



**Department of Transportation
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group
Notice of Public Meeting
1263 South Stewart Street
Third Floor Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada
June 6, 2016 – 30 Minutes after the Transportation
Board Meeting Adjournment**

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment (Discussion Only) - No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes unless the Committee elects to extend the comments for purposes of further discussion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
3. Comments from Working Group (Discussion Only)
4. Approval of March 14, 2016 Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting minutes (Discussion/For Possible Action)
5. Presentation/discussion on updates made to NDOT's Consultant Procurement Process (Informational Item only).
6. Presentation/discussion on NDOT's 2016 Resident Engineers meeting (Informational item only).
7. Old Business (Discussion Only)
 - A. CWG Task List
 - Item 1 – Contractor Prequalification Process
 - Item 2 - NDOT Disadvantaged Business Process
 - Item 3 - CMAR Change Orders and Agreements
 - Item 4 – As-Builts
 - Item 5 – Consultant Agreements – Construction and Project Management Divisions
 - Item 6 – Unbalanced Bidding
 - Item 7 – NDOT Staff update
 - B. Requested Reports and Documents
8. Projects Under Development (5-year Project Plan)
9. Briefing on Status of Projects under Construction (Discussion only)
 - A. Project Closeout Status
 - B. Summary of Projects Closed
 - C. Projects Closed, detail sheets
 - D. Status of Active Projects
 - E. Partnering/Dispute Process Update (Verbal)
10. Public Comment (Discussion Only) - No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes unless the Committee elects to extend the comments for purposes of further discussion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
11. Closed session to receive information from counsel regarding potential or existing litigation (Discussion Only)
12. Adjournment (Possible Action)

Notes:

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration
- The Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.
- Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically handicapped persons desiring to attend the meeting. Requests for auxiliary aids or services to assist individuals with disabilities or limited English proficiency should be made with as much advance notice as possible to the Department of Transportation at (775) 888-7440.
- This meeting is also expected to be available via video-conferencing, but is at least available via teleconferencing, at the Nevada Department of Transportation District One Office located at 123 East Washington, Las Vegas, Nevada in the Conference Room.
- Copies of non-confidential supporting materials provided to the Board are available upon request.

This agenda is posted at www.nevadadot.com and at the following locations:

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1263 South Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
123 East Washington
Las Vegas, Nevada

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
310 Galletti Way
Sparks, Nevada

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1951 Idaho Street
Elko, Nevada

Governor's Office
Capitol Building
Carson City, Nevada

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Chairman Len Savage	Sharon Foerschler	Dennis Gallagher
Controller Ron Knecht	Megan Sizelove	Steven Lani
Frank Martin	Darin Tedford	Kevin Lee
Reid Kaiser	Lisa Schettler	Thor Dyson
Tracy Larkin	Kimberley King	Mario Gomez
Bill Hoffman	Kristena Shigenaga	Mary Martini (Las Vegas)
John Terry	PD Kiser	Paul Schneider (FHWA)

Savage: Let's go ahead and call to order the March 14th, Construction Work Group Meeting. I'd like to welcome everybody here today. Can everyone hear us loud and clear in Las Vegas?

Martin: Yes sir.

Savage: I see Kevin from Elko so, we can hear him loud and clear right here in Carson City. Welcome everybody. With that being said, do we have any public comment here in Carson City? Nothing? Any public comment in Las Vegas?

Martin: None sir.

Savage: Okay. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 3, any comments from the Working Group at this point?

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, for the record. I've got one thing here. At the last Construction Working Group, you had requested whether we could stop a contractor from bidding our work if they have a lawsuit filed against us. I got an opinion for our Attorney General's Office and there really is no way we can stop a contractor from bidding our work if they have filed a lawsuit against us, unless there was a previous agreement where they had a legal document saying they won't bid work for a certain number of years or something along those lines. And, unless they're in some type of trouble with the FHWA where they've been prohibited to bid our work that way.

I didn't bring it with me but there is a section in our standard specifications that the Director is allowed or has the power to not award a contract to a contractor. I think it's in Section 102. Again, I didn't bring that information with me, but the Director does have that capability.

Savage: Okay, well I guess that's what it is.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

- Kaiser: It is what it is.
- Savage: It is what it is. Appreciate you looking into it. At least we know now. So, that's federally mandated or state?
- Kaiser: I believe that's federally mandated. I can't comment on it being a state funded project.
- Gallagher: We don't have any expressed authority that would allow the department to do that. The Department can certainly take into consideration the past history with any bidder.
- Savage: Okay, thank you Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Kaiser. Anybody else with any other comments?
- Knecht: One question on that. When the Department takes into consideration, could the Department basically rely on its view of the litigation and the merits for the litigation and whether it was good faith or?
- Gallagher: Well, just not litigation, past performance.
- Knecht: Okay.
- Gallagher: What are the issues that are the basis of the litigation? Is it failure to perform? Was it due to some faulty bidding processes? Certainly that would all be fair game for the consideration.
- Knecht: Okay. That's helpful, thanks.
- Savage: Anybody else here in Carson City?
- Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, for the record. I didn't know if we wanted to continue our discussion on [inaudible] from the Transportation Board or wait until maybe Action Item 11? I know there are some consultants that stuck around for the discussion. I'm just throwing it out there.
- Savage: I'd be happy to hear from the consultants in the Working Group, if anyone has anything to say?
- Speaker: [inaudible]
- Kaiser: Could you speak up, we actually have somebody listening here?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Glock: I'm Mike Glock, I'm President and part Owner of Diversified Consulting Services based out of Reno and an office in Las Vegas. I heard some of the discussion earlier and I'll answer any questions that you guys might have, but we've been—our company has been administering or augmenting construction contracts for the State of Nevada for over 25 years. We're not fly by night. We don't do things halfway. The reason that we're still here and still doing the business and still doing the amount of work that you're seeing is because we do a good job. Anybody here knows who we are and what we've done.

I just remember one comment about my name from Mr. Martin down south about how can I do all this work. I'll tell you, I know that I'm listed on two proposals to work two hours a week. That's pretty easy to do. I'm listed on another proposal to work 40 hours a week. Routinely, I work 60-80 hours anyway, so I can easily accommodate 48 hours.

I don't know if you guys have any questions of me. I'd be willing to answer them about the staffing on the proposals. Before you get into any questions, I'll tell you that the proposals that you guys brought up, as far as Las Vegas Boulevard, NEON and USA, NDOT released all those proposals the same time, within a few days of each other. We never know from day to day if we're going to be successful on our proposal, if we're going to win or lose or what we're going to do with our staff. On every proposal, we look at the staff that we have that are not working and we present those to say, this is who we're going to give you if we win this job. I don't know if I'm going to win this job or that job, you know, we had three of them out there all at one time. We also, I don't know if you have those in front of you, but we also list in our proposals alternative staff, basically additional resources that we have at our disposal in the event that somebody dies, retires or moves or something happens [inaudible]. And people quit in the middle of jobs all the time. They go to another employer. We rely on our secondary chart of staffing that we have available if need be. We're not presenting something to NDOT that's ever a lie or something that we don't fully intend to stand behind. That's about all I got to say. If you guys have any questions for me, I'll answer them.

Savage: I just want to thank you, Mr. Glock. I haven't had a chance to meet you but sitting on our side of the table, I'm sure you can appreciate some of the questions that we have. We're trying to do the due diligence for the State of Nevada. You know, the consultants are an instrumental part of our success. We just want to be

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

reassured that we're getting the right job for the right value with the right people. It's a very easy equation. We're all very busy on the vertical side and the horizontal side. We all know that we do the best with what we have, as far as personnel and that's the most important resource we all have, both here at the Department and yourselves and our company as a human resource. Without that, we're really nothing. It's important that we all work together. Like I said at the other meeting, we're grateful for everyone's participation and just want to be reassured that there isn't three guys for the south, working at the same time in the north because it doesn't look good. It's about perception and it's about professionalism and really supplying that. It's good to hear why you listed those people. I appreciate you taking the time to tell us, because we don't know that.

Glock: Right. I understand that. It's hard to get to you guys to answer those questions. I found out about this last night at 8:00 that this was going to happen today. So—

Savage: Better than 8:00 this morning. [laughter]

Glock: That is true. I would also offer that through NDOT's selection process, it's not one person that makes the decision on how we're selected. They have multiple tiers and if I'm not mistaken, you guys can elaborate, but there's at least two tiers of evaluations. One group kind of short lists and then the next group picks basically the winner or if there's a tie, or if there isn't a unanimous first place, then it goes to an interview. We compete at all those levels. It's not—I'm successful because of my due diligence and research I do. I came from NDOT. I spent 30 years working for NDOT before I became a consultant. I know the process. I know the talent pool. I know who to put on. I know who the good guys are. I know who the bad guys are.

Savage: I just—I thank you for taking the time. I think it's important [inaudible] we've been talking contractors, contractors, contractors. The consultants are at the top of the list right now and we just want to be reassured that you aren't spread too thin and we're getting dollar for dollar, what the people of Nevada [inaudible]. It's nothing personal, it's just a matter of, hey we're big picture people. We have to answer to that taxpayer and want to make sure. Any involvement any consultants have, I see [inaudible] let's talk. That's the way we're all going to be reassured that we're getting the best value for the timelines, for the different projects, because everything is different. We understand that. I'm glad you're all here and hopefully you can be here in the future meetings too.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Glock: I will offer one more thing. A lot of people don't understand, but when we are selected for work, the payment process is structured such that we're only allowed to make 10%. We're allowed to make 10% and all that—yeah, you showed \$24M of contract value for the past 10 years or whatever, but right now, as of today, 50%, or I can't tell NDOT 51% because then I'd be breaking my contract, but let's say 49% of the work that we have right now goes to other consultants. We have probably 10 other sub consultants that are working for us on these jobs spreading that work around to them and they provide value and additional support if we need them to. Then on the—so, we got 50% of that that's left and of that 50%, we only make 10%. We only make money on the labor we put on the job. We don't make money on our vehicles or our sub consultants. We only make money on the labor that's on that job and we get 10% of that. That's it.

We struggle to make a living even with the amount of work that we have. There's not a lot there, so it's very competitive in what we do. There's probably 30 firms in the State that chase this work and there's only four or five that are fortunate enough to be ranked high enough or have the resources to put together a viable program for you guys.

Savage: Mr. Controller?

Knecht: A few very brief comments Mr. Glock. First of all, thank you for the good professional work you do and you've done on a continuing basis. It's greatly appreciated and we respect that. Thank you also for making the extra effort to come here and reach out to us today, that's helpful.

I want you to understand, I want everybody to understand one thing, this is my take from this morning's meeting and from our process in general, it's that when we raise questions like that, it's not to cast dispersions upon anybody's integrity at all, or your business practices or anything. It's really just the exercise of our due diligence where there's a question that, I won't say quite leaps off the page, but there is a question inherent there, are we too concentrated? Do we have a risk there? Are people possibly spread too thin? Once we're reassured that that's not the case then we've done what we need to do for the public interest. That's the only reason we do it. Certainly not to cast dispersions on anyone's integrity or profession.

Glock: I understand.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Knecht: Thank you.

Glock: You bet.

Martin: Len.

Savage: Anything—Mr. Martin, from Las Vegas.

Martin: Yes sir. Mr. Controller, I appreciate your comments and I echo them as well. This isn't a witch hunt or anything else. Having been in the business as long as I have been, when I see seven out of maybe nine opportunities are picked up by one firm, I have to question what's going on. It's just part of our job. That's basically why the Governor hired Len and myself and put us on this Committee is to question how those circumstances happen and to make sure that the people of the State of Nevada are being fairly represented when we start to hire our consultants and start to hire our contractors. That's what—like I said, that's what we got hired for. So yeah, when I see seven out of nine or five out of seven opportunities go to one firm, I have to question what's going on.

Usually, in my world of the vertical, if you get that kind of a hit record, one, you've got a mistake in your estimate, or two, most people die in this world because of too much work. I've watched it happen over the course of the last 40 years and seen many, many really good firms go down because they've got too much to manage. I questioned today, Reid, when he's ever seen your firm with, by my calculation, could be as much as \$26M, \$27M worth of work to manage. Mr. Kaiser said, no he couldn't remember when that had happened. So, when I see that kind of backlog being acquired in a very short period of time, it creates problems for me or creates issues for me in just wondering, okay, how are you going to manage that? Therein lies the basis for the questions for me.

Many, many times in my history have called up a subcontractor and said, hey you're taking on too much work here, you're going in too cheap and I've been ignored. Usually within 6-12 months, they're gone. It's just me and Len and the rest of the Board doing our due diligence because it does no one any good if you disappear because you've swallowed a bigger pill than you can manage. Thank you.

Glock: If I can offer, we don't—at least in the current state of affairs, we're not managing any of the work. We're providing labor, basically on-call labor to NDOT in these augmentation contracts. If they need an inspector, we provide an inspector.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

We're providing the labor for them to use as their own resource to help them manage their jobs. I do appreciate your comment. I'm feeling those pains right now with the growth and the amount of work that we have but I think the proof will be in the pudding, as far as our ability to take care of this work and how well we're going to do, but so far, we're doing that.

Savage: Thank you Mr. Glock.

Glock: Thank you.

Savage: Would anybody else like to speak?

Edgington: If I may have the opportunity, Mr. Savage? My name is Ruedy Edgington. I'm with HDR, I'm a Managing Principal with HDR here in the Reno Office. I'd like to just echo what Mike said there about how proposals go in. We list the same people on a couple of proposals that are out at the same time. We don't—you know, if we list somebody on a proposal and we win that proposal, we either don't pursue the next work or we'll list a different team on that proposal. Your comments and what you looked at over the weekend, which you really weren't busy, those were good comments. I appreciate you guys, as the Board. I've seen those packets. I'm like Mike, I worked for NDOT for over 26 years. Those packets are huge. I know going through there is a big deal.

I'd also like to say, the industry has done some self-governing of itself. Just three years ago, somebody, I forget who it was, it was either Reid or Sharon or somebody, maybe even Thor questioned me about, we had people listed in our proposal that were listed on a competitor's proposal as well, for the same job.

Savage: It happened today.

Edgington: Today? Hopefully he didn't see anybody—

Savage: DCS, we had three individuals that were approved on the Project NEON project in December of 2015. Three of those individuals were listed on your resume for the USA Project.

Edgington: Yes. Yeah and that was due to the—what Mike had explained there, but you didn't see anybody and I didn't know they were on Mike's proposal, but I know how he operates that stuff, so it wouldn't have surprised me if they were there. What we do now is, we ensure, we get something in writing from our employees,

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

from the guys we're looking at hiring, I'll go into what the differences are between a designer and a construction person here in a second. When we do that, we get something in writing that says, hey these guys are available and they will work on this project for us and that they're not going to put their name in for anybody else. That's embarrassing to me if my name shows up or somebody that's working for me or proposing to work for me shows up on three different proposals for the same job, for say USA Parkway. That's no good.

Hopefully, through industry, we've kind of taken care of that. I sat on the Nevada PE Board for seven years and we addressed several issues like that. We came up with a, kind of self-regulating solution before it went and got to be a bigger mess, before someone has to write a law to take care of it.

Then, one of the other differences in people see consultants as consultants and they hear engineering consultant and they think of design stuff. When I've got a designer, that designer is usually full time and is working on several design projects at a time. Their time is as such that they can spend 50% on one project, 20% on another project, 30% on another project. Construction is not like that. When I get a construction technician or a person, they are on that construction project 100% of the time. They can't spend time on other projects, my technicians people. When that job starts, they are there. When that job ends, if I don't have another job to put them on, they're gone. I mean, it's terrible. Unless I've got like a resident engineer, I will keep them on full time through lulls and stuff and they'll know I'll put them down to a part time situation. Our technicians come and go as the wind goes, so a lot of times the technician might not be able to work for HDR because I had to lay them off. They'll have to look other places. They'll look at CA. They'll look at DCS, if DCS has got a job coming up. They'll look to go there. We try to use our same group because they're familiar with HDR and all our policies. We have kind of a core group that does HDR work and some of those guys also do work for DCS.

There is just a little bit of difference on how the construction team works as opposed to [inaudible] design. I'd love to have any questions.

Savage: Mr. Edgington, I think you're work and what your firm does, I mean, we appreciate the consultant. We do. It's vitally important that all the consultants watch the back of NDOT. That's why we hire consultants. We want to make sure that we're protecting NDOT in all those inspections and designs and things. We have a lot on our plate right now and that's all we're trying to do is make sure

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

that we're getting what we deserve at the end of the day with the right people and you guys [inaudible] so I appreciate it.

Edgington: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Savage: Thank you. CA Group.

Hanson: For the record, Chad Hanson, the CA Group. Just to quickly reiterate some of the previous comments made. It is a tough industry out there and yes we're coming out of recession, we're happy to see the work. We appreciate NDOT supporting the consulting community, the Board for diving into these contracts and figuring out and most importantly, Rudy and his staff for clarifying that I didn't have \$80M worth of backlog, which I've been fighting since the November Board Meeting.

A couple of things about those numbers to keep in mind and Mike touched on it is, we may have a \$2M contract, for example, the Northern Nevada Traffic Study. I believe our contract value is \$1.7M on that one. We actually are subcontracting out probably \$700,000 of that to other firms. National firms, we do that for a variety of reasons. One, it's to give NDOT the best team possible. We like to take pride that we've got special issue areas but there are areas that we reach out and we find people that are experts in it, but also to spread the work and to have a national firm behind us that if we get into the situation where we're overtaxed, we have no issues with going to that firm and saying, we're going to give you [inaudible] get done.

We realize, yes, you are very concerned about us meeting schedules, but for us, it's actually more critical to us because as you saw, we are based on quality, not cost. If I screw up a project, I guarantee you that the [inaudible] around the halls and I will not get [inaudible] It is very important for me and our firm to get our contracts done on schedule. [inaudible] we feel we do our part on that because we do deliver quality product on time and to the expectations of others. We do appreciate everything going on, but please kind of take those numbers with a grain of salt, because yeah—and it's the same—it's both sides. We do sub a lot of work out but we're also a sub on other teams out there. At the end of the day, it is in our best priority to make sure the jobs are done the way you expect them to be done and the way NDOT staff and their crews expect them to be done too.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

With that—and I'm sure, Rudy and Mike, would also say this, our doors are also always open. If you hear a concern or have a concern, please reach out to us too. We know you're very busy individuals. You obviously have your full time gigs, plus this little side gig you do. If you do feel there's a concern, we encourage you to reach out and to ask us just like we'd like to reach out to you and express any concerns we may have or things like that.

Savage: Thank you Chad. I did have one question. I'd like to know how you handle—sometimes you work for the Department. On occasion, you'll work for a contractor that's working with the Department.

Hanson: That's always an interesting situation.

Savage: Again, it's about perception and about understanding the ethics of how things are handled. I know we're a relatively small group of contractors and engineers and there's only so many people to go around, but how do you handle a situation when you could be working for a contractor on a design-build project and you're also working for the State of Nevada on all these other projects? How does your firm handle that situation?

Hanson: The first thing we do is to try to find a contractor that has our same interests in mind. The majority of that time, that happens. We try to find a contractor that we know has a long term commitment to the Department and their interest of satisfying the Department are in line with ours. Sometimes those contractors aren't available but at the end of the day, my livelihood depends on working with NDOT. Also the role we play for the design-builder is, we still have standards. We still have performance specs that are developed by the Department for those contracts. My job is to adhere to those regardless of who pays me. If it's a contractor or if the Department is paying me.

First and foremost, we have our professional responsibilities to take care of, the standards, the criteria and sometimes we do get into—the Department does a great job on the design-build performance spec locations. No one can ever do them perfect, I don't care how much time you spend or how much you pay a consultant to develop them, there will always be holes, just like there's always holes usually in a regular construction contract. We do our best to find win-win situations. At the end of the day, we want to give the Department what they asked for and that it adheres to all the standards. Yeah, sometimes we get—there's issues and you have to work through the middle of them but we always try to find that fair, win-

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

win negotiation. Thankfully we've never been put in a bad situation to where it reflects negatively on us. That's a lot of in part why we pick the contractors we pick.

Savage: Thank you. Anything else?

Hanson: Any questions for me?

Knecht: Just one. Concerning Len's last question, aren't there provisions in the professional engineers [inaudible] of ethics that address that?

Hanson: Yes.

Knecht: And you are bound to those?

Hanson: I'm bound to those. Once again, I've been doing this for 21 years now. 18, 19 of those have been actually working for the Department and working with staff there. These people in these halls are my family. First of all, I wouldn't hurt my friends. Second of all, it's not my ethics. Third of all, if I screw it up, I'm not going to get another job. All three of those inter tie with me doing good work and being responsible to answering to the Department and the citizens.

Terry: If I could Mr. Chairman?

Savage: Yes, Mr. Terry.

Terry: John Terry, Assistant Director of Engineering. I will point out that, we as a Department have made a conscious decision to not be as restrictive on the issue that you're talking about here. Some DOTs are far more restrictive on that issue, to the point where there's almost—there's consultants that work for the DOT and there's consultants that can work for the design-builders and we try and be a little more liberal on that interpretation. Obviously, if they worked on the preliminary design and documents for that specific project, we preclude them from being on a team on that project but we are quite liberal on our interpretation of that conflict, because frankly, we want the local consulting industry proposing on our projects and our design-build projects. While we watch that issue, we're not as prescriptive on whose precluded from putting in and working for the contractors on that issue. That's a conscious decision we made here. I just wanted to point that out.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Savage: Thank you Mr. Terry. Thank you Chad. Anybody else like to speak on consultants? Any comments? Anything else? We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 4. Has everyone had a chance to review the December 14, 2015 Department of Transportation, Construction Working Group, Meeting Minutes? If so, any comments?

Knecht: Quick one, Mr. Chairman, Page 22 the fourth line, I think two words got dropped. My last sentence there should read, has this matter been back to the full NDOT Board? 'To the' after back.

Savage: Thank you Mr. Controller. Member Martin, any comments?

Martin: No sir, I didn't have any—I just had a question for Reid on, let me find it here. We can go ahead and approve them. Reid, I'll come back to this after the Old Business.

Kaiser: Okay.

Knecht: Move to approve. How's that.

Savage: There's a move to approve from Mr. Controller, is there a second?

Martin: Second.

Savage: All in favor, say aye. [ayes around] It's approved with the notations made. Agenda Item No. 5, Presentation and Discussion on NDOT's Safety Project Selection Process.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, for the record. PD Kiser will give this presentation.

PD Kiser: I'm PD Kiser, I'm the Assistant Chief Traffic Safety Engineer in the Safety Division at NDOT. Reid asked me to put together a presentation on how we select our projects. I'm going to go through that.

Our Strategic Highway Safety Plan, that's basically where everything starts, with our Safety Program. There's basically two main goals, reduce fatal crashes and reduce serious injury crashes. We are a data driven division, here at NDOT. We don't just make this stuff up. We actually do go out and collect the data. We work with the crash data that we get, also with the traffic volumes that are on these roadways, we do field reviews and that's followed up where we do

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

interviews with the district staff or the local agency staff depending on what type of project we're talking about.

The majority of the fatal crashes from year to year, generally will fall in one of these three categories: lane departure, intersections, pedestrians. Lane departure is running off the road or going from your lane to somebody else's lane, whatever. Probably about half of the fatal crashes that we have in the State fall just in that one category.

How do we decide how we're going to do these lane departure projects? We go through and do kind of a crash review of all these major roadways that we have. The State Highway, the US routes, national highway system routes, the freeways, so forth and start looking at densities, crash densities. Where are the majority of these run off the road type crashes occurring. We start with that. Then we go through and we do a ranking based on the severity of the crashes that we find. Pull out the fatal/serious injury crashes and look at the density of those versus the total crashes. That's really kind of our starting point. I'll show you a little map here in a minute what that looks like when we go through and do that.

Whenever possible, we'll try to add these countermeasures, these lane departure countermeasures into an upcoming NDOT Project, the 3R Project or roadway widening project, whatever. In some cases we've been able to add money to that project to have that work done and so forth, so we're working constantly.

Knecht: My brain isn't fully functioning today. Remind me again what 3R is.

PD Kiser: That's the [crosstalk] Pavement Preservation Program.

Dyson: Restore, resurface, rehabilitate. The fourth R is reconstruct. So, we do a lot of 3R's. Thor Dyson for the record.

[crosstalk]

PD Kiser: In some cases where we've found a need to address this run off the road type crashes and there is not a project coming up, we've done some standalone projects to deal with that.

What are some of the countermeasures that we've done? Rumble strips, rumble stripes, everybody is, I'm sure familiar with that. We have a lot of those edge line rumble strips. If it's got the paint line on top of it, it's called a rumble stripe, for

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

your—so you know for sure. We also do centerline rumble strips on the two lane roads. That now is pretty much a standard, so it's pretty much added to any project that's coming up outside the urban areas.

Barriers, we're always looking at places where we need to have barrier to prevent vehicles from going off the road. If it's a situation where it's a very steep, long drop, so forth, we use cable. The cable barriers are primarily used in the medians to prevent the median crossover type crashes. We also use guard rail and the concrete barrier rail.

The one project that we're putting a lot of attention to and a lot of money to right now is the shoulder widening, slope flattening. We still have a lot of sections of roadway where there's a fairly steep drop off. There's either no shoulder or the shoulder is fairly narrow. It leaves very little room for correction, if a driver drops off the edge of the pavement. Again, that's where a lot of these type of fatality occur, because the vehicle will start to roll and can create a lot of problems.

Curves is another one that we're actually putting a little more effort into now, looking at that where we're going to—we're working with UNR to help us develop a program to identify all the curves and then we'll go through and look at all the crashes and everything at those curves and determine where we need to do some countermeasures at those locations.

This is just a few slides showing again, the rumble stripe where the painted line is actually on top of the rumble strip. Up here, the painted line is actually next to the rumble strip. We're going more to rumble stripes where the painted line is on top of it. We have about, probably over 3,000 miles of center line and edge rumble stripes/strips that we've done since 2007. As I mentioned before, it's a current design standard that we use on almost all of our rural roadways.

Median barrier, again, this is just a cable barrier. I'm sure you've seen quite a few of those locations around the State. We do have a list, especially on the two interstates, where if the median width is at a certain width or less, it's slated for cable barrier. It's just a matter of getting projects out there, finding the money to fund that and get that installed.

Savage: Mr. Kaiser, excuse me. Do we self-perform the rumble strip?

PD Kiser: It's basically, do we—you mean as far as, is it done in-house?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Savage: Do our crews do it in-house, yes?

PD Kiser: No. It's done by contractor.

Savage: It's outside contractors, okay. Thank you.

PD Kiser: It takes a special grinding machine to do that. The shoulder widening/slope flattening, again, we're putting a lot of effort into this one. The red is an indicator of where we have a higher density of these lane departure crashes that were either fatals or serious injury crashes. Then of course the—so, that's a high priority. The yellow is more of a medium priority and then the lower priority is the green color. This is US-93, you can see we have fairly long stretches of that. Up north on US-50, US-50 is the east/west corridor here and you can see there are a lot of issues with that.

Here's a typical, probably a before situation. You can see there's a very narrow shoulder. The slope drops off pretty quickly, down to the toe of the slope. We come in and widen. In this case, the shoulder hasn't been widened at this point. This is US-95 out north of Fallon. As you can see, where you have a nice recovery area, where if the driver drops off, the wheels drop off, they can bring the vehicle to the stop and slow down and get back on to the roadway without having to worry about having to rollover.

This is another one, same roadway, where we've gone in and actually widened or flattened the slope. The guard rail will be able to be removed so you're eliminating kind of a road side hazard there that you don't have to worry about people running into. Wherever possible we do try to do that.

Dyson: PD?

PD Kiser: Yes.

Dyson: Again, Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Really quick on these slope flattening, sometimes they're contract, sometimes Kevin's forces in District III and District II forces, districts will do the slope flattening as well. That's kind of a mixed bag.

PD Kiser: Thank you for mentioning that. Intersection projects, basically, the projects that we've done so far have been what we call systemic projects, which means things are done applied system wide. We're not just doing crash hot-spots or high crash locations. When we do those, again, we always get input from our district offices,

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

our local agency staff. In intersection projects, most of those have been in the urban area. Probably the best example of that is the flashing yellow arrow that you see at the signalized intersection, where they've replaced the green ball where you can—it's a permissive left turn and we've replaced it with the flashing yellow arrow to make the driver's more aware that they need to be cautious. We've probably done over 500 intersections that way.

Instead of going intersection to intersection and pulling up all the crashes at the intersection, we just say, we're going to do a whole bunch of these, or a number of corridors. We've had a fair amount of success. There's actually some research being done through the University of North Carolina on that countermeasure. We're sharing our data with them. We know there was an earlier study done by the City of Henderson, where they looked at these just in their area and they had about a 20% reduction in left turn crashes. That's pretty significant for that.

I mentioned the flashing yellow arrow. The other thing that we've done in the rural areas is put the flashing red or the flashing stop beacon on top of the stop signs that flashes continuously. One of the problems we've had is some of these side streets, there's a long, straight stretch of roadway and all the sudden, you're coming up on to the state highway and people blow through it and we put that flashing red beacon on top of the stop sign to let them know well in advance that there's a stop there.

The other countermeasure that we're using now is roundabouts. I'm not going to preach my sermon about roundabouts but they are very effective. They do provide a lot of safety benefits. They don't apply everywhere, but wherever we can find a place to make them apply, we will. We are doing that.

Just a few photos of all these countermeasures. Just to give you an idea of what these things look like.

Pedestrian Projects. These other two, the intersection, the lane departure projects have all been federally funded with Federal Safety Funds. The pedestrian projects, as you're aware from about a year ago, we had the Board Meeting and we saw the video up at North Virginia Street at the Bonanza Casino, what happened to the pedestrian. We, as a result of that, the Governor became our champion for pedestrians. That was really—that was awesome because now when people tell us now, you don't want to spend money on that, we say, when

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

the Governor is your champion, we're going to do it. It's helped us a lot as far as getting things moved along.

The locations, we start out with that big map that we showed, that had pedestrian crashes just scattered all over it. That was our starting point. We analyzed those for severity and so forth and numbers, traffic numbers. One of the things we found is that was probably one of the prevalent was most of these locations have very low pedestrian activity, just occasional pedestrians, maybe four or five a day. They're locations where drivers are not normally used to seeing pedestrians. When there's one that pops out there, it's a big surprise, even if there's a crosswalk and so forth. That was a problem. How do we get drivers to know that there's a pedestrian there? We'll talk about that a little bit more in a minute.

We did go out and do a field review of all these state highways or most all the state highways in the State, at least in the urban areas. Our direction, I think from the Board was more, we want about 75-80% of the funds spent down South. The rest up here in the North. That's where we really concentrated first for our locations. We went through and we did come up with a number of locations where there was an existing crosswalk with some signs, or maybe there was some pedestrian crashes at a location where there wasn't a crosswalk. We had to assess whether or not there needed to be a crosswalk.

We had a process already in place for evaluating uncontrolled crosswalk locations. Uncontrolled just means it's not at a traffic signal or four-way stop, so any other location would be controlled. Again, we evaluated and came up with a list of these locations. We went through this process to determine, what should we do with these locations. Most of those is where we're looking at using the pedestrian activated rapid flashing beacons. Maybe Danish offsets in the middle, pedestrian refuges, [inaudible] so forth.

Again, we ran this through our district offices. We also had a lot of input from the local agencies who had a lot of concerns about pedestrians on state highways through their jurisdictions.

Once we had this list and the initial list had about 50 locations on it. Again, about 70-80% of those locations were down South. The rest of them were up North. We had to decide which ones do we do first, as far as putting money towards that. We developed a selection process or a matrix. We found something up in Seattle, Washington that was pretty neat. We took that and we modified it to meet our

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

needs. That's how we came up with this kind of ranking or prioritized list, whatever we want to call it. Again, most of these locations, not surprisingly were on the higher volume streets in the urban areas. A few in the rural areas or suburban areas.

Typical locations, for instance in Las Vegas was a six-lane arterial, 45-mile an hour speed limit, if we're going somewhat faster than that, 40,000-50,000 cars a day. The first question is, why would somebody cross a road like that? It became very evident when we went out and started doing the field evaluations where we had a senior citizen center on one side of the road and the bus stop on the other side. Those people don't drive anymore. They want to get to the Wal-Mart and they don't want to walk a half a mile or a quarter mile to get to that bus stop over there so they're taking off across the street and going all the way across. Or, there's a trailer park on one side and there's a local bar on the other side. There's a lot of those in Las Vegas. Those are the kinds of generators, pedestrian generators that we found and we used to assign a weight, a weighting and ranking to.

Let me move on. I talked about some of the stuff, the pedestrian activated rapid flashing—rapid rectangular flashing beacon. They get a lot of attention from the drivers. We actually have pretty good comprehension or people stopping for those, probably up in the 80-90% range. 85-90% range.

Savage: Excuse me, Mr. Kiser, which is the most successful method, besides a stop light?

PD Kiser: It would be probably rectangular flashers.

Savage: The beacons.

PD Kiser: The beacons, yes.

Savage: And are those beacons—they're vertical on the side of the road all the time?

PD Kiser: If it's like a six-lane arterial, we have a mast arm and we have them out hanging over the roadway as well as on the pole on the side. Typically, we would probably also put them about 300 feet in advance. When you push the button, they're all going off at the same time. If it's a two lane, whatever we—lower speed, you can probably just put them on the side of the roadway.

Savage: How long have those been around?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

PD Kiser: Good question. I would say probably, they've been developed in probably the last 10 years, maybe a little less.

Savage: But they're pretty successful.

PD Kiser: They've been very successful.

Savage: Okay, thank you.

PD Kiser: Yes. Street lighting, another problem we have is about 80% of our pedestrian fatalities occur at night. A lot of people are wearing dark clothing. The lighting that we normally use for say, continuous lighting, not enough light so now we've gone to an enhanced LED street light that puts a lot more light on the roadway. I think that's going to be a huge factor when we start getting these implemented.

Refuge islands, pedestrian bulb-outs, Danish offsets, again, these are all features that wherever we can, we'll use those to—especially on these bigger, wider roads, where people have a long distance to cross.

Just a few—there's an example of the one where it's out over the roadway, or typically just on the edge of the roadway. Refuge areas. The Danish offset where they have to turn and face the traffic, get down to go across. The bulb outs and these are the—you can see the LED lighting where it really lights up the crosswalk and works very well.

That is the end. Any questions?

Savage: Not from myself. Mr. Controller, or Member Martin? Thank you Mr. Kiser, very well done. Moving on to Agenda Item No. 6, Presentation, Discussion and Calculation of the Overhead Rate for Consultant Agreements. Mr. Hoffman.

Hoffman: All right. Everything you wanted to know about overhead rates but were afraid to ask, right. I'll try not to put you to sleep, I'll go very quickly. I know through discussions at Board Meetings and Construction Working Group Meetings that overhead rates have been a serious discussion topic.

Really, the takeaway that I want the Construction Working Group to leave with today is that, we've got it under control. There are several national guidance and documents that we use to check and double check and triple check overhead rates. Just to go very quickly—

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Roadmap to the Presentation: Who is responsible for verifying the overhead rates? I'll introduce you to our Audit Services Division. What is an overhead rate? Pretty simple math but to try to get that simple math is very in depth. Federal rules and guidance that we use to make sure we're doing it accurately. National peer reviews. We have other states come in and talk to us and actually audit our Audit Services Group. Those are other State DOTs that come in and do that. An example of how overhead rates are calculated. A very simple way that—there's an AASHTO document that I'll get into that's very helpful in the process for that. Then, what is NDOT's specific process for auditing overhead rates.

Very quickly. Here's an org chart. The blue box is outlining the actual Audit Services Division. We have a Supervisor in Sandeep Garg. An Admin Assistant and Auditor III that pretty much oversees the work of four Auditor II positions and there are currently two vacant positions. Not a whole lot of staff and I'll show you how much work they have to do every year.

This kind of goes back to the Board Meeting we had today. As consultant services ramps up, the more we consult out, the more checking we need to do from an auditing standpoint. And, I will just say that this line right here is very important. I sent all the Transportation Board Members an email a few months ago stating the results of a peer review, where the audit services division has to have direct contact or at least the ability to have direct contact with the Transportation Board. You're more than welcome to contact Sandeep directly if you have any questions on any auditing matters.

Yes sir, Mr. Controller?

Knecht: Bill, thank you for that. That's helpful. One thing peaks my curiosity is, down there in the blue box and otherwise, you've got these numbers, 7001, 7003, 7009 at the bottom of each, what do those signify?

Hoffman: Those are position control numbers, I would think. [crosstalk]

King: At the bottom of each box—[crosstalk]

Hoffman: Those are just identifiers for the positions.

King: The two [crosstalk] on the front are dropped off and so they are the position control numbers.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Hoffman: So, it just signifies that that position is locked up in this chart for that division.

Knecht: Thank you.

Hoffman: Sure. What does the Audit Services Division do? Most, I would say 85-90% of what they do are cost verification [inaudible]. That is—and, this is definitely a note for—so, Audit Services, they do not audit construction projects. That's the Construction Division and field crews that actually audit construction or contractors. This is for consultants. Pretty much the difference between contracts and agreements; they focus their efforts on agreements.

What they'll do is at the end of a consultant agreement, they'll go through and double check pay rates and they'll go through soup to nuts and check every penny that was spent to make sure that the State of Nevada is properly spending every penny on consultants. As you can see—

Savage: Excuse me, Bill. Do they go into the consultants' offices to audit their books?

Hoffman: Yes, they do.

Savage: And do the Feds also go in and check our audit?

Hoffman: Yes.

Savage: Internally?

Hoffman: There are Federal Highway Administration Process Review Audits. We're getting audited by the LCB auditors, our own auditors, FHWA auditors. There's probably five or six audits every other year that we go through with different agencies.

Savage: So, on every project, or how does it work when the NDOT auditors go into the consultant offices and audit their books? Do they do it on every project or how does that work?

Hoffman: I don't think on every project. I think in order to set up all the cost codes and fringe—they look at fringe benefits, general overhead, pay rates, everything. They'll go through all of that but on an ongoing basis, once they get that core set of charge items, then from that point forward, it's just documents supplied by the consultants that just verify that. There are provisional types of exercises that go

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

on and then we audit those. It's on an as-needed basis and there are national and state guidelines on how often you do that.

Savage: Do we ever have to subcontract that work out for auditing purposes?

Hoffman: I don't think we audit subcontract—

Savage: We're able to handle that so far?

Hoffman: Excuse me?

Savage: We're able to handle that workload internally so far?

Hoffman: Well, let's talk about that. That's good Chairman Savage. If you read down, the cost verification audits, the balance, July 1, 2015, there were 85 essentially uncompleted audits. 85. There were audits assigned were 80, so a total of 165 outstanding audits that needed to be done. That's through the—that's just for these six months. This six month period here.

This just gives you an idea of the volume of work that our auditors, internal audit services are doing specifically for consultant agreements. That number is going to shoot way up, way up. Specifically based on what we talked about this morning, with this ramp up.

Savage: So how do you expect to handle that work load?

Hoffman: Well, um. Well, Mr. Terry's presentation on consultant backlog and troughs and peaks, we're going to have to cover it with consultants, I think. Either that or—

Savage: Accounting type firms.

Hoffman: Yes, it would be accounting type firms. Or, we could hire more internal folks. We have to do that analysis and make sure that we're spending money appropriately.

Savage: Okay. It's quite evident that that's going to be necessary.

Hoffman: Absolutely. Definitely is. Like I said, cost verification audits are the bulk of the work but pre-negotiation audits, which is overhead rates. Going into a consultant's office and verifying all of those numbers is very important. Pre-stewardship audits, those are audits that we do on agreements before we execute agreements with local agencies who are part of the stewardship program.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Performance audits, since we're doing the operational audit right now, we've deferred our Audit Services Division. They'd like to do more performance audits, which is a check on program areas for efficiency. Force account change orders, so if there are rates or accounting types of questions or things that maybe the Construction Division or something on the construction side is needed to be verified, then our Audit Services staff do any special request audits. Really, I just wanted to show you the range of services they perform and then where the bulk of the work is, which is in cost verification audits.

Another one and the reason why we focus our attention is because of the findings. The audits that we do are prioritized. It's a risk based analysis of which contracts or agreements we're going to audit. It's strictly—I mean, total dollars, problem areas from before, we go through a risk analysis and figure out which agreements to do first. So there's a prioritization.

Savage: Mr. Controller?

Knecht: Thank you. Bill, you've got no pending requests for performance audits. As a guy who spent eight years on an Audit Committee, Chairing it two years, that was the song I sung continuously, was the need to move from pure compliance audits to performance audits. Do you have any plans to really turn that up and make it a substantial part of the audit program?

Hoffman: We would like to do that very much so. We're down on staff and then we'd like to see what comes out of this operational audit. The operational audit that Mr. Nellis talked about at the Board Meeting today, very focused on some different program areas. We want to see what comes out of that. I think the Department knows that our staff is swamped with the existing compliance audits, but that is an area that we would like to move in.

Knecht: Keep us posted on that please.

Hoffman: Will do. We're going to rip through this. So, what is an overhead rate? Direct labor costs, any costs identified with a single project or cost objective. That's a single project. Anything you can charge directly to a single project. Indirect costs, costs not directly identified with a single project or cost objective so something you can charge to multiple cost objectives or projects. The indirect costs are made up of fringe benefits, general overhead and of those, there are allowable—an allowable overhead or indirect costs, sorry. From there, it's just

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

straight math. Total indirect cost divided by total direct labor cost. Very simple. To get there is quite [inaudible].

All the national rules that we follow, we're forced to follow all of that and I'm not going to read them. One of the most important things here is this AASHTO Uniform Audit and Accounting Guide. So, all of this is wrapped up into a guide. About eight or ten years ago, State DOTs were really struggling with how to consistently perform audits. It's just—it was just simple. What AASHTO did is they came up with a Uniform Audit Accounting Guide. Not to belabor this so much, but [inaudible]. This is a quite extensive document that we use that wraps all of those federal requirements up that have forms, worksheets, all kinds of tools. I'll just slowly kind of roll through this.

Savage: You don't have to read it to us, that's okay. [laughter]

Hoffman: That just tells me that I need to keep moving forward. You're going to have to trust me that it's like 100 pages.

Savage: We trust you.

Hoffman: It's not four. There's forms and all kinds of stuff that I'm going to show you here. And now we're stuck. Can you help me DJ? [laughter] [pause] There we go. Thank you DJ, appreciate it.

Another thing, so there's consistency among the country on using the guide that I was talking about. Another approach that helps with consistency is a separate peer review audit. We had folks come in and audit us, during that review period of time from Idaho, Oregon and Colorado. This latest one is the one where they made some recommendations.

They went A to Z. They audited us. They went and looked at everything they possibly could and they came up with these five relatively unimportant—and I'll say, we don't have major issues. There aren't major holes in the program, but they wanted to change the name. They thought, this review team, thought it would be good to change the name from Internal Audit to Audit Services, because they're actually do external work. That's a no brainer.

Here's the one here though. So they thought—I guess in a lot of other State DOTs, the Board or Commission that they report to has direct access to the Audit Division. That was a change they wanted to make. We made that change, hence

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

that dashed line that I showed you before with the arrow in the earlier presentation. The ability of the Board of Directors to contact them whenever they need information.

Knecht: Bill, clarification on that. The dashed line there means basically that all and any members of the Board have direct contact with the Audit Services people, not that you have to go through the Chairman or get a majority or anything like that?

Hoffman: That's correct Mr. Controller, yes. If you have any question at all about—what we'll do is we'll continually send you the annual management report. That was part of what I sent you in that email, describing the outcome of the peer review.

All right, you can see that, but all I'm going to do is, all of these fringe benefit costs, direct labor, all of the general overhead, all of this is looked at and gathered by our audit services. It's verified. All of that information is verified. What they do is they come up with a general ledger account balance, subtract out direct overhead, because you can't include that. They subtract out direct overhead, any disallowable costs with the notes down below, I know you can't see that but that's all right. We're just getting to the final answer, okay. You're working across the chart and before you know it, you got total labor costs, direct labor costs and then indirect labor. All that is is, indirect cost divided by direct labor costs, that's all that is.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, for the record. I got a quick question. Can a consultant request something be done during this analysis period to get a different overhead rate? We had a situation not long ago where one of our consultants had to pay some money back to the Department. I was told if they would've known the rules up front, they could've received a smaller overhead rate and therefore probably would've owed less money, or figured out how to not pay us back a large bill.

Terry: John Terry, Assistant Director, we absolutely have done that in the past.

Kaiser: Okay, so that is do able.

Terry: Bill hasn't gotten to that point, but—so, most of our contracts, we sign with a consultant say, this is your provisional overhead rate. It's usually based upon the audited rate of the year before, possibly the year before that. That stays in effect through the entire contract and at the end of the contract, say if it's two or three years, auditors go through and give us their actual overhead rate for each of the years they worked and they owe us money or we owe them money back, to even

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

it out. But, if a consultant knows something in their business is changed dramatically and their overhead rate isn't going to stay consistent, they can ask that the provisional rate be changed in the middle of a project so that that doesn't happen and yes, they can do that.

Hoffman: And we've done it, we've adjusted, but at least annually, we go and look at every single consultants overhead rate.

Kaiser: Okay.

Hoffman: Okay, and they'll adjust, just like John said, they'll come up with a provisional rate and then they'll balance up later, based on what they think the cost will be.

Kaiser: Okay, thank you.

Hoffman: Yeah and we've done that. Actually we had one go from 184% down to 110%, that's how much change occurred in the last year. Okay.

This just shows—this is out of that guide that I talked about. This is how much detail this gets into. This is just sample examples of how you could calculate an overhead rate for a home office and a field office. You just determine, at the very top, 6.34%. The percentage of your direct labor cost was 6.34%, that's easy to just then calculate the field office. There is a way to do the field office as well. Just wanted to show you that there's a lot of detail to this and that all of those national guidelines and regulations, we follow. We follow very closely. I'm sparing you the math. I see the engineers in the room, like talking about the numbers and stuff.

This is our process. As John talked about, we mail a survey packet out to the consultant. They send back a whole bunch of information. We also send out an internal control questionnaire. We want to know how they do their business as well. Then we verify—we go to the consultant's office, verify expense accounts and timesheets. Verify that all the fringe benefit, all of the overhead costs, all of that stuff is set. Analyze the consultant's accounting system. We look specifically at their accounting system and make sure that looks all right. We verify executive compensation schedule, their bonuses and those things, what the higher level executives are getting from that company. We prepare the audit report and send it to the project manager. That project manager uses that provisional overhead rate to negotiate the contract.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

I thought this was pretty interesting. It's a little dated, 2012. What's interesting is there's a two-year rolling average here. It's on its—we were talking about, when the consultants came up and talked, they were talking about self-[inaudible]. There is this trend to reduce consulting firms overhead rates. It doesn't make them any money by having a really high overhead rate, it just doesn't. But that gets calculated in the overhead rates that we use to then pay the consultants. The trend is down. The 2012 average is about 161.6%. You look at the two-year rolling average, so that orange line, takes you to about 167%.

Where do we fall? We had overhead rates between 110-185%. Our average was 159% out of all those consulting firms. Compared to the national average, we're right in there. Also, university overhead rates, the national average was about 152%. I think Harvard was at 180%, something like that. Ours is 123%, so it's much, much lower, nationally.

The key takeaways. We follow national federal rules and guidance documents. There's no way to fudge this. I mean, it is what it is. It's straight—it's just following federal rules and doing the math accurately. We participate in a national peer reviews. We have other states come in and audit us. We're part of that same team that goes out and audits other states, which I think is a great networking and education process for our staff. Tremendous consistency now among State DOTs. NDOT rates compare favorably with national rates.

One thing I wanted to leave you with, the consulting procurement process is totally different from the low bid contracting process. All of this, for the most part, is open, honest, transparent, in terms of calculating overhead rates. What isn't is, and I'm not saying it's bad, it's just part of the business, when a contractor comes in, it's bid item. They do hard takeoffs on all of the bid item work and then take those bid item hard estimates and then mark-up for overhead and profit. It's a totally different process the way consultants get compensated for overhead and how contractors do, which is actually in the bid items. Totally different process.

I just wanted to—Len, I know that you've asked questions about the differences between contractors and consultants and the overhead rates for consultants, I'm just saying that, it's two totally—it's apples and oranges and just two totally different ways to go about calculating the rates and how it's included for compensation for a contractor versus a consultant.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

- Savage: Thank you Bill, it's a very thorough, thorough presentation. Very educational, I know for myself. In the contractor world, I believe the construction specs stimulate overhead and profit for contractor change orders. That's probably a given. Then when you see the consultant rates, it is apples and oranges. I appreciate the time and effort in educating myself on this issue. There will always be questions.
- Hoffman: I am by no means the expert. I was the expert for the three that left the room, consultants that left the room.
- Savage: They should've stayed.
- Hoffman: Poked holes in my presentation [inaudible]. I just want to let you know, we follow all the rules. We're very good at what we do in terms of auditing. That's it.
- Savage: Thank you Bill, any other questions? Mr. Controller? Member Martin, any questions or comments?
- Martin: No sir, thank you. It's been enlightening. Much different world between yours and mine, right Len?
- Savage: Yes, it is. That's why I'm drinking a Smart Water, trying to get a little – [laughter] Thank you Bill.
- Hoffman: You're welcome.
- Savage: Okay, let's move on to the next Agenda Item, No. 7. Presentation and Discussion on NDOT's Employment Outlook.
- King: I'm Kimberly King. I'm the Human Resource Manager here at NDOT. We had some questions on our vacancy rate and our turnover.
- Savage: Welcome Ms. King, we look forward to your presentation.
- King: NDOT's vacancy rate, I'm using the date of February 19th for my date because that's when I had to put the memorandum together. It was 12.5% for all the permanent positions as of that date. For our temporary positions which includes our snow plow drivers, it was 36.36%, for the temporary positions. That's a vacancy rate of 13.76% for both permanent and temporary.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

As of that date, we had 229 vacant positions. 19.65% of NDOT's employees are on probation or trial, which means they're not fully proficient in their job. 80.35% of our employees are permanent in their positions.

Over the next five years—first of all, let me tell you that this is off of a project retirement report that was dated on September 23, 2015. It projects that 414 NDOT employees out of 1,720 employees can retire in the next five years. 729 NDOT employees out of the 1,720 can retire in the next 10 years. 28 NDOT employees retired between September 23, 2015 when that report came out and February 19th, when I put together the memorandum.

I have people from each of the districts. I have district engineers from each district that are going to talk specifically about their district and the challenges that they're running into. I think Mary is there in the South.

Savage: Good afternoon Mary.

Martini: Well, hello, how are you? I don't think I'm on camera.

Martin: Somebody widen out the camera. She's been sitting over here goofing off.

Martini: I told him that they wanted to see a close-up of Frank, so. I'm here.

Martin: I don't think they can see you yet.

Martini: Can you see me? Do you want me to move?

Savage: Go ahead Mary, you're fine.

Martini: Okay. Did you—I thought, Kimberly, are you going to do your presentation or do we want to talk about District I right now?

King: This is a chance for you to talk about just your District.

Martini: Okay. One of the slides that is up should show the District I personnel. Of the positions, 463—so, District I is Southern Nevada and it includes the central part around Tonopah. That's a Tonopah Sub-district, so that's part of District I. This also includes our construction aides, which are part-time employees. As you can see, the bottom line, we have a 20% vacancy rate and we have a 20% probation rate, so in combining the two, we have 40% of our staff that we either have vacancies or they are in their first year of employment.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

The other piece that isn't shown but John Terry talked about it a little bit in the Transportation Board is we've had a reduction of staff. In my 12 years here, we've lost approximately 25 positions out of District I, but the bulk of them was in the reduction of one of our construction crews. As we've talked about in the past, the Fuel Revenue Indexing in the Clark County area has put a lot of people back to work, but it's also put a lot of focus on our staff and the folks with good skills generally are leaving to better pay, often better benefits. So, that's happening.

In the Tonopah area, we share the issue where we're losing a great deal of our staff to the mines. Now that's slowed down a little bit over the last year or two, as gold prices have dropped, but it's still taking a majority of our staff. It's hard to keep them, it's tough to keep them in the rural areas anyway.

The next piece of it is, even when you can get some staff on board, it takes a while to get them trained and proficient. We've got some areas where we become training grounds for other areas and other agencies. We have a very quick turnover of our staff. Our resources are going in to getting them trained up, but because we can't—we do not have the salaries to retain them, they basically get proficient and then leave.

That's kind of an overview of where we're at. I'll let Kimberly have it back.

King: Okay, thanks.

Savage: Thank you Mary.

King: Okay, Thor Dyson will talk about District II.

Savage: Excuse me, Ms. King. I just got an urgent news alert that there's pie being served at 2:00, some place downstairs. I'd like to send a memo to make sure they save 26 pieces of pie, we're not able to make it at this time. Copy.

King: They usually have lots of pie.

Savage: Go ahead and proceed.

Kaiser: I'm surprised Thor is staying. [laughter]

Dyson: Great time to go!

Martini: Did you include pie for Las Vegas? [laughter]

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Dyson: So, Thor Dyson, District Engineer for District II. We typically—I like to see a 4-6% vacancy rate. Haven't come near that in any area of my district in quite some time. We, in District II are broken down into Maintenance, Construction and Administration for the most part. We have some other sections that are outlined in this slide where we have communication, equipment shop, right-of-way, utilities and stock room.

We've got 290 positions, as it shows up on the slide there. Like Mary Martini stated, back in 2012, due to the recession and lack of work in the construction area, we reduced our construction personnel down by one crew. All the crews were streamlined to five crews. We had six. We eliminated 18 positions and one of the comments that I want to make is that, as our workload ramps up, while it may not be as much as Las Vegas, it is ramping up, we're going to be needing some additional consultants to augment construction consultants for augmenting our crews or for doing administration of our projects. Like I said, that's due to the peaks and valleys and we're starting to peak up a little bit with our Construction Work Program.

We also are experiencing what I consider the Tesla Effect for District II and that's everything that's happening out in the Tahoe/Reno Industrial Center. It's very difficult to acquire skilled labor, particularly people that are driving trucks that we would hire on a temporary and/or permanent basis to plow snow and work on maintenance crews.

It's common to have more vacancies than applicants when we do our maintenance recruitments. I'm going to say that again. It's common to have more vacancies than applicants. It's also common when we do our interviews to have two or more no shows at our recruitment interviews. So, if we do get a list, it's quite often that they don't show up. It is also common that once we do go through all the process with the no shows and with the number of vacancies that when we finally do make a job offer, they tend to see the wage that they're being offered and they'll decline it based on wage and benefits.

We're quickly losing senior staff. In many of my areas in District II, in the Maintenance Section, what used to be 15-20 years considered senior staff in the maintenance series, in the maintenance levels is now really five years. I have supervisors in different sections of roadway that you drive that are running crews that have five years, and they're some of our senior personnel right now.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Then, when we do get our recruits and we have them going along, it's difficult to retain them because they're leaving based on wage and benefit complaints.

For the first time in my memory, we are considering outside staff for lead worker positions and supervisor positions. If we can't find them in-house, we're going outside. We're doing a lot of open recruitments with HR. Kimberly has been working with us. It affects morale somewhat, but I'm going to only hire the best people for the positions as required. If I don't have them in house because they're not senior level, I'm going to go outside.

Knecht: Quick question Thor. You said, I think I heard you say, you think the ideal vacancy rate is 4-5%?

Dyson: 4-6% is what I used to have or used to experience, 10-12 years ago when I was District Engineer, just coming on board in 2003, 2012. I mean, I enjoyed those numbers. I'm not enjoying anywhere near those numbers now.

Knecht: Right. Although, you've got the lowest vacancy rate among the three districts.

Dyson: Correct.

Knecht: And by a good margin over one. I just wondered, why you use that but what you're saying is, that's what it was in the go-go times.

Dyson: Correct. It's all relative, Mr. Knecht. It's all relative. Relative to District II, it's changed quite a bit.

Knecht: Just a thought, on your other point about in-house versus outside promotion, this is something we in the Controller's Office have had discussions of that are by weekly management committee meetings. I've discussed it with the Chief Deputy. My own philosophy has always been that long term, you want to mix, pretty much at every level, in-house and outside people. I know it's always, in a certain sense, good for morale in-house to say, well gee, there are a lot of promotional opportunities with in and that's certainly true and I emphasize that but I guess I'll go for the obvious analogy, every NFL, NBA and MLB team, I don't know anything about hockey, so don't ask me but all of them use free agents, trades, etc. Yeah, the Dodgers and the Cardinals were great with their farm systems, etc. and some other people are today, but I don't think you could do everything with the farm system. You need free agents and trades and that sort of thing.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Dyson: You're absolutely correct. And, in the last three to five years, that has increased quite a bit. If you look at this slide there at the equipment shop, I have 33% vacancy rate. The way I'm getting around some of that, because a lot of our equipment, while it's being ordered and coming, I'm still using old equipment. We're doing creative things like, hiring Manpower, Manpower Mechanics. We're doing creative things to hire retired Cal Trans workers. We're doing creative things to hire say like a Maintenance Manager out of Idaho. It's not my first choice. I'd rather hire someone that's better qualified, that's a higher senior level, that's within the system, it builds morale internally, but I'm doing what we need to do to get the job done. We kind of have our own farm system. We also kind of have our free agency system as well and that's being developed. I don't know if that—

Knecht: Yeah, I'm just making the point that there's a rationale for both. There's good rationale for in-house, but you also need continuing new blood. You can't count on the fact that you've hired and promoted the right people so that when something near the top comes open, you naturally have somebody who is just ideal for the job, much more so than you might find outside.

Dyson: That's correct. And that leads in to my next comment that, we try to recruit outside staff and we try to recruit them with needed expertise. Whether it's fixing guard rail, plowing snow or administering the maintenance program; however, it does take quite a bit of time and details to work out the accelerated step for these individuals. Because quite a few individuals that we want to pull in from free agency or from the outside, be it Cal Trans workers or somewhere else, they look at the wage and they state, hmm, that's not quite enough we want an acceleration, I'm not going to come to work for that wage. So then we go and try to make those adjustments to bring people from the outside to come to work. A lot of times we're successful at it and other times we're not. We do a mixed bag of tricks to try and pull off maintenance work throughout the district for the public.

Knecht: I'll certainly stipulate that California causes us a lot of problems.

Dyson: So, we struggle. It hurts our ability to maintain a high proficiency standard among our crews. That's pretty much it. The slide that's up there, that was prepared and finalized last week. I do want to state that it's a fluid situation and I've just lost four more key personnel from the administrative to engineering to mechanics and maintenance, just in the last week and a half. I'm spending a lot of time trying to fill positions. That's pretty much it. Thanks.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

- Savage: Excuse me Thor, did those last four leave for higher wage?
- Dyson: One left for retirement. Two left for higher wages; one to the City of Reno and one to the private sector. Then the fourth one left and went to a different agency within the State system. Not NDOT, I believe it was NDOW.
- Savage: Then the other question I have is on the maintenance side, the 17 vacant positions. Is any of that with the snow plow drivers?
- Dyson: Yes, it all is.
- Savage: it all is.
- Dyson: So, actually, on the snow storm, the big one that we had on January 29th through February 1st, we had an atmospheric river event. I did have some plows sit empty in the yard because I had no one to put into them.
- Savage: That's a dire position there, because you can't call a Manpower—I mean, what do you do?
- Dyson: Well, our snow plow drivers need to be drug tested. They need to pass different types of driving tests. Our snow plow drivers, maintenance personnel, whether they're permanent or temporary, in this case temporary, they need to be able to proficiently operate a complex, large piece of equipment amongst traffic during adverse weather conditions.
- Savage: So, in your years of experience, is this the highest it's been with snow plow removal, as far as vacancy?
- Dyson: Absolutely, yes.
- Savage: So, what is our back-up plan B? I mean, we were getting a lot of snow in the mountains this last winter. We didn't get a lot in the valleys. If we would've gotten a lot in the valleys, what would've happened?
- Dyson: Well, as you know, sometimes snow events are more localized. I've done this in the past where Carson City is getting 18 inches of snow and Reno is getting four. So, I'll shift crews over, whether it's from Reno to Carson or from Fernley/Fallon to Carson. I don't particularly like doing that because those individuals are not as familiar with the roads. I want to make sure they're not hitting curbs and there's

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

bridge joints and cal-guards and they're not going to understand their area of roadway maintenance, snow plow removal.

If it's a large, regional event, which we had in January 29-February 1, everybody is plowing snow. So I'm not afforded that opportunity to move crews to the area, because they all got their snow removal sections. I'm not quite sure how to answer your question. Contingency plan is to hope that we have some divine intervention, our trucks don't go down, we work extra hours and the maintenance personnel are going to be present, the ones that I have filled in these positions will be present to plow the snow.

Savage: There are no private contractors, as far as I know that plow snow within the State of Nevada.

Dyson: No, we do—not that I'm aware of. There are contractors that will plow parking lots.

Savage: Yeah, yeah.

Dyson: And you know, different areas. But, as far as highway removal, it does take an expertise. If we get into a dire, dire situation, I have an on-call contractor call out list and I will call them to bring out a motor grader and shave and peel off ice pack. Sometimes that results in the peeling off of the asphalt itself and certainly sometimes damage. But, if it's a dire situation, I will contact contractors with a loader and a push blade attachment to take care of snow removal.

We also hire contractors to haul out the snow. I haven't had this happen since 2005, but 2005 in Reno, Carson, Tahoe, South Lake Tahoe, we plowed all the snow to the center of the road and then we hired contractors with trucks and then we blew all the snow with our snow blowers into the contractor trucks and they hauled it off to dumping sites. If we get into a dire situation with snow removal, where I can, I will hire as many contractors—if I can get to them first. Back in 2005, there was such a demand for additional people to deal with snow removal, whoever got to the contractor first got them employed first. There is a competition between the City of Reno, City of Sparks, Washoe County and NDOT and who gets to them first, the contractor is going to hire up with them first.

Savage: Thank you Thor

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Dyson: Sure.

Martini: If I could—Frank was going to ask a question and I was going to offer just one other comment. Worst case scenario, be it snow or flooding and we deal with snow in District I, what happens is, the forces will have to go to the primary routes. US-95, a lot of the [inaudible] routes in the Tonopah area will actually have to close. We do the same thing for the mountainous areas around here. All of the forces go to the primary routes. That's in worst case scenario, when we can't keep up with it and our employees are unsafe to be out there, then we let the road close. Then we go into doing road blocks and some of those other things. Frank had a question as well.

Martin: I didn't sir, go ahead on.

Dyson: District II has a snow plan, I believe District III and I also have a snow plan. Just like Mary Martini stated, certain routes have priority. If it's really awful, we will pull everything off and just stay on the interstates and the US routes and then fan out as time lends itself to clearing snow on other routes.

Savage: Member Martin.

Martin: I had my question answered. It came to me and then as Thor went on with it, he got to it, so I'm good.

Savage: Okay, Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Real quick follow-up Thor. Of the 155 positions in maintenance and in particular focusing just on snow plows, how many of those are full time and how many are part time, if you know?

Dyson: I don't know off the top of my head. I want to venture, I can get those numbers for you.

Knecht: I would just guess that many of them—

Dyson: I would say around—well, these positions—then we hire around 40 temporary positions in the winter time. Most of them are snow removal, but I don't get to fill all of them. I think if you look on the slide there, let's see, do we have temporary up there? We have permanent positions filled. Number of positions, 155.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Knecht: Yeah.

Dyson: And, I don't see the temporaries up there. We hire about 40 temporary snow plow drivers throughout the district. That's Hawthorne, Fallon, Lovelock, Gardnerville, Tahoe, you know, everything in District II.

Knecht: And, when they're not doing snow control, what are they doing?

Dyson: Great question. We put them to work. We fix guard rails, we pick up garbage. We wash trucks. We do all kinds of other—they're not sitting around just waiting for another snow storm. We put them to work on numerous activities.

Knecht: Okay, thanks. Thank you.

Savage: Thank you Mr. Controller. Mr. Lee.

Lee: As everybody had said, pretty much the same issue. Some unique challenges that we have been going through is, I'll just say, our professional engineers on our construction crews. I can't remember the last time we've had a full complement of resident engineers. It's been years, if not probably close to seven or eight that we've actually had all of our positions full. Just to give you an idea, the 34% that's eligible for retirement in the construction side are the guys that have been holding the crews together. Those are our assistant residents. As of, I'll just say 10 days before the RE's Meeting, we finally had our second RE out of—two out of four, with Dave Schwartz being long-term, I still have two vacancies, with interviews pending on one and I'll just say the process of trying to hire somebody from Canada [inaudible]

Speaker: It's more than a passport, correct?

Lee: Yeah. He has to get a visa and a bunch of other things.

Knecht: For you and for the previous two district chiefs, to what extent does this high vacancy rate that we're facing right now, that we're living with now, to what extent does that contribute to the need for overtime?

Lee: Well, to give you an idea, I exceeded my overtime budget before the end of the year.

Knecht: Before the end of the calendar year?

Lee: Before the end of the calendar year.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Knecht: Okay.

Lee: So, granted we have so much, I'll say, in salaries left over because we have such a high vacancy rate, we can cover that personnel line item. But when you say, I'm projected right now to double my overtime budget and it could even be higher than that. Right now, I'm looking at doubling it.

Knecht: And that's substantially higher than what it's been in the past 10, 15 years?

Lee: I will say that we've had—this year was probably my lowest overtime budget because, I'll just say, over the years, we haven't really had a winter. To put it in perspective, District III had an overtime budget of \$210,000. I'm sitting at \$370,000 right now, expended overtime.

Knecht: And the other two districts have had the—had similar experience?

Dyson: Yes. Overtime, we've asked for augmentations to finance and budget people. Between snow removal and our own flooding events, wind events and accidents, when NHP has an issue where they want to close a highway, we respond, in the middle of the night, 24/7, 365 days a year, we make sure that we assist them and other agencies to do a variety of things. But yes, our overtime budget is exceeded what we were given. It's not surprising. Kevin and I expected this with the increased weather, so yeah.

Lee: Just to put it in perspective, we had an ice storm that hit the Elko Region, probably between Elko and Carlin, and just east of Elko that basically put everything at a standstill. All of our staff was out. Law enforcement couldn't keep up because—it was actually predicted, but you can only put so many people out on the road at one time. All the law enforcement agencies couldn't cover all the accidents.

Knecht: Well, in the last three or four years, setting this year's unusual weather aside, have you seen that the vacancy rate has contributed to, over time, usage substantially or has it just been sort of a normal equilibrium situation.

Lee: The best way to put it—

Martini: If I could—

Lee: --we haven't had a winter in probably five to seven years. So, staff doesn't work overtime to work overtime, they only work when it's really necessary.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Martini: A couple of things. I wasn't sure, it seemed like there was another round of questions, I wasn't sure if you were looking for the District I, so let me catch up on the questions. The question was, how many of our temporary staff for District I, I have 27 con-aides. They typically are not plowing snow. We use them primarily in the summer because they're our litter pickers, graffiti, that's the urban need. They're doing homeless clean-up as well. That's the other one.

Our overtime budget is up significantly too. And, most so in the snow areas. The other areas, and I would say two areas that are not as obvious, a consequence of this and the competition for the limited number of people and that is, 1) when you're having to hire less than desirable people, they have a lot of accidents. They're not as effective. They're probably not as proficient at doing their work. They don't have strong work ethic. The other piece of it is that, it is not unusual to see more and more candidates who have—that are felons and have pretty significant prison records and yet, they may very well be what's left. When you hire them—and it really does come down to a choice of, do we keep this vacant or do we hire the felon? When you're dealing with people with problems, we are then into a situation of doing a lot of discipline, following a process, which tends to be onerous as well and puts a lot of overtime back on our support groups such as HR. It's not just the overtime budget, there's a lot of other things that are going on when we have this kind of vacancy rate.

Lee: To tie into what Mary was saying and I know we've all seen it, at least at the district level, we get recruitments that get zero candidates. So we start the process all over again. Or, we might get a certain number of candidates on the list and then when they set up for interviews, they realize the range of the salary is really not what they thought it was. Typically, we hire them in as a Step I. Unless we try to get the accelerated salary which is a process, which a lot of candidates can't wait out that long.

King: And I'm going to talk about that a little bit more. I think Kevin has also lost candidates where he's actually hired them and they want to relocate into his area, they can't find housing. They can't find any place to live.

Dyson: On the felony aspect, so I'm the final say in District II on who is going to be hired on a temporary basis and permanent basis. When I see—one of the things I look at is, convicted of any misdemeanors, felonies or murders, whatever. I'll take a look at that and I'll look at the justification; because they're required—department personnel requires [inaudible] on if you are convicted, then you have

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

to explain what that is. I make a determination as to whether I want to go with this individual or not, am I willing to take a risk or should I have that plow empty and not available to plow snow. I'm all for giving people a second chance. Sometimes I've had some tremendous successes and other times I've had some other awful hiring experiences. If they're temporary, it's a little bit easier. If they're going into a permanent slot, that's more difficult. On my end, I take those permanent slots much more seriously.

Lee: And, keeping in mind, a piece of snow plow equipment is \$250,000. So we really don't want anybody that's really not up to par out there running the—here recently, somebody that was on probation, we're just lucky that nobody was hurt, pulled out from a median crossover and t-boned somebody on the interstate. We're just lucky that the guy that was driving was not hurt. And he's no longer employed, but that's the way it goes.

Savage: Thank you Kevin. Go ahead, Ms. King.

King: So, talk a little bit about turnover rates. There was an error made on the memorandum that went out before this meeting. I guess it was wishful thinking, but the turnover rate for FY 2012 was 18.51%. As you can see, '13 it's 19.79%, '14 is 17.75% and now in '15 we're at 20.95%.

Those turnover rates did come from State personnel and they included people leaving or moving within state service. Promoting, layoffs and deaths. I took those out. I took these and used them as a vacancy and without any movement between state agencies, we're still at a turnover rate of 11.97%, right now in 2015.

As you can see, some of the high points where they're leaving term for better paying private jobs, better paying public jobs and the public jobs it's other government agencies. The cities, the counties, other state governments. Many of them pay a higher salary than the State of Nevada does, so they're looking at those options.

Our retirees, of course, we've got those high. I think what we're seeing there is, if you remember, we expected a whole bunch of retirees to happen around 2008, that's what we kept talking about. Then we had that recession and I think that stopped some people from retiring. Now we're starting to see it again. In some cases, people are retiring because they can make more money on their retirement

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

then to continue working for the State. They used to stay and try to get that extra money but now they get [inaudible] if they retire. They are looking at that.

Also, we have people who are just moving for personal reasons. We don't know why they are and we actually have quite a few terms for reasons unknown.

Our dismissed during probation, that's gone up over these last years, these last four years, where we've had the problem. For a while there, we were getting lots of applicants, just not the best applicants and now we may not get hardly any applicants. We're taking people on that we may not have hired in the past and then that results in us having to let them go because they can't make it. I can tell you from my office, our EEO complaints, our grievances, any of those type of complaint processes are—they've really risen. I'm getting overtime, or my staff is being required to work lots of overtime for that and improvement.

We do an employee satisfaction survey each year. It started in 2008 when I got here. It was at 50% then, we were going to try to get up to 70%. We are now down to—and this is the satisfaction in pay and benefits, we're down to 26%. For a while there, we got down to 18% and then I think it's starting to go up again. We've got again, turnover that may be affecting that. It is the pay and benefits that the employees are talking about, that have them discouraged.

You may have heard that the state employees received a 1% increase, but I don't know if you also heard, our first contribution exceeded that 1%, so people's paychecks, the employee's paychecks actually went down and they noticed it.

Lee: And no longevity either.

King: Oh, yes, the longevity. That's another reason that we may have some more people retiring, they've lost their longevity, they no longer have that incentive.

Knecht: I not only heard about that, I wrote about that fact in my column this week.

King: Okay. So, what are we doing and what are we doing well?

Kaiser: One thing, Reid Kaiser for the record. Longevity, we used to get every six months was it—

King: Yeah.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Kaiser: --you'd get a check for longevity. It started out maybe \$50 every six months when you had like five years in or ten years in. By the time you got to 25 or 30, it was \$1,100, \$1,200. That went away I think in '09 or '10. Maybe it was '08.

Speaker: It stopped with the furloughs.

King: So around '10, 2010.

Kaiser: That's what that is.

Lee: And it was completely removed on this last Legislative Session.

King: There weren't incentive to keep long term employees because their merits only go to 10. Once you get to a 10, you're stuck. There's been no [inaudible] and then the longevity. It really has affected our long-term employees.

We're going to do something positive here. What are we doing well? [laughs] On our employee survey, the one thing that we are finding is that employees, they like our family friendly type work atmosphere. We're very family oriented within the Department and also we find our own family very important and we are flexible. That's one of the things we can do. The satisfaction in this area has continued to remain about 60-75% that employees are happy about our environment. In fact, we've had some employees that have left for other government and private industry jobs and they've returned to NDOT stating that they missed the family oriented organization and the NDOT employees. That is pretty impressive.

Savage: That is impressive.

King: We are striving to improve in our family oriented and flexible work place to increase on employee satisfaction.

We talked about hiring people from outside the state agency. We have a mechanism, it's called accelerated salaries. What happened was, around 2008, 2010, they stopped—there was an executive order from the Governor's Office, the previous Governor that said, no we aren't going to do accelerated salaries anymore. NDOT really held tight to that and said, okay we're not going to do accelerated salaries, so we hired most of our employees at that point in time at a Step 1. Then we had merit freezes, so we couldn't—so they stayed at Step 1.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

As we've come out of the recession and we're trying to hire people, the regulation that allows us to do accelerated salaries also says, you can't hire in somebody new at an accelerated salary at Step 5 or 6 if you're going to create an inequity that you can't deal with fiscally for the other people. We've got this group of people came in at 1 and now we're trying to hire other people in at accelerated salary but now we have to adjust the existing employees.

We've started trying to do that, to create equity throughout the whole Department. What we're trying to do is, as each new hire comes in, we're doing a matrix of all of our employees in that job class or in that region, identifying what their experience is and fitting the new person in there and then adjusting anybody else who needs to be adjusted to allow for equity across the Department. This has taken hours and hours of man-hours but I think if we can do it, I think that it will really help the morale of the Department.

We started doing that. We caught the attention of some other Departments who don't have the fiscal ability to do this. Now the regulation is real clear that each department is treated separately. That just because we do it doesn't mean that another department doesn't do it, DPS let's say. We are just within NDOT and we do have the financial ability to do it, but those other departments are creating a little bit of angst in the Governor's Office.

When we try to do an accelerated salary, we can go from as short a processing time of maybe one business day, that's not very often. On the average processing time is 13 business days, but we have new hires that we can't make a job offer because we don't have the approval that—what's longest, Kevin?

Lee: August of last year.

King: August of last year? I thought it was December.

Lee: No, it was the Tech III, it was August.

King: Oh.

Lee: And then October is the next one.

King: Okay. We have some positions where we haven't actually been able to make a job offer because we're still waiting for the approval. That's another challenge that we are facing right now.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Dyson: Right and I had a couple in District II. September we moved forward with them and they were approved, the accelerated salaries were approved in the first part of February.

King: That is impacting our ability to do our new hires.

Dyson: To do our free agency.

King: Yeah, and they aren't going to come over and take a huge cut. And they're bringing expertise that's actually important to us. I'm all for hiring them from other agencies so we can get new ideas and innovation, but right now, we are struggling.

There's a couple of solutions to throw out there. One is a short-term one. Asking for delegated authority, from the Governor's Office for us to approve our accelerated salaries. We've had that in the past. If we had that in the future, then the Governor's Office wouldn't have to maybe take that heat and we could take the heat. And it would make our hiring process faster. As soon as we did our analysis and did the approval, we could go ahead and make that okay and give them the ability and make a job offer.

A long term solution, it seems like we're having some angst with the other state departments because they're on the same classification and pay system as NDOT. There are other DOTs throughout the United States that are on a separate personnel system from the rest of their state agencies. That could be a long-term solution because if NDOT is separated out from those other state agencies under classification and pay schedules, maybe the other state agencies that don't have the same fiscal funding would be able to—they'd be two separate ones and there wouldn't be this comparison.

That's all I have.

Savage: Well, thank you Ms. King. Thank you Mary, Thor, Kevin.

Martini: Could I add one other potential solution?

Savage: How much money do you have?

Martini: Well, it's how much you want to pay me, but let me—if we go to 50,000 feet, nationally we're looking, globally we're looking at the demographics of baby boomers. We've long known that our age pyramid, where the oldest are at the top

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

and the babies are at the bottom has now changed to its more vertical. Even in countries like Japan, it looks more like this. While getting in young people and getting them trained and getting up through the ranks is important, the real issue is that, at the top, we're getting older and there's more of us. I'm at the tail end of the baby boomers and I used to tease Director Malfabon before he was the Director that he is six months older than I am. As of today, I'm retired and I'm still working here because I enjoy it and because I like doing the big projects. Now, here's the difference is that I retired from another State.

What is facing us is that after 30 years of service to NDOT, people are in their early 50s, mid 50s and they've got plenty of work life left in front of them and yet they have to leave. What happens is, it gets keyed into the discussion we had earlier with the consultants. I've had our staff basically go from being working for us and three weeks later, going to work for the consultant and essentially doing the same thing. In order to tap into a wealth of knowledge and the ability to do the work, there needs to be some concessions.

Obviously there is an issue with PERS. I know there's certain positions where people have basically come back after they've retired. I know that doesn't always look good to the taxpayers. The other thing, in the Forbes List of Best Companies for Aging Employees, there's accommodations that are necessary for the fact that they can't work as long or they need certain physical accommodations. Still, that is a wealth of individuals who could be doing this work with some accommodations. I would put that out there as another topic. I don't think we've spent a lot of time in NDOT looking at how best to tap into an aging population.

Savage: Thank you Mary. And again, I want to thank everyone for being so candid. I know it's a difficult subject. It's something that does not fall upon deaf ears. It's up to the Board to hear the good, the bad and the ugly. We have a lot of bright minds here at the Department. A lot of good, good people. I think this has to continue forward. The discussion is very healthy. Infrastructure is a key to the economic movement of this State and we need the best people. We have the best people right now. I'm passionate to say, listen, we need to come up with a formula or a mechanism or something, because I know we're feeling it on the private side as well. We call the T-Effect.

Let's not stop the conversation is what I'm trying to say. I'd like to keep this on the Agenda. I think the Director even made comment today at the Board Meeting that he wanted to take it to the next level, from the CWG to the T-Board. I really

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

complement you Ms. King, the District Engineers and everyone at the Department for being patient because we have a lot of bright minds, so let's figure out a way to keep that family environment. To see what we can do with compensation, benefits, whatever it is. It's a big picture deal. It's way above my pay grade, but let's figure it out. Keep talking about it, don't brush it underneath the carpet, it's already reached this level, let's move forward. We have to be able to want to come to work every day. We don't want to go to the RTC. We don't want to go to the City of Reno or the City of Las Vegas. We want to stay right here at NDOT. I really complement everybody. Let's keep the momentum and keep talking about it because we can get it fixed but we've got to try to get ahead of it. We keep going downhill then we're responsible, at the Board level, by saying, boy look at that slippery slope, look at what we could've done and we didn't do it. Then the burden falls on us. So, I thank you.

Kaiser: Well, thanks for listening. A lot of people have been wanting to say that for a long time.

Savage: That's our job, the good, bad and the ugly. Moving on to Agenda Item No. 8, Old Business. CWG Task List and I'd like to add this item to the task list.

Kaiser: I will. And, I'll give you guys quarterly updates. I'll get with Kimberly and figure out what we want to report. If maybe the number of people that have left NDOT compared to maybe the number of people who we've hired, maybe an update on where we are with accelerating some salary—hiring the people who have requested accelerated salaries and those kinds of things.

Savage: Whatever it is, the discussion has to continue. With the existing CWG Task List.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: Go ahead Reid.

Kaiser: Okay, Item No. 1, Contractor Prequalification. What I gave you is the contractor past performance rating sheet that the Steering Committee has developed. This is part of our prequalification package. The current contractor past performance rating, as I have mentioned previously, is not real applicable to what the contractor is doing in the field. What we've created is another, we call them CPPRs and it has items on there like quality of work, the contractor supervision, progress of work, environmental which includes water quality, public safety, environmental compliance. It has those kinds of items. This is put in here for

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

your guys' information. We still have to modify a few things about it but this form will be used by the resident engineers to rate our contractors at the end of every project.

Savage: Do the REs have a lot of input—

Kaiser: We haven't sent this out to them yet but we're going to. That's the next step. We wanted to come up with a form. They've been requesting for years at the RE Meeting that we change it, so we're doing that now. The next step will be to send it out to the REs for their review. Once we get their comments taken care of, we'll send it out to the AGC for their comment.

Savage: Good. Good, that's good. Thank you Reid.

Kaiser: Item No. 2, NDOT's DBE Process will be covered by Tracy Larkin.

Larkin: Hi, for the record, Tracy Larkin, Deputy Director. As most people know, over the past year we have done quite a bit of work in the DBE area. We have basically had 125% turnover in the area and we put a lot of work into taking care of backlog, taking care of the business part of it. Before I even start, I want to say that a lot of this could not have been done without a lot of help from other people in the Department. I reached out to Planning. I have people coming in to help us with wage compliance on there. I reached out to Admin Services and they helped with some contract compliance and processes. Reached out to Design and they helped with the ADA process and getting us caught up. Reached out to—we had ACC, we hired some contractors to come in and help with the backlogs that worked with our Unified Certification Board Program. I want to say, there's a lot of moving parts, but I want to make sure that I recognize the effort that the others have put in to help make this, what I consider really a pretty good success.

Over the past year, we've basically caught up on the backlog of all of our federal reports. We had 11 outstanding. Six were outstanding and late. We are now current on all the backlog and the five that were due this year are on time.

Savage: Congratulations.

Larkin: That was a big one. We certainly have gone through the hiring process. We have done a great deal of outreach, both North and South. We have focused more in the South on some of the issues just because we have a greater issue down there. We've really been working with the Urban Chamber, the Latin Chamber, the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Minority Contractors Association and other firms to actually get our program out there, meet with them and discuss their concerns and how to bring in outreach and training.

We have sponsored DBE training through USDOT. We had five different bonding type of different forms of bonding, like bid opportunities, bidding and estimating, access to working capital, construction accounting and law, and just regular bonding. We have had success stories in there. We've had people who have gone from a capacity of \$2M worth of bonding to \$5M worth of bonding. Others who have increased their access to working capital by \$250,000. Slowly but surely, we're making inroads there.

We partnered with the Contractors Board and the AGC in Southern Nevada and we trained a little over 1,500 different firms. 496 of those were DBE and minority contractors and that training was provided for free to them to help work on the programs.

We basically have 132 new firms that's in-state. That included a 59 backlog. We had a total backlog of 98. That was 56 in-state and 51 from out-of-state, that have been completely caught up on and we added another 183 firms, brand new on there. We're now up to, we have 603 firms in the State of Nevada. That includes all the DBE Firms. That includes airport, vending, concessions, so on.

We have hired, we have using federal funding, we have brought in a supportive services contract which has been started. That is actually identifying the gaps within the DBE community. Basically they have gone out, they're going to every DBE and we're starting primarily with the ones that NDOT would be using and identifying like, do you do residential? Do you do commercial? Do you do mixed, do you do both? If you say you're an asphalt paver, do you pave driveways or do you pave interstates? We're trying to find the capacity. Are you willing to travel to District III? If you're located in Vegas, will you travel to Elko to do work? Those types of things so we can better—we want to push on the DBE goals. We want to make sure that we have the foundation and the pool [inaudible] moving forward.

We have been working with Unified Certification Program Board and that is the Board that actually certifies the DBEs and it's composed of the two RTCs, North and South, the airports McCarran and Reno/Tahoe, Campo and NDOT. Basically, there are three agencies that actually process the applications and all

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

applications go before this Board in order to be approved. With that, we have been working very closely with them to create one site, so we have one website so that when you come to Nevada; you can just go to Nevada DBE and we'll have links, we're in the process of getting links to each agency so you can go in there and instead of having to look at four or five different sites to find opportunities, training opportunities and so on, that you can go to one firm and basically get all the information from there. That's a work in progress but it has been started.

We also joined in with them to do a new disparity study. It's about three years since we actually completed the last disparity study. This one is statewide and it is involved [inaudible].

We have drafted our DBE Membership Program, it's currently on my desk under review. We've also been working very closely with Project NEON and USA Parkway because those are very much insights for what type of business development we can do there, so we're working very closely with their staff. Like, on the Project NEON, there's actually—it was a requirement to have a DBE Coordinator as part of the contractor project so we can interface directly with them. So far they've been very good at outreaching to us and [inaudible] around the region. We have high hopes that it will greatly exceed our expectations.

That's pretty much it, if you have any questions.

Savage: Just a sincere thanks, Tracy. It was a monumental task a year ago that the program needed a lot of help and you took the reins. I thank you and the people around you who have taken that challenge.

Larkin: There were a lot of people that participated.

Savage: Taking that challenge. But, rest well. I know there's a lot of work to do like you had said, but I sincerely thank you, diving in, taking on this challenge and making it much, much better.

Larkin: Thank you.

Savage: Thank you Tracy.

Martin: Mr. Chairman?

Savage: Yes, Member Martin.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

- Martin: I want to thank Tracy too. I've been, for many, many years working with MBEs and WBEs and she has done a tremendous job pulling this program together. Tracy, thank you very much. And, Mr. Chairman, I have to leave. I'm sorry to skip out on you so early, but Mr. Knecht, you get to make the motion for dismissal or adjournment and second it too.
- Savage: I just want to make—I have one question Member Martin, is there any pie down there in Las Vegas?
- Martin: No pie.
- Savage: I want to make sure you're leaving for the right reasons. [laughter] Thank you Member Martin.
- Martin: Thank you sir.
- Savage: Moving on, Mr. Kaiser.
- Kaiser: Okay, Item No. 3, CMAR Projects. There are two active CMAR Projects right now. There are no change orders to report and you had requested, at the December CWG a list of the current agreements associated with those CMAR Projects and I do have them listed with the consultant firm or the contractor and the dollar amount.
- Savage: Thank you.
- Kaiser: I couldn't answer any questions related to those, but the guy who could left, probably eating pie. [laughter]
- Savage: That answers some of the questions we had. Thank you Reid.
- Kaiser: Okay. Item 4 is the as-builds. Again, our project where we're going to have the contractor design and submit the as-builds is the roundabout in Pahrump. It's scheduled to advertise in April.
- Savage: Very good.
- Kaiser: Last thing, one of the first items I commented on regarding the opinion from the Attorney General. Well, here is where I had it listed. I spoke too soon and on the second sheet of this section, under disqualification of bidders, I have circled the three items where the Director can reject a contractor's bid. He can reject it for the reasons listed.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Savage: All right Reid, thank you.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: Does that take care of—

Kaiser: That's Item No. 4.

Savage: Item No. 4. 8B, Reports and Documents.

Kaiser: 8B, there was only one meeting with the AGC or any other entity that you guys like to hear about and that was the meeting we had February 16th. Tracy and I attended an AGC meeting down in Las Vegas with some contractors and the AGC to see if there are opportunities to better develop our workforce. Not only from NDOT but also for contractors.

Larkin: I like how he said, ongoing [crosstalk]

Savage: That was off the record. [laughter]

Larkin: We are working—NDOT is working with the AGC, both North and South, basically as Reid mentioned on workforce development for the construction [inaudible] We're looking at different things like construction management, exposure at a younger age to schools and [inaudible] and then also internships or externships. I expect you're going to be hearing a lot more about this. We've [inaudible] like I said, with the AGCs. We met with [inaudible] contractors in to get their points and we'll be meeting with the—we like to—when I was in Georgia, I met with the AGC in Georgia, [inaudible] which is part of the [inaudible]. Then also, next week we're meeting with the AGC in Washington, they have a very successful construction camp.

Savage: Tracy, if you have a few minutes, I'd like to have a cup of coffee with you.

Larkin: [crosstalk]

Savage: And talk.

Larkin: Yes.

Savage: Anything else on 8B?

Kaiser: That is it on 8B.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

- Savage: Moving to Agenda Item No. 9, Projects under development, five-year plan.
- Kaiser: Again, this is the five-year plan. You guys had requested—Lucy Joyce gave a presentation on our landscape and aesthetics program back in December. The Landscape and Aesthetics Five-Year Plan is listed on Sheet No. 7 of 9. You had requested a copy of that in December. [pause] Do you guys have any questions on our five-year plan?
- Savage: I just have one question on Page 9. What is an example of a district betterment project? I see there's a budget of \$22M for 2016.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer for District II. We have teams that go out every year with the maintenance group, Anita Bush and what we'll do is, my staff in District II and I believe it's the same for I and III; we will go out once a year and we will go with our supervisors. I have a Supervisor in Gardnerville, Crew 227, Ed Schulte. Ed Schulte and the Super II, Maintenance Manager, my Maintenance Engineer that works for me, will go out with headquarter staff and we'll review roads, not only in his section but in all sections of District II. The maintenance people get to kick in their ideas and thoughts of what needs to be repaired. These are usually simplistic type projects. If they're not then they would be contracted out. Betterments that—we're going to better the road. We're going to better the road with an asphalt chip seal, slurry seal. Maybe we want to do some shoulder work or things that we can do in-house with our maintenance forces and things that we can do with contractors. They're not super big ticket items, just to get them cranked out.
- Savage: Okay, thank you Thor. That's the only question I had.
- Knecht: I have a question back on Page 7. In the middle of that page, the not scheduled item, community gateway to Winnemucca Recreational to Black Rock Desert for \$2.5M, which I think is the largest figure on the page other than the totals, well there's a \$5M at the bottom, cost changed from \$50,000. Can somebody explain to me how we go from \$50,000 to \$2.5M?
- Shigenaga: Kristena Shigenaga, the Landscape and Aesthetic Program is under me. The gateway program, when we put it on there initially, we thought it was just a sign. It's actually treating the interchanges in Winnemucca to a [inaudible], so that's how come it went from the \$50,000 to \$2.5M, to paint and do treatments at those

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

two interchanges. That's just a rough estimate. We haven't started the design. It's kind of our planning the whole estimate for this.

Savage: So, these are which interchange?

Shigenaga: They're the—

Savage: Exit, or—it's an exit?

Shigenaga: It's the interchanges in Winnemucca. I believe there are three interchanges in Winnemucca, so it's those interchanges in Winnemucca. I know one is in the center, but I don't remember which, if it's the west or the east interchange. One of them would be, is it 95 or—

Kaiser: 95.

Shigenaga: 95.

Savage: Thank you. Okay. I guess that's it for Section 9. Let's go to Section 10. Briefing on Status of Projects Under Construction, Section A, Project Closeout.

Kaiser: Project Closeout. We're not reporting any projects closed out this time since it was covered at the Transportation Board Meeting this morning. The only projects that were closed out would be in January and we will report January at the June meeting. We'll cover four months at the June meeting.

Savage: Okay.

Kaiser: We do have in here listed the closeout document in case CWG had any questions on that item. Any projects listed on that document.

Savage: The only question I had, I didn't realize on 3409 that Capriati had filed bankruptcy.

Kaiser: Yes.

Savage: Was that recent? Maybe I missed it. I didn't see that.

Kaiser: A year ago.

Savage: A year ago. And, is there any unfinished work and is their performance and payment bond been notified, for anything that's unfinished or outstanding?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, for the record. I'm not aware of any work that is unfinished. Our office just completed last month an audit of the books. We are holding on to their \$50,000 retain, it has not been released. How that's being handled is up [inaudible] staff.

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel to the Board. The Department has two claims in the Capriati Bankruptcy Filing. One is for that \$50,000 that was retained and the other is actually a claim on a prevailing wage matter that the Department was involved with in front of the Labor Commissioner. The amount in that is only about \$5,000.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser for the record. One other thing, the District accepted that project March 7, 2014, so we essentially granted relief of maintenance. They're done with the project and the Director accepted it on March 12, 2014.

Savage: Okay. That's the only question I had. 10B, Active Projects.

Kaiser: Any questions from the CWG on active projects?

Savage: I don't have any. No, Controller?

Knecht: Mr. Martin doesn't have any questions either.

Savage: We'll move on to 10C, the Partnering/Dispute Process Update. Lisa.

Shettler: Lisa Shettler, good afternoon. Just a couple of small updates. We've mentioned before, we have the partnering best practices project underway [inaudible] in aiding that. [inaudible] survey of the 50 states and other organizations to get best practices and documents and whatnot together. Our committee is going to meet again in May to look at the results of the survey and determine what we might want to eventually post on websites or nationwide access for best partnering practices. Our conference is still on schedule for September. We're making headway with that project.

For dispute resolution teams, we started using them on a few projects, but we finalized the specifications. A three-party agreement and a sub-sample procedures. The final step in that was to have the districts take a look at them. I think we have a deadline of—Sharon, did you give them this week or last week?

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler. The 18th.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Shettler: 18th.

Speaker: Friday.

Shettler: As soon as we get the results from that, we're going to move forward with posting them on our website and having a poll sheet for our new specifications we can use on future projects. That's all I had. Do you have any questions?

Savage: No, I don't at this time. Mr. Controller? No, thank you Lisa.

One thing we might want to talk about is adding a line item for 10, Agenda Item No. 10, as far as the work in progress for the consultants.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: You had a very good discussion at the Board Meeting today. There was a lot of interest and a lot of good response and positive, but it might be helpful to take a look at a WIP, work in progress dollar amount that you guys have given us today. Look at it on a quarterly basis, as to what's been paid out, what's pending.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: It's just a WIP statement.

Kaiser: I've never heard of that before.

Savage: WIP, Work In Progress.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: That's what my accounting [crosstalk] calls it.

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, for the record. Would you request that for all consultants or are you specifically looking for construction?

Savage: Construction Division Consultants. Design, Crew Augmentation.

Kaiser: I don't have it on here, but every six months, I go over all the consultant agreements that the Construction Division has entered into. This is a, I guess you would call it a Bi-CWG Meeting for that. We'll be going over that in June. What I'll do is, I'll get a list from Admin Services of every agreement that 040 has entered into and have it listed. I'll have our Construction Division go through that

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

agreement and list who the subs are, all the items like we presented last September.

Savage: That's good.

Kaiser: What you're requesting here is something that's on top of that information?

Savage: Well, it's just like the closeout document. Forms that we have, you know. I think it's a good review at our level by saying, this is the work in progress. The design consultants, construction, crew augmentation. Because it is such a hot topic and we'll look at it every meeting to say, this is what we have.

Kaiser: Okay, okay.

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, for the record. That includes John Terry's group then, since you said, Design. That was your intent, correct?

Savage: Yeah. Project Management and Construction.

Kaiser: So you want Project Management and Construction, or do you want design also included in that. Because we presented before as Project Management and Construction and Design is Paul Frost's group.

Savage: No, what you proposed today at the—

Kaiser: Similar to today?

Savage: Similar to what you had today. I call that the work in progress.

Kaiser: Okay.

Terry: Yeah, the only detail—again, John Terry—is, I only presented the big ones. I left out the smaller agreements and kind of just fit it to the presentation. The list of all of them gets—

Savage: We don't need to list all—I mean, you guys can look at that and—we're just trying to look at some good oversight to make sure that we're doing our job.

Kaiser: Okay. That's easy to do. I can just get with Admin Services and they can—what they have to do is just run a spreadsheet of all 040 or Project Management is 015, and they've got them all.

Savage: They have them, yeah.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
March 14, 2016

Kaiser: So, we'll do it.

Savage: Okay. Let's move on to Agenda Item No. 11. Any public comment up here in Carson City? Las Vegas?

Martini: There's no public here but for the people in the room who may not have heard, the Assistant District Engineer for Construction a few years back, Gus Michaels, passed away today.

Savage: My condolences.

Kaiser: No one ever drank more coffee than Gus.

Savage: Condolences to the Department and his family. Okay, without any public comment.

Knecht: So moved.

Savage: Do we have to request a—help me out here Mr. Gallagher, it's been a long day. I asked for a motion to move—[crosstalk]

Gallagher: There's really no pressing items to report to the Committee.

Savage: Then we'll not close and we'll ask for a motion to adjourn.

Knecht: That one you got.

Savage: I'll second that. In favor, say aye. [ayes around] Thank you everyone.

[end of session 02:36:41]



1263 South Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada 89712
Phone: (775) 888-7440
Fax: (775) 888-7201

MEMORANDUM

TO: Department of Transportation Board of Directors
Construction Working Group

FROM: Rudy Malfabon, Director

SUBJECT: June 6, 2016 Construction Working Group Meeting

Item #5 : Update on NDOT Consultant Procurement Process – *Informational Item Only*

Summary:

NDOT's Construction and Project Management Divisions enter into numerous consultant agreements each year to accomplish their respective work programs. The Construction Division enters into agreements to support the District Construction crews when; 1) they are understaffed (augmentation), 2) they have too many projects for their respective crews to manage (Full Administration) and 3) for specialized work (tortoise clearing, asbestos monitoring, etc.). Project Management procures consultant staff to design NDOT projects that are too large to be designed internally. Examples of projects that fit this category are the I-580 Project between Carson City and Reno, Project NEON, the I-15 Design Build Projects North and South and the Carson City Freeway. As a result of changes to 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 172, internal process improvements, and feedback from consultants, NDOT has made several changes to our consultant procurement procedures.

Background:

In 2013 the Nevada Legislature enacted NRS 333.705 which requires former state employees with less than 2 years since their last working day for the State of Nevada to be approved by the Board of Examiners (BOE) prior to entering into a contract for services. This required NDOT to develop policies and procedures for handling situations where former state employees were included on consultant procurement proposals.

49 CFR 26 was updated via a rulemaking dated October 2, 2014 which became effective on November 2, 2014. As a result of this rulemaking NDOT was required to incorporate Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goals and participation on consultant agreements. In addition, in 2014 Agreement Services combined the prequalification process with the proposal submittal.

23 CFR 172 was updated via a rulemaking dated May 22, 2015 which became effective on June 22, 2015. State DOTs had until May 22, 2016 to update their consultant procurement procedures and obtain Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approval. After extensive efforts by NDOT Agreement Services to make, review, and correct manual revisions, NDOT received FHWA approval of our consultant procurement procedures on May 16, 2016.

NDOT employees participating on evaluation panels for consultant proposals requested that they be provided with a method whereby they could discuss the proposals instead of being required to score the proposal individually.

Analysis:

Due to changes in regulations and feedback received from NDOT employees and consultants, NDOT made several changes to our consultant procurement procedures. These changes include:

- Standardizing the handling of former state employees listed on proposals: evaluation committees are instructed to evaluate proposals as if the former employee were to be approved by the BOE. In the event a former employee should not be approved by the BOE the proposer would be afforded the opportunity to provide an equivalent or better team member to replace the former employee.
- Assigning 5 points to DBE Goal Evaluation Criteria
- Combining prequalification and proposal submittal, and clearly stating when specific qualifications are required to be held (at proposal submittal, award, or time of work)
- Stating in the RFP whether the evaluation process will include interviews, will not include interviews, or may include interviews depending on initial proposal evaluation scoring
- Having an on-call process where consultants can be retained under a master agreement although specific project work is not defined, then issued task orders when their services are required
- Allowing for consensus evaluations where committee members discuss each proposal's strengths and weaknesses and come up with a consensus score for each proposer. This is offered as an option for the Project Manager along with individual proposal scoring.

Prepared by:

Jenni Eyerly, Administrative Services



1263 South Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada 89712
Phone: (775) 888-7440
Fax: (775) 888-7201

May 19, 2016

TO: Department of Transportation Board of Directors
Construction Working Group
FROM: Rudy Malfabon, P.E., Director
SUBJECT: June 6, 2016 Construction Working Group Meeting
Item #6: NDOT 2016 Resident Engineers' Meeting – *information item only*

Summary:

The NDOT Construction Division under Transportation Policy 1-8-1 has responsibility for the establishment of the uniform procedures for the function of highway construction; the Resident Engineers and construction personnel are responsible for understanding and following these procedures. The Resident Engineer's Meeting is held annually to provide a collaborative forum for the Resident Engineers, Districts, Administration, Construction and other Divisions to address issues, changes and updates as they affect the Department's construction program. The meeting also provides various Divisions an opportunity to address all the Resident Engineers at one time with respect to any items or issues they have which the Resident Engineers can help address across the statewide construction program.

The Resident Engineers' Meeting provides for peer-to-peer exchange of information, construction methods, techniques and solutions. It provides the Resident Engineers an opportunity to collaborate and develop solutions and recommendations for processes and procedures that can be implemented and function on a statewide level.

Analysis:

The Construction Division provides coordination and administrative support to facilitate the meeting and compiling a final report of the recommendations with respect to any specific issues or topics brought up as part of the meeting. The 2016 Resident Engineers Meeting was held March 8-10 in Elko. Included is the Agenda and well as a DRAFT version of the report and recommendations from that meeting. Some of the items are still being addressed and a final version of the report will be provided at a future CWG meeting.

Recommendation:

Informational item only.

Prepared by:

Stephen Lani, P.E., Assistant Chief Construction Engineer

2016 R.E. Conference Agenda

Tuesday March 8th, 2016:

- 11:30AM - Lunch (Provided courtesy of Red Lion)
- 12:00PM - Conference Begins – Sharon Foerschler
- 12:15PM - Opening Comments – Reid Kaiser
- 12:30PM - Key Note Speakers – Rudy Malfabon or designee
- 1:00PM - FHWA – Jin Zhen
- 1:30PM - Round Table Discussion of Issues
- 2:00PM - Afternoon Break
- 2:15PM - Round Table Discussion of Issues (cont'd)
- 4:30PM - Adjourn

Wednesday March 9th, 2016:

- 7:00AM - Breakfast (Provided courtesy of Red Lion)
- 7:15AM - Contract Compliance – Jenni Eyerly
- 8:00AM - Stormwater – David Gaskin
- 8:45AM - QA/IA Presentation - Steve Hale
- 9:30AM - Morning Break
- 9:45AM - Design – Paul Frost
- 10:15AM - Construction Engineering Services – Megan Sizelove
- 11:15AM - Traffic Engineering (Speed Reduction in Work Zones) – Denise Inda
- 12:00PM - Lunch (Provided courtesy of Red Lion)
- 1:00PM - Group Photo
- 1:30PM - R.E. & Administration Breakouts
- 4:00PM - Admin/Construction Working Group Session (Crosspollination)
- 4:30PM - Adjourn

Thursday March 10th, 2016:

- 7:00AM - Breakfast (Provided courtesy of Red Lion)
- 7:15AM - Structures Division – Jessen Mortensen
- 7:45AM - Materials – Darin Tedford
- 8:15AM - Hydraulics – Charles Wolf
- 8:45AM - Morning Break
- 9:15AM - General Colin Powell's Lesson of Leadership – Stephen Theriault (GBC)
- 10:15AM - Group Discussion on Construction Issues
- 11:30AM - Closing Comments – Trent Averett (Assign Next Meeting)
- 11:45AM - Adjourn

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

- Questions and initial responses submitted prior to RE Meeting.
- RE consensus developed at the meeting based on responses provided and discussions at the meeting.

CONTRACT COMPLIANCE

1. What are the consequences to a contractors who don't meet their DBE goals, have late or no report of certified payroll on LCP tacker? Are they fined? Are payments withheld?

RESPONSE: Please see the attached draft update to the NDOT DBE Program Plan, which specifies the consequences for failure to meet DBE goals. This plan should be finalized by the RE conference or soon thereafter. Each RE will receive the final updated plan for replacement in the Certified Payroll and Compliance Manual, CUF Form section.

As you can see, when a contractor is not meeting their DBE goal we start with a withholding of 10% of the unmet DBE goal, and can escalate from there. There are also strict requirements for substituting or removing DBE subcontractors – work with Contract Compliance if the contractor won't or can't use the DBEs they committed to.

When contractors and subcontractors fail to submit certified payroll reports, there are two possible outcomes.

- 1) If the report is late per the Federal requirements (7 days after the payment date), they receive a letter from the RE notifying them they were late. If they submit the report by the 15th of the month following payment, in general no further action will be taken.***
- 2) If the report is late per the State requirements (15th of the month following payment), Contract Compliance issues a determination to the Labor Commissioner, copying the Contractor and Resident Engineer. Penalties are \$50 per day up to a maximum of \$1,000 for the first offense and \$5,000 for subsequent offenses. If the contract is ongoing, penalties are withheld from bi-weekly payments. If the contract has finished but we are still holding retention, penalties are withheld from retention. If retention has been released, Accounting invoices the contractor. Penalties are assessed against the prime, but prime contractors may pass on penalties to subcontractors who fail to report.***

RE Consensus: Ok

2. Can you please provide an update on where the Department plans to go with weekly submittal of certified payrolls, LCP tacker, B2GNow, and all the letters and documentation that crews are currently writing to keep track of all this? Can any of this be automated? Why isn't this the contractor's responsibility?

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: *We are working hard to automate processes as much as possible. Recent changes will remove the REs from the paperwork involved with Requests to Sublet and Monthly Reports of Payments to Subcontractors – they will still have access to the data, they just don't have to do the paperwork. We would like to centralize the monitoring of late certified payrolls, ideally automating the process of notifying the contractor of late reporting per Federal requirements. We're working on it, but until the process is complete it is important to follow the current Compliance manual to avoid Federal and State payroll audit findings. It cannot entirely be the contractor's responsibility because then they would be monitoring themselves, which in some cases isn't monitoring at all!*

RE Consensus: **Ok**

ENVIRONMENTAL

3. It would appear that there continues to be an increase in the biological requirements being implemented into projects. Often times the requirements do not appear to be in sync with the plans or other project elements. Can you please explain how these requirements are vetted and incorporated into the design and specifications to insure they are not in conflict with what is to be constructed or reasonable construction seasons/timelines?

RESPONSE: *Awaiting final response from Environmental.*

CONSTRUCTION RESPONSE: *The Construction Division works to identify these potential "un-sync'd" limitations as the documents are developed and prepared for PS&E; however, there are times when specific environmental limitations do not appear/or are not identified until late in the process, thus making it very difficult to coordinate with other project elements. It would be asked that the RE's also focus additional review efforts during the review process to help identify potential issues with these requirements.*

RE Consensus: *This is for everything environmental related. They don't give RE time to review, they are entered at the last minute before ad. RE feels construction is not involved in the process during design. Burden to implement the required specs. RE wants more input. RE wants Environmental's Mission Statement. Seems like they change or add items of work during Construction, which may not be part of construction, cleaning out cattle guards, stuff near the project or off the project limits. Talking to the biology without talking to Re. Forget to put in Tortoise Fence, or wrong specs resulting Contract Modification and Change Order. Inconsistence with Design and the details provided. Detail Tortoise Crossing is one. Wire above the TF, wires dimension, never the consistence number of wire.*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

STRUCTURES

4. Has there been any consideration for use of alternative materials for "Redwood Strips" specified in Concrete Slope Paving? Standard Plan details and Standard Specifications call for a "Commercial Grade Heart Redwood, S4S." This is one of the most expensive lumber products on the market today; with all the alternative composites, is this really the best choice of materials?

RESPONSE: *No consideration has been given to substituting composite material in the place of redwood in concrete slope paving. It is assumed that redwood was initially chosen for its durability. Redwood is also more resistant to decay than other lumber and holds moisture longer to help prevent warping. Composite material may be a reasonable alternative although the binding agents may deteriorate more rapidly in contact with the ground.*

However, the choice between redwood and composite may have little impact in the future, as the Landscape and Aesthetics division prefers rock mulch in place of slope paving in most applications. Slope paving is currently used far less frequently that is was in the past.

RE Consensus: *We would like them to consider alternate materials. Would Bridge be open to accepting alternate materials if requested? Add to the StD plans with notes for QPL.*

5. On contract #3557 following the construction of the bridge deck on stay in place metal forms, a unique pattern of cracking began to appear that could not be attributed to any particular element of the construction or curing. Over time these cracks have continued to grow and propagate up into the bridge rail and other elements. Several theories regarding the source of the cracking were discussed, including the foam blockouts of corrugations and how they appeared to correspond with the crack patterns; how the 15 lbs/ft² additional weight limit necessitates a portion of the corrugation be blocked out and what effects this may have on stress concentration points. Has Structures looked at the possibility these form systems could be the cause of the cracking? Has this been identified at any other locations?

RESPONSE: *Materials Division is responding to this question.*

MATERIALS' RESPONSE: *The Materials Division has taken cores and reviewed the specifications and mix design for this bridge. It appears that a combination of the stay in place forms, concrete shrinkage and confusion regarding cover over the top mat of reinforcing may have contributed to the cracking. We have discussed internally if we should require all of the corrugations to be filled or if that method of form work should be eliminated. Other bridge decks such as Carlin have been placed more*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

successfully with the same stay in place forms. We continue to look into this matter.

RE Consensus: Materials Response is OK. Every bridge deck should be spec to be multiyear poly/overlay. Methacrylate.

TRAFFIC

6. 625.03.05 – Contractor Designed Traffic Control Plans

“Protect public traffic from longitudinal drop-offs greater than 100mm (4in) with an approved barrier of construct and maintain approved 1:6 (6:1) maximum safety slopes” and could you explain with respect to interstate mill and fill works? For instance pavement works having 2-lifts, each 3-inch thick, stagger 6-inch, is this 6-inch drop-off a required barrier?

RESPONSE: *Yes, a barrier would be required. The 6-inch stagger (about the width of a car tire) is too narrow to provide adequate opportunity for the driver of an errant vehicle to regain control and return the vehicle to the travel lane.*

This begs the question, “How wide does the stagger (flat area) between lifts need to be to provide adequate recovery for a driver so that a barrier is not required?” There is no known criteria for this situation but the critical issue is whether a driver would be able to maintain control of the vehicle as it is driven over the drop-off. It is very possible that a driver suddenly and unexpectedly driving off of a drop-off of any height would be unprepared for the jolt on their steering wheel and could possibly lose control of their vehicle in an active construction area.

RE Consensus: Not Adequate Response. Suggest more leeway in either staggering the joints or the 4" drop off. We suggest Stay out of the wheel path but be able to stagger the joints by as much additional 18" for a total (24" stagger is recommend).

7. Speed limit reduction. What is the procedure to determine speed limit reductions? It seems that only one division has a say in this. Can the procedure be modified to allow RE and District input?

RESPONSE: *The following is the relevant text from the Work Zone Safety & Mobility Implementation Guide (Red Book)*

2.5 Policies Applicable to Work Zones

2.5.1 Temporary Speed Reduction

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

Existing speed limits shall remain in effect through work zones on state highways except where those work zone activities would create a condition that would be aggravated by retaining the existing speed limits.

A temporary speed reduction on projects may be requested. The MUTCD recommends a maximum speed reduction of 10 mph. Projects with an existing speed limit greater than 55 MPH may be temporarily reduced by 10 MPH or to 55 MPH, whichever is lower with the concurrence from the Chief Traffic Operations Engineer. If approved, the limits and operational benefits of the temporary reduced speed limit shall be incorporated into the TMP.

Any temporary reductions to a speed lower than 55 mph may be reduced with concurrence from the Chief Traffic Operations Engineer and a recommendation forwarded by Traffic Operations to the Director for approval.

During the development of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP), traffic control strategies for the project are discussed, and members of the TMP team, which include the RE and the District, are tasked with identifying ways to maintain work zone safety and construction productivity while minimizing impacts to the traveling public. Approval for speed reductions can occur at this time and will be included in the TMP, or the request can come in after the project is awarded (e.g. when traffic control is Lump Sum and the contractor is preparing traffic control plans.) The Traffic Operations Division provides technical expertise in conjunction with the justifications to ensure that the requested speed limit reduction is reasonable, consistent with accepted standards of practice, does not compromise safety of construction workers or the traveling public, and that planned work zone traffic control devices will effectively reduce operating speeds.

This topic will be included in the Traffic Ops presentation at the RE meeting and additional discussion and feedback is welcome at that time.

RE Consensus: Wait for further information.

MATERIALS:

8. Calculation of RAP in Aggregate Base – We often have to argue with the contractor about the amount of RAP in Recycled Aggregate Base Course. The procedure only weighs and counts the RAP on the +#4 screen, but then is only

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

compared to the +#4 weight of the sample. Can Materials Division revisit how they calculate the RAP in a sample, so we may get a more representative result?

RESPONSE: *The Materials Division recognizes the potential for under or overestimating the percentage of RAP in base course. This method is the easiest to use and can be done easily by the Contractors as well. It is a reasonable estimation of the percentage that provides a number to control the use of the material as indicated in the aggregate base specifications. More exact numbers for RAP content are not necessary.*

RE Consensus: *We have no response to their response. It's a pain to figure out actual percentage by the crew. But if Materials is ok with the way we do it today, then we are fine.*

9. 636.02.01 of the Standard Specifications says: "Use epoxy traffic paint materials for temporary painted striping placed on surfaces to receive permanent epoxy striping."

According to one manufacturer that we have been using, their recommendation is to remove epoxies used as temporary markings prior to the installation of epoxy for permanent striping. We are also getting push back from the contractor stating the same. This same manufacturer notes that the epoxy can however be applied over water based paint applied as temporary marking. Should we be going by our specifications or the manufacturers recommendations for their products?

RESPONSE: *The current specifications are designed based on previous manufacturer recommendations and the concept that similar materials would be more compatible. The Materials Division can investigate the opposite recommendations which have been reported.*

RE Consensus: *Change the Spec to Water borne. Don K. will ask this question next year until Materials Response with their finding. Epoxy does not appear adhere to epoxy. Also, 4" temp vs 8" perm striping, seems to last longer over the 4" temp and the part that is not on the temp fades.*

10. Concrete Mix Designs - We feel NDOT is too prescriptive in relation to concrete mix. We should stick to the specifications we require, for concrete mix. NDOT is accepting risk by telling the contractor how to make the concrete instead of just the end result. For example, when we have to supply moisture to the Contractor; this is a contractor QC item.

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: *The acceptance of a concrete mix design includes conformance of the design to the specifications and a successful trial batch. The specifications we have are based on historic success of concrete design development, but we are always looking to improve our specifications. We have recently implemented specifications for a new bridge deck in an effort to get a deck that does not crack. In response to the moisture content question, we are working with the Construction Division to make the Contractor responsible for testing the amount of moisture in his stockpiles and adjusting his batching quantities. The Department would then only verify that we agreed with his moisture numbers.*

CONSTRUCTION RESPONSE: *The Construction Division has recently been made aware of a conflict between Subsection 501.03.03 Storage of Aggregates of the 2014 Standard Specifications and a memorandum entitled Hotplant/Batch Plant Aggregate Moistures (dated December 22, 2008) that was sent by Steve Hale.*

The third sentence of the third paragraph of Subsection 501.03.03 states the following: "Test the aggregates to determine the amount of free water on the aggregate and adjust the addition of mix water accordingly during batching." Hence, the specification puts the onus on the Contractor to obtain the moistures.

The memorandum from Steve Hale states that NDOT is responsible for performing aggregate moisture tests daily and that the plant inspector is responsible for adjusting the design batch weights based upon those moisture tests.

Due to this conflict, the Construction Division will be sending out an addendum to that memo to support the verbiage in the Standard Specifications. As in the past, moistures will still be required to be obtained by the crew(s) on an "informational" basis.

Please monitor the moistures that are obtained by the contractor(s) as well as the moistures obtained by the crew(s). If there are significant differences with the results, an investigation should be performed to determine the cause(s). No matter who is obtaining the moistures, the accuracy of the result is the most important.

A pull-sheet request will be sent to the Specifications Division to change the third sentence of the third paragraph of Subsection 501.03.03 to the following: "Test the aggregates, per Test Method No. Nev. T112, to determine the amount of free water on the aggregate and adjust the addition of mix water accordingly during batching."

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

AS ADDED RESOURCE INFORMATION: *The following link to an article regarding moisture corrections in the precast industry is also a very good read, also read the comments that follow: <http://precast.org/2010/05/water-to-cement-ratio-and-aggregate-moisture-corrections/>*

RE Consensus: *Ok We are good with the response.*

13a. Why can't we change prime coat to a SQYD item instead of tons? That way we could actually truly track the plan quantities regardless of the material used i.e. MC-70NV, Topien or E-prime. ***"If electing to use alternate approved products from the QPL it shall be at no additional cost to the department. The department will determine the quantity of alternate product measured for payment."*** If the inspector is required to quantify the equivalent amount of MC-70 every ton of Topien is equal to can Materials provide information on this calculation? (Same questions to Design)

RESPONSE: *The topic has been discussed and the request has been sent to the Roadway Design Division. Application rates for each material would be included in the Estimate of Quantities in the Plans.*

DESIGN RESPONSE: *Prime coat is proposed to be measured and payed for by the square yard on Muller Lane and Rainbow Canyon contracts on a trial basis to evaluate how it goes. The concern is the contractor will not apply it as per the prescribed application rate.*

The application rate will be listed in the contract for MC-70, and will reference the QPL for application rates of proprietary items (Topien or E-prime).

RE Consensus: *Ok. We are good with the response.*

DESIGN:

11. It is my understanding that one of the performance measures that Construction is tasked with is construction engineering costs. Right now, you could have a 2.5 million chip seal project and a 7 million earthwork project with lane & shoulder widenings and they would have the same construction engineering budget. Obviously, these projects have very different needs because a chip project does not have much testing, very little survey, and has a short construction duration. The earthwork project takes much longer to complete, has a tremendous amount of surveying and testing. The formulas are a good start but can we have someone review the construction engineering budget to get a better estimate?

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: *Construction Engineering is estimated by:*

- 5% - Normal Projects over \$7M*
- 5% City Force Account, Signal & Lighting, & Roadside development*
- 7% - Overlays with <25% of safety or Minor Safety Contracts,*
- 10% - Normal project \$4M-7M*
- 10% Overlay w/Safety>=25% or Major Safety*
- 15% - Normal projects <\$4M*

Design looked at the projects closed the first quarter of FY 16, and the EE and actual CE were quite close. Typically, the RE is consulted, but if not, the EE (including CE) will be in the available for review at the specs submittal, and any suggestions to the EE are welcome.

RE Consensus: *The response is ok.*

12. How are we dealing with Topien and the documentation to pay for it compared to MC-70? Are we looking at going to go to a square yard item so documentation is the same no matter what product is used?

RESPONSE: *Prime coat is proposed to be measured and payed for by the square yard on Muller Lane and Rainbow Canyon contracts on a trial basis to evaluate how it goes. The concern is the contractor will not apply it as per the prescribed application rate.*

The application rate will be listed in the contract for MC-70, and will reference the QPL for application rates of proprietary items (Topien or E-prime)..

RE Consensus: *12, 13 & 13a-This question has been asked before. The crews will track the application rates as they always have as required, just we do with SS-1h. We would like the SQYD bid items sooner rather than later. Generic Prime Coat by SQYD.*

13. Why can't we change prime coat to a SQYD item instead of tons? That way we could actually truly track the plan quantities regardless of the material used i.e. MC-70NV, Topien or E-prime. ***"If electing to use alternate approved products from the QPL it shall be at no additional cost to the department. The department will determine the quantity of alternate product measured for payment."*** If the inspector is required to quantify the equivalent amount of MC-70 every ton of Topien is equal to can Materials provide information on this calculation? (Same questions to Materials)

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: Please see the response on #12.

MATERIALS RESPONSE: The topic has been discussed and the request has been sent to the Roadway Design Division. Application rates for each material would be included in the Estimate of Quantities in the Plans.

14. When there is a utility level of confidence D or F on final plans why is it not pot holed and field verified before construction? Why isn't something done to raise the level of confidence before construction? (Same questions to R/W.)

RESPONSE: This is an area Design is working on to improve. Part of the challenge is the time it takes to get the information (years in the worst cases). Right-of-way has to issue an RFP, select, negotiate, and then the SUE company actually does the work. R/W has also suffered from resource limitations to get these contracts completed. Also part of the challenge has been that Design needs to submit a formal, written request to the right people. There have been occasions where we thought the process was underway, when in fact, had not been started.

In some cases, Design has been directed to complete plans in a timeframe where we could not request and include this information. Hopefully, those cases are becoming less frequent, but will likely still occur. Additional steps are being taken by Administrative Services to develop a process where a SUE consultant can be procured quickly (on-call).

RIGHT-OF-WAY RESPONSE: The decision to use Subsurface Utility Engineering is dependent on the type of project and the results of preliminary research on existing utility information. Ultimately, the designer decides the level of utility information is needed. If there is little anticipation of utility conflicts, based on the project activities and field/utility company information provided, then the designer, most likely, will not order Quality Level B (surface geophysical methods to designate or mark the approximate horizontal position of subsurface utilities) or Quality Level A (pot holing) as the cost benefit is limited.

RE Consensus: We will wait for the SUE On call Results. IF the level of Confidence is low, we should require potholes. Time frames should be reduced with Oncall list. Work with Design and Construction for more information.

15. Can design put in Brow Ditches at the top of cut slopes, to control erosion and assist with water quality?

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: *Ditches at the top of cuts or embankments are often problematic and prone to maintenance issues for many reasons. The ditches can fail can cause the slope to erode onto the adjacent property or roadway if any number of things is not adequate about the site conditions. Things that must be considered are:*

- *What size watershed is contributing to the conveyance (how much flow will need to be conveyed)*
- *Can maintenance access the ditch*
- *What types of materials are on the slope (Are they erosive or susceptible to piping of water)*
- *How far from the slope face is the ditch located*
- *What type of ditch armoring will be needed (a ditch at the top of a slope usually has a steep longitudinal slope along the flow line)*
- *What are the potential impacts to a slope blow-out*

There are locations where a ditch at the top of a slope make sense, but they are more the exception than the rule. The engineers in Hydraulics consider this as an option and will incorporate this type of ditch in the design if it appears to be the best and safest way to convey flows.

RE Consensus: Good.

16. In Contract Special Provisions under **Section 202-Removal of Structures and Obstructions, Subsection 202.03.08 Salvage**. We request that in every contract, a pull sheet be added stating: "All materials to be removed from the project shall be delivered to a District Maintenance facility as directed by the engineer. Coordinate delivery through the engineer." Many times Maintenance needs older items for repair purposes (guardrail, sign posts, light poles, impact attenuators). Maintenance can salvage many items, and can then be put back into the District Budget.

RESPONSE: *We salvage all materials requested by Maintenance, the District, Traffic, Bridge, the County or City, etc. Each project has specific requirements (what materials and drop off location). We have specified delivery to Maintenance yards, material pits, and County or City property. The material, location, and contact person is specific to the project and needs to be developed through the project design process. Specifications is not aware of any project that this has not occurred when requested. We have a pullsheet for salvaging materials and the project info needs to be*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

added to it. We do not want to add generic language to salvage all materials removed, otherwise you may end up with broken concrete, twisted rebar, and ground off paint and surfacing materials, etc.

RE Consensus: District should be more proactive if they want the salvage the items. Response is ok.

17. Categories (AEB) – We understand why these are needed. At the same time it is a burden at times when there are many Categories (AEB) for the same work. Can the number of Categories (AEB) be reduced as much as possible when Contracts go out?

RESPONSE: Yes. This will be noted at the next Design Staff meeting.

RE Consensus: Response is Ok.

18. 203.05.01 Payment - Some contract construction plans show Borrow Embankment quantity is the same as a total embankment fill quantity, without considering a roadway excavation quantity as fill material. Isn't it double payment when a contractor is paid roadway excavation and borrow embankment for the same material? Is there any training to clarify this issue among NDOT divisions, mainly between the construction crews and roadway design?

RESPONSE: Embankment is the total quantity and is comprised of roadway excavation, channel excavation, along with borrow embankment. Borrow embankment should only be the additional material brought in to complete the embankment after excavation items are performed and placed. This is specified in the first paragraph of Subsection 203.02.05 and the third paragraph of Subsection 203.03.11.

Design is preparing training specifically for earthwork for our staff, anticipated to be given this summer. We will be coordinating the training material with Construction to make sure we have the same understanding, and plan to offer the training to the RE's.

Design's interpretation of the Silver Book is we should not be paying for Roadway Excavation and Borrow for the same material. This question probably needs some discussion in person.

RE Consensus: Be more consistence, this most likely was a design error. Double check the quantity of borrow wvs road ex, vs embankment.

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

19. Borrow vs Roadway Excavation: Is there a better way or more testing we can do to better identify when we really need borrow? It seems that we call out roadway excavation to be disposed of quite often and then the contractor ends up using it. In some projects we have paid for the excavated material as both excavation and borrow.

RESPONSE: *Design feels this is essentially the root of the problem for question #18 as well.*

The Materials Division has specified roadway excavation to be disposed of on some projects because they did not have the time or staff to test it so they assume it is not suitable. The designer then has to have a borrow bid item to complete the embankment. The material should be tested on all projects so the suitability of roadway excavation can be verified.

Also see response to #18.

RE Consensus: *Do a better job exploring the soils. Wait for the Design training. Default Dispose of Materials, but if the material is not good, we should dispose of it.*

20. We would like to request a Pay Item for Patching NOT based on tonnage.

With the 402 spec. we have to collect an oil sample every day we pave, regardless of tonnage. If we are going to be placing 50 tons, it's not a big deal. But if the contractor is only placing 10 tons we can only get it from Granite's Glendale plant, which proved to be problematic on 3586 with every oil sample failing due to not enough quantity being produced. I don't know how serious Granites threat of only bidding to supply our projects out of their Lockwood plant @ a 100 ton minimum was, after we accessed them LD's. Which is fine, but that means we won't have permanent patches placed until we have enough area ready to use 100 tons. On 3586 that would have been over a month.

Additionally; we cannot test it per the test method when there is no windrow or behind the paver mat to sample from. So all we can do is try to get what looks to be representative, and hope for the best. But with 3586, our gradations and burn-offs were all over the place. So there were failures we're not convinced were true failures.

What we used to have:

3440 Specials

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

402.03.07 Patching. Patching consists of placing Type 1 Class B Aggregate Base, Emulsified Asphalt, Type SS-1H (Diluted) as prime and seal coat, and Plantmix Surfacing (Type 2) (Wet) (PG 64-28NV).

Base aggregate shall conform to Section 302.

Emulsified asphalt for prime coat shall conform to Sections 405 and 406. Emulsified asphalt for seal coat shall conform to Sections 405 and 406.

402.04.01 Measurement. This Subsection of the Standard Specifications is hereby deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Plantmix bituminous shoulder dikes will be measured as specified in Subsection 401.04.01. Patching will be measured by the square yard for the completed mixture of aggregate,

asphalt, mineral filler, and emulsified asphalt and placement of the material specified herein.

402.05.01 Payment. This Subsection of the Standard Specifications is hereby deleted and the following substituted therefore:

The accepted quantities, measured as provided above, will be paid for at the contract price per unit of measurement for the pay items listed below that are shown in the proposal. Payment will be full compensation for the work prescribed in this Section.

Payment will be made under:

Pay Item	Pay Unit
Plantmix Bituminous Shoulder Dikes	Linear Meter (Linear Foot)
Patching	Square Yard

The compensation payable for the additional quantity of asphalt cement and mineral filler added at the direction of the Engineer according to Subsection 401.02.02 of these Special Provisions will be made at the following set unit prices:

Asphalt Cement, PG 64-28NV Mineral Filler, Marination Method

\$700 per ton

\$150 per ton

RESPONSE: *This item may need more discussion in person at the RE conference, or submit to the Design-Construction meeting. Design does not see this as a bid item problem, but is a sampling and testing issue. It is Design's recommendation we modify the sampling and testing methods be modified as necessary for the small quantities. Compilation of the patching items into a single item does not relieve the testing requirements, and for obvious reasons, we do not want to simply remove all testing requirements.*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RE Consensus: We don't like the response. We want the patching specs as stated in 3440. We would like to escalate this issue higher.

21. Would like clarification on the Specification Division's authority to dictate Bid Items. It seems counter intuitive to the construction process. See Patching Bid Item Question. As the EDOC pay system evolves to become more fluid so should the writing of specifications IOHO.

RESPONSE: *The Specifications Division strives to keep the PS&E packages as consistent as possible for all the Divisions of the Department, Consultants, and Contractors. More consistency leads to better efficiency and fewer errors. If each Designer, Resident Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, etc., had the ability to pick and choose which items to use or which items they are not going to use to accomplish the same work from project to project, we feel it would be extremely detrimental. If you disagree with the Specifications Division's solution, please feel free to discuss it further with your Division Chief or Division Engineer and the Roadway Design Engineer, or submit it for discussion at the Design-Construction meeting.*

RE Consensus: Same as 20, escalate higher.

RIGHT-OF-WAY:

14a. When there is a utility level of confidence D or F on final plans why is it not pot holed and field verified before construction? Why isn't something done to raise the level of confidence before construction? (Same questions to Design!)

RESPONSE: *The decision to use Subsurface Utility Engineering is dependent on the type of project and the results of preliminary research on existing utility information. Ultimately, the designer decides the level of utility information is needed. If there is little anticipation of utility conflicts, based on the project activities and field/utility company information provided, then the designer, most likely, will not order Quality Level B (surface geophysical methods to designate or mark the approximate horizontal position of subsurface utilities) or Quality Level A (pot holing) as the cost benefit is limited.*

DESIGN RESPONSE: *This is an area Design is working on to improve. Part of the challenge is the time it takes to get the information (years in the*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

worst cases). Right-of-way has to issue an RFP, select, negotiate, and then the SUE company actually does the work. R/W has also suffered from resource limitations to get these contracts completed. Also part of the challenge has been that Design needs to submit a formal, written request to the right people. There have been occasions where we thought the process was underway, when in fact, had not been started.

In some cases, Design has been directed to complete plans in a timeframe where we could not request and include this information. Hopefully, those cases are becoming less frequent, but will likely still occur. Additional steps are being taken by Administrative Services to develop a process where a SUE consultant can be procured quickly (on-call).

RE Consensus: Same as 14. - We will wait for the SUE On call Results. IF the level of Confidence is low, we should require potholes. Time frames should be reduced with Oncall list. Work with Design and Construction for more information.

22. Some contracts' right of way clearance only includes footprint: however, some pay items include areas outside of the footprint, for instance seeding areas include up to 10 ft outside of the slope stake (footprint) for both fill & cut areas, what about stockpile areas of clearing and grubbing material, Topsoil (Salvage), turnaround areas, staging areas, etc.?

RESPONSE: All work must take place within the R/W limits unless rights have been obtained from the property owner which allows entrance onto their property for the work. Seeding should be limited to R/W limits. The areas that are included in the "footprint", such as for slope cuts and fill areas, may be well within the R/W. The R/W should be staked so the contractor will be well aware of the limits.

Sometimes contractors will negotiate with property owners for staging areas.

RE Consensus: Response is inadequate. We want clearance from ROW to ROW. With marked avoidance area. Make the avoidance area as small as possible.

23. What is the difference between a temporary easement "TE", a permission to construct, and a permanent easement "PE"? Who decides what the Department is going to "get" to build the project?.

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: *A temporary easement is essentially a lease on a property. It is usually valued at 10% of the fair market value per square foot. No permanent improvements may be built within a temporary easement.*

A permanent easement is a limited right the Department gets from a property owner in order to construct a project. The use of the area is clearly defined (for example: for the construction of a drop inlet, or for the construction a sidewalk). The value is based on a percentage of the fair market value per square foot. The less use the property owner will have of the property in the after condition, the higher the percentage of fair market value. For example, the Department wants a PE for the maintenance of a drainage feature. If the property owner has all rights except the ability to place a permanent above-ground improvement, then the Department may have to pay 75% of fair market value. However, if the Department is using the PE in such a way that the property owner has no use of the area in the after condition, then the easement may be valued at 90% of fair market value.

A "permission to construct" which is also known as an Agreement for Construction Outside Right-of-Way is only used if the work being performed is solely for the benefit of the property owner and the project can be constructed without obtaining the agreement. For example, if the department is feathering in a property owner's driveway just to make it a nice transition for the property owner, but the driveway and project could operate without this work, then it would be a permission to construct agreement. However, if the project impacts the driveway to the point that it is non-operational in the after-condition due to elevation changes, then a temporary easement would be needed to return the owner's driveway to be fully functional.

RE Consensus: Response is good

DISTRICTS:

24. On projects that have at least a two year duration (or in the north two construction seasons) and have a bid item for Waterborne Pavement Striping (Type II), when would be the appropriate time for acceptance of the striping? For instance a Contract with multiple projects were completed in one season through final striping and paid for in accordance with Specifications, however after the second season and final completion of the Contract the accepted striping from the first season is no longer useful. A partial relief of maintenance is asked for but denied or drawn out due to other circumstances, thus for District Acceptance can the Contractor be required to reapply all striping? If so shouldn't this be paid for at unit bid item pricing?

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

RESPONSE: *This will be discussed in detail at the RE Meeting.*

RE Consensus: *We will wait for the response. In D3, we don't expect the water bourn won't last a year.*

CONSTRUCTION OFFICE

25. Profilograph specification under 409.03.12 Riding Tolerances. state "The finished surface shall have a profile index of 80 mm/km (5 in/mi) or less, and not more than 8 mm/0.1 km (0.5 in/0.1mi), as measured and calculated according to Test Method No. Nev. T446. There is no indication if this is for each wheel track or the average. Per Form 040-073, Report of Profilograph Test, it only shows the Left and Right Wheel Tracks. We request that the specifications be changed to the following language, "The finished surface shall have a profile index of 80 mm/km (5 in/mi) or less, and not more than 8 mm/0.1 km (0.5 in/0.1mi), of the average of the two wheel tracks, as measured and calculated according to Test Method No. Nev. T446., be added to the We request the form have an added column, for the average of the Left and Right Wheel tracks. We understand the specs and forms are changing, but if this is ever needed in the future.

RESPONSE: *The 2nd sentence of the 5th paragraph of Subsection 409.03.12 Riding Tolerances (Page 194) of the 2014 Standard Specifications states the following: "The average of the two profiles per lane will be used to calculate the profile index." Pertaining to NDOT Construction Form No. 040-073 (Rev. 6/08), there is a row titled "Average total of the two wheel tracks (PCCP)" and a row entitled "Average P.I. (PCCP)". With all of that being stated, the Construction Division feels that a change to the Standard Specification and NDOT Construction Form No. 040-073 is not required as both the specification and form are clear and compatible. If the specification, test method, and/or form is still unclear, we will be happy to provide additional training.*

With that being said, projects being advertised after January 1st of 2016, should contain the new IRI (International Roughness Index) specifications and unless there is a ride incentive/disincentive on a contract, there will not be any construction forms for a crew to complete. Please see question #33 for more details on the IRI specification.

RE Consensus: *This spec will go away.*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

26. Can we get the iPhones that are assigned to the crews turned into Mobile HotSpots / Tethering for the "Wi-Fi-Only iPads" that use the Mobile Inspector App? This will allow inspectors in the field to upload the IDRs and Posting without looking for a Wi-Fi Hotspot and other Inspectors that don't have a State issue phone but have iPads would be able to upload via the Mobile Inspector App using their fellow crew member's HotSpots. This option would be cheaper than supplying a Verizon Mi-Fi per crew. I believe it is \$10/month for the Mobile HotSpot vs the \$40/month for the Verizon Mi-Fi.

RESPONSE: *This is definitely an option, and will require the approval from the RE and ADE as well the request coming from the ADE to the Construction Division. Administration (Districts and Construction) will be discussing uniformity of cell phone issuance amongst crews during this meeting which may impact this request. Administration will advise RE's of outcome.*

In the event we move forward on this, please forward the request to Megan Sizelove (888-7625) to return mi-fi's and work with IT (Sherrie Cullen 888-7885) to enable the Wi-Fi hotspots through NDOT issued iPhone.

RE Consensus: *We are ok with the Answer.*

27. Can we get a status update on the use of Excel Sheets for Load books?

RESPONSE: *An email was sent (by Megan Sizelove) on 1/22/16 regarding How to Manage Electronic Load Sheets and Records of Delivery. (See Attachment)*

RE Consensus: *Done*

28. Can we get a status update on Electronic Testing forms?

RESPONSE: *Based on the responses from the last RE Annual Meeting, the Construction Division committed to having all of our testing forms that are posted on the SharePoint site "User Friendly" by the next RE Annual Meeting. We are pleased to announce that this task has been accomplished. All testing forms that are located on SharePoint are now editable by the user. The user also has the ability to save all of the data that he or she placed on the form.*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

These Fillable PDF forms are available on SharePoint to use prior to implementation of Project Construction & Materials software (enhancement to FieldManager – goal is to implement construction season 2018).

RE Consensus: Done

29. Can there be a Liquidated Damage penalty incorporated into Contracts for failure of the Contractor submitting progress schedules as detailed in Specification 108.03? As we have been told with late payrolls, withholding progress payments has to come from the Deputy Director.

RESPONSE: The 108.03 specification does not and will not be changed to apply a LD for noncompliance. The Districts/Crews have the support from the Construction Office and Front Office to withhold bi-weekly payments for noncompliance and this will be much more effective for enforcement than applying a LD. The contractors will have significant financial impact if their bi-weekly payment is withheld. With that being said, the RE must keep their ADE and the Construction Office informed of noncompliance issues and their intent to withhold payment prior to the withholding. If the RE recommends withholding payment, please receive concurrence from your ADE and have your ADE notify the Chief Construction Engineer of the withholding so we can support the withholding as well notifying the Director's Office. As we all know, contractors do not hesitate to make phone calls when issues arise that they disagree with and the RE/ADE's do not want someone at HQ's overriding their decision. In addition, discussions should be taking place with the contractor of their noncompliance and should be put on notice in writing of the withholding prior to the withholding.

RE Consensus: Response ok.

30. Mark-up on Mark-up - Can Construction develop a policy regarding Mark-up on Mark-up (Prime Contractor Mark-up on Subcontractor work)? I believe Arizona has a provision that does not allow additional mark-up on subcontractor work.

RESPONSE: The 2014 Standard Specifications attempted to address this:

104.04 Extra Work.

Perform unforeseen work, for which there is no price included in the contract, whenever it is deemed necessary or desirable in order to complete fully the work as contemplated. Perform such work according to the specifications and as directed, and payment will be

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

made for as agreed unit prices, force account, or a combination of the two.

109.03 Force Account Work

d) Subcontracted Work. *Payment for subcontracted work may be made at the actual cost as evidenced by copies of invoices from the subcontractor performing the work. An additional 5% compensation will be paid on subcontracted work evidenced by invoice for administrative costs and profit.*

It was thought at the time this language was generated that the combination of these two sections allows the RE to dictate the amount of allowable markup for subcontracted work per the way the specs work together.

Do the RE's agree or disagree with this and/or is clearer guidance / specifications needed?

RE Consensus: *We are ok.*

31. I think it would be helpful if we have a checklist, things to get done at a projects commencement such as NOI, COLLA, MSDS, SWPPP, INSURANCE, etc.

RESPONSE: *Currently we are reviewing the Department's approach to Pre-Construction meetings. We can incorporate this request into revised approach.*

RE Consensus: *Safety Plan too. Bhu will make checklist with help form RE*

32. Do we have CMAR guidelines yet?

RESPONSE: *Specifically what guidelines are being requested (i.e. payment, closeout, documentation, other)?*

RE Consensus: *CMAR specific guideline in the Doc Manual that are different from Design-Bid-Build documentation. Still waiting from last year, but Const HQ wants more information.*

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

33. When will the PWL (Percent within limits) and IRI (International Roughness Index) specifications go into effect? Will there be a presentation on the changes and will training be required?

RESPONSE: *The PWL (Percent Within Limits) specification is in effect on Contract 3621 on US 93 in McGill (District 3) and Contract 3628 on US 6 in Tonopah (District 1). It will also be placed on the FRPE01 project in Lovelock (District 2). The intent of the Construction Division was to select one project in each district for implementation as a trial run. Based on these projects, we will be able to make changes, if required, to improve the specifications so that full implementation can take place statewide during the 2017 construction season.*

The implementation of the PWL specification is a three year process with the first year consisting of contractor friendly specifications. This will allow the three contractors and NDOT to become accustomed to the specifications. In years two and three, the specifications will be tightened each year to ultimately reach our goal.

The purpose of the specification is to not only force the contractor(s) in providing a quality product but to also provide a consistent quality product.

The PWL specification will only be placed on projects that have 25,000 tons of plantmix bituminous surface or greater and has been attached for your review.

The IRI (International Roughness) specifications for both HMA and PCC pavements (see attached) have been implemented on all contracts that have advertised since January 1st, 2016. We are currently working with the Specifications Division in developing ride incentive/disincentive language that will be utilized on all Interstate contracts.

The purpose for the switch from profile index (PRI) to IRI was threefold. One, based on research and worldwide practice, IRI is a more realistic simulation of what a driver feels as he or she travels along a roadway. Two, the IRI specifications eliminate the use of the old California type profilograph and utilizes high speed profiling systems to obtain the required data. The high speed profiling systems are much faster and easier to collect the data as compared to the California type profilograph. Three, the NDOT Materials Division utilizes IRI in their PMS (Pavement Management System). Switching from PRI to IRI in the acceptance process will be an integral part of that system.

The specifications for both IRI and PWL will be handed out during the meeting.

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

Training for both PWL and IRI will be available to the crews. Please contact your local QA inspector to schedule.

RE Consensus: OK

34. The current iteration of the combined ATSS/ATFR fails to account for all acceptance testing when only using "Bid Items", Please advise on procedures to include non-Bid Item related acceptance testing for this revised (7/13) document (040-076). For example: MFG required compaction testing on subgrade under cattle guards.

RESPONSE: Typically, only materials directly associated with a bid item will be placed on the ATSS unless there is a significant amount of material requiring sampling and testing that is incidental to a bid item (SCC for drilled shafts, roadway excavation used as borrow embankment, etc.). Regardless if the material is listed on the ATSS or not, all materials that will be incorporated into the work will require either certifications or need to be sampled and tested. The Construction Division will be sending out a memo pertaining to the ATSS process to hopefully address any questions and/or concerns that you may have. A draft of the memo will be provided during the meeting.

RE Consensus: OK

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

LATE SUBMITTAL QUESTIONS –

FOR REFERENCE AND RESPONSE AT/OR FOLLOWING RE MEETING

35. Why are we now applying 100% of the weighted value of the Apparent Specific Gravity (Nev. Test Method T104) on the Moisture Density Determination, Compaction report Part 2? Previously when using the Apparent specific gravity (Test method T104) in conjunction with the Harvard Miniature (T101), we used 90% of the weighted value in pounds per cuft. This is because the Apparent Specific Gravity is "Apparent" and not a Bulk specific gravity that soaks for 15+ hours. When we utilize the Apparent specific gravity instead of the Bulk Specific gravity as per AASHTO we should not be applying it at 100% because all of the voids in the coarse aggregates have not been fully filled. This becomes a huge issue when there is a large percentage of Oversized Aggregate that we are correcting for. This will cause our Corrected Max Density to be higher than it should be and could lead to a claim due to Contractors experiencing a high rate of failing compactions and extra time that is spent trying to gain passing compactions.

RESPONSE:

RE Consensus: Request evolution on why we change the weight value from 90% to 100%. It is hard to get compaction and we want to avoid claims.

36. Is it possible for the Construction Division to seek out alternative structures for Field Labs? We have been experiencing multiple issues with the condition of the current field labs being moved and set up and are in need of new labs as soon as possible. Due to the cost of the Manufactured Home style labs we will be waiting 6-7 years to fully replace our fleet of field labs and most of them are well past their life expectancy and will not make it another 5+ years. If the department would consider alternatives to Manufacture Home style field labs we could save money, gain a better product that would last longer and we could replace our fleet of field labs in 2 years as opposed to almost 7. Contractors have been utilizing Modified Shipping containers for years and since they are not Manufactured Homes they would not incur many of the issues we are currently facing in District 1.

RESPONSE:

RE Consensus: Wait for Executive response, most likely FY 18, this will be look in at that time.

Attachments

DRAFT

2016 Resident Engineer Meeting - Questions from the RE's

37. During the holiday seasons at the end of the year, it becomes very difficult to get things tasks accomplished with much of the department using leave before we lose it. Is it possible to establish an internal policy on vacation time with departments and offices to prevent the entire department or office from being on leave during the last month of the year? While Districts 2 and 3 have winter shut down, District 1 works all year long and this can create issues when District 1 has to wait to complete tasks until "after the New Year's" when everyone comes back from vacation.

RESPONSE:

38. Can we review the current spending limits on purchase orders for R.E.s and A.R.E.s? In order to ensure that we have the resources to complete the required duties of the department, R.E.s and A.R.E.s must be able to efficiently order supplies. With only a \$500 limit on spending per purchase order we are often having to create multiple purchase orders of several weeks to obtain all of the supplies we need, this is not efficient and for those who are working out of town this can create an unnecessary burden on the crew.

RESPONSE:

39. Why can't the field lab crews obtain and use Bio-T Max to clean their asphalt equipment anymore? The Materials Division uses this method to clean and preserve their equipment. It is environmentally friendly and safer than using heat to remove asphalt from pans and splitters. Using a torch and scrapper will only damage the equipment and require us to replace it sooner. We are told that if we do not take care of our field lab equipment we will not get nice new equipment but then are forced to use methods that damage that equipment.

RESPONSE:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SUBJECT	STATUS	DUE D...	M...	DIN FOLDER	C...
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 01: Contractor Prequalification	In Progress	Mon 6/6/2...	10...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 02: NDOT DBE Process	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	10...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 03: As-Builts	In Progress	Mon 6/6/2...	10...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 04: CMAR Projects	In Progress	Mon 6/6/2...	11...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 05: Construction and Project Management Agreements ...	Not Started	Mon 6/13/...	11...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 06: Unbalanced Bidding	In Progress	Mon 6/6/2...	11...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Item 07: NDOT Staff Update	In Progress	Mon 6/6/2...	11...	N...	<input type="checkbox"/>

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 01: Contractor Prequalification
Start Date: Thursday, February 19, 2015
Due Date: Monday, June 6, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 0%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

Contractor Prequalification:

- Draft Contractor Past Performance Rating sheet to be sent out to Resident Engineers for review.

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 02: NDOT DBE Process
Start Date: Monday, November 10, 2014
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 25%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

Nothing new to report.

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 03: As-Builts
Start Date: Monday, September 14, 2015
Due Date: Monday, June 6, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 75%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

We have decided to change the project where the contractor will supply the as-builts to contract 3619R, SR604 Las Vegas Blvd, which will advertise in June. We are having utility problems getting out the Pahrump roundabout project.

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 04: CMAR Projects
Start Date: Monday, March 2, 2015
Due Date: Monday, June 6, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 25%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

June 6, 2016

NDOT has 3 active CMAR Projects and no change orders to report.

3614 - Verdi Bridges

- ICE – Stanley Consultants - \$235,019.00
- Contractor – Granite Construction Company - \$398,000 + \$2,554,554.00 (GMP1)

EA73824 – Tropicana Escalators

- ICE – The Atkins Group - \$209,976.64 + \$86,491.00
- Contractor – The Whiting-Turner - \$289,911.0 + \$537,000.00 + \$30,463,209.00 (GMP)
- Design - Jacobs - \$1,300,000 + \$697,550
- LVCVA – \$19,612,863 (funding agreement)

SR28 – Bike Path (FLAP project)

- ICE – Stanley Consultants - \$338,686
- Contractor – Granite Construction Company - \$586,205

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 05: Construction and Project Management Agreements (December 15-May 16)
Start Date: Monday, February 29, 2016
Due Date: Monday, June 6, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 0%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

See attached spreadsheets.

**Construction Consultant Agreement Summary
Calendar Year 2013 - 2016**

		2013		2014			2015						Total Paid to Date to Consultant	
		Construction Management		Construction Admin.	Construction Management		Construction Admin.	Construction Management						
		Biological Oversight		Other Programs	Crew Augmentation		Other Programs	Full Administration	Crew Augmentation					
		P267-13-040	P498-13-040	P132-14-040	P551-14-040	P563-14-040	P373-15-040	P428-15-040	P102-15-040	P135-15-040	P430-15-040	P480-15-040		P532-15-040
		Biological Svcs	Biological Svcs ¹ Task Order # 1	P6 Training	BCBP Phase 1	I 580	RE Academy	SR 604	Carson City Freeway	US 95 Phase 3A	USA Pkwy	Neon	Neon Testing	
Total Agreement Amount		\$2,287,747	\$581,169	\$261,020	\$7,967,879	\$1,308,790	\$296,082	\$3,979,350	\$2,974,925	\$2,748,253	\$5,105,170	\$15,218,706	\$5,151,917	
Firm:	Total per Firm:													Total per Firm:
4 Leaf Consulting	\$ 899,629				s \$899,629									\$ 152,099.00
Atkins	\$ 704,492			P \$261,020	s \$147,390		P \$296,082							\$ 249,828.00
Aztec	\$ 5,151,917												P \$5,151,917	\$ -
B & E	\$ 2,287,747	P \$2,287,747												\$ 983,065.00
CA Group	\$ 1,425,867								P \$1,425,867					\$ 391,008.00
CDM Smith	\$ 2,589,154				s \$2,589,154									\$ 665,166.00
CEEC	\$ 4,105,934						s \$115,000				s \$3,990,934			\$ 125,417.00
CM Works	\$ 149,100						s \$149,100							\$ -
DCS	\$ 14,880,136				P \$3,391,552	P \$1,015,397	s \$811,899				s \$1,739,517	P \$7,921,771		\$ 2,737,752.00
Earth Safety Dynamics	\$ 219,820				s \$219,820									\$ 102,355.00
HDR	\$ 3,740,153		P \$581,169								P \$3,158,983			\$ 533,969.00
Jacobs	\$ 890,393										s \$890,393			\$ -
Kleinfelder	\$ 555,494				s \$555,494									\$ 17,310.00
McArthur & Associates	\$ 164,840				s \$164,840									\$ 55,634.00
Parsons	\$ 2,974,925								P \$2,974,925					\$ 465,598.00
QTCS	\$ 500,063					s \$293,393					s \$206,670			\$ 181,825.00
Slater Hanifan Group	\$ 1,222,386									s \$1,222,386				\$ 343,314.00
Stanley	\$ 480,790						s \$28,600				s \$452,190			\$ -
TriCore Surveying	\$ 100,000									s \$100,000				\$ 27,928.00
URS	\$ 4,838,169						P \$2,874,751				s \$1,963,419			\$ 33,111.00
	Total Paid to Date by Agreement	\$983,065	\$581,169	\$168,478	\$2,459,151	\$1,237,537	\$54,265	\$0	\$456,598	\$762,250	\$0	\$401,065	\$0	

¹ Master Agreement amount \$1,000,000.00

P= Prime
s=sub

Company	Agreement Number	Project Desc	Agreement Amount	Amount Expended	Length of Agreement	General Scope of Work
Ames	0021500	USA Parkway DB	75,923,220.00	2,411,180.00	1/11/16 - 12/31/17	Design-Builder
Atkins	0851100	US 95 NW CORRIDOR PCKG III	641,100.00	468,155.58	3/2/11 - 12/31/17	Landscape Architecture
Atkins	3951300	TROPICANA ESCALATORS - ICE	296,467.64	235,751.61	4/29/14 - 12/31/18	Independent Cost Estimating (ICE)
Atkins	63415015	TROPICANA PHASE 2	391,400.00	0.00	5/1/16 - 6/30/18	ROW Acquisition
CA Group	2941100	SR160 FM RED ROCK TO MT SPRING	6,091,900.00	3,186,303.48	11/14/11 - 12/31/16	NEPA services
CA Group	4291300	I15@TROPICANA FEASIBILITY STUDY	1,305,793.00	1,282,405.65	3/19/14 - 6/30/16	Feasibility Study
CA Group	7071500	US 95 NW Phase 2B/5	503,452.00	0.00	4/12/16 - 1/31/18	Constructability Review and Quality Review
CA Group	77916015	515/Charleston and Aux Lanes	1,430,500.00	0.00	TBD - 12/31/2018	Environmental, Preliminary Design, Traffic Analysis, SUE, Public Outreach, and Project Management Services
CDM Smith	5121400	NOA MITIGATION FOR US93 BOULDER BYPASS PH 1	250,000.00	249,892.19	11/14/14 - 5/31/15	NOA Mitigation Support
CH2M Hill	0691600	SR 28 FLAP PROJECT SERVICES	4,750,670.00	31,410.50	2/8/16 - 12/31/18	Environmental and Final Design
CH2M Hill	0911300	I15/US95 NEON PE/ROW	28,584,367.44	9,880,064.14	4/10/13 - 12/31/20	DB Procurement and Contract Administration
CH2M Hill	3020800	I15/US95 NEON PE/ROW	27,911,333.27	27,370,627.64	9/25/08 - 4/30/16	NEPA, Phase 1 Final Design, and ROW Acquisition Services
Granite	0241500	I80 TRUCKEE RVR VERDI BRIDGES	398,300.00	240,286.87	5/27/15 - 12/31/17	CMAR
Granite	7116015	SR 28 FLAP PROJECT CMAR SERVICES	586,205.00	0.00	5/16/16 - 12/31/2018	CMAR
HDR	0111000	US 95 NW CORRIDOR PCKG III	3,869,026.07	3,162,216.74	12/15/09 - 12/31/18	Final Design
HDR	4681403	Plan Updates for US 95 NW	93,664.42	81,415.55	7/29/15 - 6/30/16	CRA. PMP & Financial Plan update
HDR	4681403	US95 NORTHWEST CORRIDOR	93,664.42	81,415.55	07/29/15-06/30/16	CRA. PMP & Financial Plan update
HDR	4681404	I15 SOUTH CORRIDOR	87,140.89	69,880.30	07/29/15-06/30/16	CRA. PMP & Financial Plan update
HDR	4681405	I-11 Phase 1 & 2	28,481.15	7,654.22	03/02/16 -07/29/16	CRA & Financial Plan update
Horrocks	3511500	I15 @ STARR INTERCHANGE Engineering Services	1,297,173.27	323,412.96	8/19/15 - 12/31/16	PM support, Public Outreach, Traffic Analysis, Utilities and ROW acquisitions
Jacobs	1981100	ENVIRONMENTAL PHASE USA PARKWAY	8,872,716.65	5,631,792.69	8/31/11 - 12/31/18	NEPA and DB Procurement and Contract Administration
Jacobs	3261200	DESIGN SERVICES FOR TROPICANA PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE	1,997,550.00	1,372,943.57	7/8/13 - 12/31/17	Final Design Services
Jacobs	5661401	I515 TO WYOMING US95 TO RANCHO ENGINEERING SERVICES	1,044,200.00	757,816.37	10/5/15 - 8/31/16	Alternatives Development, Conceptual plan development, and preliminary environmental services
Kiewit	0011500	Project NEON DB	559,370,303.00	11,137,006.06	11/09/15 - 12/31/19	Design-Builder
Kimley Horn	2981400	I15 NEON TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE	837,000.00	736,083.32	9/8/14 - 12/31/18	ITS Design Support and programming
Louis Berger	1551100	I15 CACTUS AVE INTERCHANGE	2,963,531.00	2,811,311.54	4/11/11 - 1/28/16	Final Design
Louis Berger	5120200	US395 CARSON CITY FREEWAY SOUTH CARSON US50 PH2	12,375,197.47	11,849,051.27	9/5/02 - 7/1/17	Final Design
Nossaman	0141300	I15 NEON PRIV-PUB PARTNRSHP	3,700,000.00	3,442,367.66	3/11/13 - 12/31/20	DB Procurement and Contract Administration Legal Support
Overland Pacific and Cutler	3661300	I15/US95 NEON PE/ROW	5,972,283.00	3,476,802.62	1/15/14 - 12/31/16	ROW Acquisition
Parsons Brinckerhoff	3411400	I15/CC215 BELTWAY INTERCHANGE	2,058,667.00	1,382,008.98	2/12/15 - 3/31/17	Project Management, Project Scoping, Plan Preparation, VE, CRA,BCA & NEPA
Parsons Brinckerhoff	0621600	GARNET INTERCHANGE AND US 93 WIDENING	4,909,323.00	0.00	4/16/16 - 06/30/17	NEPA, Preliminary Design and DB Procurement

Parsons Brinckerhoff	2031600	GARNET INTERCHANGE AND US 93 WIDENING - EARLY ACTION ITEMS	290,000.00	0.00	3/25/16-06/30/16	NEPA -Biological time sensitive surveys, additional mapping, traffic data collection, inventory of existing drainage, structures and utilities
Stanley Consultants	0231501	I80 TRUCKEE RVR VERDI BRIDGES	306,204.00	202,398.29	6/19/15 - 12/31/17	Independent Cost Estimating (ICE)
Stanley Consultants	7016015	SR 28 FLAP PROJECT	338,686.00	0.00	5/8/16 - 12/31/2018	Independent Cost Estimating (ICE)
Whiting Turner	3941300	TROPICANA ESCALATORS - Preconstruction	826,911.00	822,066.02	4/11/14 - 12/31/17	CMAR - Preconstruction
Whiting Turner	8101500	REPLACE TROPICANA ESCALATORS	30,463,209.00	1,259,210.00	11/23/15 - 11/23/20	CMAR Contract

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 06: Unbalanced Bidding
Start Date: Monday, September 14, 2015
Due Date: Monday, June 6, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 10%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

Nothing new to report.

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 07: NDOT Staff Update
Due Date: Monday, June 6, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 0%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

March 2016: Permanent Vacancy rate – 12.5%
Temporary Vacancy rate – 36.63%
Overall Vacancy rate – 13.76%

Experience: 229 vacant positions, 315 employees (19.65%) on probationary/trial employees

Projected Retirements: 414 (24%) in next 5 years, 729 (42%) next 10 years

June 2016: Kimberly King is now working for the State of Alaska, her replacement is Ms. Allison Wall. Ms. Wall will update the numbers above at our September CWG meeting.

AGC/NDOT COMMITTEE
12:00 p.m., Friday, March 18, 2016
AGC Building – NAM Training Room

AGENDA

1. Self-Introductions
2. Review minutes of previous meeting dated Friday, November 20, 2015
3. NDOT Stormwater Division – David Gaskin
 - a. Division Update
 - b. EPA Enforcement Settlement Update
4. Federal Funding Update – Bill Hoffman
 - a. Northern Nevada Impact
5. Twelve Month Project List – John Terry
 - a. Alternate Contract Delivery Projects
6. Uniform Traffic Control Update – Sharon Foerschler
7. Smarter Work Zones – Paul Schneider
8. Tahoe Basin Prequalification – Sharon Foerschler
9. Workforce Development – Tracy Larkin-Thomason
10. Partnering Program Update – Lisa Schettler
 - a. Dispute Resolution Teams Training – April
 - b. Third Party Agreement/Specifications
11. District(s) Update – Thor Dyson/Kevin Lee
12. Personnel Changes – Bill Hoffman
13. Project Closeout – Sharon Foerschler
14. Upcoming AGC Events
 - a. AGC PINNACLE Awards – 11:30 a.m., Friday April 8, 2016 – Peppermill
 - b. CLC Sporting Clay Shoot to Benefit ACE High School – 9:00 a.m., Saturday, May 21, 2016- Capital City Gun Club
 - c. AGCPAC Golf Tournament – 7:30 a.m., Friday, June 10, 2016 – Washoe Golf Course
15. Other
16. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 12:00 noon, Friday, June 17, 2016 at the AGC.

cc: Trish Bullentini-
Kuzanek President
Dan LeBlanc, Chair
Kurt Matzoll, Vice
Chair
Chris Burke
Jack Byrom
Jim Cain
Daniel Caldwell
Sergio Callegari
Mark Casey
Matt Cates
Jason Clack
Keith Compbel
Fred Courier

Marty Crew
Emma Crossman
Don Crowell
Randy Cunningham
Bill Darnell
Jon Del Santo
Vance DeMars
Michele Dennis
Jim Dodson
Ruedy Edgington
Jeff Freeman
Jason Fritz
Robert Gelu
Maverick Gibbons
Louis Ginocchio

Shane Glenn
Dan Gotta
Matt Gotta
Mike Grock
Kevin Hamilton
Buzz Harris
Will Hellickson
Tom Herschbach
Scott Hiatt
Ross Hiserodt
Craig Holt
George Jordy
Kyle Larkin
Verdie Legg
Kevin Linderman

Tom Massaro
Barry McKeegan
Steve Moon
Tina Mudd
Doug Olsen
Dan Peterson
Taylor Polan
Cate Pressey
Max Ravazzolo
Randi Reed
Brian Roll
Mike Rooley
Jeff Shapiro
Paul Shogren
Lee Smithson

Art Sperber
Shawn St. Jacques
Jesse Steverman
Rich Stoltz
Dean Stone
Gregg Sutton
Ray Taft
Kathleen Taylor
Dave Titzel
Brian Wacker
Ron Weber
Marc Wheeler

AGC/NDOT COMMITTEE
12:00 p.m., Friday, November 20, 2015
AGC Building – NAM Training Room

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Meeting was called to order at 12:17 p.m. by Chair Will Hellickson and those present introduced themselves.
2. Minutes of previous meeting dated Friday, August 21, 2015 were reviewed and accepted as presented.
3. NDOT Deputy Director David Gaskin provided an update on the new Stormwater Division. Mr. Gaskin stated that the Division is in the process of hiring personnel and purchasing equipment as authorized in NRS. Key management personnel are being hired first in order to participate in the interview and hiring for employees in their respective department. The Stormwater Division is working closely with the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection to reach an agreement with to settle the EPA enforcement case. The Advisory Committee on Transportational Stormwater Management (ACTSWM) will host its first meeting on November 30.
 - a. Mr. Gaskin provided an update on the Waters of the US Regulation. Nevada joined other states in a legal challenge to the Waters of the US Regulation. After working with the EPA to secure amendments to the definition of tributaries, the Nevada Attorney General sought a stay to the ruling. Currently, the ruling has been stayed on a national basis and is being appealed to the US Supreme Court.
4. NDOT Director Rudy Malfabon provided an update on Federal Highway Funding. 2005 was the last time a long term transportation bill was signed into law. The House of Representatives passed a six year transportation bill earlier in the month, while the Senate had passed a six year authorization with only three years funded. It appears that the two bodies will authorize a long term measure prior to the December 4 deadline. Current projections appear to offer a slight increase to current funding levels.
 - a. Mr. Malfabon stated that the 2015 Fuel Tax Revenue was 1.3% above forecasted levels. Additionally, Nevada received an additional \$11 million in funding from the federal government.
5. NDOT Assistant Director John Terry provided an update on the Twelve Month Project List. Mr. Terry noted that difficulties with utilities were likely to cause a postponement on bidding the Glendale reconstruction. Mr. Terry also stated that three percent within limit jobs will be bid in 2016 with one occurring in each district.
6. NDOT Deputy Director Tracy Larkin-Thomason provided two Labor Commissioner Advisory Opinions. The Labor Commissioner provided an opinion that owner/operators of trucks were not required to submit certified payroll. Additionally, the Labor Commissioner provided clarification of what is a service provider on a Public Works job and when certified payroll reporting is required. NDOT will be issuing a Contractors Bulletin on these items in the next two weeks.
7. Megan Sizelove stated that there are 33 active contracts utilizing E-Docs/Field Manager. Over \$280 million has been paid out using this system. All contracts over 3576 will utilize this system. Change orders may be tracked by contractors with the purchase of this software.
8. Sharon Foerschler provided an update on Uniform Traffic Control. The NDOT Board requested uniform patrols on all construction projects. Payment for this item has been set up in force accounts

9. NDOT Assistant Director Reid Kaiser provided an update on the Bid Review and Analysis Team Committee (BRAT). Mr. Kaiser stated that the committee is reviewing the process of materially or mathematically unbalanced bids. The committee is further looking at temporary pollution control measures and inspections in the field.
10. Lisa Schettler provided an update on the Partnering Program. Training for Dispute Resolution Teams will be offered on January 21-22. A bulletin is out seeking comment by December 10 for contractor input. A Dispute Resolution Coalition has been formed to address concerns.
11. NDOT District II Engineer Thor Dyson provided the committee an update on issues in the districts. Mr. Dyson stated that change orders have been submitted for all projects in District II for uniform traffic control. Maintenance zones will have an NHP presence in addition to all construction projects. There will be no construction on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and on Christmas and New Years.
12. Mr. Malfabon updated the committee on NDOT personnel changes. A new right of way manager will be hired soon. NDOT is struggling to fill open positions due to an increase in construction projects and the stagnant wages at the State. NDOT is beginning to see a higher rate of attrition in their employees.
13. Ms. Foerschler updated the status of projects being closed out. Seven projects have been closed out in the last quarter.
14. Chair Hellickson reminded committee members of AGC Events.
15. There being no further business, the next meeting was scheduled for 12:00 noon, Friday, March 18, 2016 at the AGC.
16. The meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

cc: Justin Ivory, President
Will Hellickson, Chair
 Dan LeBlanc, Vice Chair
 Ross Brown
 Chris Burke
 Jack Byrom
 Jim Cain
 Daniel Caldwell
 Sergio Callegari
 Mark Casey
 Matt Cates
 Jason Clack
 Keith Compel
 Fred Courier
Marty Crew
Emma Crossman
Don Crowell
 Randy Cunningham
 Bill Darnell
Jon Del Santo
Michele Dennis
 Jim Dotson
 Ruedy Edgington

Jeff Freeman
 Jason Fritz
Robert Gelu
 Maverick Gibbons
 Louis Ginocchio
Shane Glenn
Dan Gotta
Matt Gotta
 Mike Grock
 Kevin Hamilton
 Buzz Harris
 Tom Herschbach
 Scott Hiatt
 Craig Holt
George Jordy
Kyle Larkin
 Verdie Legg
 Kevin Linderman
 Tom Massaro
 Barry McKeegan
 Doug Olsen
 Jonathan Pease
 Dan Peterson

Pam Pierce
 Taylor Polan
Cale Pressey
 Max Ravazzolo
Randi Reed
 Brian Roll
 Mike Rooley
Paul Schneider
 Jeff Shapiro
 Paul Shogren
 Randi Shover
 Lee Smithson
 Art Sperber
 Shawn St. Jacques
 Jesse Steverman
Rich Stoltz
 Dean Stone
 Gregg Sutton
 Ray Taft
Kathleen Taylor
 Dave Titzel
Brian Wacker
Ron Weber

Dean Weitzel
 Marc Wheeler

Also Present:
Rick Bosch
Thor Dyson
Sharon Foerschler
David Gaskin
Jenni Eyerly
Reid Kaiser
Stephen Lani
Craig Madole
Rudy Malfabon
Marid Maness
Steve Moon
Charlie Pann
Garrett Queen
Lisa Schettler
Jeff Shapiro
Megan Sizelove
Ashley Stone
John Terry

NDOT/Industry Liaison Meeting
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 22, 2016
AGC Office – 5400 Mill Street, Reno

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Review of minutes from the December 1, 2015 meeting
3. NDOT NAQTC Participation Update
4. Stormwater Division Update
5. Percent Within Limits
6. Workforce Development
7. DRT Update
8. Funding/Projects Update
9. Naturally Occurring Asbestos
10. Flagger Certification Training
11. Staff Update
12. 2016 Meeting Dates
 - a. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 21, 2016
 - b. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 20, 2016
 - c. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, December 13, 2016

13. Open Discussion

— PREQUAL — *contractor Past Peak Rating*

14. Adjourn

David Gaskin Co-Chair
Marc Markwell Co-Chair
Jeanette Belz
Rich Buenting
Thor Dyson
Sharon Foerschler

Scott Hiatt
Bill Hoffman
Reid Kaiser
Kyle Larkin
Kevin Lee
Rudy Malfabon

Mary Martini
John Madole
Lance Semenko
John Terry
Tracy Larkin-Thomason
Bill Wellman

NDOT/Industry Liaison Meeting
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 1, 2015
AGC Office – 5400 Mill Street, Reno

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Meeting was called to order by Co-Chairman Reid Kaiser at 10:00 a.m. and those present introduced themselves.
2. Minutes from the previous meeting dated September 15, 2015 were reviewed and accepted as presented.
3. NDOT Deputy Director Tracy Larkin-Thomason provided the committee two Labor Commissioner Advisory Opinions. The first opinion reversed the interpretation that owner-operators were required to report certified payroll. The second opinion offered clarification of service providers on Public Works projects. Ms. Larkin-Thomason stated that NDOT will enforce both of these matters as directed. Service providers will be determined on a case by case with input from the contractors.
4. Sharon Foerschler discussed NDOT participation in the Nevada Alliance for Quality Transportation Construction (NAQTC). NDOT considers NAQTC duplicative for their testers and certification will no longer be required for the majority of NDOT employees. Contractors will still be required to use NAQTC for training and certification. NDOT has received FHWA certification for its own testing methods. Some Nevada specific test methods are incorporated in ASHTO test methods for NDOT. Contractors expressed concerns that mix design used for percent within limits payment would not have the referee test utilizing the NAQTC methods. After considerable discussion, it was recommended to collect concerns from materials professionals and contractors for review at the next meeting. A working group comprised of materials testers, RTC, NDOT will consider this issue. AGC will coordinate the meeting.
5. John Terry provided an update on USA Parkway to the group. NDOT plans to present its recommendation for contract award at the December NDOT Board Meeting. Holidays have slowed the process for contract award. Contractors have expressed their concerns regarding the ATC panel not knowing details of the project at the debriefing. Some contradictory information was provided to contractors during the debriefing process. Concerns were expressed that it appeared to be a low bid job based on the award to the apparent low bidder. NDOT will review the process for improvement opportunities. Concern of what determines a major or minor participation in the contract as a subcontractor was addressed to ensure bids were not being shopped.
6. David Gaskin provided an update on the creation of the Stormwater Division of NDOT. Mr. Gaskin stated that the hiring of key staff was ongoing. Most of the management positions have been hired. Districts are currently hiring the maintenance positions authorized with the creation of the new department. Negotiations are still underway with the EPA for a settlement that will determine the enforcement and scope of the plan. The Advisory Committee on Transportational Storm Water Management (ACTSWM) met on November 30 and future meetings will be held quarterly. NDOT remains hopeful to have a signed enforcement agreement with the EPA by the end of the year.
7. Reid Kaiser discussed Contractor Prequalification. NDOT is looking to tailor past performance considerations for prequalification. Contractors will have the opportunity to comment for concurrence.

8. Ms. Larkin-Thomason provided an update on NDOT workforce development efforts. The Nevada Labor Commissioner has requested an audit to determine a baseline for the number of construction apprentices in Nevada. NDOT is considering establishing a committee on workforce development in May or June of 2016 to prepare for the 2017 legislative session. Information will be gathered to meet with legislators to educate them regarding the availability of apprentices. The goal of the committee will be to determine where training and personnel are available.
9. Mr. Kaiser provided an update on the Dispute Resolution Teams. NDOT will be paying for the expense generated by all DRT costs on affected projects. Training will be available for both contractors and NDOT in January. Candidate training for DRT's will be offered in all districts. A national conference on partnering will be held in Sparks on September 26, 2016.
10. Ms. Foerschler discussed that the Tahoe Basin prequalification will be occurring annually. This system will be similar to systems used in the past to work with all stakeholders. Cave Rock tunnel extension will occur after the upcoming prequalification. Prequalification's will only occur in years with Tahoe regional projects.
11. The 2016 Co-Chairs were appointed. Marc Markwell will be the industry chair and David Gaskin will be the NDOT chair.
12. Mr. Malfabon provided an update on key staff. Jesse Mortenson is the new NDOT Bridge Engineer. Paul Saucedo, Right of Way Acquisition for NDOT is leaving. District 3 is having difficulty filling positions. Currently, NDOT has four open bridge positions and 8-10 vacancies in Right of Way, including utilities. Mr. Malfabon is hopeful that the state will allow for higher starting salaries to fill the positions.
13. The 2016 Meeting Dates were announced as follows:
 - a. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, March 22, 2016
 - b. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 21, 2016
 - c. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 20, 2016
 - d. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, December 13, 2016
14. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:26 a.m.

Rich Buenting Co-Chair
Reid Kaiser Co-Chair
Jeanette Belz
Thor Dyson
Sharon Foerschler
Scott Hiatt
Bill Hoffman

Kyle Larkin
 Kevin Lee
Rudy Malfabon
Marc Markwell
 Mary Martini
John Madole
Lance Semenko

John Terry
Tracy Larkin-Thomason
Bill Wellman

Also: Craig Madole
 Dave Gaskin
 Will Hellickson

Nevada Contractors Association /NDOT Committee

12:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 26, 2016

AGC Building

150 N. Durango Drive, Suite 100, Las Vegas, NV 89145

AGENDA

1. Self-Introductions
2. NDOT Stormwater Division – David Gaskin
 - a. Division Update
 - b. EPA Enforcement Settlement Update
3. Federal Funding Update – Tracy Larkin-Thomason
 - a. Northern Nevada Impact
4. Twelve Month Project List – Reid Kaiser
 - a. Alternate Contract Delivery Projects
5. Uniform Traffic Control Update – Sharon Foerschler
6. Workforce Development – Tracy Larkin-Thomason
7. Partnering Program Update – Lisa Schettler
 - a. Dispute Resolution Teams Training
 - b. Third Party Agreement/Specifications
8. District(s) Update –Mario Gomez
9. Project Closeout – Sharon Foerschler
10. Upcoming Nevada Contractor Association Events
 - a. YCF 51's Baseball game-May 13 at Cashman Field
 - b. NCA Golf Tournament- May 20 Paiute Golf Course
11. Other
12. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 12:00 noon, TBD at the Nevada Contractors Association.



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

MAJOR/CAPACITY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
3-23068	60682	SR 160, fm. Rainbow Ave. to Calvada Blvd. MP NY 6.80 to 8.55	\$4,900,000					
Not Scheduled		FLAP - SR 28	\$23,000,000					Moved from 2018
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC	\$10,000,000					
1-03352	60725	I 15 N. fm. Craig Rd. to Speedway Blvd. - Pkg. 2A MP CL 48.43 to 53.62	\$38,000,000					Cost changed from \$40,200,000
1-03386	I15GARNC	I 15/US 93, Garnet Intch. - I 15/US 93 Interchange and US 93 Widening		\$37,000,000				
1-03367	73687	I 15 Starr Ave., Las Vegas, at MP CL 29.375		\$10,000,000				\$52M Construction in FRI funding and \$2.9M Earmark; \$15M ROW (Funding TBD)
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC		\$30,000,000				
2-03250	60702	US 95 fm. Durango Dr. to Kyle Canyon Rd. (Widening); Elkhorn Rd. (HOV Ramps); Kyle Cyn. (Interchange); Durango Dr. (Expand Park & Ride) - Pkg. 2B. MP CL 86.75 to 92.70		\$55,600,000				Moved from 2016 Cost changed from \$48,000,000
6-03143	CONST953B	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3B at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Hualapai to Tenaya Way. MP CL 88 and CC 215 MP CL 37.00 to 39.00 (Relocate Gas Line)		\$14,200,000				Cost changed from \$17,100,000
4-03442	UNASSIGNED	SR 159, Charleston Blvd. fm. Lamb Blvd. to Honolulu St. - Intersection Improvements at I-515			\$7,000,000			Cost changed from \$- \$3M in CMAQ Funds; \$4M TBD
Not Scheduled		I 580 Operational Improvements			\$40,000,000			Scope and Budget TBD
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC			\$30,000,000			
4-03389	160PH2	SR 160 Phase 2 - Blue Diamond Rd. fm. 1.24 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to beg. of Mountain Area. MP CL 22.00 to 16.63			\$60,300,000			ROW Impacts TBD
2-19070	60715	US 50, Lyon Co., fm. Roy's Rd. to the jct. w/ US 95A. - Widen & Intersection Upgrades. MP LY 19.90 to 29.44			\$36,000,000			Adv. Nov. 2017
Not Scheduled		I 15 HOV Improvements				\$40,000,000		Scope and budget TBD
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC				\$20,000,000		
6-03143	CONST953C	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3C at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Hualapai to Tenaya Way. MP CL 88 and CC 215 MP CL 37.00 to 39.00 (System to System Phase)				\$61,200,000		Cost changed from \$83,900,000
6-03145	73536	I 15, Las Vegas, at the CC 215 Northern Beltway Intch. - New System to System Intch. - Pkg. 1 of 3.				\$54,500,000		Cost changed from \$40,000,000 Phase, Scope and Budget TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15 at SR 593 Tropicana - Operational Improvements					\$150,000,000	Scope and budget TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15 N. - Phase 3 (Speedway Blvd. to Apex Intch.)					\$82,000,000	
Not Scheduled		I 15 S. - Phase 2A (Sloan to Blue Diamond)					\$45,300,000	
2-05118	UNASSIGNED	US 50, S. Lake Tahoe, Realignment (Bypass)					\$0	No NDOT funding
SubTotal:			\$75,900,000	\$146,800,000	\$173,300,000	\$175,700,000	\$277,300,000	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

ROADWAY (3R) PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
4-03430	73780	SR 592, Flamingo Rd., fm. Paradise to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 26.505 to 31.378 (Agreement w/ RTC)	\$9,000,000					Agmt. to pay \$9M in 2015 & \$9M in 2016 to the RTC
4-25057	73923	SR 529, S. Carson St., fm. Overland St. to Fairview Dr. MP CC 0.38 to 1.99	\$5,023,000					Relinquishment
2-33089	73912	US 93, N. of McGill, fm. 3.610 MS of Success Summit Rd. to 5.740 MN of Success Summit Rd. MP WP 66.995 to 76.345	\$5,825,000					Cost changed from \$5,637,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 1/6/2016; Contract Number 3621.
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave., fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd. MP WA 2.700 to 5.357	\$16,350,000					Possible Relinquishment after Completion
3-23070	73921	SR 160 fm. 0.463 MN of Basin Rd. to 13.544 MN of Bella Vista Dr. at the 2010 NUL of Pahrump. MP NY 11.190 to 27.351 and NY 37.22	\$10,096,000					Cost changed from \$21,900,000 Adv. with Misc. Project (76921) (Johnnie Curve and Turn Pockets)
4-03428	73781	SR 604, Las Vegas Blvd., fm. E. Carey Ave. to 0.240 MN of Craig Rd. MP CL 32.997 to CL 37.713	\$17,721,000					Completed with an Adv. Date 11/12/15; Contract Number 3619.
2-09041	60726	US 6 fm. the jct. of US 6/US 95 to 1.974 MW of Millers Roadside Park. MP ES 18.815 to 43.892	\$18,200,000					Cost changed from \$16,500,000 SBC Processing for \$18.2M Adv. with Safety Project (60671)
2-33085	73636	US 6 fm. the jct. w/ SR 318 to 0.30 ME of Murry Street. MP WP 13.71 to 36.78		\$14,700,000				
2-15023	60539	US 50, fm. CH/LA Co. to 1.030 ME of SR 305. MP LA 0.00 to LA 24.00		\$12,060,000				Adv. with Safety Project (2-15023)
2-19081	73639	US 95A(sharedroad US 50A), Lyon Co., fm. the jct. w/ US 50 in Silver Springs to SR 427. US 95A MP LY 44.254 to 58.39 (includes truck lane and passing lanes)		\$10,900,000				
2-23066	73928	US 6 fm. 0.736 ME of the ES/NY Co. line to US 95. US 95 fm. the ES/NY Co. line to US 6 in Tonopah. MP US 6 NY 0.736 to 3.00; MP US 95 NY 107.220 to 108.456		\$4,000,000				
Not Scheduled		US 93 fm. 12.825 MN of Cattle Pass to 2.691 MS of SR 229. MP EL 30.762 to 43.071		\$9,000,000				
3-31144	73913	SR 877, Franktown Rd., fm. SR 429 then N. to US 395A/SR 429 near Bowers Mansion. MP WA 0.00 to 4.296		\$1,500,000				
4-03443	73937	SR 596, Jones Blvd., fm. S. of US 95 to Smoke Ranch Rd. MP CL 43.007 to 45.038		\$3,400,000				
Not Scheduled		SR 160, Pahrump Valley Rd., fm. 1.030 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to the CL/NY Co. Line. MP CL 21.723 to 43.293		\$21,500,000				
4-03439	73902	SR 159, Red Rock Rd., fm. 1.989 MW of Durango Rd. to an NHS break at Rainbow Blvd. MP CL 17.030 to 21.064		\$4,600,000				
2-03275	73644	US 93 fm. FRCL08 on the S. side Garnet Intch. to 15.887 MN of FRCL07 at Garnet Intch. MP CL 54.69 to 68.050		\$24,400,000				
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave., fm. Dean Martin to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 0.01 to 7.30. Phase 2 (Concrete Bus Ln. and ADA)			\$26,500,000			CMAR RW is not included in the estimate.
Not Scheduled		I 80/I 580/US 395 Various Ramps in Reno/Sparks UL			\$5,000,000			Tentative
2-33086	73650	US 50, in Ely, fm. 0.165 ME of Ruth/Kimberly Rd. to US 6. US 93 fm. the jct. w/ US 50 to 0.634 MN of US 50. US 50 MP WP 61.794 to 68.432; US 93 MP WP 53.639 to 54.273			\$15,600,000			Adv. with Hydraulic Project
1-07126	73930	I 80 fm. 0.363 MW of the W. Carlin Intch. to 0.274 MW of the W. Portal of the Carlin Tunnels, the beg. of the PCCP. MP EL 1.097 to 7.512			\$5,600,000			Tentative
1-19015	73914	I 80 fm. 0.419 ME of the E. Fernley Grade Sep. to the LY/CH Co. Line. MP LY 5.844 to 15.912			\$13,600,000			Tentative
1-31231	73920	I 80 fm. the CA/NV Stateline to 0.023 MW of Keystone Intch. Includes frontage Rd. FRWA03 at Garson Rd. Intch. MP WA 0.00 to 12.445			\$13,400,000			FR Cost with State Funds
1-25004	60696	I 580, Carson City, US 50/Williams St. to 0.661 MS of the CC/WA Co. Line. MP CC 5.254 to 8.950			\$4,900,000			Tentative
1-13058	73789	I 80 fm. 0.345 ME of the trailing edge of H-1256 at the W. Strip Grade Sep. to 0.549 ME of the E. Winnemucca Intch. MP HU 12.023 to 17.354			\$8,400,000			Tentative
Not Scheduled		US 50 fm. 1.00 ME of Alpine Rd. to the CH/LA Co. Line. MP CH 85.961 to 106.845			\$14,300,000			Tentative
Not Scheduled		SR 28, Incline Village, fm. 0.242 MN of E. Lakeshore Blvd. to the NV/CA Stateline. MP WA 5.217 to 10.990			\$3,100,000			Tentative
2-01089	CONST50FAL	US 50, Fallon, fm. 0.008 ME of Allen Rd. to the EUL of Fallon at Rio Vista. MP CH 19.351 to 21.708			\$2,600,000			Tentative
Not Scheduled		I 80 fm. 1.108 ME of Moor Intch. to 3.263 MW of Pequop Intch. MP EL 83.332 to 94.800			\$17,400,000			Tentative
1-27067	73666	I 80 fm. 1.776 ME of Humbolt Intch. to 0.516 MW of Dun Glenn Intch. MP PE 51.38 to PE 62.49			\$14,300,000			Tentative
1-07124	73787	I 80 fm. the trailing edge of H-902 to 0.93 MW of Osino Intch. MP EL 26.58 to 32.00			\$14,400,000			Tentative
2-03280	73919	US 95 fm. The CA/NV Stateline to 7.790 MN of Loran Station Rd. MP CL 0.00 to 17.423			\$8,800,000			Tentative
3-07090	73911	SR 227, Lamoille Hwy., fm. 0.30 ME fo Licht Pkwy. to 0.20 ME of Palace Pkwy. MP EL 11.55 to EL 13.84			\$4,700,000			Tentative
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. 0.302 MN of the Moana Intch. to the Mill St. Intch. MP WA 22.563 to 23.740 SB				\$13,100,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. 0.302 MN of the Moana Intch. to the Mill St. Intch. MP WA 22.563 to 23.499 NB				\$11,000,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. trailing edge of the viaduct to the Glendale Intch. MP WA 23.759 to 25.003				\$8,000,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. Glendale Ave. to the Truckee River. MP WA 25.003 to 25.276				\$4,300,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled		I 80 fm. the crossover, a maintenance break to the beg. of the PCCP, 1.779 ME of the trailing edge of I-876. MP HU 42.426 to 54.860				\$22,800,000		Tentative
1-07121	73668	I 80 fm. 0.816 ME of the E. Wells Intch. to 1.040 ME of the Moor Intch. MP EL 74.855 to EL 83.264				\$15,800,000		Tentative
1-07118	73665	I 80 fm. 0.597 ME of the Grays Creek grade sep., the beg. of PCCP, to 0.048 MW of the Willow Creek grade sep. MP EL 62.09 to EL 68.978				\$17,500,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled		SR 157 and SR 156 Kyle and Lee Canyon Roads					\$13,200,000	Pending 3R Program Approval
Not Scheduled		US 50 fm. 0.138 ME of the trailing edge of G-686 to 0.12 ME of Ave. F					\$2,800,000	
Not Scheduled		US 50 LY/CH Co Ln to E of Sherman St. in Fallon					\$13,000,000	Pending 3R Program Approval
Not Scheduled		US 50 Fallon, LY/CH Co Ln to Soda Lake Rd & Maine St to Sherman St					\$8,500,000	Pending 3R Program Approval



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

3-13047	73783	SR 787 Hansen St. MP HU 0.00 to .497; SR 794 E Winnemucca Blvd. MP HU 14.73 to 17.168; SR 289 Winnemucca Blvd. MP HU 15.176 to 15.917; SR 795 Reinhardt Rd. MP HU 0.00 to 1.245						\$1,740,000	
3-13046	73749	SR 294 Winnemucca at Bridge St. MP HU 8.52						\$730,000	B-2673
Not Scheduled		I 80 Pumpernickel Valley Intch. to Stonehouse Intch. - MP HU 42.42 to 54.86						\$8,900,000	Pending 3R Program Approval
1-07122	73631	I 80 fm. 0.392 MW of the Elko W. Intch. to a functional class break at the 2004 EUL of Elko, the trailing edge of H-902. MP EL 20.26 to 26.60						\$12,400,000	
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. S. Virginia to Glendale Ave. Pkg. 2						\$30,000,000	
6-07052	73794	FREL72 on the N. side of the Moore Intch. fm. 0.356 MW of FREL36 to the EOP at the Cattleguard E. of FREL36. MP EL 0.000 to 0.372						\$128,000	Contingency Project
Not Scheduled		I 15 and US 95 Various Ramps in Las Vegas UL						\$10,000,000	Pending 3R Program Approval
1-07125	73793	I 80 fm. 1.040 ME of Moor Intch. to 1.108 ME of Moor Intch. and I 80 fm. a Maintenance Break at Oasis Intch. to 1.871 ME of the Oasis Intch. MP EL 83.26 to EL 102.79						\$17,400,000	
SubTotal:			\$82,215,000	\$106,060,000	\$172,600,000	\$92,500,000	\$118,798,000		

BRIDGE/STRUCTURES PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program	\$3,000,000					Cost changed from \$2,000,000 Annual Program
3-05056	73800	SR 757, Muller Ln. at Carson River - Replace Structure B-474	\$1,200,000					
Not Scheduled		SR 226 at Jack Creek, Replace B-639 (off-system bridge)		\$500,000				
Not Scheduled		SR 582 at I 515 Ramp, Replace I-1899		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled		SR 361 at Petrified Wash, Replace B-425 (off-system bridge)		\$500,000				
Not Scheduled		I 80 at Fairview Ditch, Replace B-1392E		\$500,000				
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program		\$3,000,000				Cost changed from \$2,000,000 Annual Program
1-03375	73797	I 515 at LV Downtown Viaduct - Rehab/Retrofit I-947R, I-947M		\$5,000,000				Moved from 2016 Cost changed from \$27,000,000 Scope reduced and moved from Major
Not Scheduled		I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit I-717E/W, I-740E/W, H-844E/W, I-700E/W		\$4,000,000				
3-31139	73750	SR 447 at Washoe Co. near Nixon B-1351 MP 15.49		\$1,100,000				
1-31227	60716	I 80 at Truckee River and UPRR near Verdi - Construct Scour Countermeasures for Structure G-772 E/W. (GMP #2)		\$7,000,000				Moved from 2016 CMAR
Not Scheduled		FR 09 Lockwood Dr. at UPRR, Washoe Co. - Rehab/repair G-751 on-system bridge.			\$540,000			
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Eastern Avenue, Replace I-1440			\$8,000,000			
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program			\$3,000,000			Cost changed from \$2,000,000 Annual Program
Not Scheduled		US 50 at Carson River W. of Fallon - Address Scour B-1557			\$600,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 605, Paradise Rd., at Tropicana Wash - Rehab B-1344			\$1,500,000			Moved from 2017
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Boulder Highway and Sahara - Rehab/Retrofit I-1449, H-1446			\$800,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 206, Genoa Ln., at Carson River - Address Scour B-1239			\$300,000			
6-13010	73701	Eden Valley Rd. at Humboldt River - Replace off-system Structure B-1658			\$5,747,000			Moved from 2017 R/W acquisition needed
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Flamingo Intch. - MSE Wall Rehab			\$3,000,000			Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$2,500,000
Not Scheduled		Gold Canyon Cr. S. of Silver City, Lyon Co. - Replace B-375 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		SR 278, N. of Eureka, Eureka Co. - Replace B-478 on-system bridge (dbl rcb).				\$200,000		
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program				\$3,000,000		Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Dressler Ln., Douglas Co. - Replace B-1600 off-system bridge				\$600,000		Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		E. Walker Rd., SE of Yerington, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1348 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 396, Cornell Ave. N. of Lovelock, Pershing Co. - Replace B-28 on-system bridge.				\$2,600,000		
Not Scheduled		Shady Ave. over Gold Canyon Cr., Dayton, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1711 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Six Mile Canyon Rd., Storey Co. - Replace B-2476 off system bridge				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Tedford Bridge at Truckee-Carson Canal - Replace off-system B-1707				\$600,000		Moved from 2018
3-03178		SR 163 at Colorado River in Laughlin - Widen and Rehab Structure B-1847				\$6,000,000		Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit and address scour B-716E/W				\$2,000,000		Moved from 2018
6-27026	73753	FR PE 01, G-29 Structure Removal/Replacement?				\$3,000,000		Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$1,400,000
Not Scheduled		SR 589, Sahara Ave., at UPRR - Rehab/Retrofit G-1064				\$1,400,000		Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		SR 88 in Douglas Co. - Rehab/Retrofit B-553, B-575, B-580, B-576, and B-627				\$4,000,000		
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program					\$3,000,000	Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Garson Road at I 80, Replace I-770 (off-system bridge)					\$4,000,000	
Not Scheduled		I 515 at UPRR and Main Street, Replace G-947					\$80,000,000	
Not Scheduled		I 15 at Muddy River - Rehab/Retrofit B-781 N/S					\$2,000,000	Moved from 2018
SubTotal:			\$4,200,000	\$23,600,000	\$23,487,000	\$25,800,000	\$89,000,000	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
6-03203	60683	Summerlin Parkway, Las Vegas, fm. Buffalo Dr. to CC215 - Cable Barrier Rail (Off System)	\$1,250,000					LPA - City of Las Vegas
		Safety Services/Programs	\$4,854,500					Annual Program
2-09045	60671	US 6 fm. the jct. w/ US 95 to 1.974 MW of Millers Roadside Park. MP ES 18.815 to 43.892 - Slope Flattening, Passing Lanes and Drainage	\$6,080,000					Advance Construction. Adv. with 3R Project (73648)
3-23067	73841	SR 372 at Pahrump Valley Roundabout	\$3,200,000					Cost changed from \$2,317,302
3-23066	73837	SR 372 at Blagg Roundabout	\$2,900,000					Cost changed from \$1,815,000
8-03128	60717	Multiple Intersections in Dist. 1 (Las Vegas) Pkg. 3 - Signal System Modifications	\$490,000					Cost changed from \$350,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 1/6/2016; Contract Number 3622. Design by City and Traffic Operations
3-31143	60640	SR 431 Truck Escape Ramp	\$3,895,000					Completed with Adv. Date 1/27/2016; Contract Number 3623. Advance Construction. \$205,000 State Funds.
6-00017	60697	Te-Moak Safety Improvements (SED)	\$950,000					
		Railroad Projects	\$1,100,000					Annual Program
		Safety Services/Programs		\$4,303,500				Annual Program
2-05121	73862	US 395 at Airport Rd., Johnson Ln., and Stephanie Way		\$1,300,000				
2-15023	60539	US 50, fm. CH/LA Co. to 1.030 ME of SR 305. LA 0.00 to LA 24.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening		\$3,000,000				Added to 3R Project (60539)
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements		\$522,500				
8-00266	60680	Eastern Ave. and Civic Center, fm. US 95 to Cope Ave. (SMP) Phase 1		\$1,500,000				
		Railroad Projects		\$1,100,000				Annual Program
		Safety Services/Programs			\$9,367,000			Annual Program
6-31217	UNASSIGNED	Multiple Intersections in Dist. II (Sparks) - Signal System Modification. Phase 1			\$2,250,000			Moved from 2017 Design by Traffic Operations
2-23064	60685	US 95, fm. Jct. of Amargosa Valley N. to Beatty NDOT Maint. Station. MP NY 30.34 to NY 80.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening			\$2,500,000			
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements			\$522,500			
8-00266	60679	Second St. fm. Keystone Ave. to I-580. Arlington Ave. fm. Court St. to 6th St. (SMP) Phase 1			\$1,500,000			Moved from 2017 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60681	SR 573, Craig Rd. fm. Decatur Blvd. to 5th St. (SMP) Phase 1			\$1,500,000			Moved from 2017 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled		Eastern Ave. and Civic Center, fm. US 95 to Cope Ave. (SMP) Phase 2			\$1,500,000			
		Railroad Projects			\$1,100,000			Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Safety Services/Programs				\$4,189,500		
		Railroad Projects				\$1,100,000		Annual Program
4-03416	60722	SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Pkg. 2 CL 7.35 - 9.67 - Shoulder Widening, Slope Flattening, Mill & Fill and Drainage				\$2,200,000		\$2.3M State Funds
Not Scheduled		Second St. fm. Keystone Ave. to I-580. Arlington Ave. fm. Court St. to 6th St. (SMP) Phase 2				\$1,500,000		Moved from 2018 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled		SR 573, Craig Rd. fm. Decatur Blvd. to 5th St. (SMP) Phase 2				\$1,500,000		Moved from 2018 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled		Northern Nevada (SMP) SR 430 N. Virginia St.				\$2,500,000		Cost changed from \$3,000,000 \$1.5M Federal Funds; \$1M State Funds
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP). Lamb Blvd.				\$2,500,000		Cost changed from \$3,000,000 \$1.5M Federal Funds; \$1M State Funds
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP). Tropicana Ave.				\$2,500,000		Cost changed from \$3,000,000 \$1.5M Federal Funds; \$1M State Funds
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements				\$522,500		
Not Scheduled		Safety Services/Programs					\$5,000,000	
		Railroad Projects					\$1,100,000	Annual Program
Not Scheduled		RSA Safety improvements Statewide (SEDS)					\$2,000,000	Cost changed from \$3,000,000
SubTotal:			\$24,719,500	\$11,726,000	\$20,239,500	\$18,512,000	\$8,100,000	

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
8-00223	60668	SR 147, Ped. and ADA Improvements (Road Diet) on Lake Mead fm. Civic Center to Pecos (SED)	\$4,500,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00223	60667	SR 159, Ped. and ADA Improvements on Charleston Blvd. and Boulder Hwy. at Sun Valley Dr. (SED)	\$2,000,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
4-03444	73936	SR 160 Blue Diamond Rd. at El Capitan and Ft. Apache Rd.	\$3,500,000					Completed with an Adv. Date 1/6/2016; Contract Number 3620.
4-31243	73939	SR 430, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements on N. Virginia St. Phase 1	\$500,000					Cost changed from \$300,000
8-00223	60678	SR 443, Ped. and ADA Improvements on Sun Valley Blvd.	\$1,000,000					Cost changed from \$500,000
4-31242	60727	SR 667, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements on Kietzke Ln. fm. Galletti Way to S. Virginia. (SMP) Pkg. 1	\$750,000					Cost changed from \$600,000
4-31242	60728	SR 667, Ped. and ADA Improvements on Kietzke Ln. fm. Galletti Way to S. Virginia. (SMP) Pkg. 2		\$200,000				Cost changed from \$1,500,000
4-31245	73979	SR 430, Permanent Traffic Signal, Lighting and Ped. Facilities on N. Virginia St., N. of Lovitt Ln. to Hoge Rd.		\$1,300,000				
4-03446	73980	SR 582, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements at Various Locations along Boulder Hwy.			\$3,000,000			
SubTotal:			\$12,250,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000			



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
2-31132	73962	US 395 fm. I 80 to Stead, Reno - Install ITS devices, TM Pkg. 4	\$8,000,000					Cost changed from \$2,000,000 Cost increase per Director's Request
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks	\$365,040					Annual Program
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas	\$2,617,056					Annual Program
1-03369	60657	I 15 fm. Speedway Blvd. to Apex - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H1	\$2,000,000					Completed with an Adv Date 10/21/2015; Contract Number 3618
2-00010	73951	US 50 fm. CC to Ely. MP CC 12.547 to MP WP 72.246. - Install Hot Spots and access existing FO	\$8,000,000					Cost changed from \$5,500,000 Tentative
1-03384	UNASSIGNED	I 11 fm. Wagonwheel Dr. to jct. I 215/Lake Mead Dr., MP CL 17.084 to 22.818; I 215, W. of Gibson Rd. jct. to begin St. Maint. I 11, MP CL 0.00 to 1.70; SR 564 fm. jct. Fiesta Henderson/Eastgate Rd. to begin St. Maint. I 11, MP CL 0.00 to 0.263 - Resigning		\$300,000				Project will be coordinated with completion date for Boulder City Bypass Phase 1 and 2.
2-03276	60689	US 95 fm. Bypass to Laughlin - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K1		\$5,000,000				
1-31221	UNASSIGNED	Install Electronic Check Station Signage, I 80 at Wadsworth/Mustang.		\$350,000				Ready in 2016
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks		\$365,040				Annual Program
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas		\$2,617,056				Annual Program
1-03369	60712	I 15 fm. Apex to Logandale - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H2		\$5,500,000				
1-31220	73946	I 580, Washoe Co., Neil Rd. to Moana. MP WA 20.00 TO WA 22.00, RENO PKG 1 - Install ITS infrastructure.		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled		Replace High Mast HPS Lighting w/ LED Lighting			\$1,500,000			
2-03276	60690	US 95 fm. Bypass to Laughlin - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K2			\$3,000,000			Moved from 2020 Cost changed from \$4,000,000
1-31219	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Mt. Rose to Neil Rd. - Install ITS infrastructure - TM Pkg. 2A			\$3,000,000			
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks			\$365,040			Annual Program
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas			\$2,617,056			Annual Program
1-03369	60713	I 15 fm. Logandale to AZ Stateline - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H3			\$5,500,000			
1-31223	UNASSIGNED	I 580 Fwy., US 50 to I 80 CC 00.00 to WA 14.95 Resigning to I 580 Designation				\$800,000		Cost changed from \$900,000 60% plans complete. Project will be finalized/scheduled when need/priority identified.
8-00251	60693	District 3 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A				\$2,000,000		Moved from 2018
8-00250	Pkg. A	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A				\$1,000,000		Tentative
1-25001	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Mt. Rose to College Pkwy. - Install ITS Infrastructure, WC Pkg. 1				\$3,000,000		Tentative
1-25002	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. College Pkwy. to Fairview - Install ITS Infrastructure, WC Pkg. 2				\$2,000,000		Tentative
1-31205	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks				\$365,040		Annual Program
1-03325	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas				\$2,617,056		Annual Program
8-00249	Pkg. A	District 1 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A				\$2,000,000		
4-31236	UNASSIGNED	McCarran Blvd. (SW) fm. I 80 to US 395 Pkg. 4 - Install ITS devices, TM -Pkg. 7					\$10,000,000	Funding not identified
1-03325	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas					\$2,617,056	Annual Program
8-00250	Pkg. B	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. B					\$1,000,000	Tentative
8-00250	Pkg. C	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. C					\$1,000,000	Tentative
1-31205	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks					\$365,040	Annual Program
8-00251	Pkg. C	District 3 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. C					\$1,000,000	Tentative
3-03176	UNASSIGNED	SR 160 fm. Pahrump to I 15 - Install ITS devices FAST Pkg. J1					\$5,500,000	Moved from 2018
8-00249	Pkg. B	District 1 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. B					\$1,000,000	Tentative
8-00251	Pkg. B	District 3 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. B					\$1,000,000	Moved from 2019 Tentative
4-31239	UNASSIGNED	McCarran Blvd. (SE) fm. US 395 to I-80 - Install ITS devices, TM Pkg. 3					\$10,000,000	Tentative
8-00249	Pkg. C	District 1 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. C					\$1,000,000	Tentative
4-31238	UNASSIGNED	McCarran Blvd. (NE) fm. I 80 to US 395 - Install ITS devices, TM Pkg. 5					\$10,000,000	Tentative
4-31237	UNASSIGNED	McCarran Blvd. (NW) fm. US 395 to I 80 - Install ITS devices, TM Pkg. 6					\$10,000,000	Tentative
SubTotal:			\$20,982,096	\$16,132,096	\$15,982,096	\$13,782,096	\$54,482,096	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

HYDRAULICS/TAHOE PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop	\$100,000					Cost changed from \$300,000 Agreement Split between 2 Years
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program	\$500,000					Agreement
1-11018	60723	I 80 at Structures G-884 and G-885. MP EU 4.21 and 4.38 - Scour Mitigation and Erosion Control On/Under Structures and within UPRR/I 80 ROW	\$375,000					
2-05115	73653	US 50 Slope Stability, Water Quality, and Erosion Control Imp. - US 50 fm. Cave Rock to SR-28 Spooner jct.	\$3,200,000					Cost changed from \$5,000,000 Completed with and Adv. Date 2/10/16; Contract Number 3627. Adv. with Cave Rock Tunnel Extension
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop		\$200,000				Agreement Split between 2 Years
		US 395 Martin Slough		\$250,000				Moved from 2016 Agreement
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program		\$500,000				Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop		\$600,000				Agreement
2-05120	73859	US 50 Spooner Summit to Carson City. MP DO 13.00-14.58 and CC 0.00-7.60		\$4,000,000				
Not Scheduled		Master Plan Water Quality & Erosion Control Improvements - SR 28 fm. 0.13 ME of the CC/WA line to Sand Harbor (FLAP)		\$4,500,000				Cost changed from \$1,000,000
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program			\$500,000			Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop			\$600,000			Agreement
Not Scheduled		SR 431 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP WA 0.00 to 8.00			\$3,600,000			
Not Scheduled		US 50 in Ely, MP WP 66.34 to 68.43 and US 93, MP WP 53.10 to 54.27. Storm drain system improvements along US 50/US 6 including rehabilitation or enlargement of existing trunk system.			\$4,000,000			Adv. with 3R Project (73650)
Not Scheduled		SR 207 Kingsbury Grade fm. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 11.08 - Pipe lining & rehab D2			\$5,000,000			Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$2,000,000
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program				\$500,000		Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop				\$600,000		Agreement
Not Scheduled		SR 207 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 3.15				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 431, Mt. Rose Hwy. fm. MP WA 0.00 to MP WA 24.413 & SR 341 Geiger Grade, fm. MP WA 0.00 to MP WA 6.30, MP ST 0.00 to MP ST 10.84, and MP LY 0.00 to MP LY 4.90 - Pipe lining & rehab D2				\$4,000,000		Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		US 50 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 13.07					\$1,000,000	Moved from 2019
Not Scheduled		SR 28 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP WA 0.00 to MP WA 10.99, MP CC 0.00 to MP CC 3.95, and MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 1.23					\$4,000,000	Moved from 2019
SubTotal:			\$4,175,000	\$10,050,000	\$13,700,000	\$6,100,000	\$5,000,000	

STORMWATER PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
9-29001	73971	MY 934, Virginia City Maint. Yard. SR 342 MP ST 2.65 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard.	\$2,500,000					District Contract-Cost TBD
9-33004	73973	My 919, Ely Maint. Yard. US 93 MP WP 54.28 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard	\$2,000,000					District Contract-Cost TBD
9-07035	60656	MY 927, N. Fork Maint. Yard. SR 225 MP EL 77.87 - Drainage Improvements and Repave Yard	\$500,000					Cost changed from \$1,000,000 District Contract
9-07034	60655	MY 931, Ruby Valley Maint. Yard. SR 229 MP EL 35.45 - Drainage Improvements and Repave Yard	\$1,000,000					District Contract
9-07036	73972	MY 932, Wells Maint. Yard. SR 223 MP EL 74.90 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard.	\$1,000,000					District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 983, Lovelock Maint. Yard. 6th St. MP PE 0.311		\$2,000,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 976, Mina Maint. Yard. US 95 MP MI 15.358		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 971, Battle Mountain Maint. Yard. Galena St. MP LA 0.100		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 927, Searchlight Maint. Station. SR 164 MP CL 18.483		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 920, Tonopah Maint. Yard. US 6 MP NY 1.787		\$500,000				Moved from 2016 District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 921, Las Vegas Maint. Station. SR 578 MP CL 0.503		\$2,500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 975, Goldfield Maint. Yard. US 95 MP ES 19.401			\$500,000			District Contract-Cost TBD
SubTotal:			\$7,000,000	\$6,500,000	\$500,000			



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
1-31233	73943	I 580, Reno, at Plumb Lane, SB On-Ramp and Flyover, MP WA 23.62	\$1,250,000					
2-03281	73925	US 93 at Hoover Dam - State Entrance Gateway	\$248,750					Moved from 2015
2-07064	73924	US 93 at Jackpot - State Entrance Gateway	\$248,750					
2-31133	73927	US 395 at Bordertown and SR 28 at Crystal Bay- State Entrance Gateways	\$470,833					
2-05125	73959	US 395 at Topaz Lake - State Entrance Gateway	\$248,750					
2-05123	73926	US 50 at Stateline S. Lake Tahoe - State Entrance Gateway	\$248,750					
4-31244	73942	Veterans Pkwy. Roundabout aesthetic improvements	\$600,000					
1-31228	60665	I 580 Damonte Ranch Intch. MP WA 16.98	\$2,000,000					
Not Scheduled		I 515 and Russell Rd.		\$2,000,000				Moved from 2016
Not Scheduled		I 80, through W. Elko Interchange - Paint Structure		\$225,000				
Not Scheduled		I 80 at Elko Gateways		\$2,500,000				
1-31228	LAND2	I 580 S. Meadows Pkwy. Intch. MP WA 18.33		\$1,250,000				Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		Community Gateway to Winnemucca/Recreational to Black Rock Desert			\$2,500,000			Cost changed from \$50,000
Not Scheduled		I 80, W. Winnemucca Interchange - Paint Structure			\$225,000			
Not Scheduled		I 515 and College			\$1,250,000			
1-31228	LAND1	I 580 at S. Virginia, Patriot Blvd. Intch. MP WA 19.29			\$1,250,000			Moved from 2020
1-31228	LAND3	I 580 Neil Rd. Intch. MP WA 20.71			\$750,000			
Not Scheduled		Charleston Rd. and I-515				\$1,900,000		Cost changed from \$2,000,000 Supplement 4-03442 Project Budget
Not Scheduled		I 515/US 95 - Horizon Drive - L&A (Paint) and Aesthetic Improvements				\$1,750,000		Moved from 2020 Cost changed from \$2,500,000
Not Scheduled		US 6 at Baker - State Entrance Gateway				\$250,000		Moved from 2020 Cost changed from \$160,000
Not Scheduled		US 95 North NV/OR - State Entrance Gateway				\$250,000		Moved from 2020 Cost changed from \$160,000
Not Scheduled		US 95 South NV/CA - State Entrance Gateway				\$250,000		Moved from 2020 Cost changed from \$160,000
Not Scheduled		US 6/95 at Boundary Peak - State Entrance Gateway				\$250,000		Moved from 2020 Cost changed from \$300,000
Not Scheduled		Hidden Gems Highway - Info Kiosks/Pull-Outs (4 locations)				\$500,000		Moved from 2016 Cost changed from \$160,000
1-03382	73929	I 15 Spring Mountain					\$5,000,000	Moved from 2017
SubTotal:			\$5,315,833	\$5,975,000	\$5,975,000	\$5,150,000	\$5,000,000	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8
January 28, 2016 PDC Mtg.

ADA PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
1-31235	73984	I 80 & I 580/US 395, Reno, fm. Verdi to Vista Blvd. and fm. S. Virginia St. to Stead Blvd.	\$470,000					
1-00028	73982	I 80 Intch. ramps in Winnemucca, Battle Mtn., Elko, Wells, and West Wendover	\$520,000					
Not Scheduled		SR 599, Las Vegas, N. Rancho Dr. at N. Jones Blvd.	\$20,000					
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave., fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd.	\$1,700,000					Adv. With 3R Project (73549)
1-03387	73983	I 515, Las Vegas, fm. Wagonwheel Dr. to Casino Center Blvd.; I 15, Las Vegas/Mesquite, fm. Primm Blvd. to Sandhill Blvd.; US 95, Las Vegas, fm. S. Martin L. King Blvd. to Paiute Way.	\$745,000					Cost changed from \$220,000
Not Scheduled		SR 221, Carlin, fm. 3rd St. to Allen St. and SR 766 fm. SR 221 to I 80		\$80,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Mina, fm. 6th St. to Eleventh St.		\$330,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Fallon, fm. 500ft N. of Sheckler Rd. to Keddie St.		\$190,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50A/US 95A, Fernley, fm. Mull Ln. to Farm District Rd.		\$155,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. (East), Reno, fm. US 395 North to S. Virginia St.		\$320,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 595, S. Rainbow Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. W. Tropicana Ave. to Westcliff Dr.		\$500,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 322, Pioche, Main St. fm. Railroad Ave. to Cedar St.		\$160,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		I 215/SR 564, Henderson, fm. Stephanie St. to Lake Las Vegas Pkwy.		\$250,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15, Mesquite, at W. Mesquite Intch. and Pioneer/Sandhill Intch. and SR 170 at Mesquite Blvd.		\$20,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		FREL17/FREL18, Elko, at I 80 ramps and Idaho St. Intch. and FREL18 at Delaware Ave., El Dorado Dr., and Idaho St. Ints.		\$40,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Searchlight, MP CL 19.97 to 20.53		\$250,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 372, Pahrump, fm. Blagg St. to SR 160 and SR 160 fm. E. Acoma Ave. to Lockspur Ave.		\$195,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 93, Ely, fm. US 50 to E. 15th St.			\$730,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50, Ely, fm. W. 1st St. to 0.25 MS of the jct. with US 6			\$450,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. Losee Rd. to Civic Center Dr. and Pecos Rd. to Lamb Blvd.			\$2,170,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 589, E. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, fm. S. Las Vegas Blvd. to S. Nellis Blvd.			\$1,150,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave., fm. Dean Martin to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 0.01 to 7.30. Phase 2 (Concrete Bus Ln. and ADA)			\$5,100,000			Adv. with 3R Project (73879)
Not Scheduled		SR 396/SR 398/SR 854/SR 397, Lovelock, SR 396 fm. S. Broadway Ints. to N. Broadway Ints., SR 398 fm. I 80 Intch. to 17th St., SR 854 fm. Jamestown Ave. to SR 398, SR 397 fm. 4th St. to 11th St.				\$555,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 93A, W. Wendover, fm. I80 to MP 53.2				\$70,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50, Eureka, fm. 0.054 MN of Parker St. to 0.040 MN of Richmond St.				\$115,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50, Austin, fm. Stokes Castle Rd. to 3rd St.				\$165,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 589, W. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, fm. S. Rainbow Blvd. to Las Vegas Blvd.				\$515,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 574, Cheyenne Ave., Las Vegas, fm. N. Martin L. King Blvd. to N. Nellis Blvd.				\$950,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 305, Battle Mtn., fm. Broyles Rd. to SR 304 and SR 304 fm. Eastgate Dr. to Forrest Ave.				\$285,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 223, Wells, fm. I 80 Intch. to 600 ft. E. of US 93				\$265,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15, Primm, Intch. ramps and S. Las Vegas Blvd. at E. Primm Blvd.				\$30,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		All Five Winnemucca Locations				\$535,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 582, Fremont St., Las Vegas, fm. S. 8th St. to E. Charleston Blvd.				\$645,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 612, N. Nellis Blvd, Las Vegas, fm. E. Russell Rd. to E. Charleston Blvd.					\$970,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50, Fallon, fm. Allen Rd. to Sherman St.					\$785,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 445, Pyramid Way, Sparks, fm. Nugget Ave. to Sparks Blvd.					\$380,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. Lamb Blvd. to the EUL.					\$2,170,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 93, Wells, fm. 500 ft. S. of I 80 to SR 223					\$265,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 578, Washington Ave., Las Vegas, fm. I 15 to Las Vegas Blvd.					\$165,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
SubTotal:			\$3,455,000	\$2,490,000	\$9,600,000	\$4,130,000	\$4,735,000	



MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
3-23070	73921	SR 160, Nye Co., Roadside Safety at Johnnie Curve Site (Shoulder Widening, High Friction Surface, Flashing Chevron Signs) MP NY 26.200 to 27.351; SR 160 and US 95 Intersection Modifications (US 95 Deceleration Lanes) MP NY 13.81 to 14.23	\$2,404,000					Cost changed from \$3,000,000 Added to 3R Project (73921)
3-17097	73901	SR 317 Rainbow Canyon, Lincoln Co., fm. 1 MN of Elgin to the jct of US 93. MP LN 41.77 to LN 52.37	\$2,000,000					
4-03417	73725	SR 612, Nellis Blvd. and SR 589, Sahara Ave. Reconstruct Intersection.	\$1,900,000					
2-05124	73948	US 50 at Cave Rock. MP DO 7.11 - Extend Westbound Tunnel	\$4,000,000					Completed with and Adv. Date 2/10/16; Contract Number 3627. Going with US 50 Slope Stability, Water Quality Project (73653)
3-05057	73867	SR 756 Centerville Ln. at Structure B-287. MP DO 3.68		\$600,000				TAP funding (Douglas County)
3-05058	73966	SR 756, Centerville, fm. Waterloo Ln. to US 395 (Bikelanes)		\$600,000				TAP Funding (2nd Project)
Not Scheduled		SR 445 at Calle de la Plata (NB Deceleration Lane)		\$1,600,000				
3-19053	73861	SR 828 Farm District Rd. fm. Crimson Rd. to Jasmine Ln. in Fernley. MP LY 0.90 to LY 2.75		\$530,315				TAP funding (City of Fernley); \$173,485 City of Fernley; \$650,000 Safe Routes
Not Scheduled		SR 163, Laughlin, Roundabout				\$2,500,000		Moved from 2017
SubTotal:			\$10,304,000	\$3,330,315		\$2,500,000		

DISTRICT BETTERMENT PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
		District Betterments	\$22,623,698					
SubTotal:			\$22,623,698					

BIKE & PED PROJECT

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2016	\$2,214,600					
Not Scheduled		US 50 - Warning Signage in all mountainous areas regarding bicycles may be in travel lane	\$100,000					
Not Scheduled		US 50, Stateline Ave. to Elks Point Rd. - Bicycle Lanes	\$10,000					
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2017		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2018			\$1,000,000			
Not Scheduled		US 50 / US 95 - Bicycle Improvements			\$1,000,000			
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2019				\$2,000,000		
SubTotal:			\$2,324,600	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000		
Grand Total			\$275,464,727	\$336,163,411	\$440,383,596	\$346,174,096	\$562,415,096	

Qualifiers/Disclaimers

This list is not fiscally constrained. It is preliminary and subject to revision based on funding, resources and priorities. The primary intent of this list is help NDOT determine priority of NDOT construction projects from a funding and resource allocation perspective. The initial emphasis was placed on the first two years of the list. Additional projects for later years will be added as those are identified.

The list of projects shows those projects which NDOT has identified as being funded or potentially funded with money controlled by NDOT, such as STP Statewide, NHPP, Safety, state funds , etc.

The list does not show projects which are solely locally funded or funded with federal funding controlled by the MPOs, such as CMAQ or STP Local funds. The list does not show Local Public Agency (LPA) projects which do not have NDOT controlled funds included in the project or an agreement to have NDOT controlled funds in them.

The dollar amounts may not be the total project cost but rather the amount of NDOT controlled funds in the project. It does not include any funding from federal earmarks or local/Developer funds.

The dollar amounts show the federal fiscal year in which it is anticipated the funds may be obligated. It does not represent the year that the funds will be expended. The dollar amounts shown are for the construction phase only and does not reflect design or right of way costs.

Backup projects may be used in the year shown. If not used, backup projects will be used the following year.

Contingency projects may be used to replace any planned project in a year that experiences issues . If not used, contingency projects are reevaluated for use in future years. Projects whose funding has not yet been identified may not be obligated in the year shown. There are not current commitments to actual fund those projects but staff recommends them.

Not Scheduled - indicates that the project is not currently scheduled in NDOT's Project Scheduling and Management System (PSAMS)

CHANGES FROM THE 10-22-15 VERSION OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN ARE SHOWN IN BOLD AND BLUE

N = Need
 S = Submitted (HQ reviewing)
 A = Approved

Department of Transportation Construction Contract Closeout Status May 19, 2016																								
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	CA	CP	LE or CM	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CHANGE ORDER STATUS	
3532	1	916	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP - RUGULEISKI TRISH	RE-OPEN F STREET UNDER I 15 INTERSTATE TO TRAFFIC	\$13,600,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	S	S	N	A		10/24/14			10/1/15	10/1/15		Y	HQ is working with crew on closeout. Given back to crew for corrections on 12/17/15.	1 - Trish		
3546	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING - CONNER TRISH	I-15 MILL, 3" PBS, 3/4" OPEN-GRADE, 2 MI TRUCK CLIMBING LN NORTH BOUND	\$35,650,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	S		6/10/15			1/19/16	1/19/16		N	Crew preparing to request pickup.			
3554	1	926	LAS VEGAS PAVING - SULAHRIA TRISH	US 95 FROM ANN ROAD TO DURANGO DRIVE	\$35,700,000.01	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N		9/18/15	10/22/15	9/13/16	partial relief 11/24/2015				N	Crew is preparing for pickup. Partial relief granted, full is pending Plant Est. (exp 9/13/16).		
3566	1	915	NEVCAL INVESTORS INC - STRGANAC - TRISH	SIGNAL SYSTEM MODIFICATION CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	\$590,432.20	\$30,379.11	N	A	A	A	A	A		9/14/15			4/25/16	4/25/16	1/26/16	Y	Pick up complete. Can not send out qty to contractor until EEO is received.	Done		
3576 FM	1	906	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 147 FM 2ME OF EUL OF NLV CL 9.67 TO APPX BOUNDARY LAKE MEAD NRA	\$5,948,497.07	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	A	N	A		1/7/16			2/17/16	2/17/16		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final			
3577 FM	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP - CONNER TRISH	US 95 FROM 1.2 MILES NORTH OF FRCL 34 TO 0.9 MILES NORTH OF THE TRAILING EDGE OF I-1075 3" COLD MILL & FILL w/ OG	\$23,642,334.99	\$50,000.00	A	N	N	A	N	N		11/17/15			1/19/16	1/20/16		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final			
3584 FM	1	915	VSS INTERNATIONAL DBA STRGANAC (BAER) TRISH	US 95 AMARGOSA VALLEY TO BEATTY NYE COUNTY	\$1,710,710.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		6/26/15	7/26/15		8/17/15	8/25/15	4/19/16	Y	Qty's sent to contractor on 5/3/2016. Targeting payoff 6/3/2016.	Done		
3589 FM	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP - CONNER TRISH	SR 158 DEER CREEK ROAD COLDMILLING AND PLACING PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE	\$2,118,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	S	A	S	A		8/5/15	9/5/15		8/12/15	9/3/15		Y	HQ received corrections on 5/3/16 and is currently working on pick up.			
3602 FM	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP - CHRISTIAN TRISH	SR 160 EMERGENCY MEDIAN CROSSOVERS / PLACEMENT OF CABLE BARRIER RAILS	\$794,000.00	\$42,197.00	N	N	N	A	N	N		1/6/16			2/17/16	2/17/16		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final			
3292	2	910	FISHER INDUSTRIES - DURSKI ROB-MATT	FROM 395 S. OF BOWERS MANSION CUTOFF NORTH TO MOUNT ROSE HWY.	\$393,393,393.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	S		11/19/12		2/28/15	3/2/15	3/9/15	4/5/16	Y	HQ pickup completed. Crew still has testing books at office. Need ATSS cleared thru QA before qty's sent to contractor.	Done		
3389 ARRA	2	913	MEADOW VALLEY CONST - LIGHTFOOT DEENA	I-580 AT MEADOWOOD MALL EXCHANGE	\$21,860,638.63	\$50,000.00	A	N	N	N/A	N	N		7/10/13		11/1/13	8/12/14	9/26/14		Y	Claim settled. Final Payment made to contractor. HQ reviewing books/docs for closeout. Per S.Lani, no CPPR is required. Review is about 95% complete. No quantities will be sent out for signature.			
3516	2	907	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - LANI MATT	US 395 CARSON CITY FREEWAY FROM CARSON ST. TO FAIRVIEW	\$9,545,454.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	S	N	A		7/11/14			5/15/2015	5/18/2015		Y	Closeout complete, pending corrections from S. Lani. Partial submittal of CPPR's (waiting on prime) & LE.	Done-pending correction		
3541 CMAR	2	911	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - ANGEL DEENA	CONSTRUCT PHASE 1 C MULTI USE TRAIL OF STATELINE TO STATELINE BIKEWAY PROJECT	\$1,424,013.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		10/15/13		12/20/15	2/5/16	2/10/16	5/13/17	Y	Qty's sent to contractor on 5/12/2016. Targeting payoff 6/12/2016.	2 - Deena		
3558	2	913	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - LIGHTFOOT MATT	SR 431 MT ROSE HWY FROM 0.11 MILES EAST OF THE MT ROSE SUMMIT TO US 395	\$1,459,145.70	\$50,000.00	N	A	A	N	A	N		7/1/15			9/2/15	9/10/15		Y	HQ working with crew on closeout. Given back to crew for corrections. Need EEO, CPPR and ATSS.	Done-pending correction		
3561	2	911	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - ANGEL DEENA	2 3/4" MILL 2" PLANTMIX SURFACE WITH 3/4" OPEN GRADE	\$6,354,354.01	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	A		11/7/14		N/A	9/21/15	9/28/15		N	Crew preparing to request pickup after 3541 (picked up 4/19/16).		#3 paid prior	
3564 CMAR	2	911	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - ANGEL MATT	SR 207 KINGSBURY GRADE FROM THE JUNCTION WITH US 50 TO 3.866 MILES E. OF US 50	\$14,877,619.23	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	A		10/15/14		10/1/15	11/3/15	11/3/15		N	Crew preparing to request pickup after 3561. AB completed will collect at time of pickup.			

EEO=Contract Compliance Clearance
 LAB=clearance from Materials
 AB=As-Built

CPPR=Contractors Past Performance
 LE=Letter of Explanation
 ATSS=Acceptance Test Summary Sheet

WC=Wage Complaint
 CA=Contractors Acceptance
 *= Internal

Department of Transportation Construction Contract Closeout Status May 19, 2016																						
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	E O	L A B	C P P R	LE or CM	A T S S	A T W C	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CHANGE ORDER STATUS
3582 FM	2	911	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. ANGEL MATT	US 50 IN DAYTON, 0.13 MI WEST OF PINE CONE RD TO, 0.17 MI EAST OF RETAIL RD. - REVISE STRIPING, CONST RAISED MEDIAN ISLANDS AND DECEL LANES @ VARIOUS LOCATIONS	\$328,357.56	\$10,000 remaining	A	A	N	A	A		5/22/15			6/12/15	6/24/15		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final. Reduced retention to \$10,000.00 on 2/12/2016 per request of contractor.		
3586 FM	2	911	MKD CONSTRUCTION ANGEL MATT	US 5- CARSON CITY LOWER AND CENTRAL CREEK WATERSHED STORM DRAIN PROJECT FM CREEK INTERCHANGE TO JUNCTION OF US 395	\$1,323,150.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	S	11/6/15			3/29/16	3/29/16		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final		
3587 FM	2	911	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. ANGEL DEENA	US 50 FROM BOYER LN TO PINTO LN CONSTRUCT FENCE WITH CATTLE GUARDS @ VARIOUS LOCATIONS	\$689,007.00	\$37,854.11	A	A	N	A	A		10/23/15			1/29/16	1/29/16		N	Pick up pending closeout of other IFS contracts.		
3588 FM	2	910	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - DURSKI MATT	5 SCHOOLS IN WASHOE COUNTY - OFF SYSTEM	\$610,937.25	\$10,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	S	8/7/15			8/26/15	9/3/15	2/18/16	Y	Final qty's will be send upon approval of ATSS. Sent back to RE for corrections April 2016. Reduced retention to \$10,000.00 on 2/12/2016 per request of contractor.	Done	
3591 FM	2	910	Q & D CONST. - DURSKI DEENA	I-580 @ S. VIRGINIA (SUMMIT MALL); CONSTRUCT LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS	\$1,915,906.50	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N							N	Construction ongoing		
3592 FM	2	911	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. ANGEL MATT	SR 823, LOWER COLONY AND ARTESIA ROADS, FROM SR 208 TO UPPER COLONY ROAD 2" PBS OVERLAY	\$1,609,665.96	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	N	9/17/15			11/3/15	11/3/15		N	Construction complete. Crew working to request pickup and semi-final.		
3593 FM	2	904	A & K EARTHMOVERS- BOGE DEENA	SR 722 2" PLANTMIX OVERLAY	\$2,792,971.35	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N	10/28/15			2/24/16	4/12/16		N	Construction complete. Crew working to request pickup and semi-final.		
3595	2	907	GRANITE CONST. CO. - HURLBUT DEENA	SEISMIC RETROFIT, SCOUR COUNTERMEASURES & REHAB OF STRS. I-1263 NB/SB (CRADLEBAUGH SLOUGH) & B-1262 NB/SB (CARSON RIVER)	\$1,699,881.25	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N							N	Construction ongoing		
3601 FM	2	904	Q & D CONST. - BOGE DEENA	NORDYKE RD. EAST OF WALKER RIVER LYON COUNTY, REPLACE BRIDGE B-1610	\$792,700.00	\$41,685.00	N	A	N	N	N	N	3/3/16						N	Construction complete, in cleanup phase.		
3608 FM	2	904	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC - BOGE MATT	SR 115 HARRIGAN ROAD AT LINE CANAL	\$668,904.69	\$33,445.23	N	N	N	N	N	N							N	Construction complete, in cleanup phase.		
3611 FM	2	905	Q & D CONSTRUCTION INC- LOMPA DEENA	DIST II MTNC YARD (RENO) DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	\$760,006.15	\$38,000.31	N	N	N	N	N	N							N	Construction ongoing		
3612 FM	2	905	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - LOMPA MATT	FR WA 06 SPARKS NUGGET AVENUE PYRAMID TO MCCARREN STREET	\$839,623.86	\$41,981.19	N	N	N	N	N	N	5/3/16			5/17/16			N	Construction complete. Crew working to request pickup.		
3524	3	920 WINN	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - SCHWARTZ MATT	RUBBLIZING, PBS WITH OG SEIMIC RETROFIT AND REHABILITATION	\$32,106,106.01	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A		8/6/15	9/5/15		10/1/15	10/1/15	1/25/16	Y	Qty's sent to contractor on 5/3/2016. Possible payoff 6/3/2016.	Done	
3525	3	912	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS - DECARLO (Acting R.E.) DEENA	DOWEL BAR RETROFIT, PROFILE GRIND, SAW & SEAL, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB OF STRUCTURE ON I-80	\$14,222,222.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	A	A	A	Y	3/11/15	4/12/15		5/18/15	8/14/15	2/24/16	Y	Outstanding Wage Complaint. Qty's were rejected based on underrun & DBE determination; Contractor has appealed.	Done	
3550	3	918	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC PIERCE MATT	2" MILL, 2" PBS WITH OPEN-GRADE AND 3 3/4" MILL, 1" STRESS RELIEF COURSE, 2" PBS WITH OPEN GRADE.	\$19,656,656.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N				10/12/16	Partial 3/3/2016			N	Construction ongoing. Minor items remaining.		
3551	3	908	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC SENTRUD (Acting RE) DEENA	ADD 6' SHOULDERS, PASSING LANES, FLATTEN SLOPES, & EXTEND DRAINAGE FACILITIES. PACKAGE 2	\$8,363,636.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	N	N	A	N	10/9/15	10/14/15		12/10/15	1/5/16		N	Construction complete. Crew working to request pickup and semi-final.		

N = Need
 S = Submitted (HQ reviewing)
 A = Approved

Department of Transportation Construction Contract Closeout Status May 19, 2016																							
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	CA	PPR	LE or CM	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	RPU	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CHANGE ORDER STATUS
3557	3	912	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - DECARLO (Acting R.E.) DEENA	REPLACE SUBSTANDARD OFF-SYSTEM STRS G-324 & B-395 ON FR EU NEAR DUNPHY @ THE HUMBOLDT RIVER	\$7,835,211.70	\$50,000.00	S	A	N	N	N	S		9/11/15		11/17/16	Partial Relief (Str. G-324) 11-2-15		11/17/15	Y	HQ review complete and Final Pmt pending resolution of field issues that are temp sensitive.		
3559	3	920 WINN	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - SCHWARTZ DEENA	2" Mill 2" PBS WITH OPEN GRADE WEARING COURSE	\$10,069,069.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	A	A	A	A	Y	7/20/15	8/19/15	12/10/15	10/2/15	10/7/15		Y	Contractor has accepted final qty's. pending resolution of Wage Complaint . Nancy is following up some questions to Dwayne (Labor Comm)	Done	
3563	3	301 ELY	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. CO. HESTERLEE DEENA	US50-S, US93, SR140, SR278, SR292, SR294, and SR305; CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	\$4,824,007.00	\$50,000.00	S	S	N	N	N	N		7/29/15			9/30/15	9/30/15		N	Crew working on CM19I and preparing for pickup request.		
3594 FM	3	301	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION AVERETT MATT	MY925 INDEPENDENCE VALLEY MAINTENANCE YARD AT SR 226	\$621,019.04	\$0.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		12/16/15			2/17/16	2/17/16		Y	Crew requested pickup 4/29/2016. Job to be shipped to HQ. HQ at 0% pickup.	1-Matt	

EEO=Contract Compliance Clearance
 LAB=clearance from Materials
 AB=As-Built

PPR=Contractors Past Performance
 LE=Letter of Explanation
 ATSS=Acceptance Test Summary Sheet

WC=Wage Complaint
 CA=Contractors Acceptance
 *= Internal

**NDOT Construction Contracts Closed Out
(Aug-Oct) 2015**

Item #9B

Contract	Description	Contractor	Resident Engineer	NDOT/Consultant Manager	Project	Original Bid	CCO Amount	% CCO	Qty Adjustments (Tot Pd - (Bid+CCO))	% Adjustments	Total Paid	Total Amount Over/Under Bid Amount	% of Bid Amount	Agreement Estimate (budget)	Total Amount Over/Under Budgeted Amount	% of Budget
3501	WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENTS AND EROSION CONTROL FEATURES	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	JOHN ANGEL	M. NUSSBAUMER/R. WOOD		\$5,318,188.00	\$260,575.44	4.9%	(\$409,974.94)	-7.7%	\$5,168,788.50	(\$149,399.50)	97%	\$5,703,141.00	(\$534,352.50)	91%
3581	MICROSURFACE EXISTING ROADWAY	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC.	SAMI YOUSUF	PHILIP KANEGBERG		\$1,538,538.00	(\$182,538.27)	-11.9%	\$163,083.05	10.6%	\$1,519,082.78	(\$19,455.22)	99%	\$1,701,621.04	(\$182,538.26)	89%
3505	WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES WITH DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS; INCLUDING REMOVAL OF BITUMINOUS SURFACE (COLD MILLING) AND PLACING PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE WITH OPEN-GRADED SURFACE	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	STEPHEN LANI	STEVE BIRD		\$21,212,121.00	\$505,954.64	2.4%	\$2,217,064.96	10.5%	\$23,935,140.60	\$2,723,019.60	113%	\$22,256,347.00	\$1,678,793.60	108%
3530	CONSTRUCT NEW INTERCHANGE	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	SAMI YOUSUF	EDUARDO MIRANDA		\$38,900,000.00	\$342,182.00	0.9%	(\$251,397.67)	-0.6%	\$38,990,784.33	\$90,784.33	100%	\$40,534,954.00	(\$1,544,169.67)	96%
3556	REALIGN US 93 FOR APPROXIMATELY 5000 FEET USING GEO-FOAM TO AVOID UNSUITABLE SOILS.	ROAD AND HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	CHRISTOPHER PETERSEN		\$3,595,595.00	\$0.00	0.0%	\$15,848.79	0.4%	\$3,611,443.79	\$15,848.79	100%	\$3,881,087.00	(\$269,643.21)	93%
3409	WIDEN FROM 6 TO 8 LANES FOR 1 HOV LANE. ADD 1 AUX LANE BTWN INTGS. ADD ANOTHER AUX LANE NB FM RAINBOW TO ANN. BRAID NB AND SB RAMPS AT RANCHO / ANN ROAD INTG. OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS AT CHEYENNE AND DURANGO INTGS	CAPRIATI CONSTRUCTION	STEVEN WILLIAMS	COLE MORTENSEN		\$68,761,909.90	\$4,700,681.70	6.8%	\$325,203.45	0.5%	\$73,787,795.05	\$5,025,885.15	107%	\$71,947,575.00	\$1,840,220.05	103%
3534	CONSTRUCTING SHOULDERS, AND A SET OF PASSING LANES, FLATTENING SLOPES, AND EXTENDING DRAINAGE FACILITIES.	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	DON CHRISTIANSEN	JIM CERAGIOLI		\$9,886,886.00	\$195,567.89	2.0%	\$96,909.53	1.0%	\$10,179,363.42	\$292,477.42	103%	\$10,592,452.00	(\$413,088.58)	96%
3540	REPAIR TUNNEL, RENOVATE DRAINAGE SYSTEM AND IMPROVE LIGHTING. PERFORM WORK ON STRUCTURES B-1066 E/W, B-1111 E/W, B-1112 E/W, B-1113 E/W. REPAIR PCCP WITH NEW ASPHALT SURFACE FROM MP EL 7.50 TO EL 9.33. PACKAGE 2	Q & D CONSTRUCTION INC.	CHRISTOPHER RUPINSKI	DALE KELLER		\$28,340,000.13	\$0.00	0.0%	(\$158,489.18)	-0.6%	\$28,181,510.95	(\$158,489.18)	99%	\$28,339,999.00	(\$158,488.05)	99%
Totals						\$177,553,238.03	\$5,822,423.40	3.3%	\$1,998,247.99	1.1%	\$185,373,909.42	\$7,820,671.39	104%	\$184,957,176.04	416733.38	100%
													Number of Projects Over/ Under Agr. Estimate (Budget)	Projects Equal to or Under Budget	6	
														Projects Over Budget	2	

Contract No. 3409**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73451**FHWA Project No(s):** NH-095-2(051)**County:** CLARK**Location:** US 95 FROM 0.16 MILES NORTH OF WEST WASHINGTON AVENUE TO ANN ROAD, PACKAGE 1, ON US 95 AT DURANGO DRIVE**Work Description:** WIDEN FROM 6 TO 8 LANES FOR 1 HOV LANE. ADD 1 AUX LANE BTWN INTGS. ADD ANOTHER AUX LANE NB FM RAINBOW TO ANN. BRAID NB AND SB RAMPS AT RANCHO / ANN ROAD INTG. OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS AT CHEYENNE AND DURANGO INTGS**Advertised Date:** APRIL 29, 2010**Bid Opening:** MAY 6, 2010**Contract Awarded:** JUNE 8, 2010**Notice to Proceed:** JULY 12, 2010**Work Completed:** DECEMBER 1, 2012**Work Accepted:** MARCH 7, 2013**Final Payment:** APRIL 12, 2016**Contractor:** CAPRIATI CONSTRUCTION**Resident Engineer:** STEVEN WILLIAMS**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$90,783,875.63
Bid Price:	\$68,761,909.90
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$73,462,591.60
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$71,947,575.00
Final Contract Amount	\$73,787,795.05
Percent of Budget:	103%
Total Change Orders:	\$4,700,681.70
Percent Change Orders:	6.8%
Original Working Days:	520
Updated Working Days:	610
Charged Working Days:	610
Liquidated Damages:	\$152,667.92

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	\$3,539,320.74	4.11%
Right of Way:	\$167,499.46	0.19%
Construction Engineering:	\$8,547,370.44	9.93%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$73,787,139.98	85.76%
Total Project Cost:	\$86,041,330.62	

Contract No. 3501**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73415**FHWA Project No(s):** MS-0431(006)**County:** WASHOE**Location:** SR 431, MOUNT ROSE HIGHWAY, FROM THE JUNCTION WITH SR 28 TO INCLINE LAKE ROAD**Work Description:** WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENTS AND EROSION CONTROL FEATURES**Advertised Date:** JANUARY 12, 2012**Bid Opening:** FEBRUARY 2, 2012**Contract Awarded:** MARCH 13, 2012**Notice to Proceed:** APRIL 16, 2012**Work Completed:** MAY 1, 2014**Work Accepted:** MAY 18, 2015**Final Payment:** JANUARY 19, 2016**Contractor:** Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC.**Resident Engineer:** JOHN ANGEL**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$6,071,833.15
Bid Price:	\$5,318,188.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$5,578,763.44
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$5,703,141.00
Final Contract Amount	\$5,168,788.50
Percent of Budget:	91%
Total Change Orders:	\$260,575.44
Percent Change Orders:	4.9%
Original Working Days:	100
Updated Working Days:	110
Charged Working Days:	110
Liquidated Damages:	\$1,000.00

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	\$1,016,113.16	(15.31%)
Right of Way:	\$55,617.16	(0.84%)
Construction Engineering:	\$396,438.21	(5.97%)
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$5,168,788.50	(77.88%)
Total Project Cost:	\$6,636,957.03	

Contract No. 3505**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60506**FHWA Project No(s):** NH-050-2(012)**County:** LYON**Location:** US 50, LYON COUNTY, FROM CHAVES ROAD TO ROY'S ROAD**Work Description:** WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES WITH DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS; INCLUDING REMOVAL OF BITUMINOUS SURFACE (COLD MILLING) AND PLACING PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE WITH OPEN-GRADED SURFACE**Advertised Date:** MARCH 9, 2016**Bid Opening:** APRIL 12, 2012**Contract Awarded:** MAY 25, 2012**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 25, 2012**Work Completed:** MAY 1, 2014**Work Accepted:** MAY 18, 2015**Final Payment:** MARCH 4, 2016**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**Resident Engineer:** STEPHEN LANI**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$21,027,702.10
Bid Price:	\$21,212,121.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$21,718,075.64
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$22,256,347.00
Final Contract Amount	\$23,935,140.60
Percent of Budget:	108%
Total Change Orders:	\$505,954.64
Percent Change Orders:	2.4%
Original Working Days:	220
Updated Working Days:	230
Charged Working Days:	226
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$1,293,579.62	5.13%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$23,935,140.60	94.87%
Total Project Cost:	\$25,228,720.22	

Contract No. 3530**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73625**FHWA Project No(s):** DE-STP-015-1(146)**County:** CLARK**Location:** I 15 AT CACTUS AVENUE IN LAS VEGAS**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT NEW INTERCHANGE**Advertised Date:** NOVEMBER 9, 2012**Bid Opening:** NOVEMBER 15, 2012**Contract Awarded:** JANUARY 15, 2013**Notice to Proceed:** APRIL 1, 2013**Work Completed:** AUGUST 29, 2014**Work Accepted:** DECEMBER 2, 2015**Final Payment:** APRIL 13, 2016**Contractor:** LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION**Resident Engineer:** SAMI YOUSUF**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$49,893,258.24
Bid Price:	\$38,900,000.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$39,242,182.00
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$40,534,954.00
Final Contract Amount	\$38,990,784.33
Percent of Budget:	96%
Total Change Orders:	\$342,182.00
Percent Change Orders:	0.9%
Original Working Days:	400
Updated Working Days:	400
Charged Working Days:	346
Liquidated Damages:	\$3,892.64

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	\$3,359,646.34	6.96%
Right of Way:	\$3,879,193.49	8.03%
Construction Engineering:	\$2,072,052.65	4.29%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$38,990,784.33	80.72%
Total Project Cost:	\$48,301,676.81	

Contract No. 3534**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60571**FHWA Project No(s):** SI-093-4(018)**County:** ELKO, WHITE PINE**Location:** US 93 LAGES JUNCTION TO CURRIE.**Work Description:** CONSTRUCTING SHOULDERS, AND A SET OF PASSING LANES, FLATTENING SLOPES, AND EXTENDING DRAINAGE FACILITIES.**Advertised Date:** MARCH 21, 2013**Bid Opening:** MAY 2, 2013**Contract Awarded:** JUNE 10, 2013**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 24, 2013**Work Completed:** OCTOBER 21, 2014**Work Accepted:** FEBRUARY 11, 2015**Final Payment:** APRIL 29, 2016**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**Resident Engineer:** DON CHRISTIANSEN**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$11,008,052.32
Bid Price:	\$9,886,886.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$10,082,453.89
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$10,592,452.00
Final Contract Amount	\$10,179,363.42
Percent of Budget:	96%
Total Change Orders:	\$195,567.89
Percent Change Orders:	2.0%
Original Working Days:	200
Updated Working Days:	202
Charged Working Days:	202
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$1,028,384.27	9.18%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$10,179,363.42	90.82%
Total Project Cost:	\$11,207,747.69	

Contract No. 3540**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60591**FHWA Project No(s):** IM-080-4(095)**County:** ELKO**Location:** I 80 AT THE CARLIN TUNNELS**Work Description:** REPAIR TUNNEL, RENOVATE DRAINAGE SYSTEM AND IMPROVE LIGHTING. PERFORM WORK ON STRUCTURES B-1066 E/W, B-1111 E/W, B-1112 E/W, B-1113 E/W. REPAIR PCCP WITH NEW ASPHALT SURFACE FROM MP EL 7.50 TO EL 9.33. PACKAGE 2**Advertised Date:** MAY 15, 2013**Bid Opening:** APRIL 18, 2013**Contract Awarded:** MAY 13, 2013**Notice to Proceed:** MAY 20, 2013**Work Completed:** JULY 1, 2015**Work Accepted:** SEPTEMBER 3, 2015**Final Payment:** APRIL 29, 2016**Contractor:** Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC.**Resident Engineer:** CHRISTOPHER RUPINSKI**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$25,881,557.41
Bid Price:	\$28,340,000.13
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$28,340,000.13
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$28,339,999.00
Final Contract Amount	\$28,181,510.95
Percent of Budget:	99%
Total Change Orders:	N/A
Percent Change Orders:	N/A
Original Working Days:	210
Updated Working Days:	N/A
Charged Working Days:	N/A
Liquidated Damages:	\$14,845.20

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$1,381,753.14	4.67%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$28,181,510.95	95.33%
Total Project Cost:	\$29,563,264.09	

Contract No. 3556**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60613**FHWA Project No(s):** SPF-093-3(009)**County:** LINCOLN**Location:** US 93 MILEPOST LN 106.00, BETWEEN CALIENTE AND PANACA, LINCOLN CO.**Work Description:** REALIGN US 93 FOR APPROXIMATELY 5000 FEET USING GEO-FOAM TO AVOID UNSUITABLE SOILS.**Advertised Date:** JUNE 5, 2014**Bid Opening:** JUNE 26, 2014**Contract Awarded:** JULY 14, 2014**Notice to Proceed:** AUGUST 18, 2014**Work Completed:** DECEMBER 3, 2014**Work Accepted:** OCTOBER 19, 2015**Final Payment:** APRIL 13, 2016**Contractor:** ROAD AND HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC**Resident Engineer:** SAMIH ALHWAYEK**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$3,693,352.96
Bid Price:	\$3,595,595.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$3,595,595.00
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$3,881,087.00
Final Contract Amount	\$3,611,443.79
Percent of Budget:	93%
Total Change Orders:	N/A
Percent Change Orders:	N/A
Original Working Days:	50
Updated Working Days:	50
Charged Working Days:	50
Liquidated Damages:	\$1,892.50

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$282,745.78	7.26%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$3,611,443.79	92.74%
Total Project Cost:	\$3,894,189.57	

Contract No. 3581**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60648**FHWA Project No(s):** SPF-093-2(018)**County:** LINCOLN**Location:** US 93 MP LN 0.00 TO LN 24.71 AND SPCL54 MP CL 0.0 TO CL 10.22**Work Description:** MICROSURFACE EXISTING ROADWAY**Advertised Date:** NOVEMBER 5, 2014**Bid Opening:** DECEMBER 4, 2014**Contract Awarded:** JANUARY 14, 2015**Notice to Proceed:** FEBRUARY 17, 2015**Work Completed:** MAY 27, 2015**Work Accepted:** OCTOBER 6, 2015**Final Payment:** FEBRUARY 19, 2016**Contractor:** INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC.**Resident Engineer:** SAMI YOUSUF**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$2,273,213.39
Bid Price:	\$1,538,538.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$1,355,999.73
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$1,701,621.04
Final Contract Amount	\$1,519,082.78
Percent of Budget:	89%
Total Change Orders:	-\$182,538.27
Percent Change Orders:	-11.9%
Original Working Days:	40
Updated Working Days:	40
Charged Working Days:	33
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$54,793.34	3.48%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$1,519,082.78	96.52%
Total Project Cost:	\$1,573,876.12	

Open Contract Status 04/27/2016

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	¹ ADJUSTED BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	² % Budget	³ % Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	RESIDENT ENGINEER	COMMENTS
		\$ 1,033,839,596.28	\$ 977,628,452.65	\$ 1,057,684,950.31	\$ 826,658,346.30						
¹ Adjusted Bid Contract Amount for EDOC contracts may include liquidated damages (Contracts 3576 and up) ² % BUDGET = Total Paid to Date / Agreement Estimate ³ % TIME = Charged Working Days to Date / Updated Working Days											