportunity here to take a global leadership role in terms of autonomous vehicles and autonomous technology. You probably already know that there is a member of the faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno, who also teaches in Germany. But he was one of the ones that really encouraged us to move it to the same time as the Consumer Electronics Show, because that will really allow for more participation in a lot of the other scientists that are building this car and have built this car. The same thing with Daimler, who is also in Germany and they tested their freightliner truck in North Las Vegas.

So, at least the individuals that I chatted with while I was there, are very excited about the opportunity and also, already view Nevada as having, being one of the top, if not the top place to be able to test. And so, this Summit is a really good opportunity for us to get international attention and really create an opportunity for us to show what we can do. There's a lot of testing that individual companies want to do and Nevada, as I said, with the regs and such can accommodate them.

So, in any event, it's really something to ride in an autonomous vehicle in Berlin at 60 miles an hour and go in a circle. So, we're in this massive circle and it reads the different lights and then a couple cyclists actually jumped in front of us and the vehicle slowed down. And, people walked in the crosswalk in front of us and the vehicle recognized that. And then we came back, so it was a few miles.

Another thing that was interesting to me, when we were finished, the individual, I don't know if I want to call him the driver, but the person who was behind the wheel asked how I felt about it and as I said, I was in complete awe because you don't get to do that every day, but the one difference and it's something they can account for is, they drive much more aggressively in Germany then they do here. And so, as that vehicle brakes a lot later than I do, because I'm kind of—So, as we approached, you know, a red light, it was like, it's time to slow down, but my toes were curling up because I wanted to push on that brake pedal, but they can

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

actually adjust the vehicle and the autonomous function by the way people drive, as well.

So, I'll backup, this is a great opportunity for us. And, you know, I really—those of you who are involved in putting together this forum, this is a chance to really put Nevada on the map when it comes to autonomous vehicles and get people here testing. As I said, we now have a faculty member at the University of Nevada. We have several graduate students that are participating in that and there are international companies that are aware of what we are doing and not only do they want to test here, but there's an opportunity for them to come and build here and manufacture and develop here.

So, I feel this fall was kind of pushing it too far so I thought that, you know, to do it at the same time as CES, because all those people will be here. They'll be in Las Vegas. Sorry to interrupt but it's an exciting opportunity.

Malfabon: And, we'll definitely coordinate with Director Hill, also, from the Office of Economic Development. Thank you Governor.

Sandoval: Member Skancke is also a big part of this in terms of putting it all together. In fact, is going to be Chairing the Subcommittee in terms of putting it together, but here we go.

Skancke: It is a little scary, isn't it, when they—the car doesn't brake in your time.

Sandoval: Right. No, I thought, I'm going to be in the paper for rear-ending somebody. But, no it slowed down and it worked perfectly. Please proceed Rudy.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor. Wanted to express my appreciation to the District II Maintenance Staff that repaired a couple of highways that had some serious flooding issues recently, in the last month. State Route 447, the Pyramid Highway and Scheelite Mine Road which is State Route 839 were damaged and the District was able to get out there. SR 839 is a very low volume road, but nonetheless, it's still a safety issue when you see drop-offs, such as you can see there that they had to repair. I know that District I and District III are having flash flood events. We enjoy the moisture but not all at once in the State of Nevada.

An update on federal funding. The House and Senate passed a short-term extension prior to the expiration at the end of the July. They extended it to

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

October 29th. The funding level for this extension actually will cover until the end of the year, if they need to extend it again for a short-term.

The good news is that the Senate passed a six-year DRIVE Act. DRIVE stands for Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy. That's what State DOTs, including NDOT want to see as a long-term bill, sustained funding from the federal government for the Federal Aid Highway Program. The levels are—well, the House and the Senate, they're still having their differences. When they get back from their recess, they'll have to reconcile those differences. Both agree that they want a long-term bill, they just don't agree on how to fund it. So, you hear things about tax reform, even some Congressmen putting in bills about a gas tax increase for the Federal Gas Tax. Not a lot of support for the gas tax increase but they have to reconcile their differences and identify what revenue sources will achieve that long-term bill and fund it properly.

We've covered some of the overview of the DRIVE Act previously, but it's funding at current levels plus a slight increase. Just to give you an idea, previously in 2015 we had about \$41B of Federal Aid Highway Program, that includes several different programs, but the DRIVE Act is about \$43.8B the first year, nationally. So, it's a slight increase. There is a new freight program, which not relatively speaking, not a lot of money nationally, but it's still a good start. As we advance our freight study, we expect some projects to come out of that study that will be benefited by that new freight program. And, Senator Heller was very instrumental on the DRIVE Act with getting some amendments that helped Nevada; such as the designation of I-11 all the way up to the I-80 area here in Northern Nevada. In Arizona, their Senators did the same thing, to get it extended all the way, designated to the Mexico border. I read recently that even in Mexico, that they're designating that major route for freight all the way to Mexico City, so that's a good thing. The Lake Tahoe issue, one thing that Senator Heller was successful in inserting the language for considering the populations around the Lake Tahoe area and California and Nevada as one single entity. That's always been a challenge for Tahoe MPO and they have Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, but the population is not considered as one population in the planning efforts, although that's basically how they work. So, this will put it into law that that entire amount of population is considered one area for Lake Tahoe. Also, some language to improve pedestrian safety was inserted in the bill by Senator Heller.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

A little update on our major Project NEON. Proposals are due August 21st, as you recall last month, we gave about a three week extension to the proposal due date so that they could see what the impacts of the right-of-way acquisition schedule changes would have on their schedule for construction. It is a best value determination. So, it's a combination of price, 60% weighted to price and 40% to technical score. The technical criteria are things such as construction approach. Their transportation management plan, how they're going to handle traffic. How they're going to manage the project in general. Their design approach, they have to anticipate a lot of reviews by staff at NDOT and our consultants. Their overall schedule. Traffic operations and public involvement approach. That comprises— all those criteria comprise the 40 points towards technical proposal. One of the important things to note is that confidentiality is very important. So, we have these proposals pretty much locked down. We allow access to the review team members. They have to sign confidentiality agreements to not discuss proposals other than in their collaborative setting of when they're meeting together because it is a consensus approach where the review teams get together and review the proposals and discuss it. Confidentiality is very important and one thing that I clarified with the project team was that the price proposal is locked down until the technical scores are finished. So, there's no concerns from the design build teams that anything is going wrong or unfair with the point scoring on the technical score. So, once the technical scores are in, then we'll evaluate the price.

A little bit about the methods. So, on the far right, there's a block that's a little hard to read in the light, but there's an administrative team that administers the procurement, makes sure that it's a fair process and that we're following our procedures. So, we have NDOT, FHWA and Deputy General Attorney Staff assigned to that team. Then you have the various committees and a plan put together. There's an orientation to the reviewer so they know what to look for in the review to develop those technical scores. So, it's apples to apples, from all the reviewers on those scores. Then there's a consensus evaluation and eventually that recommendation comes to the selection official. I serve as the selection official. So, it's a recommendation to me and then we will, in the October Transportation Board Meeting, make you aware of who the selected team is and then get feedback from you at the October Meeting and the November Meeting, that's when we actually bring back, if it's ready in November, hopefully, December at the latest—bring back the actual contract for you to approve. In the meantime, there's opportunities for the Board to, at that October Meeting, to ask questions and we can follow-up and communicate.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

So, this is kind of the schedule. At the bottom, you see the evaluation and then it goes to a selection official. Then we negotiate the contract and then the Board ratifies the selection. The reason we announce at October is so that if there is any concerns from the other teams that were not successful, we can entertain and discuss those issues. If there was a formal bid protest, of sorts on the apparent selection to the preferred team, then we can start dealing with that legally. So, November is when we expect to bring it to the Board for action.

Update on USA Parkway. As you recall, we had short-listed the four teams that are shown there. The final Request for Proposals was issued at the end of July. We are allowing, since it's a big earthwork project and some rock cut on the upper end of the project, we are allowing on-site investigation by the design build teams if they want to collect some more information, reputability of rock, maybe take some additional cores of the rock cut areas if they want to. That's where they're going to drive the price proposals from the teams. So, we're allowing them a few weeks to do some additional investigation. There is a typo on that, it's October 19th, which is actually a Monday, is when the proposals are due. We couldn't avoid any opportunity to make people work over the weekend on that submittal, I know they will be. And then, we're on schedule for completion still by the end of December of 2017 for the project. So, you'll see about the same timeline for bringing it to the selection official and then to the Board. Similar to Project NEON. Not the same months but the same type of timeframes.

We had the groundbreaking last week for the US 95, Clark County, 215 Interchange. The first phase called 3A. On the left photograph, you see Crescent Hardy, our Congressional Representative there in Southern Nevada and the group that was present. A lot of good representation of the various funding sources. We had Regional Flood Control District money. We had RTC Fuel Revenue Indexing Funds, associated with the project. Federal Highway Administration provided the lion share of the funding. We also had some State Highway Funds in the project, but it's a great project that was kicking off. It's going to build the first two bridges of that multi-phase interchange project.

And, I wanted to thank Las Vegas Paving for setting up the tent and all the chairs and those items, but really thanks to our NDOT Communications Team in a successful groundbreaking event. And, a lot of the things that they've been doing lately with national coverage, some of their stories are being picked up by the Associated Press and getting more national coverage. Engineering News Record

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

is a national publication that publishes updates on our major projects as well as roads and bridges. And, Tony Illia, has been very good down there at reaching out. He has some good contacts at ENR, since he provided stories there before in his past life, before he came to NDOT. I wanted to also acknowledge the efforts of the entire team. We're doing a lot more videos. You might have noticed the video at the beginning that we were having shown at the beginning of the meeting with a construction project on 580 in Reno that was shown. A lot of videography, a lot of more interview format that's good for internal communication as well as external communication. Adrienne Packer is in the left side, in the center of the photo, is a new addition to the communications staff in Las Vegas. Some of you may know that she was previously a columnist in the Las Vegas Review Journal, a transportation column called the Road Warrior. She did a very good job in that, so she has a lot of transportation knowledge that she can bring to this communications position. So, she was a good catch for us.

Some other major projects—we avoided nighttime closures on some of the ramps during the 580 Rehab project in consideration of Hot August Nights and a lot of tourism activities that occur up here in Northern Nevada. We're still removing and replacing some of the concrete pavement. A lot of the work will continue this Fall and then in the Spring, will wrap up the project and do the final touches and profile grindings, making the concrete pavement smooth.

Sandoval: Rudy, I'm sorry. What's the anticipated date of the completion for that project?

Malfabon: I think it's in mid-2016, because I think that they're still—do you know John, for sure, or Reid? I think that it's—after the construction season commences again next Spring, it's going to probably take a couple of months to wrap up.

Savage: Excuse me Governor and Rudy, at this time too, I'd like to compliment District II, as well as, a contractor on the barrier replacement. It seemed like it went very, very well. Prior to the Hot August Nights arrival and the completion 100%. So, compliments to the private contractors, as well as, District II, thank you Governor.

Malfabon: Yes, Granite Construction did an amazing job getting that done in just a few weeks time. It was an emergency contract after the barrier rail was damaged in a vehicle crash. They collaborated very well with—and between Granite and Q&D on the South, on the 580 project, they worked well together and traffic was able to get through those construction zones.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

And, I wanted to highlight one of the minor projects that we do that's still important to children and parents and schools in Nevada. That's the Safe Routes to School Program. This program pays for coordinators that are looking for ways to get kids to bike and walk to school. This is a before and after picture on Elizabeth Lenz Elementary in Northern Nevada, in Washoe County. You can see that before they had this obstacle and really no sidewalk, so it'd be difficult for kids to walk to school in that kind of situation. Afterwards, we have a nice sidewalk along the edge of the school. So, wanted to highlight that program and the staff that worked on those Safe Routes to School projects. A lot of those projects are delivered by the local public agencies but this is one we wanted to highlight that we worked on.

Recent settlements—we took the July 2015 Board of Examiners meeting the Wykoff Settlement. This was on Warm Springs Road, associated with I-15 South Design Build Project. Nearly a \$3M settlement. I think Dennis might have some latest information, although the Board of Examiners approved that, I think during the—I don't know, Dennis, if you want to add anything about that, recent developments on that settlement.

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel for the Board. After the Board of Examiners approved that settlement, the settlement agreement was provided to the property owner who rejected it and now is rejecting the agreed upon settlement. We filed a motion to enforcement the judgement—enforce the settlement, which will be heard next month in District Court in Clark County.

Malfabon: So, we had an agreement with the property owner, they're kind of reneging, so we'll find out in court whether that stands. Jensen was a minor settlement associated with temporary easements and sliver takes of property at Pyramid and McCarran and McCarran Boulevard. You're going to see more of those types of smaller settlements on those types of projects in Reno and Sparks, on the McCarran projects. The MLK/Alta was a property associated with Project NEON. We were actually in the midst of the trial, in the second week of the trial and wrapping up arguments when we reached a settlement. We were able to get some advice from the Judge and this settlement was in the best interest of the State. We feel that we'll take that the Board of Examiners soon. We polled the jury afterwards and found that this was right in the ballpark of what they were going to have as a verdict. So, we feel very comfortable with the settlement on MLK/Alta. Meadow Valley claim, we met once again with the Owner/President,

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Robert Terril and his project manager asked for some additional information. We also have an independent assessment report on the drilled shafts coming to us this month that should give us the full amount of information that we need to deliberate and discuss our alternatives.

Wanted to give you an update and we did provide this informative packet, that's in draft form. We're working with the Governor's Office on finalizing the facts in that overview. The Deputy Director position was one of the new legislative positions that we received. We're going to have interviews this Friday with the top five candidates. Out of the 42 new positions filled, I mean, approved at the last session, several have advertised. One has been filled but several more have been advertised and many more to come to have job announcements and conduct interviews and fill those positions. Some of the top-level positions, we wanted to have the Deputy Director in place to fill those direct reports to that individual. Our meeting with the US EPA to negotiate the consent decree is being scheduled for mid-September. We're continuing with several projects, not only on our highways, but also on our facilities. So, we have Clear Creek Water Quality project on US-50 that's underway as well as new projects for reconstructing the drainage systems and wash pads and making some parking lot improvements in Reno and Carson City. We'll continue doing those types of projects throughout the State at various maintenance facilities. We did have a bid protest on the project in Carson City. We have, under Nevada Revised Statutes, we have the obligation to review bids and if we see that we're going to pay more or damaged in some way from unbalanced bidding, then we determined that it was not in the best interest of the State to award to the apparent low bidder. We awarded to the second low bidder because we had a bid error in the quantities. Once we adjusted the quantities and looked at the math, it turned out that the second low bidder was actually the low bidder after we corrected that. We did receive a bid protest. We don't know if it will actually go to court, but we're handling that administratively at this point.

That concludes the Director's report and I'm willing to answer any questions. I wanted to also note that we are getting that Safe and Connected logo out there. We're using that on our PowerPoint slides and our messaging.

Sandoval: Thank you, Director Malfabon. Any questions from Board Members? Member Skancke.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Skancke: Thank you, Governor. Just a couple of things. First of all, great news on Project NEON and that moving forward. So, I think that's exciting. I was just in Southern California and some of the proposers that we have here for Project NEON have some projects going on in Southern California and I'll tell you, these companies are becoming more and more innovative on reducing congestion and design. I'm very excited to see what type of proposals we get for Project NEON to mitigate congestion and lane closures and the creativity that they come up with on these projects. I wanted to know, what role the Board plays in that process? Do we get to see those proposals or can we go to any of the meetings or interviews? Has that been done before? I'm just personally intrigued because I've seen what these companies are coming up with and I would love to see what they're proposing.

Malfabon: Typically Board Members have not had observation roles during the deliberations or presentations, review of those proposals. I don't know if staff wanted to comment on that. The issue for us is that the perception of influence to the reviewers, it is a consensus, so they do discuss collaboratively as a team. Even if a Board Member didn't get engaged in the conversation, I think that the perception to the other teams if a Board Member wasn't there for all three reviews, then it gives a perception that we want to avoid for the sake of fairness.

Skancke: That's fair. Second, I had two other comments if I could Governor. The second thing is, on the DRIVE Act, while Congress passed a six-year bill, I think it's important for us and the Board to know that they only passed three years of funding, which puts the bill in jeopardy after the first three years. So, while it looks good on the surface, it's kind of a shell game. I probably shouldn't have said that, but that's what we end up with. So, we're going to be in the same situation, if they pass any of this, three years from now. Which is, the bill will be bankrupt. I think as a Board, we have to be cognizant of the fact that that continues to put us in a crisis every time a bill like this doesn't pass. So, while on the surface it looks great, it's actually not a fully six-year funded bill. That causes problems for contracts, for bidding, for long-term projects and bigger investments. So, I'm hoping that they can make some changes once they get to conference, if they get to a conference on this, but I don't think—there's no call for the happy dance just yet.

The final thing that I had Governor, if I could just take one more minute is, I wanted to also congratulate and thank the Communications Team. I don't know if

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

there's anyone here from the Communications Team today. And, I know Tony and Adrienne are in Las Vegas—

Malfabon: Could you guys stand up and you down there in Las Vegas to be acknowledged?

Skanche: And, I'm a fan of the Southern Nevada folks because I've known them for a long time and I'm a fan of yours. I have to tell you something, the visibility of this Department over the last year has just been amazing. And, the outreach and the connections that you're making nationally and globally and regionally have really, really made this Department shine in a lot of different areas. So, as a guy that does communication work, I think you all are doing an outstanding job and I wanted to thank you for making the Department look good, but also making Nevada look good. So, thank you very much. That's all I had Governor, thank you.

Malfabon: Thank you, Member Skanche.

Sandoval: Thank you, Tom. Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Thank you, Governor. And, Member Skanche raises an interesting point, but I would assume that and maybe Mr. Malfabon can address this, I would assume that when we let contracts—a standard provision is that the continuation in subsequent fiscal years of the contract and our obligation is contingent on funding by the Legislature, Congress or whomever. Do I error in that assumption?

Malfabon: Every contract, if we had funding and from the federal government and it was a federally funded project, what we would do is negotiate for that contractor to either complete what they can and demobilize and it would cost more money for that effort—so, it's additional—the Contractor is not at risk, they have to be paid for that demobilization and that effort of completing what they can and stopping work. We also—our ending fund balance that we issued for in the State Highway Fund allows us about two months, roughly six weeks of construction contract payments. So, we consider those things in our budgeting. We do have to pay the contractors fairly for, if they did have that situation occur, which we hope doesn't happen where we have to shut down a contract.

Knecht: I too, of course, hope that those contingencies aren't realized, but I just wanted to make clear for the record that it's not exactly a crisis when it happens, it's something that we manage by proactive good contracting. Thank you, Governor.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: Any other comments? We'll move to Agenda Item No. 2, Public Comment. Is there any member of the public here in Carson City that would like to provide public comment to the Board? Yes ma'am, if you'd come to the lectern. And, if you would please identify yourself for the record.

Rodriguez: Sure. My name is Lori Rodriguez. And, I'm a member of the Golden Valley Homeowners Association which is a small valley north of Reno. By extension, you would be Lemmon Valley, Panther Valley, the Stead area which has the airport and Cold Springs. We are concerned about our freeway system up there. Now, what they did was they took the 395 from McCarran north and expanded it to three lanes, but the southbound is still the two lanes and is experiencing a lot of congestion. At 7:00AM in the morning, the traffic is backed up from the 580 at McCarran all the way back to Lemmon Valley Drive. Our area is absolutely exploding with housing developments. We have at least five major—sorry, I'm a little nervous.

Sandoval: Which is fine, you're doing fine.

Rodriguez: Five major developments have gone in of at least 200 homes. We have another one planned for 91 homes in Golden Valley itself. We have about 500 new homes that are trying to go in. We also have north of the Stead Airport, there's 2,200 acres that they're trying to develop with about five homes per acre. We also have probably 50-60 new warehouses and the newest one that is not even completed yet is Amazon.com, which you know, we're glad to have it, but we're looking at severe traffic problems. We do have a project already here for the US-395 North, everything is still to be determined. And, we were wanting to find out if that includes the southbound, so that we can widen—at least get three lanes going into town because it's taking close to 40-45 minutes to go 12 miles, unless you take the old Virginia, which is—there's only two routes into town from the north valleys. So, we wanted to find out how we can help that process along to open up the southbound lanes and what we can do to move the process along. I know it's a very expensive project up there, but the freeway itself also is in, shall I say major need of repair. There's a lot of cracks. I know they've tried to keep up with it, I can see it, but we just wanted to address the Board to see what we can do to get the project going, or if this is just for the northbound.

The other concern is, we have the Pyramid Highway, 395 connection, coming in, which is just going to add to the problem if the 395 is not widened by the time this project goes into effect, which this says it's complete but it's really not. Because

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

they're going through Sun Valley, which already has its own problems. We don't really represent Sun Valley because they drop in usually around McCarran, but, nonetheless, they have issues too. If you watch the cars trying to merge on to the 395 in the morning, they tried to fix it and it's okay, but it really is a mess in the mornings. So, that's what I wanted to ask about.

Sandoval: Thank you Ms. Rodriguez and what I'll ask is that the Director identify somebody to meet with Ms. Rodriguez and get her contact information, perhaps answer her questions and give her some information.

Malfabon: Yes, Governor. Just to add, we are having a meeting set up with the RTC in Washoe County and Reno City Councilman Paul McKenzie, he's raised that issue. We have a traffic study going on right now that's going to feed into an environmental study that I've asked John Terry to look at a different approach to at least start considering the alternatives, the solutions available to us in that area and the Spaghetti Bowl. So, it is going to be a ways off to do the project, but we have to start doing the studies and everything that has to be precursors to the project, we're aware of that.

Rodriguez: One of our biggest concerns is Amazon because once their employees start coming—they're still building. They have one building open right now, but we're going to have their trucks coming in and out. I understand they're also going to be going to the Stead Airport and bringing in planes there, however, in the meantime, they're going to be rolling up and down that freeway to get to the Reno/Tahoe Airport, or wherever, you know, their center is. So, that's one reason we're looking at it. We also have a problem with our two off-ramps to Golden Valley and Lemmon Valley are not light controlled. They're free right turns, but to make the left you have to stop. Right now, if you come about 5:15, the line to turn left is all the way up to the freeway so the people turning right are just sitting there, or they're skirting on the right hand side to try and get around, because they're in a hurry, they need to get to Raley's, okay.

Malfabon: Thank you. And, definitely one of the elements we want to look at is what we call operational improvements; lights, ramp meters, traffic signals, those kinds of things. So, we'll definitely work on that Governor and keep the Board apprised. You had asked Governor, for the list of projects and John Terry, our Assistant Director for Engineering is working on that list to present next month. We're quite aware that this project is of a lot of interest from RTC in Washoe County, the Board Members and the public in that area.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Rodriguez: Okay, thank you.

Sandoval: Thank you Ms. Rodriguez. Any other public comment from Carson City? Any public comment from Southern Nevada?

Martin: None here sir.

Sandoval: Thank you. The next Agenda Item are the proposed minutes. What I was going to suggest is that we continue these to next month. There are quite a few errors in here, Rudy. One of them says, 'thank you Rude', and one of them says Project Beyond, which actually isn't bad. But on Page 7, at the top, for my statement, it says, 'and we always get good news like this' and it should say, 'we don't always get good news'. So, I want to take some time to go through here because there are quite a few that I identified like that and I'd rather not do it on the fly here today.

Malfabon: Yes. And, just to mention, Governor and Board Members. We had to change the company. State Purchasing just acquired the new list of companies that does transcription services for state agencies and we just switched, so some of the errors that we see we'll have to correct and make sure that that company is providing the services that we need so it's more accurate.

Sandoval: You'll have to work with them directly because I—I mean, this is a lot of information to have to go through here. And, there's some significant errors in here that change the entire meaning of the sentence. And so, as I said, I mean, that's—this one alone is 30 plus pages. It's a better use of everyone's time.

Malfabon: Will do so, Governor, we'll get all of the Board Member's comments.

Sandoval: Controller has a comment.

Knecht: Thank you Governor, just real quickly, for the benefit of Mr. Malfabon and the staff, look at Pages 25 and 34, you'll see some things attributed to me that I'm sure the Governor said. I'll be happy to communicate with you on it.

Malfabon: Okay, thank you.

Sandoval: So, Member Skancke, do you have a motion?

Skancke: Yes, Governor, I'll move that we hold Item No. 3, the Approval of the Minutes, from the July 6th meeting until our September Board Meeting.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Martin: Second.

Sandoval: We've heard the motion, second by Member Martin. Any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye, [ayes around] Oppose, no. Motion passes. Is that you Mr. Lieutenant Governor on the phone?

Hutchison: Yes, Governor, it's me.

Sandoval: I apologize, I didn't know that you were participating.

Hutchison: I'm sorry, yes. I would be on the phone for the meeting, I'm in North Carolina right now.

Sandoval: All right, thank you.

Hutchison: Thank you.

Sandoval: Let's move to Agenda Item No. 4, which is Approval of Agreements over \$300,000.

Nellis: Thank you Governor, Members of the Board. There are five agreements under Attachment A that can be found on Page 3 of 29 for the Board's consideration. And, I should say for the record, Robert Nellis, Assistant Director for Administration, thank you.

Regarding Line Item No. 1, Members should've received an updated memo regarding the first item. This is a contract with Horrocks Engineers in the amount of \$1,297,173.27. This is for project management support, traffic analysis and reporting, public involvement, right-of-way utility and acquisition activity services for Interstate 15, Starr Avenue interchange.

The second line item is Amendment No. 2. To increase authority by \$375,000 for continued legal support in inverse condemnation matter, regarding Blue Diamond Overpass.

Finally, Items No. 3-5 are for \$1,000,000 in each District for statewide maintenance and repair of intelligent transportation system devices and Governor, that concludes Agenda Item No. 4. Are there any questions I may answer direct to the appropriate person?

Sandoval: Questions from Board Members? Member Savage.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Savage: Thank you Governor. Mr. Nellis, as you stated, the Item No. 1, we received the packet this morning for, is it Horrocks Engineers?

Nellis: Horrocks, correct sir.

Savage: And, Ryan Wheeler, that name is not familiar to me. Are they are a new firm for the State of Nevada, Department of Transportation?

Nellis: Just a quick answer from me and then I'll let Assistant Director, John Terry answer. They do have a Las Vegas office. They have offices in Arizona as well, but I can let Mr. Terry answer the rest.

Terry: Assistant Director, John Terry, for the record. They are primarily a Utah based firm who has set up an office in Las Vegas in the last couple of years and has done projects for us out of Las Vegas previously.

Savage: Okay, thank you Mr. Terry. And, one other comment, Governor. Mr. Nellis, on Items No. 3, 4 and 5, I commend the Department and yourself and your team. It's nice to see three competitors, three different vendors for the same scope of work. That's all I have, thank you Governor.

Sandoval: Any other questions or comments?

Hutchison: Governor?

Sandoval: Yes, Mr. Lieutenant Governor.

Hutchison: Thank you Governor. Just wanted to turn to Item No. 2 and this is probably best for Mr. Gallagher to respond to. I just note that you've got an amendment here for additional legal services and it sounds like, you've got a plaintiff who had a deal with the State and they're now trying to claim a basis for rescission, is that right?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel to the Board. Lieutenant Governor, that is correct. He had a number of other claims, including inverse condemnation, all of which have been dismissed. The only remaining claims are all based on the breach of contract claims. Earlier in the spring, we had a five-day mini-trial, before the Judge, on whether or not the statute of limitations precludes the breach of contract claims. We're still awaiting the court's decision on that, should the court grant our motions that the statute of limitations bars the claims, that will pretty well resolve the matter at least at the District Court level. Given the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

amount of the claim, I would anticipate that the property owner would appeal it to the Supreme Court. But, right now, we're still awaiting the District Court's decision on our motion to dismiss based upon the statute of limitations.

Hutchison: Thank you very much. And, Mr. Gallagher, if the statute of limitations argument is not successful and this proceeds, what's the basis for the rescission claim?

Gallagher: The breach of contract is predicated upon an allegation of failure to disclose and a breach of the duty of fair dealing. The plaintiff is alleging that the government owes a higher standard in its dealing with citizens than to other parties, non-governmental parties. It's a novel argument.

Hutchison: Yes, so I assume if we don't win the statute of limitations argument, you would try to dispose of the claim by way of motion practice or do you think this is going to go to trial?

Gallagher: I believe it will go to trial on that issue. We filed extensive motions already to dismiss, including all the other allegations—all the other claims for relief and they were all granted via summary judgement with the exception of this last remaining breach of contract claim.

Hutchison: Okay. And then if it goes to trial, is this a bench trial or a jury trial? This will be a bench trial?

Gallagher: The trial would be a jury trial.

Hutchison: Okay. All right, Governor, thank you very much, that's all the questions I have on Item No. 2.

Gallagher: Thank you Lieutenant Governor.

Sandoval: Thank you Mr. Lieutenant Governor. Any other questions? If there are no further questions, the Chair will accept a motion for approval of the agreements over \$300,000 as described in Agenda Item No. 4.

Knecht: So moved.

Sandoval: Controller has moved for approval, is there a second?

Savage: Second.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: Second by Member Savage. Any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Oppose, no. Motion passes. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 5. Mr. Nellis.

Nellis: Thank you Governor. Again, for the record, Robert Nellis. There are three attachments that can be found under Agenda Item No. 5, for the Board's information. Beginning with Attachment A, there are seven contracts on Pages 4 and 5 of 31. Since there are seven contracts total, I'll summarize the first three on Page 4 and then pause for questions before continuing to Page 5.

The first project is located at Interstate 580, at South Virginia, Summit Mall, in Washoe County to construct landscape and aesthetic improvements. There are five bids and the Director awarded the bid to Q&D Construction, in the amount of \$1,915,906.50.

The second—

Sandoval: Mr. Nellis, before you move on. What are we getting in the way of landscape improvements for \$2,000,000?

Nellis: Well, and one comment on that Governor is just, this is a unique situation where there's a lot of dirt that had to be imported for these particular improvements, so that accounts for some of the costs in there, but if I could redirect to the Director, if you'd like to add.

Malfabon: Yes. There are aesthetics, similar to what you see on the Carson Freeway with sculptures, metal sculptures. They have picked a pioneer and kind of an early rancher theme, sheep ranchers. They had some landscape rock paint and aesthetics such as that. There are some trees, I asked about the trees. There's a plant establishment period, these trees are able to survive once they get established without having to install irrigation. It doesn't require irrigation. What they're doing is capturing a lot of the water onsite. There is a way that they capture water and then get it to the plants that they are going to be installing on this but it's a minimal amount of plants.

Sandoval: Is that a formula, this amount?

Malfabon: The formula is typically for new capacity projects, such as we were talking about Starr Interchange on I-15, that design contract. So, we would tell that designer to work with our landscape and architectural staff to have up to 3% is the policy that

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

the Department has, as approved by a previous Transportation Board. So, it's up to 3% would be used for landscape and aesthetics. It doesn't necessarily mean landscaping. It could be paint, rock, sculptures, hardscape, that kind of thing that doesn't require water.

Sandoval: And, is that the area in that big loop as you come down?

Malfabon: Yes.

Sandoval: And, the other thing I noticed and I was interested in your comment about the water is that, when we do get rain, I just recall a couple of years ago that there was a large volume of water that passes through that area. So, that will be accounted for. Last question is, that project has been completed for quite some time, why are we waiting until now to get it done?

Malfabon: Yes, when we built the—about four interchanges on south end of Reno, on 580, we didn't have that landscape and aesthetics policy in place. We've received comments from the public and from developers in that area saying, hey you did it over there, what about us. So, we've actually hired the landscape architects to design the improvements needed and we'll go from this interchange to the north to address the lack of aesthetics that are at those older interchanges.

Sandoval: Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Thank you Governor. Rudy, you mentioned the aesthetics component of this and I thought that the public art requirement would cover that. Are the dollars that are spent on the aesthetics here being credited to whatever our public art requirement is? How do these expenditures interact with those requirements?

Malfabon: I don't know about the public art requirement. This is more of an internal policy that you adopted for our interchanges or capacity type projects, which typically interchanges and addition of lanes and bridges. We do have occasionally some projects that actually are augmented with public art, such as the red kind of porcupine looking thing near the Meadow Wood Mall, that was not—

Sandoval: Did we pay for that Rudy?

Malfabon: No, that was public art. So, we didn't pay for that. I get a lot of comments about that, I say, that's not ours. But, it's art.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Knecht: The reason I ask, Governor and Mr. Malfabon is that, Rudy referenced some of the public art that tends the Carson City projects and I presumed that the various deer running amuck on the north end of town, the metal deer that is and the hawks and so forth and the cowboys riding and the trains and so forth, I presume all of that's covered by our public art requirement.

Malfabon: That's actually—well, NDOT installed those, but it's part of our landscape and aesthetics program too. So, we developed plans for each corridor of each major freeway and route, including the rural areas of the State, so that we can have certain themes that are reflective of the local community. That's why we have the rancher theme in Carson City. The sheep herder theme in other areas of the State. Railroad theme in Carson City. So, it is something that we do, not as a public art requirement, but because of the policy adopted years ago, under Governor Guinn, when he chaired the Board.

Knecht: Thank you Mr. Malfabon and thank you Governor.

Sandoval: Please proceed, Mr. Nellis.

Nellis: Thank you Governor. Again, for the record, Robert Nellis. Picking up on Item No. 2, a resurfacing project that's on State Route 823 in Lyon County. There were six bids and the Director awarded the contract to Sierra Nevada Construction in the amount of \$1,449,007. Finally, on this page, another resurfacing project, Item No. 3, on State Route 722, in Lander County, there were five bids and the Director awarded the contract to A&K Earthmovers in the amount of \$2,542,000. Governor, are there any questions from the Board regarding this first page before we move on to Page 5.

Sandoval: No questions.

Nellis: Picking up on Page 5. The fourth item at the top of the page in your packets is for a Maintenance Yard 925 in Independence Valley, Elko County for drainage improvements and to repave the maintenance yard. For your notes, this is related to Agreement 49, at the bottom of Page 18, where the septic tank needs to be replaced first before this project can move forward. There were three bids and the Director awarded the contract to Remington Construction Company in the amount of \$499,999.

The fifth item is on US-395 in Douglas County, for seismic retrofit, scour countermeasures and rehabilitation structures. The engineer's estimate is in the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

amount of \$1,582,882. There were three bids and the Director awarded the contract to Granite Construction Company in the amount of \$1,625,625.

The next is Item No. 6. This is the emergency contract that was referred to earlier in the Director's Report on US-395 in Washoe County to remove and replace a median barrier rail. There were two bids and the Director awarded the contract to Granite Construction Company in the amount of \$776,776.

Finally, Item No. 7, is on US-93 in Elko County for wildlife safety crossing. This is a state-funded contract. There were two bids and the Director awarded the contract to Remington Construction Company in the amount of \$2,177,777. Before moving on to Attachment B, are there any questions I may answer or direct to the appropriate person.

Sandoval: Yes, Mr. Nellis, on those Contracts 6 and 7, there were only two bidders. Do you know why—why didn't we have more?

Nellis: I could direct that to Assistant Director Terry, we'd like to get three as the minimum, there just weren't more than that.

Terry: Yes, again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. Yes, it is concerning when we only get two bids. I will note that Item 6 was an emergency contract put out in a very short period of time with very short durations that they had to do the work. So, a little bit of an unusual one, but—and again, No. 7, sometimes in the rural areas, which this is a rural area, we only got two bids, but you're right, we do not like seeing only two bids.

Sandoval: And, is Remington Construction Company a new entity?

Lee: Kevin Lee, District Engineer for District III. Remington Construction actually is a local company out of the Elko/Spring Creek area. So, they actually have a number of personnel that actually work for the likes of Frehner, and some of the other big contractors back in the day.

Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Item No. 6, the reason—one of the reasons we only had two contractors that submitted bids is they're the ones that had that type of equipment to do a slip for them, for the barrier rail. So, really, it just came down to those two but it was advertised for anybody that wanted to bid it.

Sandoval: And then, that damage was the result of a car accident, or the repair?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Dyson: Well, the barrier rail in question needed attention. Yes, the accident helped accelerate the emergency. It became very apparent to the Department, to us out in the field that we had to address it quickly before a larger vehicle hit it and go into the oncoming lanes.

Sandoval: And, this is a question for Mr. Gallagher, do we seek compensation if somebody's at fault for causing that damage?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel for the Board. Governor, yes we do, if it's called to our attention. A lot of times it will be referred to the Controller's Office for collection. And, they'll deal directly with, in a case like this, the driver's insurance company. Other times, when it can't be resolved that way, it is referred to the Attorney General's Office for collection proceedings.

Dyson: Governor, my staff out in the field, when there is property damage to the highway, whether it's a sign, barrier rail, guidepost, whatever, we fill out all the documents. We do what's called a Property Damage Report. If the person is apprehended by the police or there's an accident investigation and we have all the information, Mr. Gallagher is absolutely correct, we collect that money and it goes through the process of the tort claim—not tort claim, but it goes to the reimbursement and it comes back into the Highway Fund.

Sandoval: Board Members, any questions with regard to Contracts 4-7? Please proceed, Mr. Nellis.

Nellis: Thank you Governor. Again, for the record, Robert Nellis. There are 54 executed agreements under Attachment B that can be found on Pages 14-19 for the Board's information. Items 1-17 are inter-local agreements and acquisitions. 18-27 are appraisals and facility agreements. 28-35 are grant and right-of-way access agreements. Lastly, 36-54 are service provider agreements. I do have a couple of corrections for the Board, Governor. They can be found on Page 18 of 31. Items No. 44 and 47. In the notes, they refer to Project NEON, both on 44 and 47, that is incorrect. Project NEON needs to be stricken. In the case of Item 44, this is for Interstate 15, a design build project at Warm Springs. There will be no federal funding. So, we need to cross out in the federal funding column a yes and put a no in there. The same for Item No. 47, cross out the federal funding and put in a no there. This is an Ad America, inverse case. Both are within the proximity of Project NEON, so that may have created some confusion, but they are not related to Project NEON or Project Beyond as the last minutes stated.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

The only other item to refer to for your notes is, contract—or, I'm sorry, Item 49, which is Agreement No. 49, to replace the septic tank that refers to Contract No. 4. This is the agreement I was stating that needs to move forward first before Contract No. 4, could move forward.

With that, are there any questions I may answer or direct to someone else regarding any of these agreements?

Sandoval: Thank you, I'll begin on Contract 39 and perhaps this is a question for Mr. Gallagher. Will you provide a little more detail with the progress on the resolution of this Meadow Valley construction matter?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel for the Board. Governor, I would like to defer this to my colleague, Mr. Reid Kaiser, for an up to the minute report.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, Assistant Director of Operations. That agreement is kind of information wanted to get a third-party opinion dealing with the drilled shafts, which are the supports for the bridges on this project. And, just wanted to make sure that—we believe that the contractor is at fault, so we wanted to make sure that—the contractor thinks we're at fault, so we got a third-party and they're going to give us their opinion on whether—who they think is at fault, for the drill shafts.

Martin: Governor.

Sandoval: Yes, Mr. Martin.

Martin: Along those same lines, Reid, you and I talked about this when you were in my office the other day. This report that we were requesting, that's being paid jointly by Meadow Valley and the State of Nevada, or am I confused?

Kaiser: No, NDOT requested this, Meadow Valley was not part of the—will not be—did not request this report at all, it was only NDOT.

Martin: So, then the results of that study will be revealed only to NDOT?

Kaiser: Yes.

Martin: Okay. I had a question on one other item, Governor, if we could, unless you've got more on this—on the Meadow Valley. I too am—it's been nine months now trying to get this thing settled, so I'm rapidly running out of patience on that one.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: And, we will pay close attention to that. I guess I'll leave it at that.

Malfabon: Yes, just to add Governor and Member Martin. I did have a conversation with Robert Terril the President of Meadow Valley and he committed to getting the additional information that we've been requesting to us today. So, that will—with the addition of that report, which we told the consultant, we're paying you but don't be beholden to the Department just because we have the contract with you. We want to know what's a fair assessment of the facts here for the drill shaft, so with those two pieces of information coming in this week, we think that we can make some progress and further deliberation on that.

Sandoval: And, do we have a timeline, Rudy?

Malfabon: Once we receive all that information, I would think that we would be able to establish our position within 30 days.

Sandoval: And, when do you expect to get that information?

Malfabon: Well, the President of Meadow Valley said today, for the Meadow Valley information. We expect, probably in another week or two, for the consultant's report. So, probably two weeks for the consultant report and then within 30 days of that, we would have our position established.

Sandoval: Thank you. We'll move on to Contract No. 50. And, I just—it's probably my ignorance, but \$240,000 to clean up pigeon droppings?

Malfabon: Governor, I'll take this one. This is along the lines of the slides that you saw last month on the cleanup of encampments within our right-of-way. We have challenges with pigeons nesting in bridges and the girders. The pigeon droppings then get into the storm drain system and become water quality issues and public health issues. So, the pest control company that we hire puts in some of those pigeon spikes on the nesting areas, cleans out the areas and it helps us not only with the public health issue, but also the storm water program, for clean water compliance. This is a multi-year contract. We only pay them for what they actually perform, but that was the estimated amount of the agreement for, I think, two and a half years.

Sandoval: Member Savage.

Savage: Excuse me. Governor, this one has really got my hair up as well. \$240,000 from the private world. I'm sorry?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: Tom, or Member Skancke, said it's ruffled your feathers.

Savage: Yes, it has, but in all joking aside, it's a very serious matter. \$240,000, I mean, I got to believe that we can do this with in-house crews and I just question your team, Rudy, and I believe it'd be worthwhile to revisit this contract because of the overly excessive amount of dollars being spent, very serious matter in my mind. Thank you Governor.

Malfabon: Thank you, Member Savage. One of the things I want to point out—correction, it is about a year and a half contract, but we will definitely follow-up with direction from the Board to see if we can self-perform this in the future and try to minimize the amount of this contract.

Savage: Or, maybe even intervene with this contract, if we can perform—because I know we have the right as a Department to terminate a contract if it's in the best interest of the State of Nevada.

Malfabon: Yes.

Savage: Thank you, Governor. Thank you Rudy.

Sandoval: My next question is on Contract 53.

Nellis: Governor, I'll let Assistant Director, John Terry answer that one.

Sandoval: We don't know whether the quarry contains materials that include the asbestos, and that's what this contract is for?

Terry: Again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. I forget the exact month where we made the presentation, it was a few months back, about this and this is really what we said we were going to do. This is to test quarries that are not related to the Boulder City project, for asbestos, so that we can use them on other projects in the Las Vegas Valley. So, I do not know of any test results that have come back under this contract, but I do know we have started using this contract to write special provisions for contracts moving forward in this area. So, this is to test areas that are not part of Boulder City, that are contractors currently have going and like you stated, material sources in order to keep these moving forward.

Sandoval: No, and I—you know, this has been an ongoing issue, but I want to make sure it's clear. It's very important we do this for public health and safety. That way we are not bringing—this will clarify, once and for all, regardless of the project, in

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Southern Nevada, that we'll know going in that any material that's brought in won't include that, assuming they don't find anything.

Terry: And again, this is the stopgap contract. We said we would do this amendment to Tetra Tech, to keep these projects going, and the bigger one which I believe is, out on the street, to carry us for the next couple years, statewide, it is proceeding as well. So, we said we would do this one, amend Tetra Tech, to keep us going and to test these sources and the bigger contract to cover us more statewide is out there and we are proceeding with like we said we would.

Sandoval: And, I don't know how much we have invested on this issue, but hopefully the day is not far that we will know exactly where all materials are that would include asbestos so we won't have to get into a project or a contract like this to figure this issue out once this is completed?

Terry: We hope so. We'll see what the testing shows.

Sandoval: And, do you know off the top of your head how much we have all in with regard to this airborne asbestos issue?

Terry: We presented and gave a total number a few months back, I don't remember what that was off the top, but I could pull out the minutes from that meeting.

Sandoval: Ballpark figure? \$3M? \$4M? Maybe more?

Terry: Yes. Because we counted what we estimated, both the design builder and the design bid build contract on Boulder City would've added to their bids in addition to what we have already spent. We haven't spent over \$3M. But, if you add in what we think they had to add to their bid for it, it was millions. And, I'll follow-up with that, it was in that last presentation.

Sandoval: Right, thank you. Any other questions with regards to Contract 53?

Savage: Yes.

Sandoval: Member Savage.

Savage: Yes, Governor, thank you. Mr. Terry, if you could remind me please, I thought that the Department was going to go after federal reimbursement funds for this Tetra Tech work and it denotes a no for federal funds. If you could please remind me where we stand there?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

- Terry: Yes, back when we procured Tetra Tech, we had this discussion with the Board that we didn't fully follow the federal process because we wanted to get this out quickly and the part that we didn't follow in the federal process which is what we sort of pre-selected the ones we wanted to send this out to because they had this experience and we felt that would accelerate it. That made it and all amendments to that ineligible for federal funding. So, we did intentionally do it that way in order to accelerate it.
- Savage: Yes, I remember that, but I also thought that there was a discussion that we were going to attempt retrieval of those funds and maybe that's not the case.
- Terry: I have no knowledge of us doing that.
- Savage: Okay. Thank you Mr. Terry, thank you Governor.
- Sandoval: I'll move to Mr. Martin, you had additional questions?
- Martin: Yes sir, on Items 10 and 11, flush investments. We're paying a protective rent sum of \$15,000 and I get that, you explained that to us before, but the very next item is, it would appear that we're authorizing the payment of \$316,000 to buy the property. So, we're paying the rent going forward and we're buying it at the same time? And then, I have another question about some of the other acquisitions down here.
- Nellis: We'll have our Chief of Right-of-Way, Paul Saucedo, answer that question for you sir.
- Saucedo: Yes, for the record, Paul Saucedo, Chief Right-of-Way Agent. Member Martin, yeah, we did enter into an agreement with the property owner to purchase the property. There was an extended time of vacancy that he had experienced because of a relocation of a tenant and so we agreed to go ahead and pay for that separate, that was before we actually got the agreement for the settlement. Typically, we could've handled it under one agreement, but because we hadn't reached that agreement yet, we went ahead and handled it as a typical protective rent agreement.
- Martin: Okay, thank you. And, where are we with the—I noticed there's several parcels here, being acquired. Are most of these on what would be the west side of Interstate 15?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

- Saucedo: I believe so. For these in here, we're—that's true. Most of these are on the west side. They're residential, multi-family, some commercial. Yes sir.
- Martin: Okay, thank you.
- Sandoval: Any further questions Mr. Martin?
- Martin: No sir, not at this time.
- Sandoval: Questions from Northern Nevada? Member Savage.
- Savage: Thank you Governor. Just one other question that has not been addressed, would be Line Item 36, the funding to AGC, I don't recall that in the past, maybe we have, I just want clarity on this, if we have provided funding to AGC South or AGC North in the past, on issues?
- Malfabon: Rudy Malfabon, for the record. So, we benefited from AGC's year round training to Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, the minority contractors and women owned contractors. So, we've partnered with them to use funds to train these DBEs. Our goal is really to enlarge the pool of DBEs available to our contractors. It's a very limited pool currently and we saw that AGC gives very practical educational opportunities throughout the year. They repeat classes periodically. So, we've partnered with them to have them deliver the training to these subcontractors.
- Savage: Thank you Rudy and I'm not being critical for the training for the DBE and the SBE, I know that's critical for the Department. I was just not aware of having us fund the different AGCs. Have we done that in the past?
- Malfabon: In the past, we would set up our own, hire a consultant and deliver the same type of training. We felt that that was not cost effective when there's good training already available through the AGC, the same type of training that we want to deliver. It didn't make sense for us to create our own training program when there's one there that is beneficial and available.
- Savage: Okay. That answers—again, I'm glad to see the Department pursuing the DBE and the SBE funding, so thank you Governor.
- Sandoval: And, if I may follow-up on that because it begs the question, are we paying for something that was being provided anyway?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

- Malfabon:** What we're paying for Governor is the—the smaller businesses that may not have typically taken that training, we're offering to pay for them to take the training. Get involved in our DBE program and enlarge the pool of subcontractors available to our prime contractors under that program.
- Sandoval:** So, in other words, are we scholarshipping small businesses to be able to attend the AGC training?
- Malfabon:** In effect, that's what we're doing, instead of setting up our own training program.
- Sandoval:** So, do we follow-up to make sure that the Southern Nevada AGC isn't billing those that attend?
- Malfabon:** They do bill the ones that attend that are normal AGC members that are not involved in our type of work. So, if they're a DBE that does highway work, then they coordinate with us and we tell them about the opportunities for training through the AGC. So, we collaborate with the AGC, but we determine and preapprove those firms getting that training. So, it's not just a flood gate open to anyone, all takers. It's someone that has to be doing work on our type of projects.
- Sandoval:** No, and I get that. I think the policy is good. I just want to make sure that we're not supplanting a regular budget item, that we are enhancing the ability for more individuals or entities to attend.
- Malfabon:** Yes, that's what we're doing.
- Sandoval:** Okay.
- Savage:** Just to be clear, so AGC is not collecting fees for this training. And, not reimbursing the Department, that's where I need clarity, I'm sorry.
- Malfabon:** Our agreement is with the AGC, so we pay them to offer the training to the DBEs. Since the training is offered year round, it's for multiple opportunities, repeats of the same classes throughout the year. And, we get out there and communicate with companies and try to get them engaged in attending the training so that they can be knowledgeable before they get on to an NDOT project as a new subcontractor.
- Savage:** And, I understand the philosophy and the strategy and I commend that, I just want to ensure that there's no double collection here from the AGC.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Malfabon: No, they don't—

Savage: That's my concern.

Malfabon: They don't double collect.

Savage: They don't collect, okay. Thank you Governor, thank you Rudy.

Sandoval: Member Skancke.

Skancke: Thank you Governor. On that same item, is there an opportunity for a cost savings here? If we partner with these types of organizations, is the Department actually saving money by not having to put a contract out to bid and not having to have staff time oversee these types of efforts, to increase this DBE/SBE participation?

Malfabon: Definitely Member Skancke, that's a good point, as it would cost us a lot more than \$75,000 a year to set up this type of program and administer it separately as our own training program. So, it's definitely a cost savings to take this approach.

Skancke: Just if I could Governor, follow-up to Member Savage's point. If there's some type of accounting or some type of—let me just say, accountability so that there isn't double dipping, not that there's going to be, but I think it's important for us as a public agency and a Board that oversees that to make sure that there's some type of accountability in place that, you know, accidents do happen and in accounting procedures there are mistakes, but I don't think we want to open up the door for us to have any type of exposure to that type of mistake. So, if there's some type of accountability measure we can put in place that Ron's not paying AGC and being sponsored by NDOT and if that, in my mind, if that happens like three or four times and it's a problem, once I get but if it's repeated, then I think we need to have some type of performance measurement so that we as an agency have that accountability.

Malfabon: We'll follow-up with that Member Skancke and the Board.

Sandoval: Other questions from Board Members? Anything else Mr. Nellis?

Nellis: Governor, there was Attachment C and then we'll be done with this Agenda Item. Again, for the record, Robert Nellis. There are two eminent domain settlements that can be found under Attachment C on Page 21 of 31 for the Board's information.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Line Item No. 1 is in the amount of \$8,000 for a temporary easement adjacent to South McCarran Boulevard in the City of Reno for the South McCarran Widening Project.

Line Item No. 2 is the amount of \$2,990,000 for acquisition of vacant land fronting Warm Springs Road, for the widening of Interstate 15 and Warm Springs Road Project.

Governor, that does conclude Agenda Item No. 5. Questions on these items may be directed to Mr. Gallagher on either of these settlements.

Sandoval: Controller has a question.

Knecht: Thank you Governor. Mr. Gallagher, Governor, Mr. Malfabon, anyone who wants to answer, considering that \$8,000 item. Do we have a lower limit threshold that distinguishes what comes to this Board in the way of settlements for—well, this is information, but is there any range of settlements that the administration of NDOT is empowered to make on its own, or? I just wonder about the utility of including that in this meeting and in the materials.

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel for the Board. This particular item was presented to the Board, as you noted, for informational purposes, as it was a settlement of a claim against the State. It was presented to the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners currently has a policy for tort claims; they've delegated the authority on tort claims to the Tort Manager in the Attorney General's Office, of claims under \$100,000, which are then reported annually to the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners has not yet delegated to the Department similar settlement authority. I will note though, that what we take to the Board of Examiners are matters that have involved actual litigation. So, once the litigation is filed, it goes to the Board of Examiners. The Department in the Right-of-Way section, does have the ability, under NDOT's own policies to enter into administrative settlements. I don't know if Paul would like to elaborate on that.

Saucedo: Yes, for the record, Paul Saucedo, Chief Right-of-Way Agent. Mr. Gallagher is correct, we do have an administrative settlement process that we go through. And, if we have support for that kind of a settlement, whether it's appraisal or sales or something to indicate that that is a supportable amount, we do try to get those through our administrative process if at all possible.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Knecht: Thank you both and Governor, my point, I think was well answered by Mr. Gallagher that these small things can be aggregated and reported, that's important that there be some public sunshine but I just don't know that they rise to, in every event, to the level of an item on our agenda, but I was more curious than anything what our procedure is and what the thresholds are. Thanks.

Martin: I have one question please.

Sandoval: Member Martin.

Martin: On the matter of the \$8,000 settlement, I went further ahead in the Agenda. It seems that we have spent \$111,000, unless I'm misreading the legal piece of the Agenda. We've spent \$111,000 in legal fees, settling this \$8,000 case, am I correct or incorrect, Dennis?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher. Mr. Martin, all of the McCarran Widening Project matters are under one contract, so that \$111,000 reflects probably a half dozen to eight lawsuits that are filed there. So, it's not directly all attributable to this claim.

Martin: Thank you sir. Because the information on the back side of the agenda refers directly to these two individuals, the Jensens. That's why I was questioning if we had actually spent the \$111,000 on the Jensens.

Sandoval: So, the answer to the question is no.

Gallagher: Correct Governor.

Sandoval: Yeah, okay.

Martin: Got it, thank you.

Sandoval: Any other questions, Board Members, with regard to Agenda Item No. 5? If there are none, thank you Mr. Nellis, we'll move on to Agenda Item No. 6, which is Condemnation Resolution No. 450.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor, Rudy Malfabon, for the record. So, on Project NEON, you'll be seeing a lot more of these condemnation resolutions where we make an offer of settlement to the property owner. If they choose to not respond or to not have an acceptable counteroffer, then we bring it to the Board, in order to maintain the timelines for acquisition of the properties, for our design build

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

contract on Project NEON. We made an offer of roughly \$309,000 for this residential property, for the land and improvements and a temporary easement. So, we're at an impasse. We just want to maintain the schedule for the project and we request approval of the condemnation resolution associated with this parcel.

Sandoval: Thank you Mr. Director. Board Members, any questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 6? If there are none, the Chair will accept a motion to approve Condemnation Resolution No. 450, as presented in Agenda Item No. 6.

Martin: So moved.

Skanccke: So moved.

Sandoval: Member Martin has moved for approval. Member Skanccke has seconded the motion, any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Oppose, no. That motion passes. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 7, another resolution of relinquishment.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor and Board Members. This is for a parcel of land along Mount Rose Highway in Washoe County. You may recognize it as the access point for a Park-and-Ride lot. It's adjacent to Mount Rose Highway. The parking spaces for that lot, we've had conversations with the developer and interested parties that want to expand that mall. So, the Park-and-Ride lot will remain within that area to serve the folks that park at the base of Mount Rose Highway and travel up the highway. So, this is just to relinquish the property and City of Reno consented to take this property. Pretty much, I'm available to answer any questions and we have Paul Saucedo as well.

Sandoval: Questions from Board Members? If there are none, the Chair will accept a motion to approve the Resolution of Relinquishment as described in Agenda Item No. 7.

Knecht: So moved.

Hutchison: So moved.

Sandoval: The Controller has moved for approval, Lieutenant Governor has seconded the motion. Any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Oppose, no. That motion passes. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 8, another resolution of relinquishment.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

- Malfabon: Thank you Governor and Board Members. This is for relinquishment of a parcel that's near the West Wendover Welcome Center, it's the parking area there. We received it from the BLM years ago, in 1948 and the City of West Wendover has requested and consented to a resolution in May of this year. The transfer will benefit the Department with the elimination of all liability and future maintenance responsibilities for this parking area.
- Sandoval: Rudy, I do have a question on this one. It says, we have an easement interest that we're relinquishing.
- Malfabon: Yes.
- Sandoval: And, there are a significant amount of improvements on that property, were those improvements paid for by the State?
- Malfabon: I believe that we installed them. Kevin Lee might be able to answer some questions about what's going to be happening with the property in the future.
- Kevin Lee: Kevin Lee, District Engineer for District III. It's really the Welcome Center, which includes the parking for the Welcome Center and some park facility that's adjacent to it. And, what the City of West Wendover wants to do is continue to be a Welcome Center, as well as, they want a transportation hub for some of their buses. So, they plan on building some bus stops and some shelters there for some of that as well. So, it will always be a Welcome Center, until we ever build a new one in the future, on that part of the State, which I'm not sure if one is planned in the future, but they plan on some multi-mobile transportation issues to address there as well.
- Sandoval: I guess I should be a little more specific. So, did we, we being the State, NDOT, pay for the Welcome Center and the parking area?
- Kevin Lee: We as a State—it was either State or Federal money back in the, I'm going to say the 80s, mid-80s, I think it was, that that was originally installed.
- Sandoval: And, have we, we being the State, paid for the maintenance since then?
- Kevin Lee: Yes. And actually, the agreement with West Wendover ends at the end of this month because we paid them to maintain it for us.
- Sandoval: So, by virtue of this resolution, are we giving them all these improvements?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Kevin Lee: Yes, we are. We're giving them everything.

Sandoval: And, what's the value of that?

Kevin Lee: I wouldn't know the value. All I can tell you is, right now, it's in need of an HVAC upgrade, which is in maybe the \$50,000 range as well as a new roof. So, we're actually giving up some liability as well.

Sandoval: But we paid for a building and a parking lot. I mean, we don't normally give this significant amount of improvements away.

Malfabon: It will still be operated as a Welcome Center, Kevin?

Kevin Lee: Kevin Lee, District Engineer, again. As part of the agreement with West Wendover, they will continue to run that as a Welcome Center for the State, as well as, West Wendover itself.

Saucedo: Paul Saucedo, Chief Right-of-Way Agent, for the record. Governor, under the relinquishment rules, as long as the local public agency is going to use it for a public use, we are allowed to do that under that law, but whether we want to do it or not is the question.

Sandoval: Well, it sets an interesting precedent here. And, I'm not aware of us doing this before. Or, I don't recall, I should put it that way.

Saucedo: Yeah, I can't recall of one that may have gone to this Board, to be honest with you, it doesn't come to my mind, but—yeah. We could research it and see if we had something, but I'm just drawing a blank at this point.

Malfabon: We have relinquished property, not a Welcome Center, but was used for a public purpose and it continued to be used for the local agency as a public purpose and it—we have language that says, if they don't use it for a public purpose, it reverts back to the Department. Would that be the case with this one?

Saucedo: It wouldn't because it's an easement area that we own an easement in. So, it's not a fee ownership type situation. If it was a fee ownership then that language usually is in the agreement.

Sandoval: I can only speak for me. I'd like to have a little better idea what we're relinquishing here. The value of it.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Saucedo: We can get some pictures and have an appraiser look at it and maybe give us an idea of what kind of value we have sitting there and look at the cost to upgrade it and things of that nature, included in that analysis. That's something we could do.

Sandoval: Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Thank you Governor. And your last comment I think captures most of what I was going to say. When we get an item like this, what would be helpful to me is to have an expressed statement of roughly estimated asset value and roughly estimated liability amounts. It's not that we wouldn't give away some value in certain cases to another public agency, to a local government agency, we might well do that under the facts of the case, but I think the record should be complete that we considered it expressly what the financial values on both sides were and that we were informed at the time. Thank you.

Sandoval: Any other questions or comments with regard to Agenda Item No. 8? Member Skancke.

Martin: I have one sir.

Sandoval: I'll go with Mr. Martin and then Member Skancke.

Martin: Thank you. What do we pay the City of West Wendover annually for maintaining this station?

Kevin Lee: Excuse me, I missed the question.

Martin: How much do we pay the City of West Wendover annually to maintain this Welcome Center?

Kevin Lee: I would be guessing, Frank, I apologize. I know that we had roughly \$14,000 left on the agreement and we used a lot of that to repair the plumbing that was going bad in it, here this last month. So, I'd have to get—we could probably get that information by the end of the Board Meeting though.

Martin: Thank you.

Sandoval: Mr. Skancke.

Skancke: Thank you Governor. If it would please the Chair and the Board, I think before—in my opinion at least, I'm not comfortable moving forward with this item until

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

we have all the financial data in front of us. And so, if we could move this—hold this item until next month and if we could have the value of the property and the assets and then take a look at what do we gain. I think the Controller and the Governor both made very good points. The Governor's point on this is setting a precedent, at least in the eyes of this Board. And, I think to the Controller's point of having some type of an idea of what this is worth is really important for us. So, I would, Governor, if it pleases the Chair, I would make a motion to hold this item until the September Board Meeting, until we have all of that information available to us so that we can make an educated—a fiscally responsible decision.

Knecht: Second.

Sandoval: Thank you Member Skancke. Member Skancke has made the motion to continue Agenda Item No. 8 until the next meeting of the Board in September. The Controller has seconded the motion. Any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Oppose, no. That motion passes. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 9, Approval of Equipment in Excess of \$50,000.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor. We have Kenny Lee, Head of our Equipment Division, to be assisted by Kevin from District III to talk about equipment. We have three items I wanted to clarify. So, we have fleet replacement is, our legislative request includes fleet replacement and then when we're not replacing and we're actually asking for new additions to the fleet, that's a separate request to the Legislature in our budget that was approved. So, you have the next tab in your binder has additions to the fleet. Then we had a budget amendment during the last legislative session for our storm water program. So, that equipment is additions to the fleet as well, but it was a special request as a budget amendment to the Legislature and was approved. So, we have three items that are equipment related and if it's the pleasure of the Board, we can cover the three and take questions as we go through the presentations and then we can have action on all three or you can have action individually, whatever the Board's pleasure is.

Sandoval: Why don't we go ahead and take all those agenda items at once.

Kenny Lee: All right. For the record, Kenny Lee, Equipment Superintendent. I'm here today to request your approval for the replacement of vehicles which exceed \$50,000 in cost. Down there at the bottom—oh, you have corrected that, okay. We have a total cost of \$5,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2016. This is a partial list of our

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

replacement criteria for the replacement of our equipment. This should be in your packet there.

NDOT has 80 classes of equipment within the fleet. These are some examples of this request; these would be what we consider our Class 1, which is a sedan. A Class 1A which is an SUV of some type. Class 3 which is a 3/4 ton pick-up, which can be numerous configurations. Class 5 which is a 1/2 ton pick-up, there again in numerous configurations. Our Class 10 and 11 are medium duty pick-ups, those can include dump beds, flat racks, a number of different ones. Our Class 12 are our single axle dump trucks, they're the smaller ones. Generally used around town and that. Class 13 are tandem axle dump trucks which are basically the work horse of the Department. Our Class 15 are an all-wheel drive dump truck, or a lot of them are configured solely as a sander and plow which are used up on Mount Rose, Mount Charleston and other regions like that. Class 21, which are small self-propelled brooms. Class 24 which is our street sweepers. These street sweepers also can be used in conjunction with our storm water projects. Class 25 which is a water truck. That also can be used in conjunction with storm water equipment projects. Class 41 which is a rotary mower which is used to mow the different right-of-ways and that. Class 54 is a tractor, which is used to pull that mower. Class 54A is a skid steer, which can also be used with the storm water projects. Class 54B is a backhoe, there again, that again can be used with the storm water projects. Transport trailer, these are used to transport, oh our excavators and different things like that, used by Materials and Testing when they're digging a test pit, or just to move equipment from one end of the State to the other. We have our programmable message boards which are put up on the highway to alert the traveling public to things ahead of them. This is our Lab Trailer, this is what the construction crews use when they're doing testing on the materials for the project. The asphalt, road base and different items like this.

This is a list of vehicles that we're proposing to replace for District I, which would be Las Vegas. The items in the, somewhat of an orange color down there, would be ones that we would want to get if we did have a cost savings amongst the others. There again, District II, same thing there, if there was cost savings, we'd look at the other two items down below. District III, same thing there. They've only got a few items. I think there's another on the other page. Nope, and this is actually for the Headquarters Division here as well as the construction crews and the Equipment Division.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

These are the different classes that we're requesting to replace right now. And, there again, if you have questions on these here.

Sandoval: I have a few, but what is the specific criteria with regard to mileage and age?

Kenny Lee: Mileage and age, it depends on what class of vehicle it is. If we go back in there, I believe a car is, geez, I'd have to look for sure, but I believe it's a 150,000 miles on it now. The larger dump trucks, the older ones were 200,000 and the newer ones are up to 250,000 with 12 years on them.

Sandoval: And, do we surplus those trucks out?

Kenny Lee: Yes, we do. We take those trucks, we take them to State Purchasing where they hold them in their lot there for anywhere from 4-6 months, generally. Then after that, they are—if no one picks them up, say one of the counties or whoever, they're taken out to the auction that they hold out there at the parkway and they're auctioned off by TNT Auctions. The money comes back to the General Fund.

Sandoval: And, when you say, we hold them for 4-6 months for other governmental entities—

Kenny Lee: Right.

Sandoval: --do they purchase those?

Kenny Lee: Yes, they do. When we take them over there, we put an estimated value on those vehicles. That's just going historically, what they've sold for for the past few years. If Accounting does want to go over there and purchase one, or that they feel it's too high, they can come back and talk to us and we can readjust that cost on that to help them out. We've had Pershing County purchase a number of those, quite a few of their dump trucks are ones that were excessed by us.

Sandoval: And, that does beg the question that if they can buy them and continue to use them, why don't we continue to use them?

Kenny Lee: We have started a rebuild program on the Class 13, back in 2008. The problem we're starting to have now is that the trucks are getting obsolete. We can no longer get cab replacement parts. Certain engines, they no longer make or remanufacture. We would have to take ours out and send it in to have them do that. There are drivetrain components we can no longer get. So, it's getting to the point that the older vehicles are getting very hard to maintain.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: So, why would they want them?

Kenny Lee: They do not put near the miles on them that we would. For them, they might use them around town or on some of their other roads like when they'll go plow out by Rye Patch Dam, certain things like that that they have out there that they do.

Sandoval: And then, my final question, at least on this item is the sweeper. I don't remember how long ago it was, but it feels like we just bought some. Is this just another one in the fleet that has reached that time and age?

Kenny Lee: Yes, it is. The ones you're talking about were previously purchased through a CMAQ funds as an addition to the fleet. And, these are just ones that have reached the point that they need to be replaced. The maintenance cost on them is quite extreme and we're having to replace quite a few parts.

Sandoval: Okay, Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Thank you Governor. Pointing your attention to the last table of Attachment 3, where the first half of that table is four-door sedans, I see about three of those that have reached the 150,000 threshold and some of them as low as 51,000, etc. Obviously there are a difference in ages and that sort of thing, but can you tell me why we would be replacing a vehicle with 51,000 miles? Well, that one is 18 years old, but some others here, 10 years old, etc. What's the rule or the logic that—

Kenny Lee: Well, I know some of those are very unreliable. We use these as loaner cars for either the Headquarters here, or a lot of these are out of the Equipment Division, they're in Sparks. They're used as loaners for people flying in and need to go somewhere. Those there, they cannot be depended on to take you much of anywhere other than around town. And, they're old enough that they're no longer making certain replacement parts for them. If we damage a window crank or an interior panel, we cannot buy those any more to repair that vehicle.

Knecht: Okay. So, there's one unit of each of these and you're making an informed unit specific inspection and making a judgement on each of those?

Kenny Lee: Yes.

Knecht: And the same would be true for the trucks at the bottom?

Kenny Lee: Yes, you're talking about the pick-ups and that?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Knecht: Yes.

Kenny Lee: Yes.

Knecht: And, for that matter, there aren't as many on the District I, II and III list, but there—it would be the same principle, the same process there.

Kenny Lee: Yes, it is. And, we go out once a year and inspect every vehicle that we have. Then we have that person come back and make a report as to the condition of that vehicle and what that vehicle may need as far as repairs or other items in that respect.

Knecht: Okay. Thank you, that satisfies my question, Governor.

Sandoval: Member Savage.

Savage: Thank you Governor. Mr. Lee, just a quick question on funding. I'm not real clear, this \$1,500,000 that's in front of us today for this fleet replacement, is that coming out of the 2015 or the 2016?

Kenny Lee: This will be 2016 and that should be \$5,000,000.

Kevin Lee: Kevin Lee, if I could just apologize on the Board Memo, that's an error, it should be \$5,000,000 on that last sentence. That was a carryover from February's Board Meeting. So, it should be \$5,000,000.

Savage: So, it's \$5,000,000 for the 2016 Fiscal Year.

Kevin Lee: That is correct.

Kenny Lee: Yes.

Savage: By the Legislature, but what's in front of us today for this fleet replacement is \$1,500,000, with my math, just in this Section No. 9.

Malfabon: Rudy Malfabon for the record. I added them up, Member Savage and I had about \$1,250,000 for District I. District II was the same, and District III a little bit over \$1,250,000. Then the Headquarters and the construction crews was \$1,147,000, for a total of about \$4,900,000. So, it was close to the \$5,000,000. As Kenny Lee indicated, there are some additional—there's savings on the individual purchases. They would like to get those additional line items that are in orange.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Kenny Lee: What it was, we were authorized \$5,000,000 for FY '16, and what we did, we split that up to \$1,250,000 per District. So, the three districts and then the Headquarters and Equipment Division.

Savage: Okay. So, this purchase is for 2016, not 2015?

Kenny Lee: Yes.

Savage: Okay, thank you. That's all I have. Thank you Rudy, thank you Governor.

Sandoval: Any other questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 9? Just one last one for me. Are there any high mileage aged vehicles that are running well that you've kept?

Kenny Lee: Yes, there are.

Sandoval: Okay.

Kenny Lee: Even with our equipment rebuild program, a lot of times we will rebuild the truck, ask the District to replace one that shows it has high mileage, but they may have another one that has lower mileage that's in far worse condition. So, we will retain the one with high mileage and replace the one with the lower that has all the problems. So, we've done that in the past.

Sandoval: The only reason I ask that question is because I think it's important for the record that it's not this 100% replacement, that we do essentially exhaust, no pun intended, every vehicle and get everything out of them that we can.

Kenny Lee: Right, we do. And, that was part of why we started the rebuild program, was back when we couldn't purchase.

Malfabon: District Engineer, Thor Dyson has a comment—but, Kevin was showing me statistics that show that this \$5,000,000 purchase of replacement equipment, although very substantial, was a very small percentage of the fleet that's eligible for replacement. So, I don't know, Thor, if you want to comment.

Dyson: Governor, Thor Dyson, District II Engineer, one real quick comment to yours or your question. The Reno area had a couple of garbage trucks that we use 24 hours a day, seven days a week, throughout the year. They had over 560,000 miles and we didn't want to give it up because it was running pretty well. So, I just wanted to state that.

Sandoval: Is that a State record?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: 560,000 miles. Wow. All right. Let's move to—does that complete the presentation on No. 9?

Kenny Lee: Yes, it does.

Sandoval: Why don't I go ahead and just take a motion on that. Any further questions from Board Members on Agenda Item No. 9. If there are none, the Chair will accept a motion for approval of equipment purchases described in that Agenda Item.

Skanche: Move to approve.

Sandoval: Member Skanche has moved for approval.

Martin: Second.

Sandoval: Member Martin has seconded the motion. Any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Mr. Lieutenant Governor, are you still on the line?

Hutchison: I am, yes, that was an aye.

Sandoval: Thank you, I just want to make sure that you're on the record for having voted.

Hutchison: Yes, I am, thank you.

Sandoval: Let's move to Agenda Item No. 10.

Kevin Lee: Kevin Lee, District Engineer for District III.

Sandoval: Mr. Lee, can I ask you to speak up, just a little bit?

Kevin Lee: I'm sorry, yeah. Kevin Lee, District Engineer for District III. As Rudy mentioned, this would be an addition to the fleet. And, as mentioned in the 2016 Legislature, they approved \$1,300,000 for additions the fleet. And of those there are some sweepers, culvert cleaner and one item that is not on this request right now is the High Speed Profilograph which is an attachment which we'll have to take before the Board at a later date.

To just give you an idea, there would be three sweepers, a culvert cleaner truck and two tow plows for District III. This will just give you an idea what a PM-10 Sweeper looks like. This one happens to be an Elgin. This doesn't mean exactly what we're buying, but just to give you an idea. A culvert cleaner truck—and I'll go over some of our issues with the amount of money we have in there for this

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

one. And then, the tow plows which we brought before the Board on other occasions. There would be two more for District III in this. Just to give you an idea, this is a picture of a tow plow, for Board Members that haven't seen what a tow plow looks like. This is District III's.

Then the cost benefit analysis are shown on Attachment 2. Just one corrective note, I updated the cost on the tow plow in the Board Packet. I think it had \$100,000 instead of \$115,000 and that brought our costs from a negative number to a positive number; from I think it was a negative \$6.00, to a positive \$7.00. So, the more we use these units, the more they pay for themselves.

Any questions? What I'd like to note is the culvert cleaner, we only have \$250,000 and that is not enough to buy a culvert cleaner. We're hoping that some savings in the environmental program or the other fleet replacement, if we can use that money towards this, that's what we're going to be researching. They're closer to \$420,000. You can buy what I pictured in here, is just a DI Cleaner, it doesn't have some of the high pressure wash capabilities but it's still going to be more than the \$250,000.

Sandoval: Why are we short on that one?

Kevin Lee: Originally, I'm doing a little bit of guessing here, but originally when District I put in for that culvert cleaner, they put in \$250,000 and they didn't check on the cost. It was just a guesstimate at that point and then it got through the process and we're here today.

Sandoval: That's not going to undermine any of our EPA storm water efforts, is it?

Malfabon: No, Governor. We'll continue to acquire those trucks for our storm water program, those cleaner trucks. And, hopefully as Kevin Lee indicated, we'll have the savings that will offset that increase in the actual cost of that piece of equipment.

Sandoval: And, on those trailer plows, part of—I recall when we purchased them, perhaps it was a couple of years ago?

Kevin Lee: Actually, just to refresh your memory, we had one probably three to four years ago and we went before the Board last May, those are in Reno right now. We actually haven't put the next two into service yet. So, that means we have two in service, two ready to be put in service and then we'll have two more coming.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: I don't even know if we had an opportunity to use them, given the winter we just had.

Kevin Lee: Last year, we had minimal hours on ours in District III, but we're still trying to use them as much as we can and hopefully, I guess you don't pray for snow—

Sandoval: Oh, yes we do.

Kevin Lee: In this case, yes we do.

Sandoval: Yes, we do. I'm just curious because part of the policy of buying those is that we didn't have to buy the big trucks because they were more efficient. We just really haven't had an opportunity to see if that has proven out.

Kevin Lee: What we have determined in using ours, we need to go to a higher horsepower truck, which in our May request last year, we actually put trucks on there. They're going to be built and hopefully have them and put them in service this December, to try them on some of our summits. What we've found is the lower horsepower trucks, we couldn't pull the summits as quickly as we'd want to. So, we're still learning as we go.

Sandoval: Fair enough. Questions from other Board Members, Member Skancke and then the Controller.

Skancke: Thank you Governor. You mentioned—and this is kind of a, not just for you, but maybe globally on equipment, I just had a thought. On the PM-10 Sweepers, maybe even statewide, is this the newest technology that's available, if we acquire these, based upon the new EPA regulations coming from the administration on transportation funding? The reason why I ask the question is, if those regulations are implemented and we're using old technology, I'd hate to have you come back before this group and say, well, that's all changed. Now, this may be the most recent and the new regs are going to change it, but I think we need to be cognizant if there's going to be massive changes, like should we wait and find out what happens or do we need to do this right away?

Kenny Lee: Kenny Lee, Equipment Superintendent. This is the latest and greatest on the requirements for sweepers. It is a PM-10. We've talked to the manufacturers, there's nothing out there that they're aware of to get this down to a finer particular matter on these. So, these would be what is the newest technology for that.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

- Skanske: Thank you, and Governor, if I could just follow-up with Rudy, just out of curiosity, have we done an analysis yet on the new regulations for EPA? The only reason why I ask is, if we've not done an internal analysis and those new regulations are going to affect our ability to make these investments, I don't want to hold it off, but if they're going to have an adverse effect on our decision today, I'd rather hold this, have the analysis and come back and say, we've got to do—it's $X + 1$, or $X - 1$. These new regs are, from what I've read, are to say the least, interesting.
- Malfabon: In response to Member Skanske, I haven't seen an analysis. I'm aware that the sweepers, because of all the moving parts in them, they wear out quickly. They unfortunately don't last much more than five or six years and then they're on the downline quite often. So, we do need these sweepers, but we will ask the Environmental Air Quality group to look into those—the PM 2.5 Regulations that are coming.
- Skanske: Thank you. I support this. You need to have equipment and we've got to run a Department. I just want to make sure that we're not putting the cart before the horse with what's going on in Washington DC, because those unfunded mandates cost us money to play catch-up in a year or two and technology changes and regulations change, and I'd rather have us be ahead of the game than behind. Thank you, thank you Governor.
- Sandoval: Mr. Controller.
- Knecht: Thank you Governor, and I agree with Mr. Skanske said. Only other comment I'll make is, please don't make any comments about my age, but I had my coin collector's magnifying glass here and I still can't read this. In the future, can we— We're not going there. In the future, can the cost benefit analysis be accessible to all of us.
- Malfabon: Yes sir, will do so.
- Knecht: Those who have hair and those who don't.
- Malfabon: Mr. Controller, we will do so. I take offense too, Tom. So.
- Sandoval: Any other questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 10? I have one more question and it would apply to all of these equipment purchases. Do we use in-state vendors, if at all possible?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Kenny Lee: For the record, Kenny Lee, Equipment Superintendent. Yes, we do. When they are available. Generally these sweepers are not. The dealer for most of them come out of California. There are certain ones that are in Nevada and for the most part, most all of our equipment comes from a Nevada dealer.

Sandoval: All right, thank you. Any other questions on Agenda Item No. 10? If there are none, the Chair will accept a motion for approval.

Knecht: So moved.

Sandoval: Controller has moved for approval.

Martin: Second.

Sandoval: Mr. Martin has seconded the motion. Any questions or discussion? All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Oppose, no. That motion passes. We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 11.

Kevin Lee: Again, Governor, Transportation Board, Kevin Lee, District Engineer for District III. This would be the new equipment for the Environmental Program, or the amendment that was in the Legislature for our budget. In this is approximately \$4,900,000 to \$5,300,000, what was approved in the budget is the \$5,300,000. What we have shown, we're estimating it at the \$4,900,000 right now, which there's the savings for the culvert cleaner to put towards the other item, if we get the approval to do so.

This is just the approval of the Biennial Legislative Budget with the \$5,300,000 for the purchases. This just gives you a rundown of the sweepers, the culvert cleaners, the remote controlled track loaders and the 22 vehicles that were approved for the Environmental Program. Again, just an idea, nine sweepers in this approval, or this request, which would mean 12 new ones to the total fleet. Three culvert cleaners, one for each District. If we have enough money savings, there'd be one more for District III, so that'd be two for District III, or two for District I, excuse me, and one for the other two Districts. And, the remote controlled track loader, which in this picture depicts a diesel one on the left, an electric one on the top right. I'm not exactly sure which one we're going to go for. I believe the diesel one because it's narrower but a little taller. The electric one is wider but not as tall, so we're just going to have to determine which one is going to work best for our needs.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Just to give you an idea of the light vehicles, anywhere from sedans to flatbeds or maybe a dump body, depending on if we try to load the track loader. We're still trying to work out those details, if we can haul it in on one of these flatbeds. And, the pick-ups for the environmental group.

The cost analysis is in your packet. And, I think that's it.

Sandoval: On the specialized equipment, the cleaning equipment, is there a delay from the time we order and the time we receive?

Kevin Lee: I would say, yes, but I'll let Kenny explain that, because a heavy fleet, like we said, for those Class 13s, it's going to be about a year and a half before we actually put them in service. So, hopefully these won't take that long.

Kenny Lee: For the record, Kenny Lee, Equipment Superintendent. On the sweepers, the sweepers are approximately eight months out from the day they receive a purchase order to build them, culvert cleaners are about the same thing. Eight to nine months out from the purchase date.

Sandoval: And, the reason I ask that, and perhaps you can help me with this Rudy is, I don't want to get dinged by the EPA. I mean, they should know that we've made this investment. It's a significant investment for compliance. But then now we have this time where we don't have the equipment in service and I don't want to be penalized for that.

Malfabon: Governor, that is a good point to make then in this packet, that is our statement and overview of what we've done so far and if we are going to be acquiring this new equipment for our storm water and environmental program, we have to make that clear that it takes a while to get it into the fleet and into the hands of our maintainers.

Kenny Lee: Also, plus in the interim, District II is also renting culvert cleaners. Right now they have two of them that they're renting. Elko is renting some brooms. So, we do have rentals going on so that we are in compliance.

Sandoval: Other questions from Board Members, with regard to Agenda Item No. 11? If there are none, the Chair will accept a motion for approval.

Savage: Moved to approve.

Sandoval: Member Savage has moved for approval, is there a second?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Skanccke: Second.

Sandoval: Second by Member Skanccke, any questions or discussion? All in favor, say aye. [ayes around] Oppose, no. That motion passes. We'll move on—

Kevin Lee: Governor?

Sandoval: Did I skip one? No, okay.

Kevin Lee: I have one update, Governor, excuse me. On the Welcome Center, I have some update on some—what we spend is approximately \$1,500 to \$2,000 a month and that varies due to, we pay for the cost of some of the maintenance items in the Welcome Center. So, it's approximately \$24,000 a year, just an update, thanks.

Sandoval: Thank you. We still need to know the value of the improvements.

Kevin Lee: Correct, but that's just what we pay them, West Wendover, in our agreement.

Sandoval: Thank you.

Hoffman: Governor, we lost Lieutenant Governor, we don't know if it was on purpose, but we're trying to connect up to Lieutenant Governor again. Okay?

Sandoval: Did the Lieutenant Governor participate in that last vote?

Hoffman: I don't believe so.

Sandoval: Okay. So, let the record reflect that he wasn't participating in the vote. We'll move to—do you want to wait for a minute to see—does he need to call back in?

Menzel: Yeah, he left at 11:01 and I haven't seen him try to call back.

Sandoval: All right. Let's move to Agenda Item No. 12, Update on Pedestrian Safety Improvement Projects.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor, PD Kiser will update the Board on this.

PD Kiser: Governor, Members of the Board, for the record, PD Kiser, I'm the Assistant Chief of Traffic Safety Engineering. Back in February, we had a very interesting meeting on pedestrian safety and as a result of that the Board directed us to really address the problem, this epidemic of pedestrian fatalities that we're having. And, I will say, at least right now, our pedestrian fatalities are less than they were this same time last year. So, hopefully that trend will continue. What I'm going

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

to do is give you an update today on where we are with that direction from the Board.

So, let me go through, this—I'm going to talk about the projects up north here, as well as, down south. These are the projects that we are spending approximately \$10,000,000 on pedestrian safety improvements. First is the project at Incline Village, that's two locations where we're going to have pedestrian safety improvements that would be pedestrian activated flashers with additional street lighting at those locations. This project is actually already advertised and we anticipate that the construction will start this next month. It will take about 30 days to complete that project.

Moving over to the Kietzke Lane Project. These locations were selected from the Safety Management Plan that was conducted for Kietzke Lane, in the last—couple of years ago. Again, these are locations that have been identified for pedestrian improvements, that would include the pedestrian activated flashers and street lighting and potentially some pedestrian refuge, in the center of the street and bulb-outs to shorten up the pedestrian walking distance. This project is approximately—the 60% design submittal should be completed this month. We anticipate advertising this project in January 2016 and having the construction done in May of 2016.

Moving up to the Sun Valley Boulevard locations. This location or this segment of roadways was selected based on a corridor study that was done by the RTC recently and so they had identified these locations for pedestrian improvements. So, those were selected and again, those are pedestrian activated flashers with additional street lighting. There's a possibility that we'll do pedestrian refuges in the middle of the street to assist the pedestrians. This project is also about 60% designed—about 60% is done. It will be done this month and we will also anticipate advertising this project right after the first of the year with the construction in May of next year.

Moving over to the Virginia Street location, at the Bonanza Casino. The temporary signal was installed and is operational at this point. We are looking at some additional design or geometric improvements, perhaps to line up the driveway at the casino with the street across the street, so we can have a nice, straight, crosswalk across the street. Some of those design concepts have been reviewed with the casino owners and we'll figure out what we're going to do from there as far as a full time or permanent signal at that location. Also, on North

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Virginia Street, we've got three locations that have been identified for pedestrian improvements. Again, some of these are locations where we've had pedestrian fatalities in the past and those are also under design at this point. We hope to have a 60% design review this month for those locations. They would include the pedestrian activated flashers and the street lighting at those locations. We would anticipate the advertising of those projects after the first of the year and construction in May of this year.

Moving on to the Las Vegas locations. Up at the top of the map is the Lake Mead Boulevard Project. These were projects that were actually already underway and so we saw the opportunity where we could make pedestrian improvements on these. The Lake Mead Project is a road diet or a Complete Streets type project. They've identified several locations on this project for pedestrian improvements throughout that project. That project is—the 60% design should be done later this month and again, we would anticipate advertising this project after the first of the year, with a May start date for construction.

Sandoval: Will you explain a little bit more what a road diet means?

PD Kiser: The road diet, what they're looking at doing at this location, right now I think there's six lanes on the roadway, so three in each direction. They're going to reduce the number of lanes, put in a center median. They're going to have bike lanes. They're going to actually widen the sidewalks, bring them out into the street further, so it's a much more pedestrian friendly facility along that stretch of roadway. And so, that's why the cost is as high as it is. So, it's more than just pedestrian, but it's to also slow down the traffic. They feel like they—with the additional capacity they have on the other streets, that they can actually squeeze down the number of lanes on this roadway and improve that.

The Charleston Boulevard Project. That one came out of a Road Safety Audit that was conducted from that location. There were really numerous issues with this involving pedestrians. So, they have identified a number of locations on this route where we will put in the pedestrian refuge islands, the pedestrian activated flashers, as well as, enhanced street lighting for the location. That project is also about 60% designed, is done and we'll be doing a review on that here shortly. We will anticipate advertising that project in January of this next year and construction in May.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Then, just south of Charleston on Boulder Highway, there is a location there at Sun Valley Drive and Boulder Highway. There is the Cannery Casino on the eastside of Boulder Highway and we have a Denny's Restaurant on the west side. So, a fair amount of pedestrian traffic is going on there. Boulder is a very wide roadway and so to try to give the pedestrians a better way to get across there, we are installing a pedestrian refuge. Actually, there's a median there now but we're modifying that. Then flashers, pedestrian activated flashers and enhanced street lighting at that location. Again, that one is being reviewed as part of the Charleston Project, so it's part of the 60% review that we'll be doing here shortly. It will also advertise after the first of the year and construction, hopefully in May, along with the Charleston Project.

And then, the last one is, the two traffic signals out on Blue Diamond Road at El Capitan and Fort Apache. Those signals, the 60% design is complete and we're moving forward with the review and the final design for that. Again, it would also probably, we're anticipating an advertising date in January, this next year along with construction in May.

That's the sum totals—there's about \$7,000,000 here in the Las Vegas area, about \$3,000,000 up in Reno. So, it's going to come in fairly close, hopefully to the \$10,000,000 that we've been given to work with.

Following that at the, I think it's the March Board Meeting, we were directed to continue our effort to try to find locations for pedestrian improvements. We have done that. You can see the little blue dots, they're kind of scattered around the State, with probably most—there's a big bunch of them down in the Las Vegas area and I'll show you another map where those are, but we reached—we went through all of our crash data for pedestrian crashes. We contacted the local jurisdictions, got a lot of feedback from them on locations that they were aware of where there were state highways and their jurisdictions where we could do some pedestrian improvements.

Down in the Las Vegas area, you can see, they're kind of scattered in a lot of places. A lot of emphasis on Boulder Highway. There's a lot of problems in that location. We ended up with about 50 locations at this point. We have gone through and done a ranking of those locations. I don't have time to go in and give you all the details on that, but we would like to come back at a later meeting and give you a little more information on how we prioritized those.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

What we're doing now is we're actually going back to the local jurisdictions. We've already done Reno. We've met with them, we've showed them the locations. We've shown them the priorities that we've come up with. The methodologies that we use for that. So, we're getting good feedback from them. But, as the word gets out around the State that we're doing this, we're getting a lot more locations. So, our list is going to get bigger, but now we have a methodology to evaluate these and put them into some type of ranking. Hopefully, we were talking about \$5,000,000 more in pedestrian improvements. It would probably do maybe about half of that list of 50. But, we're going to continue on. Hopefully if we have success with this, you'll give us another \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000 or whatever it is. But, we hope that we can, you know, really start to address the problem with the pedestrian fatalities here in the State.

Sandoval: Does that complete your presentation?

PD Kiser: Yes.

Sandoval: All right. I want to thank you. So, I want to make sure I heard you right. So, for \$5,000,000, we could get 25 more projects, give or take?

PD Kiser: Give or take, yes.

Sandoval: Also, as we do maintenance, can't we incorporate these improvements, pedestrian improvements into the project cost for the bid?

PD Kiser: Well, if there's other projects out there, roadway projects that we can, you know, include them into those projects, I mean, certainly we could try to do that. You know, we're always looking to see where there's projects coming up, roadway projects where we can do that. But you know, it's—we're looking at about \$200,000 or so per location to do these pedestrian activated flashers and the lighting and so forth. So, it's not a small expense, by any means.

Sandoval: No, and I guess where I'm going with this is, we should include this in all our projects so we're not constantly chasing our tails with regard to trying to fix all this. So, as we move forward, I just want to make sure that we're taking care of it from the get-go, rather than having to go back.

PD Kiser: Well, up until February, really all of the money that we've had to spend on safety has been federal dollars. There has not been really a pot of state money that was

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

specifically for safety. So, this is really our first opportunity to address this. I mean, before then, we didn't really have a way to or a pot of money that we could go to and say, hey we've got these problems, these pedestrian safety problems. So, I mean, you know, this has been a windfall for us to be able to do this but the \$20,000,000 something that we get a year from the federal dollars, most of that money is obligated in to other safety projects that we've had, you know, that are just as important as the ones that we're looking at today.

Sandoval: The reason I ask that, and I'm not trying to pit art against safety, but we're spending \$2,000,000 on art and landscaping on 395 and that exit there and at least on my priority list, pedestrian safety ranks above that. So, when we spend \$2,000,000 on an art installation and landscaping and then I see that we can get 25 projects completed for \$5,000,000, which would—again, I wasn't a math major, that's the Controller, but we could get 12 more projects if we have, you know, if we were a little bit more specific with our money.

Malfabon: And, I think the Board would agree that our vision was to have a continuing program. Roughly, that \$10,000,000 a year target. I think that we should continue to reach out, identify those within the Department from our several road safety assessments that we've conducted already, as well as reaching out to the local jurisdictions and the public, where they've identified some safety issues. So, I see it as an ongoing program.

To speak to your point Governor, we do—in the past, when we did the maintenance projects, we did add safety elements but they were focused on roadway safety and that's typical, as part of our process, but it wasn't focused on pedestrian safety, typically at least. So, I think that it's a good program to continue and have that kind of target of \$10,000,000 a year.

Sandoval: And, I'm not questioning that. This is a huge priority for me, but when we have these other contracts that we're putting out, I think we have to keep in mind, could we have a \$1,000,000 public art and landscaping and take that other \$1,000,000 savings and put it towards this.

Malfabon: We could. We could look at—those priorities, obviously, safety is a higher priority than the landscape and aesthetics program.

Sandoval: Maybe because that area that we're landscaping hasn't been landscaped—I don't know how long that's been there, but it's been at least five or six years.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Malfabon: Oh, it's longer.

Sandoval: Yeah, and as I said, we have limited money and rather than—for \$2,000,000, like I said, we can get that many more done. So, I would rather wait on installing that landscaping and art and put it towards this pedestrian safety. It's too late, I suppose.

Malfabon: We have the funding to do both presently. But, I think that it's that type of direction is clear to us that the priorities of the Board, and Governor, to be on safety and less so on the aesthetics program, that we can still accomplish both but maybe do less costly treatments that are still aesthetically pleasing at the interchanges, that are not landscaped currently. We can do both, but put the money where it's more important.

Sandoval: Okay. Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Thank you Governor. I don't usually take up people's time on the record with 'me toos', but I'll make an exception on this one. I completely agree with everything the Governor said.

Sandoval: Member Skancke.

Skancke: Thank you Governor. I want to go back to a point that you made on maintenance and see if I understand, if I got the answer to that Rudy. If we're in the right-of-way maintaining a project or we're doing a project and I think what you're saying Governor, if there's an opportunity for us to add that safety component and maybe you're already doing it. If we've got a project going out and let's say that bid is \$1,000,000 and for another \$500,000 in the bid we could get some of this, is that occurring? Because maybe that's \$1,000,000 and the maintenance is \$1,000,000, but if we combine them it might be \$1,500,000 because you're already out there. Is that where you're headed Governor? I mean, I'm trying to get my hands around how we might be able to save money.

Sandoval: Well, save and what I'm trying to do is work both ends against the middle. So, if some of those—if you go back to that map, if we've got any projects going, we should be fixing those as we maintain them because invariably, if we're maintaining them, we fix it and then we go back and tear it up to put the safety component, I'd rather do it all at once. There's your efficiency point. But also, it expedites our ability to solve all these little dots if we're including that as part of our maintenance program.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

- Malfabon: Yes, and when we do have those types of pavement projects that we can make pedestrian improvements on, we have been doing some of that, but it's always a balance between, if we add the pedestrian safety elements, in the past it was late in the game when they made those requests. Now we're very aware of doing this and marrying up those projects to do them at the same time. Less impact, cost efficiencies. So, we're doing it now, but in the past I can say that that's not the approach that we took on pedestrian safety. Now, we're doing it.
- Skanche: And, just finally Governor, Rudy, thank you for your answer by saying we could do both. I think that's what the Board is asking, is to find us a way to do both. I mean, if it's one less sheep or horse, okay, we get that. But, there has to be enough money in the budget and in our budget that we can accomplish both. That we can have an aesthetically pleasing environment, right, and a safe environment for which our driving and walking public can participate. So, I just wanted to thank you for that answer, that was the right answer for me.
- Sandoval: I don't know, I want to ask this question before it goes. Rudy, what happens if I was contemplating reversing our decision or asking for a reversal of our decision to take that money and put it towards this and putting off the installation of the landscape and the art.
- Malfabon: I suppose it would be—we've had public meetings on this, so there's an expectation from the residents and the business owners that we're going to be doing these types of projects in that area. I would say that—I would recommend that we modify the designs going forward to make it more of a reasonable cost. Still look nice, but use some of that money towards these types of projects that are going to enhance safety.
- Sandoval: But again, if we were to take that money, how much of a delay would there be on the installation of the landscaping and the art?
- Malfabon: I don't know the response to that Governor. I'd have to check with staff on how much of a delay there would be.
- Skanche: Thank you, what if we went back, Mr. Gallagher and held that item, until September, until we could get the right answers, because Governor, I think you're on the right line there. It's not an either or, so to Rudy's point, can we afford both and if not, I like the way you're heading in the prioritization of what's important to the driving and walking public. It's always nice to have things look

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

good. So, maybe we can go back. I'm not sure we can legally do that, but maybe we go back, reconsider the item and then hold it, a motion to hold that item until September.

I mean, this is a great meeting of really drilling down into things, from a policy point of view. So, I don't know who made that motion, but Governor, if you want, I'd make another motion to hold it.

Malfabon: Well, Member Skancke if I could, the contract for that landscaping was already awarded. It was one of those that's below the threshold for Board approval, so it didn't require Board action, it was there for information only. Since the project was awarded, that's why I would recommend that we just go forward with that and change the design of the future projects in that area.

The question was raised previously in the meeting about, what if we have to shut down a project subject to available funds, this is a case where we've awarded and if they're mobilizing or they've incurred some expenses already, we pay for it and not getting any benefit out of it. So, I say, go forward is what my recommendation would be, is just go forward with this one and modify the design on future ones to kind of lower the expenses and have that money available for other uses such as pedestrian safety.

Sandoval: Then there isn't a way to do it, I guess is the bottom line. But, I hope, you know, not everybody is here who is responsible for that decision making chain, but I really want to get rid of those dots.

Malfabon: I do too.

Sandoval: And so, every time there is an opportunity to achieve savings where we can put the money towards those projects, I'd like to do that. Because it sounds like, we bought the Cadillac plan for the landscaping over there on the 395 and if we can get the Ford and maintain that savings and put it towards those safety projects, that's what I would like to do.

Malfabon: I agree Governor. We'll take that direction forward with both of those program areas. And, I wanted to also put a plug in for the City of Las Vegas, has added lots of dots for their pedestrian safety projects on State Highway System as well. So, they used some of that Fuel Revenue Indexing from the RTC of Southern Nevada to improve pedestrian safety. I just wanted to mention that. That other

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

agencies are recognizing the pedestrian safety issue and doing projects with some of their local funding as well.

Sandoval: Member Savage.

Savage: Thank you Governor. I feel it's quite clear that the Board is looking to make this process more efficient as well as fiscally responsible. Mr. Kiser, so that begs my question, on the speed of the design. I look at the north, we're looking about \$3,000,000, south we're looking at about \$7,000,000. To me, looking from the outside in, the dollar values are a little bit lower in the north, so I would expect the design would be moving quicker, because of the less volume and I don't see that. So, the question to you and your staff, do you feel that design speed has been sufficient to this point for these projects?

PD Kiser: I mean, I think so. Designing the project—there's so much and I'm learning a lot more about this as we go along, but there's a lot that goes into designing any kind of project. And so, there's steps that we've got to all follow. If we've got to deal with—in these types of projects, we've got to deal with the utility companies, there's potential right-of-way issues, potential environmental issues. So, all of that really is part of the process that we go through. We're moving along pretty quickly. Actually with most of these projects, we're at 60% design, pretty much right now or this month for those projects and that's actually moving along pretty good. And, we've mixed up some of the designs being done in-house, by in-house staff that were available. And, where we didn't have in-house staff, we've been using consultants to do that. So, I think, yeah, I think it's—I mean, we all wish it could be done a lot faster. I know the signal at the Bonanza got done quickly because there was equipment available and we were able to put together—and again, it was a temporary signal. So, that was—that took three months to do that. But, I don't have a lot of control over how all this design goes. We're kind of pushing the project along, saying these are the elements that we need, but it does—perhaps our engineering folks could maybe elaborate on that a little more, but I think we're going about as fast as we can, given the process that we have to work through.

Savage: I guess that's my concern because I think the Governor and the Board make it very clear, as the priority for the safety of the pedestrians and I do believe that we can do a quicker design. When there's a will there's a way. I know the Department has the in-house and I know we have the outside consultants, so I'd just like to make sure that we're doing everything possible to expedite the upfront

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

design in order for the construction to be implemented as soon as possible. That's all I had, thank you Governor. Thank you Mr. Kiser, thank you Rudy.

Sandoval: Any other questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 12? Any further comments?

PD Kiser: I wanted to show these photographs. These are some of the types of improvements that you'll see out there, as we get started with these projects. The one on the upper right is for where we have our multi-lane roads, or two or more lanes in each direction and over 35 mile an hour speed limit. We will have overhead signs with the flashers on them. These are some of the offsets, the refuge areas that we have. Then the lower left here is the—just the comment about the lighting, we're actually using a higher lumen light at these crosswalks to really light up the crosswalk area and also give advanced kind of lighting, so as the driver comes up, with this LED lighting, it's the bright white lighting, gives you much better contrast. So, we're going to a 16,500 lumen fixture. All the other LED lights are normally around 12,000, so it's going to help quite a bit at night.

Sandoval: Thank you very much. Agenda Item No. 13, Demonstration of the new eSTIP System.

Peacock: Good morning, Governor, Members of the Board. For the record, Coy Peacock, Program Development under the Planning Division. It's my distinct pleasure to be able to bring forward to you a demonstration of the Electronic Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, or as we like to call it eSTIP.

Nevada is one of the first states in the nation to actually bring together the Regional Transportation Improvement Programs and the STIP, all in electronic format. Utah has one but it took them several years to actually get all of the MPOs or the Metropolitan Planning Organizations on board and we've done it in under a year. I'm really proud of the partnership that we've created with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations, FHWA, FTA. The many phone calls, the many sit-downs, Adobe Connects, to develop this STIP, but it was a great partnership between all of us.

All electronic adoptions, administrative modifications, amendments are set in place right now electronically. What happens is, we send out emails each time someone needs to review or approve a particular action that we put forward. And, once the action is approved, finally, it is sent out to a distribution list, so anyone

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

that's involved in that project will know that the action has been taken. An example is the MPO submits an amendment and the amendment goes to NDOT's staff. We forward that to our Director, for approval. Then it gets forwarded, automatically, through this electronic system, to FHWA or FTA for their final approval and then the distribution list is sent out to notify everyone.

What used to take several weeks, now we can do in days. So, it's quite a unique system. Right now the new public website is in place and I'll be showing that to you in a few minutes. And, we're out for a 30-day Public Comment Period. Hopefully some of you, we actually sent out an email, a press release, hopefully some of you have had the opportunity to actually play with it. So, we'll show you that in a few minutes.

The RFP started in 2012. Actually, this started for me back in the 90s. I've been looking forward to this program for many, many years. I've been in the Program Development Division for over 20 years and this has been one of my vision and one of my goals and I appreciate the Board supporting that. I think you're really going to enjoy what we've put together. We've brought it before you in July 2014, you guys approved it. Very good vision, foresight. We selected Eco Interactive, January 2015. I tell you what, that was one of the best choices we could've made, was Eco Interactive. They've been doing this for over 10 years and Software as a Service—on a six month deployment, Software as a Service is a modular program and is currently being used by several of the largest MPOs in the United States, San Diego, Indianapolis has been working with Eco Interactive for over 10 years. Los Angeles has been working with them about five years. Their programs—their four-year program is larger than our 20-year program, just in the MPOs alone. So, that's a lot for a very low upfront cost in the development side, because they'd already had the program built.

There are separate MPO and NDOT interfaces. Each MPO has their own interface, which they totally control. What that does is, it allows less duplication of effort. In the past, they would give us a report and we would turn around and enter it into our database. You know, they'd enter it and we'd enter it. Now, they have total control of it and it automatically goes in the eSTIP once we go through the approval process. They also can let their locals enter data for their review and then submit it to us. So, it's like that same data is being used over and over.

We've got—it includes a long-range element function. Eco Interactive, during the process, actually decided to give us a long-range element at no additional cost.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

We're going to be working on that this month and there will be a separate location in the eSTIP for the long-range plan. We're also going out with an RFP for a long-range policy plan and performance based project levels as well. These are two separate things. This is just a database, the long-range plan is an actual plan.

Each of the four MPOs has an eTIP, or an E-Transportation Improvement Program. That's the interface that I talked about. They have total control of it and then we get included into the STIP through that electronic process. We have over 15 custom reports that we've created and we have many more that is a part of the agreement with Eco Interactive. Now that we've got this out on the street, I've been getting some feedback and we've already got some new reports that we're going to be creating. Also, the MPOs needed several specialized reports that they report to their Boards and we were able to develop those and provide those to them as well.

Okay. Here is the eSTIP. This mouse is really sensitive, so I'm going to—okay, one of the things you can do is you can sort it. You can sort it by ID Number. Project Type, all of these across the board at the top level, Project Title, Total Cost, you can sort it by all of those. And, you can actually sort it by the other way as well. We can filter this by different MPOs.

This is all the Clark County projects in the draft STIP. Now, this is our draft STIP. You can sort it by Lead Agency. Those are all the agencies in the State, or you can sort it by Project Type. These are all of our bike and ped projects that we plan on doing for the next four years. You can also sort it by multiple. You can select MPO and Project Type or Lead Agency, however you'd like to do that. You can also sort it by ID. If you have an ID Number, you can sort it by that ID Number. Then you can drill down into the project. This actually gives you the project description, project status, the limits and the dollar amounts, type of funding there is, what year, what phase we're actually doing those projects. We also have these projects maps, through a GIS System. This is a Google System that we use. You can actually zoom in and zoom out, all the way down to the street level.

We also have funding history. This will tell you what the project has been through, the type of changes. As you notice, you can see the actual dollar amounts, as you go down, change. This happens to be the VRT Program in Washoe, with a Tiger Grant that they received to do this particular project. You also have an amendment history. It's been amended three times and this is our,

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

for fiscal year '16, its pending. Once the Board approves it and it goes to FHWA for approval, there will actually be a date put in there.

We have another feature that I really like. It's the County Dashboard. What this does is it allows you to kind of look at the overall project categories, number of projects and the total funding in the different areas of the State. This happens to be Clark County, and this is the four-year program. We also have Washoe County. Then you can actually drill down into the actual projects themselves. So, there are all the projects that are in that particular category. Also, you can select by multiple counties, you don't have to go—you can select here, it will bring up Elko and you can select Humboldt County as well.

We also have a link to our NDOT Website. This is the, About eSTIP and it kind of gives you an overview of the whole overall program and what the STIP is about. We also have links back to our system. This is our work program. Now, the work program and the STIP are actually similar. The STIP is just the federally funded projects and the Work Program is all of the projects. The transit projects, the state funded projects. We've got over 700 projects that we had entered into this database in the last six months, so we were pretty busy.

Now, we can go into an advanced search. You can search on all kinds of types of things.

Sandoval: Can you do a run through? I'm glad Ms. Rodriguez is still here. So, let's go to that roadway that she was talking about.

Peacock: Which roadway?

Sandoval: 395. Oh, you got it. So, it's the same thing—then we don't have to go through it, but— It works! No, but I think let's go through this demonstration so if there's a member of the public who is curious about a project, we can walk through this.

Peacock: Pedestrian Safety Project, do you see that? Not that one? This is the actual Work Program. The whole statewide and 20-year program. Here's the information on the—so, for North Virginia to Parr Boulevard, about 3.13 miles, they're going to be doing a widening. So, that's the—this project right now, the funding has not been identified, and it's scheduled outside of the four-year program, that's why it says 'future project', right here. But, it's definitely on our long-range plan and we're actually doing studies to study what we're going to be doing out there right now. We've got a traffic study, the RFP has gone out on it.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Sandoval: I guess the point I want to make because it's probably not good news for Ms. Rodriguez, in terms of right now, it doesn't show anything for four years, but you, yourself or anybody else, can know exactly what's going on with a specific road by just coming to the website and going through all this.

Peacock: You bet. You can search by all kinds of different things. Just for US-395, you can bring up all the projects for US-395 and then drill down in from that.

Rodriguez: This is how I found out the...

Peacock: We've actually had more comments in the last week than we've had in the last three years on this program, so I'm pretty excited about that.

Back to our interactive map. One of the things we can sort it by is the different project types. We can turn on and off these layers. So, just the groups, and remember, this is a 20-year program. We can actually zoom in and zoom out, just like we do on all the other maps. As you'll notice, down at the bottom here, every time we get closer and we zoom in, it actually changes the list of projects down below, so you can actually keep going in and going in and it will actually limit the amount of projects. Whatever your view is, is what's left. You can see that keep changing, then you can zoom back out. You can also select projects from this view and it will actually pull up, kind of a highlight. Gives you the TSP number, the STIP Number, the Title, the Project Description. And, no matter where you are in this system, when you see that TSP or ID Number highlighted, underlined, you can drill right down into that project, no matter where you are in the system. It takes you all the way down into the—you can put the satellite on any time you want and like I said, you can zoom all the way down in.

I wanted to show you the advanced search. We didn't get to finish that part of it because there's a lot of ways you can actually search this information. Sometimes it appears slow, but 700 projects is a lot of projects. So, it takes a little while to load. Let's go back to the advanced search. You can type in a project number, which we did. You can look at the status. One of the things that you have to remember when you're in here is you've got to clear it. Because when you come back in here, the key words will be there, but not always. Could you type in US-50 for me—so these are all the projects on US-50 for the next 20 years that we're going to be working on. So, when you go back to the search, make sure you clear it. Because if I type Douglas County and US-50, well US-50 isn't in Douglas County, so. These are all the projects in Douglas County.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

When we go out on our consultation tours, we sort—we bring out to each County, which—again, remember that you have to make sure you clear it. We can go by Lead Agency. You can select it by MPOs. These are all the projects in Clark County or the RTC of Southern Nevada for the next 20 years. And, they're not all our projects, they're their projects as well. There's a lot. About 160.

Knecht: Question on that real quickly.

Peacock: Sure.

Knecht: When I drove it yesterday, Douglas County, US-50 went into Douglas County. It took me up to the California side for—

Peacock: Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize, you're right. Up at the lake, I forgot. Thanks for pointing that out. But, even so, the point was, is that if you have multiple different selections and you don't clear the selections, it could mess up your searches. You can select it by Project Type. You can look at the road reconstruction and rehabilitation throughout the State.

One of the things we're going to do, I've talked to Eco Interactive, is when we run a search, we want to be able to map just the search that we ran. So, we're actually working on that right now as well. Then you can do multiple—say you wanted to know what the CMAQ projects were in Clark and Washoe Counties, say in fiscal year '16 and '17. This will bring all the CMAQ projects for the next two years in Clark and Washoe. You can select multiples of these.

We've also got an 'About Work Program' selection. We kind of went through the interactive map, so I'm not going to go through that again. It will take you back to our Work Program. This is our old PDF files. We're actually—I've got a work order out right now, we're going to be cleaning this up and we'll have a link added to it this week.

So, one of the things, one of the features I really liked about this particular program is that you can actually have an approved STIP, we have a draft STIP, we have a draft Work Program and next year we'll actually have an approved program, Work Program. So, we can do multiple things on this site. So, people will still be able to search the old site, or the old program and they'll actually be able to search the new program and the draft as we're going.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Next month, we'll be bringing this back for your approval, as a draft, at the September—we have, if you guys would like, a one-on-one talk, you know, we can sit down with you, kind of go through this. I hope it's fairly intuitive, so you know, it's fairly easy to use, but if there are any one of you would like to have us help you go through that, we would be more than happy to do that. We want this to be open and transparent. One of the things this allows is the MPOs actually can see the fiscal constraint sheet now, whereas before we actually kept creating a hard copy, which it will be automatically created through this system. And, we actually have a backlog to the FMIA System which is our Financial Management Information System, through the federal government. So, when projects get programmed, it automatically loads back into our system. We're loaded to our financial management system so that EA numbers, the PSAMS numbers are going to be able to be utilized on the public website as well.

I'd like to, our work is not done yet. We still have things that we can create and if there's any reports you guys would like, just let us know. We can have that created for you on the fly.

I'd like to acknowledge a few people. Obviously I'd like to acknowledge the Board. Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to be able to create this. I think everyone is going to really enjoy it. The front office, Rudy Malfabon, Bill Hoffman, Sondra Rosenberg, without their support we couldn't have accomplished this either. All of the MPOs, FHWA, FTA, all worked together in a partnership to create this system and to do it in such a short period of time, I was very, very impressed. I'd like to thank the Project Manager, Holly Smith. Holly, you raise your hand there. With our her guidance and focus, she kept us focused on what we needed to do. And, special thanks to Joseph Spencer, he spent a lot of time and effort. His computer skills are off the charts. I don't think we could've ever accomplished this without Joseph. David Wooldridge, Melvin McCallum, Cleveland Dudley, Ryan Agiletti and last but not least, Anne Happle, with Eco Interactive, she was tremendous in her experience and her knowledge. One of the first people I had ever talked to outside of our world, the STIP world, that could actually speak my language. So, thank you very much and if there's any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer.

Sandoval: Thank you Mr. Peacock. This is really impressive. I want to thank everyone who has been involved with it as well. It's an incredible amount of information, complexity. So, if it works as well as what you've just demonstrated, it really will

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

be a service to the public so individuals can know exactly what's going on. I guess my only question is, do they work on DMV issues as well?

Peacock: Not that I know of. No, but you can find stuff—remember that book we used to have, that great big book, well it's—I still keep them for nostalgic reasons, because I created the first one, so—

Sandoval: But it's not just that. I mean, what's important to me is that anybody, regardless of where they reside in the State can click and know exactly what's going on on a road that they travel each and every day. As I said, for Ms. Rodriguez, we're going to look into this some more and hopefully we'll make that connection for you within the Department, you didn't get the news that you wanted in terms of what's going to be happening in the very near future, but you know. And that's important. Is for the transparency here for everybody to have access to meaningful information. So, as I said—

Peacock: In a few points and clicks. I mean, it's very nice.

Sandoval: But the other end of the—the other side of the ledger here, what are we paying for this, do you know?

Peacock: I do know. The start-up cost—the overall contract was \$262,000. We're looking at \$14,000-\$14,500 a month as a Software as a Service. And, no matter what happens with the reauthorization, all of that is taken care of as a part of that service.

Sandoval: You said \$262,000 for this—

Peacock: For the start-up. If you subtract the \$14,000 per month, then it was about \$175,000.

Sandoval: Wow. I mean, that's cheap.

Peacock: That is cheap. Yeah.

Sandoval: Now I'm going to use this against everybody else in the State, because you know, I'm not a technician, but this is very, very impressive and for that amount of money, congratulations. I mean, it will pay for itself in paper.

Peacock: We're trying to get away from paper. People have asked me for PDF files, but we're trying to get away from that. If they want something, you can actually

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

export to an Excel spreadsheet, so you can take that—whatever you query, whatever search that you do, you can actually export it to Excel and then you can have a hard copy if you want one. Yeah, there's the export feature right there. You can do either the whole database or just whatever you searching on.

Sandoval: Member Savage.

Savage: Thank you, Governor. And, I can't agree more. This is a game changer. A game changer for the Department. Ultimate in transparency at the Governor's direction and I know, as far as my personal grade on electronic proficiency, I'm about a C-, and I think my sons and my wife will probably give me a D-. Over the weekend, I took the time to surf and I can't tell you how easy it was to get from Point A to Point B, look-up the different categories, the different agencies, the dollars. Rudy, compliments to you, Sondra, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Spencer, Ms. Smith and everyone in NDOT. It's a huge day and very proud to be part of NDOT today. Thank you Governor.

Sandoval: Thank you, Member Skancke.

Skancke: Thank you Governor. I just wanted to also congratulate you all. This is a very exciting day. To the cost saving point, Governor, if you take a look at the amount of time, personnel time of having to input all of this, across every agency, for \$175,000 and the long-term cost savings to the tax payers of the State is huge. And, I just want to say that, really, welcome to the new Nevada, right? I mean, this is this Department delivering on your vision for our State and delivering on building a new vision and a new Nevada. So, congratulations, you really delivered. Thank you.

Sandoval: Other comments? Well done Mr. Peacock.

Peacock: Thank you.

Sandoval: Thank you. Let's move to Agenda Item No. 14, Old Business.

Malfabon: Thank you Governor and Board Members. We have the monthly items for old business, reported outside counsel costs on open matters and monthly litigation report. Chief Deputy Attorney Dennis Gallagher is available to answer any questions.

Sandoval: Questions from Board Members on Agenda Item No. 14?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Martin: I have a couple sir.

Sandoval: Please proceed.

Martin: I'm taking a look at this outside counsel, and it's Item No. 14, Attachment A and I'm looking at the Ad America, there was two places, Chatman Law Firm is one and then Lemons Grundy and that got settled but it's still in appeal. I notice there isn't a lot of money left in those accounts, are you going to come back looking for some additional money or how is that going to work Dennis?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher. The Ad America appeal was decided, Mr. Martin, last month. So, it will really depend on what Ad America does. They may walk away, given the decision or they may decide to continue to litigate it. So, the contract with those firms really are just in limbo right now until we determine what action the property owner is going to take, Mr. Martin.

Martin: Thank you. I know there's still a grievance that have to be drawn, so that's why I was asking about the hours and the dollars left. I have the same question about the Wykoff, you know, \$69,000 left in that account for Sylvester and—yeah. So, I'm wondering, since that's been settled, is that enough money to draw the—and these numbers are old, so I'm just wondering if it's enough money or are you going to have to come back for an extension on that one as well?

Gallagher: On the Wykoff matter, that's the one we discussed a little bit earlier where when we present the Board of Examiners approved the settlement, but when we presented them with the settlement document, the property owner rejected it. My best guess is, it's buyer's remorse. We have a motion now in District Court that will be heard next month to enforce the judgement, the agreed upon settlement. If the court grants our motion and Wykoff agrees then to continue with it, this will be ample money, but Mr. Wykoff has on one occasion already gone up to the Supreme Court in this case. So, if the District Court does order that the settlement is an enforceable judgement, it's quite possible that Mr. Wykoff would then seek another appeal before the Supreme Court, in which case, I would probably be back before the Board requesting additional authorization for more fees for this case.

Martin: Thank you Dennis. And then the last one was the Fitz House Enterprises, I thought that got settled here a while back, didn't it?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

Gallagher: It did. We've still got a couple of loose ends on it and until the entire file is closed, I won't remove it from this report.

Martin: Okay, thank you very much sir.

Gallagher: Yes, thank you.

Sandoval: Board Members, any other questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 14? Hearing none, we'll move to Agenda Item No. 15, Public Comment. Is there any member of the public here in Carson City that would like to provide comment to the Board? Ms. Rodriguez, please.

Rodriguez: Hi Lori Rodriguez again, tax payer this time. I find it hard to believe that on a landscaping project that a nearly \$2,000,000 sticker price didn't cause some sticker shock. There's this thing out there called haggling, frankly, I find that landscaping at \$2,000,000 to be outrageous. Absolutely outrageous. That particular area is a very small area. We live in a desert, let it be a desert. If the people and the business owners in that area find it offensive, let them get together with a volunteer action committee to do something about it. I understand there are rules and regulations, you know, EPA, but if they really want something done, they can get together and get the materials donated. They can do something about it. The State on the other hand, could pay for the insurance for them to put it in, which would probably be more like a \$25,000 bill instead of nearly \$2,000,000. Also, is there not a way, at this point, has the work already begun? You said the order have been made.

Malfabon: The contract was awarded on June 11th, so they typically have a 30-day notice to proceed period. I don't know specifically what has been performed to date. I haven't—don't have personal knowledge of what's been performed.

Rodriguez: So, at this point, could we not change the plan and tell the contractor we need to cut some, you know, cut the budget here instead of putting in trees that will, if in a drought need to be replaced, how much is that going to cost us? Put in decorator boulders. Why can't we go back to the contractor and say, okay we need to save some money on this project. And, I don't know, I think going forward any project over \$1,000,000 should be approved, that's a lot of money. \$2,000,000 for landscaping, especially that small an area. I mean, I don't know how many of you know that area, that loop goes around. The people coming around on that loop don't see it. They should be watching the road, and they're not because you can

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Board of Director's Meeting
August 10, 2015

tell by the tire tracks that are on the barrier there. Okay, so they don't need to be looking at it. There's very few people traveling that part of South Virginia that are going to take the time to look over. What they should be looking for is that traffic that's merging with them.

So, like I said, if the businesses and the residents want it done so much, they need to get together and do it themselves with the State's help, not the State jumping in to the tune of \$2,000,000. That's all.

Sandoval: Thank you Ms. Rodriguez.

Rodriguez: Thank you.

Sandoval: Is there any public comment from Southern Nevada?

Martin: None here sir.

Sandoval: Let's move to Agenda Item No. 16, Adjournment. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Skanche: So moved.

Sandoval: Member Skanche has moved, is there a second?

Savage: Second.

Sandoval: Second by Member Savage. All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Thank you ladies and gentlemen, this meeting is adjourned.



Secretary to Board



Preparer of Minutes