



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 12, 2017 – 45 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 April 10, 2017 Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting minutes (*Discussion/For Possible Action*)
5. Old Business (*Discussion Only*)
  - A. CWG Task List
    - Item 1 - NDOT Disadvantaged Business Process and Work Force Development
    - Item 2 - As-Builts
    - Item 3 – CMAR Change Orders and Agreements
    - Item 4 – NDOT Staff Update
    - Item 5 – Resident Engineer’s project assignments
    - Item 6 – Unbalanced Bidding
    - Item 7 – List of active agreements for Construction Division and Project Management Division
    - Item 8 – Update on Design Build Contracts
  - B. Requested Reports and Documents
6. Projects Under Development (*5-year Project Plan*)
7. 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*)
8. 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.
9. Closed session to receive information from counsel regarding potential or existing litigation (*Discussion Only*)
10. 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](http://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  
April 10, 2017

Chairman Len Savage	Cole Mortensen	Mary Martini (Dist I)
Controller Ron knecht	Stephen Lani	Thor Dyson (Dist II)
Reid Kaiser	Darin Tedford	Greg Novak, FHWA
Bill Hoffman	Sam Lompa	Bill Wellman, Las Vegas Paving
Sharon Foerschler	Pedro Rodriguez	Chris Koenig, Kiewit
Allison Wall	Dale Keller	

---

Savage: Everyone welcome to the April 10, 2017 Construction Working Group Meeting, also known as the Consultant Working Group Meeting. Welcome our guests. Member Martin is supposed to be calling in, are you on the phone Frank?

DJ: Not yet.

Savage: We'll go ahead and get started, since we have a quorum with the Controller and myself. DJ, if you would just let us know when Member Martin calls in.

There's nobody from Elko today, I take it. Kevin Lee is retired and—[laughter]

Hoffman: He's the only person we ever see in there.

[crosstalk and laughter]

Savage: That's right. Anyway, I'd like to open up, if there's any public comment, here up in Carson City today. Anybody from the public if they'd like to comment. Las Vegas, Elko, is there anybody in Las Vegas attending?

Martini: No public comment here.

Savage: Mary, anybody else besides yourself in Las Vegas?

Martini: Just me and us chickens.

Savage: Okay. Hang in there. I appreciate it. It's been a long day. We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 3, Comments from the Construction Working Group. I would like to start off on sincere condolences about the passing of Pierre Gezelin. I'd like to take a quick moment of silence for Pierre. He worked very closely with the Construction Work Group. Very important on the legal side. May he rest in peace. [moment of silence]

Would anybody else like to say anything, regarding open comments about the Working Group, any discussion or thoughts?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, Assistant Director for Operations. At the September CWG, which was the last time we had a CWG Meeting, you had wanted to know how the consultants were doing with our augmentation projects and also our full administration. I talked to all the Districts and there was really only one issue amongst all of the agreements we have so far. It was down in District 1. They dealt with it. Other than that, everything has been running smoothly. They're doing a good job for us. We're getting the inspections services that we need, the testing services that we need and we're paying them on time. Right now, it's running smoothly.

Savage: Good.

Kaiser: Sharon, do you have any—

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, I would agree. We're really busy. Lisa is retiring May 5<sup>th</sup>. We're trying to get other staff up to speed quickly. We're doing interviews, one this week and a couple next week. We only had four applicants for her job. You're here more about that when Allison gives her presentation. I would say, we're doing a good job with keeping our head above water and the consultants seem eager and happy to be providing services for us.

Savage: That's on the construction side?

Foerschler: Correct.

Savage: And the project management side, Cole Mortensen, welcome to the CWG.

Mortensen: Thank you.

Savage: And project management consultants, are they informing you up to standards?

Mortensen: We're working on some issues that we have with one project but other than that, we seem to be doing really well. I think both of the groups that we have helping us out with contract administration portions of Project NEON and USA Parkway are both performing outstandingly.

Savage: Good.

Mortensen: Yeah, we're moving forward.

Savage: That's good. That's what's nice about the CWG format here. It's pretty informal. We roll up our sleeves. We talk a little bit. There's nothing worse from a

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

contractor or a consultant standpoint is to over promise and under perform. I think that we're all in that stage right now, thankfully, with the economy, so we just have to ensure that we get that value at the end of the day from all of our vendors.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser again, one more comment. We had a partnering conference this last week and I was able to talk to some of the consultants. One of the things that they're running into is, they're running out of people to employ. It's kind of an interesting dilemma to be in. That's why we hire consultants, to help us out with what we cannot cover and they're going to be in the same boat here, pretty quick. It's interesting that they had that comment to bring up.

Savage: Yeah, that's very concerning. That's what I was eluding too because if they can overpromise and underperform. That's their responsibility. They shouldn't take the work unless they have the people. That's disturbing. We have to ensure that they can man it and provide the services that we need and expect.

Mortensen: We share the same concern. We've seen a lot—you know, the economic downturn, you saw a lot where the consultants reduced their staff and then we're seeing teaming more on our RFPs[inaudible] so rather than getting the several proposals to choose from, we get two. I think sometimes that causes other issues for us as well, as far as coordination and staffing. We've been trying to encourage companies to prime proposal and make sure they're staffed enough for us because eventually we're going to need to have that support. I think that at this point in time, we've encouraged them to make sure they have the right people on board. Whether it's somebody that's actually sitting Reno or Las Vegas isn't as important to us as somebody that's actually qualified to do the work and efficient at getting the work done.

Savage: That's good. I'm glad everybody is aware that manpower situation. Any other comments from anybody else or from Mr. Controller?

Knecht: Let me just add to what you just said. This is becoming something of a national problem. You hear about the people who have dropped out of the workforce, but companies are having trouble filling STEM type jobs. Science, technology—especially technology, engineering, etc. And, there's kind of a mismatch between the labor pool that might be and the jobs that are there. A lot of it has to do with the just out of college and younger people not being basically STEM oriented or oriented towards those jobs. We're going to see that for quite a while and especially the point you made about, we had a deep recession. The recovery has

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

been terrible. Everybody has assumed, well when I need them, I'll be able to hire them because that's the way it always was before but now they have that problem. A lot of times, Mr. Chairman, they may do just what you say. They may essentially take jobs in anticipation of being able to staff them and then they find that they won't. That may be a message we need to communicate to them, be careful that you're really staffed up and ready to go when you bid on these things. Because it's a systemic problem.

Savage: Absolutely. Point well made, Mr. Controller. Any other comments from the group here, anybody else—

Hoffman: Mr. Chair, I have a comment, just regarding the Agenda. I was hoping we could get Allison, our HR Division Manager up front. She has to give testimony at 3:30. Just, will you take that into consideration?

Savage: So, the Legislature is not going to wait? [laughter]

Hoffman: I wish it did.

Savage: [crosstalk] I'm going to be late.

Hoffman: We'll probably be late anyway, you're right.

Savage: We can certainly do that. Not a problem.

Hoffman: Thank you Chairman.

Savage: Right after we approve the minutes. Any other comments from the working group, Agenda Item No. 3? We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 4, the September 12th, almost six months because we had to cancel the December Meeting due to the fact there wasn't a T-Board meeting at that time. We elected to move it until March. In March, we didn't have a quorum, so here we are in April.

Knecht: Mr. Chairman, I've got four small changes. I must've really been chewing my words that day. On Page 18, the fourth line under the statement I made, there's the word improvise, which I think should be impoverished. No one should be impoverished or damaged by it.

Then on Page 24, the second line, fourth word in, we've got two words, there in, I mean, therein. Which is to say, basically Clark and Washoe Counties and the Cities therein cause this problem.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Then, in reversal of the problem I had with the Transportation Committee minutes, Page 32, the fourth line of my statement says, Your responding—should say, you're responding. That's exactly the reverse of what I earlier said.

Finally, two of them on Page 38, in the middle of the page, just below where it says at the top of the D for Draft, it says, [inaudible] in brackets, that should be dues. That is dues paying members. Finally, the second line from the bottom of the page, it says, with the power deduced to you all. I must've really chewed those words because that should be, with the apologies due to you all. Thank you.

Savage: Thank you Mr. Controller. A couple of corrections for myself. On Page 42, about the middle of the page at the very end it says, there is no Southern California AGC, it should be Southern Nevada.

Knecht: Probably true in California.

Savage: Page 42. Page 43 at the bottom, Savage says, I saw a block out there too and I didn't see one of his trucks. He is a subcontractor to HDR. That's all I had. Do you see any other corrections or comments or additions or deletions to the minutes? I'll take a motion.

Knecht: Move approval with those corrections, etc.

Savage: I'll second the motion. Everybody in favor say aye. [ayes around] That motion passed. Move on to—let's go to Agenda Item 6, Attachment A, Item 5. This is Ms. Wall's agenda item. [pause] Okay, Ms. Wall, if you could go ahead.

Wall: Well, basically in September, you had asked for some statistics including turnover and vacancy and also one of the questions asked was, what are some of the things that we're doing to make this a great place to work? Regarding turnover again. We provided information for your packets which included current programs that we have for recruitment, current programs for retention and basically, I'm here to answer any questions that you have from those packets, including turnover statistics. We spoke quite a bit before the meeting about what we had available to us, our statistics don't really go back as long as what would be beneficial because it can't compare current to the recession and to prior to the recession, we don't have those statistics available to us for turnover and vacancies. We've compiled everything that we have that is accurate.

Savage: That was the interesting point was trying to—

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Wall: Compare it all.
- Savage: --compare with the 05', 06', 07' times. There was no data from those years.
- Wall: No, that was after a lot of research and using all of the long-term employees here in HR, as well as DHRM which is our State resource.
- Hoffman: And Allison is new to her position, so she's not—it's not her fault that [crosstalk]
- Wall: Yeah, thank you and it's not my fault.
- Savage: You had six months to find [crosstalk and laughter]
- Wall: That's the thing, I started in September looking and this is what was available as far as accurate data on vacancy or turnover rates.
- Savage: Do you want to go through page by page and explain some of your thoughts and understanding of some of these graphs? If you could please, Allison. Page 2, start with Page 2, and see what you see as far as trending or concerns or areas of improving.
- Wall: One important point is the different between internal and external turnover versus avoidable versus unavoidable. Things that are avoidable include separations from the Agency, internal turnover, promotions, demotions and transfers. Moving on to the next part of the chart, before looking at the numbers is the external turnover. That includes only separations from the Agency.
- Savage: You're on Page 2 of 6, is that correct?
- Wall: I'm realizing, I don't have it in the same printout as you. They must've made it look prettier than how I turned it in.
- Kaiser: No.
- Wall: No? [laughter]
- Kaiser: No flowers.
- Wall: No flowers, okay. [pause] I'm going to regroup here just a moment, so I can see—mine was in a different order here. On Page 2, you're looking at—
- Knecht: While you're doing that, thank you for the offer to come and brief me on this. I'm sorry that we weren't able to do it, but fire away.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Wall: That's all right. I was trying to get it—you know, make sure I was getting you as much as we had available and finding out in advance. I was looking at the chart [inaudible]. Your Page 2 is our vacancy rates. You can see under the linear line that our vacancy rate is going up from 2011. It's quite considerable from 6% to 14%. I think it comes back to what Reid was talking about where even consultants don't have enough people to hire. A lot of it can come back to the salary. That's something that, from an HR standpoint, that we see as outside of our control. That's a state-level. We have to look at what can we do internally as an Agency, what do we have control over. That's—I don't want to jump ahead too far. You should have that list, which we can look at on Page 4. These are some of the—we're already doing a lot, I think, within this Agency and then at multiple agencies, NDOT is doing a lot more than other state agencies as far as recruitment and retention.

Martini: Allison?

Wall: Yeah.

Martini: Hi, for the record, this is Mary Martini in District 1. Before the last report we did, what a year or so ago, we had a breakdown as to the vacancies in each of the Districts and then also vacancies in construction versus maintenance versus some of the other. Am I missing something or is that breakdown here?

Wall: No, that wasn't requested but if that would be useful to you, I can get that to you Mary. That was not something that was—

Martini: I think we know anecdotally that District 3 has suffered a lot because of the mines. District 1 just has a tremendous amount of competition in Las Vegas and so far, Thor's fared better but still in trouble. So, it would be nice if we could, at least internally, get those numbers.

Savage: I think that's very important Mary. Allison, just so you know, this is a business item. It's going to stay on the agenda every month. I think this is a real hot topic. Just be prepared, whatever you come up with—not every month, every quarter, I'm sorry, every quarter, which will be June actually because we missed March.

Seriously, I think Mary's comment is [inaudible] me and whatever else you might come up with to ensure us—

Wall: Well, when I give updates, we can provide the strategic planning effort with NDOT, workforce development and succession planning as part of that. I'm on

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

that Committee and on that team. There will be more. We certainly didn't want to commit to what we're going to be doing in the future because our strategic planning efforts are going to define that.

Savage: Right.

Wall: We don't have what's coming in the future.

Savage: Okay.

Wall: Do you have any specific questions? Other than, I mean, we have vacancies rates are rising. Then, if you turn over to Page 3, just wanted to clarify the difference between avoidable and gross.

Savage: That was one of my questions, what is avoidable?

Wall: That's including the separations from the Agency, internal turnover such as promotions, demotions and transfers. I thought I had it listed on here, the specifics. Avoidable turnover, yeah, would be all of those but unavoidable is easier to define. That's retirements. I thought it was identified on here. [pause]

Kaiser: There's notes on the bottom of Page 3 of 6, underneath the—includes separation from agency, internal turnover such as promotions, demotions and transfers.

Knecht: Those are internal and external.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Knecht: Versus external only. We have the same on Page 5.

Martini: One of the reasons I asked the question is last year when we did this report, I was actually surprised that District 1 was near 40%, which was actually a little bit higher than what I perceived it to be. Since then, we've seen so many more turnover, that it would seem to be worse. What we're seeing in the other agencies, the County and the City, there's—most of their higher level management positions are retiring and turning over. We are constantly finding our staff being wooed with salaries that are a good 50% or higher, more. They're competing for the same consultants as we are. It's definitely affecting our projects and it would be nice to get enough information so we could make some very key decisions about what our project delivery is really going to look like. I'd hate to be in a situation of a project delayed because we don't have staff, enough

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

staff or good enough staff working on it. Maybe we need to know that as we're doing the programming.

Savage: I agree Mary. That's good input.

Dyson: This is Thor Dyson for District 2. I have last year's personnel report that we had worked on. I just have only District 2's. We have a total of 290 positions and that was last year. 32 vacancies. I know that I just had one printed out. Got it this morning actually from my HR person in District 2 and I have 40 vacancies right now, permanent vacancies. I had 32 last year. I've been hovering around 40-45 every month for the most part. Last year, 32 vacancies. Last year, I had 31 on probation, which means they're brand new. They don't even have a year's timeframe. I had 11% vacancy rate—percent on probation was 11% in August. Percent on vacant positions and probation was 22%. 11% and 11%. Then, the number of eligible retirees, this is as of last year in the next five years was 63. That percent in five years is 28%. A year ago it was pretty bad. Like Mary was stating, it feels worse. Just trying to get the workload out. Hustling to get consultants for augmentation administration.

I talked to my Assistant, Rick Bosch earlier this morning and for the first time that I can remember in a long time, we have, I believe it's eight vacancies, it might be seven vacancies on our construction side. I can't remember when we've had seven vacancies in District 2 Construction. Very rare. The turnover rate is not that high.

Kaiser: That's almost a construction crew.

Dyson: That is exactly what Rick Bosch stated to me, that an entire construction crew is usually around 8-10 people. Not only did we, you know, we were asked to eliminate one construction crew in 2012 because of lack of work and issues with state budget. We eliminated a construction crew, I'm practically down a construction crew. Thankfully the Transportation Board this morning, graciously approved consultants for I-80 in District 2 and consultants to augment us on the Glendale job. We're scrambling. We're being as creative as possible and we're scrambling.

As I stated, last year—this is just a permanent report. It's not temporary positions, because we rely on temporary positions, six-month positions to help us augment with our activities for snow and ice control in the winter time and then other activities in the summer. It's pretty desperate.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

I can tell you for a fact that last season, starting November/December of 2016, we had 40 temporary positions available to us to fill throughout the entire District. We were able to fill 18. Less than half. We were unable to fill all our temporary positions. Less than half of our temporary positions. That really put a difficult challenge for District 2 and its workers to plow snow and ice and a lot was asked of them to deal with the epic snowstorms and floods and whatnot the last three to four months. We got it done. We did it. It wasn't pretty, but it was with half the staff of temporary help that we usually get.

Savage: I don't think anybody knows that. I think it's important that we do know that. You guys—the men and women of NDOT stepped up like no other during this epic winter.

Dyson: With half the temporary staff.

Savage: With half the resources.

Dyson: You'll see that reflected in the overtime, once you get overtime dollars.

Savage: I'm sure we will.

Dyson: I can tell you—I can tell you very—I was interested, so July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016 we spent around \$200,000 in overtime for various reasons, workload, emergency, snow and ice. Then the first two weeks in January, we spent around \$250,000 in overtime in District 1. In a two week period, we spent as much overtime as we did in the previous six months.

Savage: Yeah.

Dyson: It's okay, it had to get done. We did it. The personnel issues are very real like Mary is saying, it doesn't feel right. At least in our areas, we're behind the curve.

Savage: Thank you Thor. Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Mr. Chairman, this morning Thor said his staff was going to hell and back for us. Just make sure they come back, okay.

Dyson: We'll make sure they come back.

Hoffman: Bring some heat with them. [laughter]

Knecht: I believe we need to at least release Allison at this point, so she can—well, it will be legislative time, but by the time you get over there.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Wall: Thank you.

Kaiser: Chairman, can I say one thing. Allison, I don't want you to think that any of this is a reflection on you, the low numbers. It's industry-wide, so we appreciate all your efforts in trying to help us build these positions. I look back 15-20 years ago, we didn't have to do all this to go fill a position. We do appreciate you going out and advertising in places that we have never had to advertise before. We appreciate it.

Savage: Exactly. That's the nice thing about the CWG format, it's very informal. You'll learn that as you come to different meetings. We're not trying to be critical of anybody's role, we're just trying to be helpful from the outside, looking in. Because this is an issue and we want to make sure that we have the men and women to do the work, at the end of the day and there's a lot of different ways to find those people.

Wall: And we'll be continuing these statistics, so we'll just add on as we get them.

Savage: And, if you could do what Mary had proposed, [inaudible] that would be very helpful. Breaking it down by Districts, so we can kind of drill down a little bit. Thank you.

Wall: Absolutely.

Martini: Mr. Chairman.

Savage: Yes Mary.

Martini: Is there anything under works to talk about salary and wage or any studies going on because I just heard it was brought up at the City of Las Vegas and just as an example and hopefully there's nobody in the room that can rush out and apply but their [inaudible] inspector with a minimum of three years experience will get \$33.50 an hour; where Combination Plans Examiner is at \$44.43 an hour, which roughly translates into what our Resident Engineers are making at that \$44.00 an hour wage. I was just wondering if there's any studies going on for salary equity?

Savage: Can you respond to that comment?

Wall: No, I mean, not at this time for—I mean, that would again come from the Governor—

Hoffman: That would come from the Governor's Budget Office.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Wall: Yeah, that's not something that internally we would do. We have an [inaudible] salary—[inaudible] sorry, wrong association, AASHTO Salary Survey that we participate in every year. It's because of the benefit, total comp and benefit packages, it's not something that we can do internally, to even look at, as you've done the City of Las Vegas or we have maintenance records that we'll look at and someone will compare to in Reno. The comp and benefit packages are completely different. Unless you have a professional organization like AASHTO that's performing the salary survey, it's like comparing apples and oranges.
- Savage: But you know, I thank Mary for bringing that. Again, a private businessman, private world, I want to know where my competition is at. I think that's what Mary is trying to say and say, listen, can we as a Department at least be aware of where our competition is at. What are the RTCs of the world doing? What are the City of Las Vegas'? And we know those jurisdictions are going to be more but we want to realistically understand, how far are we off, so that we know. I know it's a legislative issue but it's always nice to know the dynamics from [crosstalk]
- Wall: That might be something we present in our strategic planning, because that would, like I said, entail going in, professionals to accomplish that task. It's a big task, like you were saying, even to do the comparison to know what's our competition and is our accelerated salary program working? Those kinds of questions. We could certainly propose that. I think it'd be wonderful information. All of us, we could all benefit from it.
- Kaiser: I don't know, Reid Kaiser for the record. I don't know if want to know that information. [laughter]
- Hoffman: That's why no one has left here. [crosstalk] Serious.
- Wall: There are such a small percentage of companies left or public entities with the PERS Program that we have and you see, even in the last couple of sessions, they're trying to propose hybrid plans because it's not an economically feasible plan, the one that—the retirement program we're in. That really sets us apart from a lot of companies. Where when you look at the dollar figure that somebody that starts at \$18.00 and retires at \$48.00, they can collect 75% of their salary until they're 100. It doesn't weigh out. That's one of the reasons—
- Hoffman: Are we focusing on the right things to be focusing on, to show that comparison, quite frankly. Bill Hoffman for the record. I think it's—while Allison brought up

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

a very good point, we need to be looking at the right things. Not just salary. I mean, that's hourly, but there's bonus packages, there's retirement. What she's saying is its very complicated to try to get apples and apples as a comparison.

Back to the point she made regarding the succession planning, I think that's where NDOT is really going to take the strides down the road is our strategic planning process and under that is a task group that's going to handle succession planning and resource development. I really think that through this group and down through this task force, we can make a lot—at least look at a lot of this information and then decide how we're going to make changes to it.

Savage: Yeah, it's a work in progress. Exactly.

Hoffman: Right, right.

Savage: Just a lot of different data.

Knecht: Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with what Bill just said and the things that Allison said, but in addition to looking at the competition, I would look at the underlying demographics and ask the question, is a lot of this retirement driven? I think you mentioned the 18/48 syndrome, etc. I suspect that some chunk of this is not just an NDOT problem but it's an industry-wide problem and it is demographics and retirement driven.

Wall: Allison Wall for the record. Bringing in, also the changing workforce that with the millennials, the retirement package is no longer a driving force. It's not a priority for the younger generation coming out. Although I could say all day long, we have a comp and benefit package that is way better than a private company, that's not necessarily a selling point to a 22 year old engineer or a construction—person coming into construction out of college. Those are things that we are looking at actively. Saying, we're not just looking at money. One of the factors of the millennials or the younger generation coming out is putting above money is a flexible work schedule. The State is the State. We're the government, so sometimes we're a little bit slower to be able to figure that out and stay within all of the laws and NACs that we need to follow.

We're saying, how can we evolve our workplace to be able to bring in the new generation. And, keep all of the other generations and keep them working and a part because we need all of everybody in order to make this work.

Savage: It's not easy.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Wall: No, there's a lot to it.
- Savage: I know we've taken too much of your time. You've got to run. I appreciate your time Ms. Wall and we look forward to seeing you in June.
- Wall: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for taking me out of order, I appreciate it. I don't need to miss the legislature.
- Knecht: Give them my regards. [laughter]
- Martini: If I could add one thing for the Controller. Mr. Controller, there's the engineering boards throughout the states, they have actually statistics. A common phrase is, 50% over 50. 50% of the registered PEs are over the age of 50.
- Knecht: Yeah. And you put that together with what Allison said about the different values and different preferences of the two age groups and you've got a real problem. Especially when you recognize that, as the State, you don't have the latitude to be as flexible as you'd like. [inaudible] here is interpreted as, everybody gets the same deal, when a broader scope of fairness might be, we give people comparable deals but we tailor them to what it is they want and need, as long as we get full value.
- Savage: Okay. Let's move on to—back to Agenda Item No. 5. Presentation and Discussion on NDOT's Design-Build/Construction Manager at Risk versus the Design-Bid-Build, versus the design-build. [inaudible] Who is going to present this?
- Mortensen: For the record, this is Cole Mortensen, Assistant Chief Project Management here in Carson City. I'll be the one handling the project delivery selection process and then I'll hand off each project specifics to the Project Managers that are currently managing those projects.
- Fortunately, who decides or how we decide how to deliver a project is a lot easier to answer than where the projects come from.
- Savage: Excuse me, Cole. Did Member Martin ever call, because this was one of his major concerns.
- Speaker: No.
- Mortensen: I'd be more than happy to meet with him and go through this personally

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Savage: You might have to meet with him one-on-one.

Mortensen: If necessary, I don't have any problems with that.

Savage: Thank you. Please proceed.

Mortensen: We actually have a process that's set up in our Pioneer Program Guidelines. Some of the processes have roots in state statute and then others are basically guided by those guidelines and we've been basically working through there.

To start with, when it comes to project delivery, we have a project delivery selection approach. For those of you that are gathered around the room, I've got a handout with it on there. Whether we go design-bid-build, design-build or CMAR with the project, it depends largely on the process that I'll lay out for you guys here in just a minute. Then, as I mentioned, as we get further into this, we'll allow Pedro Rodriguez and Dale Keller to give you guys an update on Project NEON and USA Parkway.

As I mentioned earlier, we follow our Pioneer Program Guidelines when we go through the project delivery selection process. Generally speaking, what will end up happening is we'll get together a Committee of Division Head and Assistant Division Heads to evaluate a project. We'll actually have the project managers themselves fill out the information that you see in this—in the handout itself as far as project name, project location, sponsors, project description, estimated cost, budget availability, is it in the STIP, where are you at in the environmental process, what does the right-of-way look like, design and project delivery date, project corridor, major project features, scheduled milestone, third-parties, major challenges; whether it's utilities, right-of-way, environmental, during construction, specialty items or constructability issues. Then we'll also look at risk. Along with that, we have to also identify major goals for the project.

Basically, when we sit down as a Committee, we have the project manager then present all of that information to the Committee for them to sit down and be able to step through this process. Some of the major items that we end up looking at after they've gone through that are cost impacts, schedule impacts, opportunity to manage risk, complexity of design and construction phasing and opportunity for innovation. Essentially as a Committee then, we'll sit down and discuss each of those items and try to identify the delivery method that would be best suited for that sort of delivery.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

For example, if we have a project that has a very tight timeline for schedule, we'd be looking at this and sit down and the order preference that you may look at, we have examples of potential advantages and disadvantages, but just right off the cuff with something that's scheduled critical. Odds are, you're going to be able to get a shovel in the ground much quicker with the design-build process because you go through the procurement, you have the contractor and the engineer team. They can go out and start getting a shovel in the ground almost immediately.

The next one we sit down and discuss may be CMAR. Because you could have the argument that once you bring a Construction Manager at Risk on board, you could actually do say an early work package or something, a GMP Early and actually get things moving before the majority of the work. You've seen that on a couple of projects recently, in fact, the Bike Path was one. We got out there, we got that tunnel in. We got some of the parking done. Then we're doing the remainder of the project here in the future.

Generally, our longest lead delivery method is the design-bid-build delivery method because it tends to have to stay sequential. You get the engineering done. Then it bids. Then you award it and then it goes to construction and gets constructed.

Each of these categories get discussed in that regard and then basically, the Committee itself decides on a preference and what they feel is the most appropriate method for each of those criteria. At the end of the day, we put together the memo with the Committee's recommendation or the Director's group.

I guess, with that, are there—it's kind of a high-level approach. Are there any questions on the process itself?

Savage: Thank you Cole. I have a couple of questions. Thanks for putting this together. It was very informative. I'm sorry Member Martin is not here because this is one of his questions. The PSC, I have a couple of questions so I'll just go through them as they come up. The PSC, it says, typically is a project manager, Deputy Director has applicable and other significant stakeholders. Can you give me an example of a PSC Committee?

Mortensen: What we would have, generally what we've had or if the project is still environmental, you'll bring on the Chief of Environmental to sit on the Committee to give us an understanding of what it might take to get through the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

environmental process. If it's a big bridge job, we'll bring in a Bridge Engineer. The Chief of Bridge on the project. We try to tailor the Committee to some of the issues and challenges of the type of project that it is.

Savage: That Committee, is there a quantified number on every Committee? Are there always five people?

Mortensen: No, I think we've been pretty flexible just based on the project and kind of the involvement. Part of that, you'll see that we can have outside stakeholders involved with it also. I don't know how often we've actually done that. I'm trying to think of a [crosstalk]

Dyson: Mr. Chairman, Thor Dyson. On the I-80 design-build project in Reno, the PSC Committee consisted of the Deputy Director at the time, Scott Rollins, myself and an individual from the RTC, a traffic engineer, Mr. Chris Lewis. That was the three of us and then we gave the recommendation to the Director at the time.

We took in all the information from all the various committees, all the scoring. We interviewed the various committees, with counsel and with others in the room. Then we reviewed the documents and proposals. Not as extensively as each committee did in their respective areas, but we did review them and as a Committee chose, the three of us chose who we thought was the best candidate for the design-build and submitted that firm to the Director. As RTC, NDOT, which was the District and the Director's Office.

Savage: Thank you Thor, good example. Cole, back to your submittal here. This is my—I still don't understand the difference between construction and project management. Project management, what year was that initiated?

Mortensen: Project management, I believe, [inaudible] about 2007, 2006. Right around there—

Dyson: Tom Stephens was the Director at the time where he insisted that we have a project management group. We were getting these super projects coming in together. And so, he created the Project Management Division. At the time, there was four or five project managers. They would—one would get a 5% or 10% bump in pay, I believe it was 5% and they would manage the project management group, that individual and would rotate every year. There were five project managers with one leading the group effort. Those individuals had the super projects. Correct me if I'm wrong, if you remember differently, Darren or Reid,

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Sharon. The Project Management Group developed in either the late 90s or early 2000s.

Tedford: Early 2000s.

Mortensen: Where my answer is coming from is that's when Scott Rawlins created the Project Management Division itself and started developing project management guidelines and the Pioneer Program Guidelines. I don't think—they ran a lot looser back—the early project managers, basically they reported directly to the Deputy Director. It wasn't—as far as the Project Management Division, they started up in 2006 or 2007. What we do, at least within the Project Management Division, we handle the major projects. Generally speaking, that's \$100 million or more. Along with those major projects, we start to have to produce additional reporting requirements to the FHWA, annual financial plans, financial plan updates, project management plans that basically get coordinated with the FHWA. Then, along with that, we do the innovative delivery. That's all guided by our Pioneer Program Guidelines.

Under that innovative delivery group, we've got the design-build, design-build-finance, you've got CMAR. That's also where we had the authority and the guidelines for the unsolicited proposal. Because you were around for that whole process, basically. Those guidelines are set up to handle that. That may be changing here if the legislation for the P3 passes or changes. Those could be the types of things that we'll have to go back and take a look at our guidelines and make sure that we're still up to snuff with the statutes and how we can manage projects at NDOT.

Savage: Is it fair to say that the design-build-bid on those through the construction department? And CMAR all goes through project management? Is that what I heard?

Mortensen: Correct. Design-build and CMAR go through project management. Now, it's not entirely correct to say that design-bid-build goes to construction because the project manager over that major project still has the responsibility to continue that coordination and keep those financial updates going with the FHWA. Generally speaking, a good example of that would be say the I-15 South Project. It's been split into several projects, several phases. We still have a project manager over the top of that, overall program of improvements. If a phase of that project or Boulder City Bypass is another example. If a phase of that project goes out as a design-bid-build, it becomes more administrated by the District under the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Resident Engineer and Construction and Project Management. At that point in time, we tend to stay involved so we have an understanding of any change, change orders and how that impacts the federal reporting requirements.

Savage: That's fair.

Foerschler: If I can add some clarity.

Savage: Yes, Sharon.

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, for the record. Any design-bid-build, any maintenance contract that's rehabilitation and CMAR projects all run through the Construction Crews and the Construction Office.

Savage: CMAR?

Foerschler: CMAR, for payment to the contractors. The payment for design-build runs through project management through an agreement. From our world, in the Construction Division and the Districts, CMAR—the difference between CMAR and design-bid-build is the early involvement with the crews during project development. Once it goes to contract, we administer the same way we do our conventional projects.

Savage: You will administer those CMAR and design-build contracts. Design-build-bid.

Foerschler: Design-bid-build. Yes, that's correct.

Mortensen: With the CMAR we maintain as project manager, as far as coordinating, working through the contract with risk reserve items. Generally, the payment method goes through the system Construction generally uses and it kind of lends itself to it, although generally speaking the CMAR is a lump sum contract. We run it through their system and basically, when the contractor either A) hits their pay limit on a particular bid item they get paid for it and then anything above and beyond that that's their risk. Or, B) they get to the point where that particular item work is done and then they get paid for it regardless of whether or not the quantities they actually installed meet the [crosstalk]

Savage: Right. I mean, just take a job example today, the GMP Project that was awarded. Okay, GMP means Guaranteed Maximum Price. In our world, there's something called shared savings on a GMP project. I don't know if that exists in the horizontal world or not, but there's a shared savings clause. Sometimes it's 50/50. Sometimes it's 60/40. Sometimes it's 70/30. To give the contractor the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

incentive that if they save X amount of dollars, \$100,000, then that savings is shared between the—does that exist here at NDOT?

Tedford: We have value engineering proposals.

Savage: Value engineering is something different than GMP.

Hoffman: There's a risk reserve on CMAR projects.

Savage: Right, I saw that. That Guarantee Maximum Price, in my humble opinion is a lot different than Member Martin's world and my world, that that shared savings, I mean, you can actually come in under. Wow, what a thought, save some money. [crosstalk]

Mortensen: To address that, that's where we kind of have the risk reserve area, so even though you guys approved a GMP today of what, \$35 million. \$36 million. There was \$3.5 million in risk reserve in there, which means the contract may only get paid \$33 million if none of those risks are realized. They'll continue to work together to make sure that they risks they've allocated funding for don't materialize.

Savage: What I'm saying is, that \$36 million, that frees a contingency, okay, this reserve by—if it's mutually agreed upon, I don't know who controls the contingency, but out of the \$33 million contract, if their job costing and all the support documentation comes up to only \$30 million, then you save \$3 million on the project but that's not being done.

Mortensen: No, we don't have that.

Savage: Does any DOT do that?

Foerschler: Yes.

Savage: They do.

Foerschler: Yes. We talked about it last week at our partnering conference.

Savage: I think that's something we need to talk about a little bit more. It's full transparency. It's full support documentation. Yes, they charge from the truck to the No. 2 pencil down to the accountant back in the home office, but it's something I think that we should have further discussion on.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler for the record. Arizona DOT did a presentation on the way that they manage their CMAR. The DOT pays the contractor up to 100%. If more quantity is placed, they don't get compensated for that. Any quantity that doesn't reach 100%, they don't pay on. If a contracted item or say an item reaches 80% all they get is 80%, where in our administration, we say Guaranteed Maximum, we pay 100%. Regardless if they come in low, or if they come in above.
- Savage: What incentive is there to the contractor to come in lower? Rather than just not get paid. That's where that shared savings clause comes in by saying, listen, I'll share that 70/30, 60/40, 50/50, there's a carrot stick. It makes a lot of sense. I don't know if the horizontal guys do that or not, I just—Chris is here from Kiewit, maybe you can chime in. Have you seen this throughout the country, anywhere else?
- Koenig: Chris Koenig with Kiewit. It's very similar to what you're talking about. There are other states, other DOTs that administer an incentive. What's being talked about here at ADOT is really, it's a GMP but then it's more administered by unit rates. You get paid for the units you do, right. And, I mean, really what you're talking about in the end is the management and the mitigation of risk.
- Savage: Exactly.
- Koenig: And, in CMAR, the risk is much more transparent and much more shared and if the best part manage that risk, theoretically, when you agree to that pot of contingency for risk that's left over, it's been built up over risks that have potential to occur. Everyone in the room knows it. Some parties may think it's more likely than others, but in the end, you're managing to that risk contingency to hold that down. It's really two different things, right. I mean, talking about the contingency and you're talking about an incentive.
- Savage: Right. Bill, I'd like to hear from you too, if there's any thoughts. Have you guys ever run into the shared savings or the incentive side on a GMP contract?
- Wellman: Yeah, we do it quite often, with the other local entities. They all have that. The risk, as Chris talked about, very specifically it's just risk shared, what do we think. I'll give you a simple example of it. Over excavation. We have no idea what you're going to run into out there or what that geo-tech is going to want. A lot of it is subjective once we excavate, whether it's for a road bed or whether it's for a pipeline or whatever it might be. That one there is actually one that usually

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

the owner will take the burden on himself, that means you get 100% of the shared costs back.

We're doing some stuff right now in the Las Vegas Wash. We know we're going to get flooded, we just don't know how many times over the course of the project. That's crystal ball stuff. That's some shared risk, if you will. We're at risk to a certain point and then after a certain point, the owner starts taking on that risk with us. If not, that GMP starts to climb because CMAR is not the—is kind of misleading when it's says the Construction Manager at Risk. We're not taking—we're taking on the risk that we have covered and identified everything we can in the project itself and associated risks. It's not us going out and taking risks just to take risks. If we manage it appropriately, that's when the GMP comes up. If it's a risk that we should have identified and we had the means to identify it, then that risk is on us, if in fact it's in the way of gas lines. If we knew the gas line was there but we failed the pot hole, or to verify the information—we've seen that happen a lot in the past. We've also had the owner say, no don't pot hole it, just did it a few months ago and found it to be a three-foot pot. The owner picks up that cost after the fact. We see it quite often. It goes both ways.

Savage: Thank you, Bill. I would like to continue this conversation when Member Martin comes back.

Kaiser: Chairman Savage, Frank called and apologized, something came up all the sudden and won't be able to call in today.

Savage: Thank you. We'll continue some of this question on the GMP. The last question I have on the design-bid-build, versus the design-build and the CMAR, in some of the documentation, looking at the Silver Book, we use the Silver Book on the design-bid-build, but we don't use it on the design-build, is that a correct statement?

Mortensen: No.

Speaker: No.

Mortensen: No, we actually pull in part of the Silver Book in to the design-build contract. Some of the things that we have tried to allow the contractors to work around are some of the means and method specs that we have in there, to allow some of that flexibility and innovation that we're looking for in the design-build. There are portions of the 100s that we don't use and those are basically kind of the means

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

and methods] type specifications out of the Silver Book. Most of the material specs are called into the contract.

Savage: The design-build-bid, it's a hard Silver Book spec. You've got to comply.

Mortensen: Uh huh.

Savage: But there's more flexibility, you're telling me on the design-build with the Silver Book.

Mortensen: Correct.

Savage: You get to use what you want to use or how does that work?

Tedford: Darren Tedford, for the record. What we've attempted to do and its evolved ever since our first design-build project, everyone has been different. Because we started to learn and we're still learning. What we attempted to do most recently in Project NEON was we called out sections of the Silver Book that the design-builder could either follow or propose alternatives to. Those were methods. We're doing the same thing on USA Parkway.

Where it says, do this many tasks, it says, do this, do that, that's a method spec. We said, you can either follow that method spec and get the result that we want or you can choose your own method spec and still get the density as the result, in that case that we were after. We put the option in there.

Mortensen: I believe you still require approval for the proposed specs, if I'm not mistaken. The same thing goes for products that we don't have specs for. Hollow soil nails for example. If the contractor wants to use hollow soil nails which so far, we have been real excited about, if they want to come to us with their own spec for hollow soil nails we'll have them talk to us about it, run through it and then we can incorporate it in the contract.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, for the record. That issue that Darren is talking about has been one of the major problems between a lot of our conservative engineers and the design-build engineers because a lot of it is left up to engineering judgment. We've got 50-60 years of engineering judgment that we've put into our specifications and that's how we developed our specifications up to the current standards that they are. When what we think is very clear engineering judgment in our specs is not always interpreted the same on a design-build contract. Hence, that's why there's problems on some of our design-build contracts in certain respects. Because

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

engineering judgment to NDOT is not the same as engineering judgment to a consultant or to a contractor.

Savage: So, it's a work in progress.

Kaiser: It's a work in progress.

Savage: There's no black and white answer on this thing.

Mortensen: Correct.

Savage: There never will be.

Mortensen: Correct. He's absolutely right about that too, it's not only the construction industry but it's the design end of things. The last couple of design-build jobs that we've had, we've had some challenges with geotechnical engineering. You get two different geotechs out kicking rocks and tasting dirt and they come up with different ideas of what's an appropriate valued use and most of them use tables and charts and they're pulling values off. The argument that, the discussion gets inappropriate to pull value X or it tastes like a value Y. Those are some of the areas that we're trying to work on to tighten it up, so that's generally what we would expect to get.

Kaiser: Therein lies the battle. Project management wants to loosen it up. All of us conservative engineers on the design side, the materials side, we want to tighten things down because we've got all these specs written. We've developed them for the last 50-60 years, we know what works. That's—

Savage: A lot of internal debates [crosstalk]

Kaiser: There's a lot of internal debates going on.

Savage: Pedro.

Rodriguez: For the record, Pedro Rodriguez, NDOT Project Management. It is evolving. Our design-build template is evolving and getting better and stronger as we do it more and more often. One thing we should definitely consider here is, obviously this delivery method introduces both a design and build component that occurs at the same time. In this particular delivery method, we do turn over much of that risk over to the design-builder. Whereas, our design-bid-build method introduces the majority of that risk to the Department.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

There is some give and take. Obviously on the Department's side, we definitely want to be clear in regards to what we're looking for. Mention items that we won't bend on and give enough information over to the design-builder that will allow him to take on the risk and design and construct the project accordingly. I can't say it's black and white but there is give and take.

Savage: That's a good interpretation. [crosstalk] Thank you Pedro. Chris.

Martini: Mr. Chairman?

Savage: One second Mary, Chris from Kiewit is speaking.

Koenig: That's the key. Pedro hit it right on. Under design-build, the contractor is asked to take on risk. Much more risk. From a contractor's perspective, the other side of that risk mitigation is the opportunity to optimize and bring other ideas from maybe other DOTs, other experiences and we're always going to press the envelope and take it as far as we can. If your design-build program starts limiting that opportunity to optimize, from a contractor's perspective, it starts tilting that risk optimization that Pedro is talking about.

Savage: It doesn't make [inaudible], so you have to be very careful.

Koenig: Yeah.

Savage: Thank you Chris. Mary Martini, Las Vegas.

Martini: Mary Martini, District 1, for the record. I wanted to go back to your original question and maybe just talk about the mechanism by which the Silver Book may be referenced. It isn't in there totally by reference. There's nothing at the beginning of a set of technical provisions that says, references the Silver Book. Section by section, while the technical provisions are being written, they can be added. So, for the folks that are working on technical provisions, I think that's what usually brings up the debate between how much you include that's prescriptive, which is what normally is in the Silver Book versus something else. Almost all of the conversation within the Department I think are batting that pendulum back and forth. I think when we are writing the technical provisions, there may be an opportunity to miss things that are automatically covered in the Silver Book. That's been a difficulty when it gets under construction because a lot of the construction level folks like or REs, they're used to seeing it and they're going, well wait a minute, where's the provision for, fill in the blank and then you

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

go back to the technical provisions and it was never picked up from the Silver Book and put into the technical provisions. It was missed.

Mortensen: Mary, I think you're actually working off of maybe a little bit older design-build spec. Because starting with NEON, I believe its Section 26? Is it 26?

Rodriguez: Uh huh.

Mortensen: 26, we actually pull in not only NDOT standard plans but the Silver Book. Like I said, with the exception of some of the 100 clauses that basically have to deal with the way that we normally do business as far as measuring payment and that type of thing. We actually on the more recent jobs have tried to incorporate more of those in there.

Now, as we talk about the give and take on specs and what contractors are trying to bring to the table, some of the things that we're looking at are ways of helping them save on schedule. Other items along those lines. An example would be, if we spec out a bridge deck and under normal circumstances we say you're going to do X, Y, Z. And our design-builder goes out there and does X, Y and Z and we end up with a cracked bridge deck, that risk is NDOT's risk because we told them that they have to do steps X, Y and Z to get there. Whereas, if we say we want a bridge deck that doesn't have cracking, we're open to you guys using these methods. Then, if they have a cracked bridge deck, then it's their responsibility to make sure that we get a quality product in the end.

That's where the dance back and forth with the technical provisions comes. We've gone both ways. We're continually trying to improve our specs and get staff on board to try to help us do that. You have some people that either don't understand or don't like the design-build delivery method. There's often times where we've had to correct some [inaudible] that are put in there. For example, one that comes to mind almost immediately here is on the Garnet design-build. We had bridge engineers say, we don't allow a design-builder to use closed abutments. We'll the reason they said that is, if you have open abutments, you want to come in and widen it in the future, you can do a soil nail wall back and add an additional lane in each direction if you like. The bridge engineer says, no closed abutments. Only open abutments. Well, our design engineers had already included in that width an additional future lane. Basically, had a doubling up. We had somebody making concession to have an additional lane and then somebody else saying, well we need one more.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

We're constantly going back and forth with that. Each project unfortunately has different challenges. An anywhere from just the utilities and the interaction between the design-builder and the utility companies, whether or not we have the right-of-way available for them to go out and do appropriate geotechnical investigation in certain areas and how we manage that risk.

One of the examples that I can think of where we've tried to learn and grow as a Department was on NEON. We actually had a number of the contractors through our one on ones come in and say they felt that there was a huge risk involved with the utilities on that project because it's a dense urban core project. What we did is we recognized that and put together a list of every known utility that we knew that was out there and from MTP-1, we allowed them 120 days to go in and pot hole and to dig up every utility that we listed there and basically at that point in time, we asked them to put us on notice of anything that was misidentified or unidentified. We talked about mitigation methods and measures at that point in time. Essentially that was our method of sharing risk because we wanted to have the problem taken care of on the front end of the contract rather than on day 1200 of a 1300-day contract we have the contractor say, well we just hit a jet fuel gas line that's going to set us back a year and a half.

With that in /mind, it was a way of allowing the contractors to get a level of comfort with the risk that they were taking on as part of the bid and allowed us to share that risk to try to get the best, most cost-effective bid.

Koenig: Great process, by the way. It's a very—very fair. I think, in the end, I can just speak from the way we bid, it helped us with how we looked at contingency around utilities. We were easily backed off of risks that ended up not really being there and didn't cost the taxpayer anything.

One last thing, everything you're talking about is very typical of a DOT going through their first 10 years of design-build. It's very typical.

Savage: Spot on.

Koenig: Yeah.

Martini: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I've got people telling me to mute my line but I'm actually wanting to talk. I just want to put a correction in. I'm not referring to ancient technical provisions. I was referring to a conversation that we had on Garnet less

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

than four weeks ago where one of our consultants, Margo, explained the very thing that I repeated, so it is current.

Savage: Thank you Mary. One last comment, from my private experience on the design-build-bid, it's important as a Department, I think that we have that as our number one priority, to ensure that we don't get lazy internally with the CMAR and the design-build and the CMAR, there's less work for the Department to do, its more contractor. We have to be careful, I believe, in my humble opinion to maintain, to keep practicing, to keep delivering those design-build-bid projects and utilize the design-build and the CMARs.

What I've seen with other jurisdictions, it hasn't been NDOT. I want to be very clear. Because it's all about consistency and trust with the contractor. If the jurisdiction of the Department can ensure that trust, consistency and confidentiality is there, day in day out, you'll get the best price from the contractor. If the entity gets sloppy in handling the CMAR process, whether it's the valuation or whether it's the advertising or whatever it is, it has to be consistent. I think that the Department has to be well aware of the pitfalls of the CMAR and the design-build side and use it in a consistent, trustworthy, confidential delivery from the contractor, not as a CWG Member.

Mr. Controller.

Knecht: Oh, the only thought I have is, a lot of people think that the only professions that live on arguing with each other are economists and lawyers. Now we can add engineers. [laughter]

Savage: Very good. Anybody else have anything on Agenda Item No. 5?

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser for the record. One last comment. John Terry and I have lots of discussions on this very subject. We both agreed, same thing that you just said that you know, we don't want to get too many design-build projects going at the same time because they are very taxing on our NDOT staff. They take a lot of time, they take a lot of travel. We honestly would prefer to build as much as we can on the design-bid-build. It's just sometimes, a Project NEON comes along and we all agreed the best way to build that would be on a design-build. We've got to cut down the schedule as much as possible.

I think we are all on the same page with your comments, Chairman Savage, that we need to stay focused on design-build and do what's best for the taxpayer.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Savage: Exactly. Exactly. Thank you, Reid. If you could kind of keep this an ongoing conversation for Member Martin's benefit. Just keep this in the Old Business, if you could moving forward.

Kaiser: Sure.

Savage: Moving on to Agenda Item No. 6, Old Business.

Mortensen: Chairman Savage, we still have Dale and Pedro to present [crosstalk]

Savage: Oh yes, we do. [laughter] [crosstalk]

Mortensen: With that, I'll turn it over to Dale Keller.

Savage: I'm sorry, thank you Cole.

Keller: All right, Dale Keller for the record. We'll give a quick little brief—a quick update on Project NEON, where we are today. As you recall, we awarded the design-build contract to Kiewit back in November 2015. We're about a year and half in the job more or less. This is as of April 1<sup>st</sup>. All these figures will be to April 1<sup>st</sup>. This is a calendar day contract. We are roughly over 500 days of our over 1300-day contract. That puts us right around 37% complete for contractual days. We're a third of the way done with Project NEON for a calendar year contract.

With this though, the contract, Kiewit, has earned roughly 27% of that contract. They've earned \$162 million. You maybe noted from the previous slide that more contractual days have been expended, more than what the value has been earned. The main reason of that is if you look on the bottom left of the screen, design is [inaudible]. The real money is in the construction and as you can tell, we're only 15% done with construction.

We're on schedule. That's always been the plan. Roughly the first year, get done with finalizing design and then really have a very condensed construction schedule. As we go through a couple of these slides, you'll see that the earned value will definitely catch up and surpass the number of working days there for that percentage wise.

Knecht: Dale, quick question on that.

Keller: Yes sir.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Knecht: When you have spent to date of 27% and 94% on design and 15% on construction, since you point out construction is what costs, are we basically on schedule in terms of spending and progress on design and construction or ahead or behind or you can't say?

Keller: Big picture is, we are on schedule. As you can tell, there's a lot of work left to be done and to be performed and do. With this Project NEON has a lot of these interim milestone completion and have incentives associated with it. There's projects within projects. Right now, we're impacting US-95, there's 300 days to get that work done. There's roughly a \$6 million incentive associated with that. That's a project within a project. That just kicked off a few weeks ago. That really started to really ramp up construction as well as some other work on the left side.

Big picture, yes we're on schedule. As a Department, do we know there's—we should have more work done on some of the side streets, maybe so. The real answer, some key check and time periods. One is when we get done with that 300 days. The next will be that March of 2018, when we start impacting the I-15. A lot of work has to happen in order to get to some of these interim milestones. We're hitting all of our interim milestones, so big picture, we're on schedule.

Knecht: Thank you.

Keller: Here's our earned value curve and chart. The yellow area is what's in our approved baseline schedule. We have these activities that are cost loaded and that's how we can project all the way out to the completion of the job which is around, our substantial completion is Summer of 2019. The blue is what they earn on a monthly basis. As you can tell, for the next six-months, they're projected to earn over about \$20 million. Once again, there's a lot of action happening, a lot of costs associated with that construction.

Then once again, it starts to kick back, spike back up there in March of 2018. I know Kiewit is trying to do their best to even out of some of those spikes, but this is what we're showing on our approved baseline schedule as we progress with Project NEON.

Change Order Status to date. We have executed roughly 15 change orders, totaling over \$11 million out of the \$559 million contract. That's roughly less than 2% of contractual value. I know FHWA has that in measures per year about what they look to, any indicators that the project might be off track and I believe

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

that is the value, 2%. We're under that 2%. Right there in contractual change orders. As you can tell, the second column on the right is regarding who initiated that change order. A lot of these are the owner directed change orders. Either from NDOT or the City of Las Vegas. I'd like to point out, the City of Las Vegas, through our cooperative agreement has roughly a \$5 million contingency associated with it. They can go ask NDOT or direct NDOT, we would like to get this work done and incorporate that as part of Project NEON. That's what's listed there as assumed responsibilities.

Savage: That's a very important column. You don't see one change order that the contractor initiated.

Keller: If you take a look at, for example, No. 4, on Sales Tax Increase. You take a look at some things, we talked about shared risk in our contract, if the sales taxes increase in Clark County then NDOT would pay and cover that. We put a pot of money that they're pulling out through \$150,000 to draw from, from that sales tax and they have to provide receipts showing that additional increase in that cost. Also, we talked about utility costs. For example, Century Link, additional costs. There was a scope of work that wasn't identified in the project. We said, yes that makes sense and we incorporated that as a change order.

As you walk through some of this—you also talked about opportunity. In design-build, there is opportunity to have done. If you take a look at No. 6, Pavement. [inaudible] same for valued engineering. With that, we looked at some of the local streets that we can find a better way of doing some of pavement after we got buy-in from FHWA on some of the local street facilities. Once again, that's a shared value. Half of that—the total value of that was roughly \$200,000. We got half as the Department, Kiewit got the other half. There is value in the design-build projects as well.

Savage: Thanks Dale.

Wellman: Can I ask, just out of curiosity, your sales tax, that's not exempted?

Keller: That increase of sales tax occurred after the setting date when the proposals were due. Part of that was in—I don't know, that's a good question for what exactly—

Wellman: When we do it—once the project is bid, then it stays at that sales tax rate perpetually until its completed. That's just our—you know—not that Clark County can't use the sales tax.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Keller: That increase came in after the fact. It was approved by, I believe, I want to say the Legislature in 2015. Didn't go into effect until that January 1<sup>st</sup>. As we look back into that, from our setting date—the setting date for the design-build contract is when the contractor can actually use that date and put their proposal together. That didn't get approved until after that setting date.
- Wellman: One I think just came on, I know it's exempt. We just got a new sales tax in Clark County again, for the more cops. That would be exempt.
- Keller: I'll take a look into that. I'll have to get back to you there.
- Savage: Because in our world, I mean, when we bid a project, we have to bid it through the term of the project and incorporate all taxes and wage increases and everything else. You guys are [crosstalk]
- Wellman: Revailing wage is set too. Prevailing wage is set for the duration.
- Savage: If there's a union increase—
- Wellman: Unions, yes.
- Savage: That's the contractor's responsibility.
- Wellman: [crosstalk] Correct.
- Savage: And if there's a tax increase—so, anyway, it's something to look into. Thanks Dave. Thank you Bill.
- Knecht: Mr. Chairman. The biggest item on there is sub-structural bridge resolution. Can you give us some background on that real quickly?
- Keller: Cole mentioned, if you have a [inaudible] in the room, Geotech in the room, you really get three opinions. As we walk through this design—through the design process all year, we saw eye-to-eye on every item except for substructure and geotechnical drill shafts. This is our battle with the contractual engineers. What this did was found common ground on assets to the Department, contracting the contract or incorporate certain elements in the design. There's a figure and I'm sure Chris can talk about this even more is that where if they want to use local opportunity, maybe use across the country in different entities and different State DOTs or Canada, you name it, that they felt they had onus to include that opportunity in the contract. From us in the Department, we felt that, no, here's some of the guidelines that we want to install and direct you to use.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Out of all these change orders, this one was the most work all the way from my level, all the way up to the Director's Office and back down about finding a solution that works best for the project. What's included here is win-win for the Department and for the contractor, for a couple of reasons. First, it was a solution that our engineers and our geotechs could agree upon and knew that it was a fair solution. Second, it did not delay the project or the schedule. With those two events in mind, we actually work together to find ways to say we have, I forget how many different bridge [inaudible], 10 that we can still move forward some of the design without delaying design, without delaying the project. As we talk through our partnering, other aspects, this was actually a very beneficial for both sides. Even though it cost the Department and taxpayer's more.

Knecht: Thank you.

Keller: With that, I'll be happy to answer any other questions about Project NEON. That's a very high-level overview. I know some of the quarterly Board updates with Project NEON has a lot more information where we are. Director Malfabon mentioned today about turning over all the right-of-way. On time or if not early. That's been a huge success on the Department that cannot be underplayed at all. A lot of effort that went into the Right-of-Way Group and the Director's Office as well. That's a tremendous success. That gets us—we talk about risk transfer, well that's [inaudible]

Savage: That's really a big deal because the contractor has his terms and if we can't [inaudible] then we're responsible. I thank you again Dennis. I think Ruth Borelli. Of course, thank you Dale and Project Management for staying on top of things down there.

Rodriguez: For the record, Pedro Rodriguez, NDOT Project Manager. Similar to what they all went through, I'll just give you a real quick high-level view of USA Parkway. We've had a lot of success with this project being a design-build.

Here are some general timeframes. As you recall, we elected to give the design-builder the notice to proceed, pursuant to Board approval in January. We worked diligently to put together all our documentation and quality plans in place to allow them to move forward with a second notice to proceed in April. As of now, substantial completion is still set for the contract of September 9<sup>th</sup>. In fact, it's moved up and we anticipate completing the project by September 1<sup>st</sup>. 92% of the design is already complete. I'll show you a chart there kind of explaining that. I have more updated numbers in regards to the construction status. We're actually

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

about 64% complete. I'll show you more on that as well. Schedule status, as of now, we're looking at about 74% complete of contract days. Costs were expended at about 60%.

Our design status, these are the different packages we have for USA Parkway. We have that last design unit there for the sculpture that's going to go in on the northern part of the project. That actually just came in last week and we expect to have that up to the 90% level this Wednesday. In essence, a next step on this would be to conform the plan set and then have a submittal there for final. There really isn't much more left to do, other than to put together your ASPO Plans pursuant to the construction completion.

Construction, as I mentioned before, they're at the bottom. We're actually more about 64% complete. The first area, the paved area within USA Parkway or the most northern part of the project, where it reads Work Area 1 Intersections. The only piece of work left to do there is the insulation of the sculpture which is being fabricated now. The rest of the project, it is moving forward well. We've reached our connection point there at USA 50 and if I can add here too that the earthwork on the project is at about 90% complete. We're in essence, waiting for some good weather to pave.

Right-of-Way has been completed. That's been completed for quite a while now. All advanced utility adjustments pursuant to the contract has also been completed. The other thing I want to mention, real quickly here regarding the construction is a part from the 64% complete on the project and mind you, these numbers are changing daily because Ames is moving forward pretty quickly. We've had change orders that have been introduced to the project. 30% of the change order work is complete and maybe more so today.

Savage: The largest change order was that conduit and ITS vault.

Rodriguez: That's correct. And 30-40% of that insulation is complete.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser for the record. What that conduit and vault installation is, as most people know, there's a fiber company out there and there's a big push right now by the Governor to install fiber statewide. In fact, there's a couple of bills in Legislature right now to do that. One way we could get fiber to this area is by installing the conduit and the boxes/vaults on this project. That's what this change order takes care of, it installs conduit and vaults from US-50. Does it go all the way up to I-80, Pedro, or just up to—

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Rodriguez: It goes into the paved section where Switch already has facilities in place.
- Savage: It was good timing, really. It's a cost savings. You can't see that cost savings, but just imagine if that stood on its own, what that would cost.
- Rodriguez: That's correct. And, maybe going into a little bit more of the details. Here's a quick look at our change orders on the project. We have a couple of pages on that. As you can see there, the impacts on the schedule of the project, the design-builder has been well aware as to when we, the Department, would like this project to be completed. Essentially completed and open to the public. None of these change orders have any impacts to the schedule.
- The major change order, as we were discussing here is the Change Order 9 there which is the insulation of the conduits for future fiber optic installation. That \$4.6 million constitutes, again, the 6% of the 7% of total change orders on the project, Department directed.
- Knecht: You said that's 30-40%--
- Rodriguez: As of last week, the insulation of that change order work is 30-40% installed.
- Knecht: Thank you.
- Rodriguez: And mind you, this was one of our later change orders that was introduced on the project but our design-builder was adamant that they'll get that included in the project without any additional time.
- With that, I guess I can take any questions you guys might have.
- Savage: I'd just like to compliment you, Pedro and Sam, since you're here. Everyone from NDOT and as well as the contractor. I mean, it was a high-risk project. We had one heck of a winter. We persevered. It looks like—or, it sounds like you can see the light at the end of the tunnel.
- Rodriguez: We're excited, yes.
- Savage: You're excited. You never know. I appreciate all that's been done from the Department's standpoint, as well as the Contractor's standpoint.
- Rodriguez: We appreciate that for sure. I can definitely say that this project has a lot of people in the background. It's involvement from all Divisions from the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Department, obviously working hand-in-hand with our Construction Division, as well as the design-builder has a lot to say in the success of the project.

Savage: The question I have of the consultants, how are the consultants doing?

Rodriguez: Our consultants are doing great. Both our crew augmentation is on top of things, as well as our design consultants that are assisting us with the review of the project.

Savage: Good to hear. Thank you. Anybody else? Moving on. Now we'll close Agenda Item No. 5. Moving on to Agenda Item No. 6. Reid Kaiser.

Kaiser: Okay. I'll march down through the items on Item 6. The first one is Contractor Prequalification. We went live April 1<sup>st</sup> with our new Contractor Past Performance Rating. We did send it out to the AGC in the North and also the AGC in the South and we received no comments. It's out there and we're using it.

Savage: Everything is perfect.

Kaiser: Everything is perfect.

[crosstalk and laughter]

Savage: I'm glad Reid was laughing at that.

Kaiser: Item No. 2, NDOT DBE Process and Work Force Development. We've had a lot of discussions already about work force development. I also know just from spending some time at the Legislature this morning, their struggle statewide with the laborers/operators work force [inaudible] also.

I'm going to give a little update for Tracy here. Tracy did receive an award from the Urban Chamber which is the African-American Chamber for promoting small businesses and women. Two plus years ago, NDOT did not have a good relationship with this entity and it's through the efforts and the work of our Civil Rights Team that we were recognized. Kudos to Tracy and her group for turning us around in this area.

Savage: Yes, thank you Tracy.

Kaiser: Okay. The applications for the DBE/SB certification have been steady so far this year. There's been 57 new applications in 2016 and six so far in 2017. 37

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

interstate applications and three so far in 2017. The DBE supportive services program is very active in 2016. Two RFPs for NDOT's new DBE Supportive Services for 2017 will go out in the few weeks. Outreach, the external Civil Rights staff have attended 21 outreach events in 2016.

Project NEON is moving forward with work being completed in the construction phase of the project. Kiewit continues to recruit DBE firms for the construction phase and has been successful in identifying and contracting with various DBE firms. They're currently on target for achieving their DBE goal.

That is all I have for Item No. 2. Do you have any questions for Item No. 2? They should probably be fairly shallow because I'm not real schooled in this area.

Okay, Item 3, As-Builts. NDOT's contractor on this contract, Aggregate Industries is moving forward. They've been working with our consultant RE in preparing their As-builts. This is a project in Las Vegas, on Las Vegas Boulevard in North Las Vegas. Our consultant RE has been working with Aggregate Industries in preparing their As-builts. We'll see how that turns out.

Okay, Item No. 4, CMAR Change Orders and Agreements. We have four active CMAR projects. One on Charleston Boulevard, down in Las Vegas, that is in its infancy so it's just beginning. Verdi Bridges, we've got the Tropicana Escalators and the Bike Path up at Lake Tahoe. Do you have any questions in regards to that? I think there is one change order on the escalators for some janitorial services that the District is going to take over.

Savage: The District? I thought we were giving the whole escalator project over to the Convention Authority or Las Vegas. I didn't think [crosstalk]

Kaiser: Well, we are at the end of the project. From what I understand and Cole could probably—

Mortensen: I believe this is just in the interim.

Kaiser: This is just the interim to the end of the project.

Savage: How long—where are we on this project?

Mortensen: Unfortunately, this is one that's under Lynnette, so I haven't had a whole lot of exposure to it but I believe that we've gotten some of them installed. I know we were accelerating it based on requests from stakeholders there. I can certainly get that information.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Martini: I can give you an update if you'd like.

Savage: Is it done? Is it done? [laughter]

Martini: Sorry, it's not. This is Mary Martini, District 1, for the record. The status right now on the Tropicana Bridges is the one is complete and the work is continuing corner by corner. The agreement is that we will turn over the project when complete to Clark County Public Works. Clark County Public Works has been very adamant that they do not want to have it piecemeal. They want to see a completed project, so we're about 35-40% finished with the project. It is a CMAR. The current issues that are going on regard some of the work that was not in the original scope and yet which is turning out to be needing to be fixed. Maybe a preview of coming attractions. We are still on track to be finished by the end of next year. Our costs are on track to be at about \$30 million and there's about a \$5 million risk reserve, don't hold me too close to those numbers. I know they're more refined, I don't have that information in front of me.

Savage: Is the \$5 million risk reserve in the \$30 million?

Martini: No, it isn't.

Savage: Okay.

Martini: The agreement with Clark County has gone back and forth a couple of times for review. We're still hoping to be able to transfer them to the Clark County as we're finished. There were a lot of details around the warranty that are currently being worked out.

Savage: Thank you Mary. Reid?

Kaiser: Any more questions on CMAR Change Orders and Agreements?

Savage: None here.

Kaiser: Hearing none, we'll move on to Item No. 6, our Resident Engineer's Project Assignments. You guys have any questions in regards to our RE's assignments so we can answer them. Right now, most of the REs are located in Las Vegas. One is up in Tonopah working on two projects. The District 2 projects or REs. We have one RE which is working out in the desert. One is at USA Parkway. One is in Carson. One is in Reno and one is in Tahoe. We have a scattering of consultants all over the place.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Savage: Very quickly, what I noticed, I like—this is a new add to this packet. I noticed District 2's graphic. I'm a visual guy, so you can automatically see which RE has got work stacked. Versus the D1, everybody is pretty flat. I don't know, maybe I'm overanalyzing this but to me, it was very informative. I'd just like to see—and then D3 didn't have any graph. It would just be nice moving forward that we all use the same format in all three Districts.

Kaiser: I think District 1 and District 2's format is the same, I just believe the projects are so big in District 1 that each RE really only has one project assigned to it. District 2's projects seem to be a little bit smaller, dollar wise, a lot of betterments, maybe a lot of chip seals and stuff, projects like that. They can handle a lot more projects.

Savage: In my experience, whether it's small or big, the smaller projects a lot of times take as much time and effort as the larger projects, to some point.

Kaiser: They do on the paperwork side. Sometimes you can get away with less manpower on the smaller projects. Thor, got any comments?

Dyson: Well, the small projects are painful because they're small and they have the same amount of paperwork as the big projects. Even though they're smaller, you might only put one or two inspectors on them there are some days when the contractor on the small project will have a ton of questions or possibly cause a lot of problems with traffic control or some other—so, it does take time of the RE. We're happy to change the graphics.

[crosstalk and laughter]

Kaiser: Your graphics are fine. I'll work—we had one person prepare them all. I'll just talk to the guy and make sure that we get some more graphics, I believe on the District 3 showing what work they have going on at this time.

Savage: Just some uniformity so it's a quick snapshot.

Dyson: District 3 is in transition too. Kevin is not there.

[crosstalk]

Kaiser: Yeah, District 3 is in a state of transition because two of the people who will be working for one of our consultants just east of Fernley just retired from District 3 this last fall. District 3 is definitely a work in progress right now.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Dyson: We can help out too, with District 3. [inaudible] You Sharon, in District 3, can help out.

Foerschler: Well we have a pretty good—Sharon Foerschler for the record. A pretty good finger on the pulse of what's going on because we have to manage where the construction crews in the districts, the consultant program to help with the workload. And we also generate the budgets for all the travel and per diem. We have a pretty good idea in our office when contracts are going to be under construction. We will get you that information.

Savage: Sounds great.

Foerschler: We'll work with Reid to accommodate your request.

Kaiser: Thank you.

Savage: I had a question on 3580.

Kaiser: Boulder City, District 1.

Savage: And NEON.

Kaiser: Those are both on the second page of District 1, so Page 2 of 2. Martin [inaudible] he has NEON. Tim [inaudible] has Boulder City.

Savage: One is a design-build-bid on 3580?

Kaiser: Yes, design-bid-build.

Savage: On 3580.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: Okay. And, [inaudible] Okay. Go ahead, I don't have any more questions on that.

Kaiser: Okay. Unbalanced Bidding, Item No. 7, nothing new to report. Item No. 8, Construction and Project Management Division Agreements. Are there any questions associated with these two spreadsheets? We tried to work together and make the spreadsheets the same, so that they're easy to follow.

Savage: I'll tell you, this is the first run at this.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Savage: Again, this is a work in progress. I thought it was a good first attempt and we'll just keep the format improving and more consistent. A couple of questions very quickly. On the second page, for example, CH2M Hill, there's no dollar value there.
- Kaiser: I think that's probably my mistake, when I printed this thing out. I thought I caught all of those. I monkeyed with this a lot to try and get the margins wide enough so that the number would print. I think I'll take the blame for that one.
- Savage: Oh, I don't know about that.
- Kaiser: The spreadsheet they sent me, it did show the numbers but when you're trying to get them on one page so that you can also read them. [laughter] It sounds like a job for Claudia next time.
- Knecht: It sounds like a job for eliminating the cents in those listings.
- Kaiser: Good call.
- Savage: Also, I didn't see the NOA Consultant. The Natural Occurring Asbestos. Maybe I missed it.
- Kaiser: CDM Smith?
- Savage: Oh, CDM Smith.
- Kaiser: They are probably under the DCS Agreement for—
- Savage: I thought it was Terra something.
- Kaiser: They came—I believe they came up with the specifications and the design package.
- Savage: Oh, CDM Smith is the—
- Kaiser: CDM Smith—
- Foerschler: CDM Smith is on—
- Kaiser: They're on the first spreadsheet.
- Foerschler: 3580.
- Kaiser: Yeah, they actually are listed on the first spreadsheet.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Foerschler: TerraCon was hired through environmental services, so you wouldn't see them on the project management.

Savage: Okay.

[crosstalk]

Tedford: Yeah, you're not looking at environmental agreements, that's why you don't see them.

Savage: Okay. I think that's a good first run. We can improve the years and a few other things, but I think it's a real good—it's going to be a real good tool.

Kaiser: Now, do you want to see these every quarter? They're quite a bit of work to put together and you're probably not going to see a whole lot of change every quarter. If we could, I'd like to present them every six months.

Savage: Semi-annually?

Kaiser: Is that okay?

Savage: That sounds good.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: I do refer to the CWG now and I am going to say it again, the Construction Work Group and the Consulting Work Group. There's only a few of us left here, for whoever cares, the consultants all left.

Foerschler: So, if I can float Construction Division for a minute, we do keep ours updated monthly, so if you ever need it, just ask.

Savage: Thank you very much.

Dyson: And, from the District standpoint, which I think this is modeled after, what Rick Bosch put together, we do it weekly. Well, I should say—when we see a major—when Thursday shows up and the apparent low bidders come in, we update it.

Savage: That's good, thank you Thor. Reid?

Kaiser: Okay. Item 6B, this has a list of projects—or, excuse me, not projects, meeting we attended and most of them are just AGC Meetings. Keeping contractors up to speed with what we have going on within the Department. There's been a lot of

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

discussions regarding Legislature and what we have going on there. There's been a lot of discussion with work force development. Tracy has been spearheading quarterly meetings with Committees to spearhead not only promoting the unions to hire people but also project managers to go to work for contractors. They're trying to get a degree from either UNLV or UNR that would allow contractors to hire project managers from within Nevada.

Savage: Nice.

Kaiser: It's good. It's a good program.

Savage: It's a real good program and I thank Tracy and everyone at NDOT. Quick question, does our PIO Office get involved in any of these work force issues or are they strictly staying out ahead of the construction?

Kaiser: For the most part, they don't get involved in the work force development.

Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Our HR Office, years ago, got involved in marketing, working with high school students, universities. Not so much with the contracting community, but when you have engineers coming out of—or students in elementary and high school and college, some of them will go to the contracting community and work. HR, Rob Easton, Kimberley King, those individuals did some ancillary work force development if you will.

Savage: That's good. It will be interesting to see what Ms. Wall comes up to next time. Thank you Thor. Reid?

Kaiser: Okay. That finishes Item No. 6.

Knecht: Question on 6B, Page 5 of 8. That's an NRS section, [inaudible] attached to the agenda for December 13<sup>th</sup>. Have we run into problems, like the waters at the US problems with that definition or have we not had to confront that?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher. To my knowledge, we haven't had any problems with it. At least not that have been directed to my attention.

Kaiser: I think why that item was on there was there's a new administrator in NDEP and he was interpreting the law a certain way. I think there was a conflict with what the previous administrator had interpreted it. That item was to talk it over with the contractors and we actually—Dave Gaskin used to work over at NDEP and he got it straightened out.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Knecht: My observation, as a non-Bar Member, JD is that, this is one of those things where especially Section 2 there, basically leaves to the ‘as applied’ review by courts. When you get a new guy applying it differently, that’s when you possibly run into trouble. I’m glad to hear we don’t have—
- Kaiser: We straightened it out.
- Knecht: --those problems with that.
- Kaiser: Okay, Item 7, Projects Under Development. This is our five-year project plan. Usually John Terry gives a little schpeal on this item. John is not here. Do you guys have any questions, we’ll see if we can answer them.
- Savage: We’re good.
- Foerschler: Well, after the winter, you may see Page 2 which are the 3R projects, moved around a little bit.
- Savage: I had some questions but I think I’ll save it for the June Meeting.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson for the record. Back to the contract list, for the three districts, the construction contracts. I don’t believe that showed any of the emergency contracts that we did.
- Savage: It doesn’t.
- Dyson: I happen to have it here for District 2, a list of, I think it was either 23 or 25 emergency contracts in District 2 alone, ongoing. A couple of them have been completed but this is on top of what we have on the documents that Reid collected from all three districts with Sharon’s help. I just want to point out, we’re pretty overloaded with emergency work and regular planned construction work. I’m happy to provide this to you if you want.
- Kaiser: Thor—Reid Kaiser for the record. Do you have—do the emergency contracts take the same amount of documentation?
- Dyson: Well, we’re doing time and materials. A lot of them have a fair amount of documentation in regards to the forced account procedures that we have to follow. We still have to enter them into the pay estimates or no, those are agreements, right. They don’t have four-digit contract numbers. It’s a little bit less, but

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

nonetheless, it still takes away some people, some inspectors and assistant RE. Sam can, if he were here, he could explain to you how much time he spent the last 2-3 months doing emergency contracts. Which you know, he's unable to prepare and really stay on top of his normal contract work.

Savage: Thank you Thor. We'll probably see that, those dollars at the next T-Board Meeting, I would imagine. Rather than objecting those at this time, we'll hold out, but thank you.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, for the record. Robert Nellis has a lot of those projects listed in his small agreements under \$300,000. A lot of those emergency projects are listed.

Savage: Yeah. We saw some of those. My only question was on Page 8 of 10, the landscape and aesthetics. All of the budgets are either \$1.9 million or \$2.9 million, so I have some question on those. Then also on the Damonte, the \$1.6 million, I remember that it was \$1 million. I don't know how it jumped to \$1.6 million. I remember Damonte and South Meadows were each \$1 million. We'll want to look at that and maybe have an answer next CWG Meeting.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: The budgets are questionable to me.

Dyson: Thor Dyson, are those the landscape—those are the landscape budgets.

Savage: All being \$1 million or \$2 million.

Dyson: Those seem to have changed. They seem to be fluid.

Foerschler: I've got a processing memo for those two. I want to say one was \$1.6 million and was \$675,000, something like that.

Savage: I remember the budget was \$1 million for Damonte and I see the \$1.6 so I'm concerned about that.

Kaiser: I will let John know.

Foerschler: I think we all remember a contract that was out that we decreased the scope on to keep the dollars down, on the [crosstalk] project.

Savage: Yes.

Foerschler: [crosstalk] Chairman of the Board.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Savage: That's all I have at this time, Reid.
- Kaiser: Okay. Moving on to Agenda Item No. 8, Project Closeout Status. We closed out eight projects this past quarter with 3292 being among them. Good job Thor and your staff and the Construction Office. I'm sure that was a monumental task, closing out that project.
- Savage: Yes, that's very good news. Sharon, Steven, Thor. Everybody, thank you.
- Foerschler: It's our pleasure. [laughter] You will notice the contract closeout schedule has increased in size. I just want to point out that that's indicative of the size of our program. Our staff now, running electronic documentation in closing out our projects, we decreased the time of closeout. Once we get it from the crews to do the independent audit by 70-80%.
- Savage: That's huge.
- Foerschler: Yeah. Although there's a lot of projects on there, I'd just like to note it's just indicative of the large work program we have going on right now.
- Savage: And kudos to you, Sharon, Steven, in the Construction Division. It's a breath of fresh air. I made mention of that at the last Board Meeting in March.
- Kaiser: I second it.
- Savage: But, Reid, and yourself as well. It's everybody.
- Foerschler: It's a team effort.
- Savage: And this is where you see it. Now we're harvesting [inaudible] by saying, let's [inaudible] project closeout. Thank you.
- Kaiser: Are there any questions on Agenda Item 8A, B, Summary of Projects Closed. Item C, projects closed, the detail sheets?
- Savage: I just comment, again, the formatting is nicely simple. It's very transparent. It's easy to look at. Good snapshots. I mean, I think we're getting [inaudible] I appreciate it.
- Kaiser: Item 8D, Status of Active Projects.
- Foerschler: I would like to point something out for your attention. Sharon Foerschler for the record. With our new electronic documentation system, the way the system

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

reports had led us down a path and back up it and down again about three or four times because the data that we used to be able to capture in our Legacy System is different than what we capture now. You may notice that the column, we dropped Updated Contract Value. I think that's what we called it, right Steve?

Lani: Yeah.

Foerschler: Because what we were pulling out of our electronic system was not indicative of updated contract values. What it did was, it would pull all the contingencies, whether they were spent or not. It would pull information that skewed the data. If you compare this spreadsheet to what you saw at our last meeting, you might notice that change. I just wanted to bring that to your attention. We still show the budget. We still show what was bid. We show contract modification amount and then payment date.

Savage: That makes good sense.

Foerschler: Just so you're aware.

Savage: Thank you Sharon.

Foerschler: You're welcome.

Savage: So, are we going downhill or uphill?

Foerschler: No, we're doing good. Doing really good. [laughter] We're doing good. It just took us a while looking at the data going, that doesn't quite make sense. Why doesn't it make sense? There were many hours spent with all of us talking about what this data really meant and what it didn't mean.

Savage: Good. Thank you Sharon.

Foerschler: You're welcome.

Savage: Reid.

Kaiser: Okay. If there are no questions in regards to our status of active projects, our next item 8E, we just finished having our National Partnering Institute Meeting, which I was able to attend one day. I really enjoyed it. Listened to some really good presentations. Sharon, Steve, you guys were there, any comments?

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler for the record. I would like to say, this was an agreement that was on the Board for informational only back late in 2015. There was a lot of

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

discussion, this was money given to the Department by FHWA to do this sort of research project that included a one-day conference. That was originally scheduled for September of last year and we had a lot of trouble getting other DOTs to attend because there's limited out of state travel.

You saw an amendment to that agreement back in November/December, maybe you didn't see it until January, that brought the dollar value right up under the \$300,000 and that was to accommodate the travel for other DOTs. We had about 110 people signed up. We probably had close to 100 show up. We had representatives from across the nation. FHWA had quite a few people there and we did a half day on Tuesday that were two training modules. People could select what they wanted to listen to. Then we had an all-day on Wednesday. Then a half day on Thursday. They got a lot of good feedback. I believe it went well.

What I would like to mention, I was a little bit disturbed with was they had one local contractor attend. We reached out for a number of months and a number of platforms to get as many contractors there as we could and it was discouraging to only see one local contractor. We feel like we're making or we're continuing in our efforts in partnering. I don't know if it was a case of emergency work or why we didn't have more presence from Nevada Contractors, that would've been nice to see.

Savage: Yeah, that's unfortunate.

Foerschler: Yeah. We're glad—we said, we checked that off. That was a lot of work to put that on. We appreciated FHWA's assistance with that. We had a consultant on board that helped put it all together. I think it went over well, I think.

Savage: That's good to hear. I know the Board was concerned about it. I do thank the FHWA for helping us in a successful [inaudible]

Lani: Steven Lani for the record. The project was not entirely done yet. While the conference is over, there's a toolbox and an assembly of lessons learned, as well as a compilation of the survey data and elements of effective partnering programs from throughout the nation that are being compiled as part of this project. When that is complete, that should help bring us to the end of the agreement as a whole. The conference was one of the intermediate steps along the way.

Savage: Nice. Thank you Steven. Mr. Kaiser.

Kaiser: That is all I have.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

- Savage: Okay. Agenda Item No. 9, Public Comment. Any public comment here in Carson City or Las Vegas?
- Martini: None in Las Vegas.
- Novak: I've got one for you. You can guys can hire. We have a hiring freeze going on for the time being. With the change of administration, but that's not abnormal. We will be hiring federal employees sooner or later.
- Savage: Okay, that's—we don't know when that's going to be resolved?
- Novak: Nope.
- Foerschler: I have a little something for your approval. Mr. Lani is somewhat of a celebrity. He did an interview with—what's the Editor of—a news reporter took her out on the Carson Freeway and gave her a briefing on how NDOT has changed and whatnot. I haven't read it yet. He put it on my desk this morning. [crosstalk and laughter] I thought you might enjoy seeing that. He's quoted in it and he's passionate about his life with NDOT, you'll find it an interesting read.
- Savage: Yeah, on Page 4. Sharon Foerschler is the best boss I've ever had. [laughter] Okay.
- Kaiser: Yeah, Steve grew up in Austin, Nevada. His dad was a maintenance foreman there.
- Savage: Nice.
- Kaiser: Yeah, how many people you know come from Austin?
- Savage: It's a beautiful area.
- Lani: She made me feel old when she said, the Department is 100 years old and you've been here for a quarter of that.
- Savage: Well, thank you Steven. All right, are there any other public comments? Agenda Item No. 10, Closed Session. There's probably no need for a closed session.
- Gallagher: There's no need for a closed session. There's been no changes in our construction litigation. Now that this group has taken over consulting responsibilities, we'll have to add to that.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Construction Work Group Meeting  
April 10, 2017

Kaiser: I would like to say one comment, you know, there was this issue with AVAR and they were suing the Department from the I-580, from the Galina Creek Bridge, that project. One of Pierre's last projects was—

Gallagher: He was working on what's called a Motion for Summary Judgment. He got too ill to go argue it so another Deputy went down to argue it. The Court heard it on a Friday, issued its opinion on Monday and Pierre was still pretty alert at that point in time, so he knew he had won that motion. It was really great to be able—we sent the—somebody from District 2, Thor, was it you?

Dyson: Yeah, I took it up.

Gallagher: Yeah, hand carried up and delivered it to Pierre. It was—

Dyson: He was pretty fired up.

Savage: That's quite special.

[crosstalk]

Dyson: He went out a winner just like he was eluding to.

Savage: We'll miss him dearly.

Knecht: He'd gone out a winner even without that victory. Once in a lifetime thing.

Savage: May he rest in peace. I'll take a motion for adjournment.

Knecht: So moved.

Savage: Second. Thank you everyone.

Dyson: Wait, the Motorola guy has a comment. [laughter]

[end of meeting]

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 01: NDOT DBE Process and Workforce Development  
**Start Date:** Monday, November 10, 2014  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 2017

**Status:** Not Started  
**Percent Complete:** 0%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

June 2017: Nothing new to report.

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 02: As-Builts  
**Start Date:** Monday, September 14, 2015  
**Due Date:** Monday, June 12, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 75%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

June 12, 2017: As of May 19 we are at working day 137 of 300. RE is meeting monthly with the contractor to discuss progress they are making in preparing the as-builts for this project.

March 13, 2017: NDOT's contractor Aggregate Industries had an NTP of October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2016. As of January 30 we are at working day 64 so approximately 20% of the Contract time (300 WD contract) is over. RE has been discussing with the contractor the As Built plans on a weekly basis and they are working on process to document what is needed in the final set.

September 13, 2016: Contract 3619R, SR604 Las Vegas Blvd, should be up for NDOT Board approval in September.

## Kaiser, Reid G

---

**Subject:** Item 03: CMAR Change Orders and Agreements  
**Start Date:** Monday, March 2, 2015  
**Due Date:** Monday, June 12, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 50%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

June 12, 2017 (changes highlighted in yellow)

- Discussion item from April 10, 2017 CWG regarding Shared Savings on CMAR projects.

NDOT has 4 active contracts

VVVV – Charleston Blvd.

- Contractor – Granite Construction Company – PCS Agreement \$685,900 (NEPA - \$193,700)

3614 - Verdi Bridges

- Stanley Consultants (ICE Teams) - \$202,398.59 + ICE Consultants - \$144,614.00 (Total \$347,013)
- Contractor – Granite Construction Company - \$398,000 + \$2,554,554.00 (GMP1)

EA73824 – Tropicana Escalators

- ICE – The Atkins Group - \$209,976.64 + \$86,491.00 + \$68,536.93
- Contractor – The Whiting-Turner - \$289,911.0 + \$537,000.00 + \$30,463,209.00 (GMP) - \$160,000 (change order for Janitorial services that will be handled by District Staff)
- Design - Jacobs - \$1,300,000 + \$697,550
- LVCVA – \$19,612,863 (funding agreement)

SR28 – Bike Path (FLAP project)

- ICE – Stanley Consultants (ICE Teams) - \$338.686
- Contractor – Granite Construction Company - \$586,205 + \$4,331,331.00 (GMP#1) + \$36,177,177.00 (GMP#2)

March 13, 2017 (changes highlighted in yellow)

NDOT has 4 active CMAR Projects and one change order to report.

VVVV – Charleston Blvd.

3614 - Verdi Bridges

- ICE – Stanley Consultants (ICE Teams) - \$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) - \$160,000 (change order for Janitorial services that will be handled by District Staff)
- Design - Jacobs - \$1,300,000 + \$697,550
- LVCVA – \$19,612,863 (funding agreement)

SR28 – Bike Path (FLAP project)

- ICE – Stanley Consultants (ICE Teams) - \$338.686
- Contractor – Granite Construction Company - \$586,205 + \$4,331,331.00 (GMP#1)

June 6, 2016/September 12, 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 + \$4,331,331.00 (GMP#1)

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 04: NDOT Staff Update  
**Start Date:** Monday, March 14, 2016  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 0%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

June 12, 2017: Vacancy/compensation rates in the Districts:

**Vacancies (April 18, 2017):**

District 1:	Construction – 96 Positions, 82 filled, 14 vacant (14.58%) Maintenance – 198 Positions, 182 filled, 16 vacant (8.08%)
District 2:	Construction - 68 positions, 60 filled, 8 vacant (11.67%) Maintenance - 160 positions, 143 filled, 17 vacant (10.63%)
District 3:	Construction - 49 positions, 39 filled, 10 vacant (20.41%) Maintenance - 154 positions, 147 filled, 7 vacant (4.55%)

NDOT Engineers: 481 engineering positions statewide, 64 vacancies (13%)

**Compensation:**

NDOT Maintenance Worker III (hourly):	\$15.35-\$22.45
Carson City:	\$19.44-\$29.16
City of Reno:	\$22.50-\$31.67
City of Sparks:	\$22.63-\$28.85
Washoe County:	\$19.35-\$25.13
City of Henderson:	\$24.12-\$27.61
City of North Las Vegas:	\$19.07-\$27.08
Clark County:	\$16.82-\$26.06
NDOT Engineer Technician III (annual salary):	\$33,366-\$48,984
Carson City:	\$40,428-\$60,648
City of Reno:	\$51,612-\$72,636
City of Sparks:	\$49,400-\$63,024
Washoe County:	\$54,308-\$70,533
City of Henderson:	\$68,088-\$77,964
City of North Las Vegas:	\$55,096-\$92,888
Clark County:	\$55,464-\$86,040
NDOT Resident Engineer (Manager 1):	\$58,476-\$88,188
City of Las Vegas Construction Manager:	\$82,908-\$132,660
Clark County Construction Manager:	\$75,504-\$117,012

March 13, 2017: See attached information prepared by Allison Wall, Human Resources Manager and Melody Duley, Personnel Analyst 1.

September 2016: Permanent Vacancy rate – 11.7%  
Temporary Vacancy rate – 42.98%  
Overall Vacancy rate – 13.03%

Experience: 204 vacant positions, 399 (24.58%) on probation/trial period

Projected Retirements: 423 (24.16%) in next 5 years, 717 (41%) in 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.

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 probation/trial period

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

Employer	Job Title	Min	Max	Monthly @ 40 hours/Wk
CITY OF LAS VEGAS	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR	\$4,613.55	\$6,491.74	
	SENIOR CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR	\$5,086.45	\$7,157.15	
	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SUPERVISOR	\$6,033.63	\$8,489.89	
	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION SUPERVISOR	\$6,033.63	\$8,489.89	
	CONSTRUCTION MANAGER - Cap Improv	\$6,909.98	\$11,055.96	
CITY OF HENDERSON	BARRICADE INSPECTOR	\$5,078.32	\$5,816.03	
	PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR	\$5,674.41	\$6,497.75	
	SENIOR PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR	\$6,649.24	\$7,614.19	
	QUALITY CONTROL MANAGER	\$7,677.12	\$10,967.31	
CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR	\$4,591.39	\$7,740.72	
	CONSTRUCTION PROJECT INSPECTOR SUPERVISOR	\$4,952.06	\$8,348.81	
CLARK COUNTY	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR	\$4,281.33	\$6,636.93	
	SENIOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR	\$4,622.80	\$7,170.80	
	SUPERVISING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR	\$4,995.47	\$7,744.53	
	ASSISTANT MANAGER OF OFFSITE CONSTRUCTION	\$5,395.87	\$8,363.33	
	MANAGER CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	\$6,292.00	\$9,751.73	
NDOT	ENGINEERING TECH 1	\$2,100.18	\$3,020.64	
	ENGINEERING TECH 2	\$2,462.10	\$3,586.14	
	ENGINEERING TECH 3	\$2,780.52	\$4,082.04	
	ENGINEERING TECH 4	\$3,156.36	\$4,666.68	
	SUPERVISOR 3, A.R.E MANAGER 1, R.E.	\$4,264.74	\$6,399.72	\$4,873.74 \$7,349.76

\*BASED ON EMPLOYER PAY SINCE OTHER ENTITIES PAY FOR NVPERS

Calculations based on 40 hour work weeks

Employer	Job Title	Min	Max
City of Las Vegas	Construction Inspector	26.62	37.45
City of Henderson	BARRICADE INSPECTOR	29.30	33.55
	PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR	32.74	37.49
	SENIOR PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR		
City of North Las Vegas	Construction Inspector	26.49	44.66
	Construction Project Inspector Supervisor	28.57	48.17
Clark County	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR	24.70	38.29
	SENIOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR	26.67	41.37
	SUPERVISING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR	28.82	44.68

\$5,078.32 - \$5,816.03 Monthly  
\$5,674.41 - \$6,497.75 Monthly  
\$6,649.24 - \$7,614.19 Monthly

\$55,096.70 - \$92,888.64  
\$59,424.77 - \$100,185.70

\$4,281.33 \$6,636.93  
\$4,622.80 \$7,170.80  
\$4,995.47 \$7,744.53



Employer	Job Title	Hourly		Calculations based on 40 hour w
		Min	Max	
City of Las Vegas	Maintenance Worker (NDOT Worker I)	18.46	25.98	3199.73 4502.4
	Public Works Maintenance I (NDOT Worker I-II)	24.12	27.61	
City of Henderson	Public Works Maintenance I (NDOT Worker III-IV)	26.58	30.44	
City of North Las Vegas	Roadway Operations Worker II (NDOT Worker III-IV)	19.07	27.08	2014-2015 Teamsters Schedule
	Roadway Operations Crew Leader I (NDOT Supv)	21.38	30.59	39668.06 56326.4 Step 14 44469.76 63619.51 Step 16
Clark County	Maintenance Worker I (NDOT Worker I-II)	15.58	24.12	32406.4 50169.6
	Maintenance Worker II (NDOT Worker IV)	16.82	26.06	34985.6 54204.8
	Maintenance Supervisor (NDOT Supv I)	22.89	35.47	47611.2 73777.6
	Maintenance & Ops Supervisor (NDOT Supv II)	26.67	41.37	55473.6 86049.6



# NDOT Hourly Wages Compared with Partner Agencies

5/25/2017

NDOT	NDOT		Carson City			City of Reno			City of Sparks			Washoe County		
	Low	High	Low	% NDOT	High	Low	% NDOT	High	Low	% NDOT	High	Low	% NDOT	High
Highway Maintenance Worker IV	\$16.67	\$24.51												
Highway Maintenance Worker III	\$15.35	\$22.45	\$19.44	126.64%	\$29.16	179.89%	\$22.50	146.58%	\$31.67	141.07%	\$28.85	\$19.35	126.06%	\$25.13
Highway Maintenance Worker II	\$13.59	\$19.72	\$17.67	130.02%	\$26.51	134.43%	\$20.42	150.26%	\$28.73	145.69%	\$23.75	\$18.43	135.61%	\$23.94
Highway Maintenance Worker I	\$12.07	\$17.36	\$16.36	135.54%	\$24.54	141.36%	\$18.52	153.44%	\$26.06	150.12%	\$16.94	\$15.58	129.08%	\$20.25
Highway Construction Aid	\$10.77	\$15.35												

Lead Worker  
Journey Level Operator  
Laborer/Truck Driver  
Entry Level/Laborer  
Temp Laborer



**CITY OF RENO**  
Department of Human Resources  
and the  
Civil Service Commission  
PO Box 1900,  
Reno, NV 89505

<http://www.reno.gov>

**INVITES APPLICATIONS FOR THE POSITION OF:  
Maintenance Worker III - CITY OF RENO INTERNAL PROMOTIONAL FOR PUBLIC WORKS  
MAINTENANCE WORKERS ONLY**

*An Equal Opportunity Employer*

**SALARY**

\$22.50 - \$31.67 Hourly    \$1,800.31 - \$2,533.58 Biweekly    \$3,900.67 - \$5,489.42 Monthly  
\$46,808.02 - \$65,873.09 Annually

**OPENING DATE:** 04/11/17

**CLOSING DATE:** Fri. 04/21/17 5:00 PM Pacific Time

**THE POSITION**

**Note: The salary and benefits associated with this position are subject to change at any time.**

**This opportunity is promotional for employees of the City of Reno Public Works Department Maintenance Divisions. This promotional opportunity is for regular classified employees of the Maintenance Division classified as a Maintenance Worker.**

**Position Summary**

Under direction, leads, oversees and participates in the more complex and difficult work of staff responsible for performing a wide variety of maintenance and repair functions on various City facilities and infrastructure such as streets, signs, sewers and storm drains, fountains, planters, trash cans, and related public works structures; operates a variety of heavy trucks and maintenance equipment; and ensures adherence to safe work procedures and practices.

**DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS** The Maintenance Worker III is the third level in the Maintenance Worker series. The Maintenance Worker III performs the most complex maintenance functions within the series and is distinguished from the Maintenance Worker II by assuming regular technical and functional supervisory responsibility for larger crews and the operation of heavier equipment. Employees at this level are fully aware of the operating procedures and policies of the work unit.

**EXAMPLES OF ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS**

- Lead, oversee, plan, train, and review the work of all lower level maintenance staff responsible for performing a variety of maintenance and repair work on various City facilities and structures such as streets, signs, sewers and storm drains, fountains, planters, trash cans, and related public works structures; participate in performing the most complex work of the unit including assisting the supervisor with day-to-day job planning and scheduling.

4/11/2017

## DII Maintenance Years of Service Review

	All Maintenance Positions	All Permanent Maintenance Positions	Supervisor II Positions	Supervisor I positions	Worker IV Positions	Worker I-III Positions	Mechanic I Positions
Mean Years of Service	7.59	8.40	23.74	14.19	9.72	5.62	2.70
Median Years of Service	4.41	5.41	23.02	13.02	8.15	2.61	1.12
95th percentile Years of Service	25.05	26.09	27.69	28.98	18.16	22.88	5.70
90th percentile Years of Service	20.17	20.88	27.18	20.64	16.93	14.51	5.19
85th percentile Years of Service	17.31	18.04	26.66	19.13	15.98	11.80	4.68
80th percentile Years of Service	14.32	15.29	26.15	18.02	14.80	9.39	4.17
75th percentile Years of Service	12.26	13.36	25.64	17.49	12.94	6.41	3.66
70th percentile Years of Service	9.52	11.37	25.12	16.06	11.74	5.51	3.15
65th percentile Years of Service	7.94	8.76	24.60	15.78	9.62	4.76	2.64
60th percentile Years of Service	6.41	7.85	24.08	15.15	8.47	4.23	2.13
55th percentile Years of Service	5.41	6.40	23.55	14.05	8.36	3.45	1.62
50th percentile Years of Service	4.41	5.41	23.02	13.02	8.15	2.61	1.12
standard deviation Years of Service	8.33	8.41	3.48	6.98	6.60	7.04	3.05
Total positions	215	191	5	14	23	106	7
Filled positions	191	169	4	24	20	93	5
Vacancies	24	22	1	0	3	13	2
% vacant	11.16%	11.52%	20.00%	0.00%	13.04%	12.26%	28.57%

All NDOT	
Permanent Positions	1826
Filled	1650
Vacant	176
Vacancy Rate	9.64%
Permanent Employees	1182
% of Employees who are Permanent	71.64%
Probationary and Trial Employees	456
% of Employees on Probationary and Trial Periods	27.64%
Unclassified Employees	12

Dist 1	
Permanent Positions	405
Filled	371
Vacant	34
Vacancy Rate	8.40%
Maintenance Positions	198
Filled	182
Vacant	16
Vacancy Rate	8.08%
Construction Positions	96
Filled	82
Vacant	14
Vacancy Rate	14.58%
Equipment Positions	37
Filled	35
Vacant	2
Vacancy Rate	5.41%

Dist 2	
Permanent Positions	332
Filled	294
Vacant	38
Vacancy Rate	11.45%
Maintenance Positions	160
Filled	143
Vacant	17
Vacancy Rate	10.63%
Construction Positions	68
Filled	60
Vacant	8
Vacancy Rate	11.76%
Equipment Positions	53
Filled	49
Vacant	4
Vacancy Rate	7.55%

Dist 3	
Permanent Positions	292
Filled	273
Vacant	19
Vacancy Rate	6.51%
Maintenance Positions	154
Filled	147
Vacant	7
Vacancy Rate	4.55%
Construction Positions	49
Filled	39
Vacant	10
Vacancy Rate	20.41%
Equipment Positions	33
Filled	32
Vacant	1
Vacancy Rate	3.03%

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 05: Resident Engineer's project assignments  
**Start Date:** Monday, September 12, 2016  
**Due Date:** Monday, June 12, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 75%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

Attached are construction project schedules for NDOT's Resident Engineers for each District.







DISTRICT III WORK PROGRAM																											
CREW	CONTRACT/EA	WORKING DAYS	DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATE	BID AMT	STATUS	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018
							May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	
<b>908 - BERHANE TESFAGABAR</b>																											
<b>DCS AUGMENT</b>	3615	210	CONSTRUCT SAFETY OVER CROSSINGS AND FENCING I-80 at Paquopa	\$ 9,550,000	\$ 14,076,434	03/14/16 NTP																					
	3647	110	US93, Elko 12.8 miles north of Cattle Pass to south of SR 229, Coldmill / Overlay / Pave Shoulders	\$ 7,950,000	\$ 8,989,989	05/15/17 NTP																					
	73982		180 Winnemucca, Battle Mtn, Elko, Wells, Westwendover ADA	\$ 520,000		8/12/17 DOC																					
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 18,020,000</b>	<b>\$ 23,066,423</b>																						
<b>912 - VACANT (LEYVA/HOGUE)</b>																											
	3657	30	US 50 - Austin, Eureka & Ely Maintenance Stations, ITS Smart Zone Access Fiber Optics	\$ 1,956,251	\$ 2,300,587	02/13/17 NTP																					
	3661	130	US 6 from SR 318 to Murry Street Ely, 3" CIR w/ 2" Overlay	\$ 13,714,971	\$ 13,895,595	05/02/17 NTP																					
	73634/60539		US50 CH/LA to SR 305, Mill & Overlay Slope Flattening	\$ 16,597,346		8/14/17																					
	73650/60810		US50 Ely - Complete Streets	\$ 26,000,000		3/21/18 DOC																					
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 58,270,578</b>	<b>\$ 15,896,182</b>																						
<b>918 - REGINA PIERCE</b>																											
	3634	70	US 93 SR 225 Chlp Seal	\$ 3,211,802	\$ 2,254,007	7/1/2016 NTP																					
	3647	35	US 93 Chlp Seal	\$ 890,000	\$ 883,007	7/1/2017 NTP																					
	3654	50	Off System Safety - Tribal Lands Te-Moak - Battle Mtn, Elko, South Fork, Wells, Duckwater	\$ 689,973	\$ 969,800	8/1/2017 NTP																					
	3676	30	SR 278 Chlp Seal with Seal Coat	\$ 746,000	\$ 1,424,000	05/01/17 NTP																					
	73930		180 West Carlin Interchange to Tunnels	\$ 2,215,000		8/7/17 DOC																					
	73911		SR227 Lamolle Highway, Mill and Overlay	\$ 5,217,000		11/22/17 DOC																					
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 12,938,775</b>	<b>\$ 5,530,814</b>																						
<b>926 - DAVE SCHWARTZ</b>																											
	3604	65	I 80 from 1.045 miles west of HU/LA county line to the HU/LA county line; I 80 from HU/LA county line to 0.93 miles east of E	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 11,494,494	05/23/17 NTP																					
	3651	120	I 80 from 1.776 miles east of the Humboldt Interchange to 0.516 miles west of the Dun Glen Interchange	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 10,449,000	04/15/17 NTP																					
	60778		SR 305 - Chlp Seal (District Contract)	\$ 1,424,903		5/3/2017 Adv																					
	73789		180 East Winnemucca Interchange, Mill and FH	\$ 7,488,000		8/23/17 Doc																					
	73701		Eden Valley Bridge Replacement	\$ 5,400,000		12/6/17 DOC																					
	60781		180 Humboldt County Mote Interchange to HU/LA EB only - Rubblize and Overlay	\$ 7,600,000		12/13/17 DOC																					
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 49,111,903</b>	<b>\$ 22,148,494</b>																						
<b>301 - TRENT AVERETT</b>																											
	839-17	50	Install drainage and reconstruct roadway.	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 1,980,210	05/01/17 NTP																					
	833-17		Extensive damage due to heavy flooding including erosion of shoulders and under pavement in various locations and wash	\$ 748,000		02/14/17																					
	829-17		SR 225, Emergency Repairs 28.5-37.00	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	02/17/17																					
	Q3-087-17-301	20	Slope Paving Exst 298 I-80	\$ 250,000		summer																					
	73972		Wells Maintence Yard Rehab	\$ 2,248,000		6/15/17 Adv																					
	60645		Ruby Valley Maintenance Yard Rehab	\$ 500,000		8/23/17 Adv																					
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,190,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,230,210</b>																						
<b>NO RE AVAILABLE</b>	73973		Ely Maintenance Yard Rehab	\$ 548,000		1/24/18 Adv																					
<b>NO RE AVAILABLE</b>	73634		US50, SR305 thru Aarth, Storm Drain and Paving		N/A	9/15/17 ???																					
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 548,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>																						
			<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 145,076,248</b>	<b>\$ 68,848,527</b>																						

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 06: Unbalanced Bidding  
**Start Date:** Monday, September 14, 2015  
**Due Date:** Monday, June 12, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 75%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

Nothing new to report.

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 07: Construction and Project Management Divisions Agreements  
**Start Date:** Monday, March 14, 2016  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 50%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

Construction Consultant Agreement Summary  
Calendar Year 2013 - 2016

Updated: 2/8/2017

Service	2013			2014			2015						2016						Total Paid to Date to Consultant
	Construction Management	Construction Admin.	Construction Manager	Construction Admin.			Construction Management			Construction Management									
	Biological Oversight	Other Programs	Crew Augmentation	Other Programs			Full Administration	Crew Augmentation			Crew Augmentation			Other Programs	Crew Augmentation	Full Administration			
	Agreement #	P267-13-040	P132-14-040	P551-14-040	P373-15-040	PD42-15-040	P014-15-040	P428-15-040	P102-15-040	P135-15-040	P430-15-040	P480-15-040	P532-15-040	P083-16-040	P248-16-040	P301-16-040	P348-16-040	P635-16-040	
Contract #			3580					3585	3583		3624	3624	3609 & 3615	3629	3583				
Federal Fund Participation	0%	0%	95%	0%	0%	100%	0%	95%	95%	0%	95%	95%	95%	95%	33%	0%	0%	0%	
Description	Biological Svcs	P6 Training	BCBP Phase 1	RE Academy	DRBF Training	Partnering Best Practices	SR 604	Carson City Freeway	US 95 Phase 3A	USA Pkwy	Neon	Neon Testing	I 80 Elko	I-15 Craig to Speedway	SR 160 Phase 1	IA Testers in each District as needed	PROVIDE RE TO Augment C914 for District 1 LPA	PROVIDE RE TO District 2 LPA Project	
Execution Date	11/13/2013	12/18/2014	4/29/2015	12/30/2015	May 29, 2015	August 31, 2015	April 5, 2016	8/10/2015	8/7/2015	3/23/2016	1/12/2016	May 17, 2016	June 22, 2016	October 20, 2016	9/29/2016	11/17/2016	11/28/2016	11/29/2016	
Termination Date	June 30, 2018	12/31/2017	12/31/2018	June 30, 2019	April 15, 2019	12/31/2017	June 30, 2018	September 30, 2017	May 31, 2017	1/31/2018	June 30, 2020	June 30, 2020	10/31/2017	August 31, 2018	8/31/2017	12/31/2017	May 31, 2019	May 31, 2019	
Total Agreement	\$2,287,747	\$261,020	\$7,967,879	\$296,082	\$155,800	\$299,800	\$3,979,350	\$2,974,925	\$2,748,253	\$5,105,170	\$15,218,706	\$5,151,917	\$1,932,409.04	\$3,845,882	\$959,723	\$297,489	\$298,110	\$298,600	
Total per Firm:																			
4 Leaf Consulting	\$899,629		\$899,629																\$363,394
Atkins	\$704,492	P \$261,020	\$147,390	P \$296,082															\$344,369
ACI	\$222,745															s \$222,745			\$35,899
Aztec	\$5,816,179											P \$5,151,917		s \$664,262					\$557,866
B & E	\$2,287,747	P \$2,287,747																	\$1,121,544
CA Group	\$1,724,467								P \$1,425,867									P \$298,600	\$935,372
CDM Smith	\$2,589,154		s \$2,589,154																\$1,119,718
CEEC	\$4,105,934						s \$115,000				s \$3,990,934								\$572,408
CME	\$99,000															s \$99,000			\$0
CM Works	\$655,833						s \$149,100								P \$506,733				\$75,307
DCS	\$18,118,783		P \$3,391,552				s \$811,899			s \$1,739,517	P \$7,921,771		P \$1,932,409	P \$2,321,635					\$5,948,597
Resolution Board Foundation	\$155,800				P \$155,800														\$55,599
Earth Safety Dynamics	\$219,820		s \$219,820																\$160,253
HDR	\$3,457,093									P \$3,158,983							P \$298,110		\$957,862
Horrocks	\$859,985													s \$859,985					\$957,862
Jacobs	\$890,393										s \$890,393								\$0
Kleinfelder	\$555,494		s \$555,494																\$25,214
McArthur & Associates	\$164,840		s \$164,840																\$116,380
Ninyo & Moore	\$198,489														P \$198,489				\$0
NOVA	\$230,245														s \$230,245				\$38,585
Parsons	\$2,974,925							P \$2,974,925											\$2,290,458
QTCS	\$206,670									s \$206,670									\$99,786
RHA, LLC	\$299,800				P \$299,800														\$123,621
Slater Hanifan Group	\$1,222,386								s \$1,222,386										\$709,813
Stanley	\$480,790						s \$28,600					s \$452,190							\$18,340
TriCore Surveying	\$100,000								s \$100,000										\$50,038
URS	\$4,838,169						P \$2,874,751					s \$1,963,419							\$1,069,698
<b>Total Paid to Date per Agreement:</b>	<b>\$1,121,544</b>	<b>\$194,396</b>	<b>\$4,486,320</b>	<b>\$113,516</b>	<b>\$55,599</b>	<b>\$123,621</b>	<b>\$820,482</b>	<b>\$2,290,458</b>	<b>\$1,695,223</b>	<b>\$1,744,428</b>	<b>\$2,115,336</b>	<b>\$518,960</b>	<b>\$1,154,586</b>	<b>\$200,863</b>	<b>\$149,790</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

P = Prime  
s = sub consultant



## **Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 08: Update on Design Build Contracts  
**Start Date:** Monday, January 16, 2017  
**Due Date:** Monday, June 12, 2017

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 50%

**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

June 12, 2017: Update from Project Management.

April 10, 2017: Cole Mortenson, Assistant Chief Project Management, gave a presentation the process for determining how a project became either a design-bid-build, CMAR or design-build (.

**AGC/NDOT COMMITTEE**  
**12:00 p.m., Friday, April 14, 2017**  
**NAM Training Room**

**AGENDA**

1. Self-Introductions
2. Review minutes of previous meeting dated Friday, January 6, 2017
3. Highway Fund Update
  - a. Federal Funding Outlook
  - b. Legislature
  - c. Raiders Stadium (Impacts to Northern Nevada Projects)
4. Twelve Month Project List
  - a. STIP vs 12 Month List
5. Emergency Contracts
6. NDOT Stormwater Division
  - a. BMP Manual
7. Inertial Profiler Certification
8. Partnering Program Update
  - a. Partnering Awards – (May - Contract 3609)
  - b. Partnering Conference
9. Workforce Development Update
10. DBE Program
  - a. Disparity Study
  - b. Trucking Rules and Special Provisions
11. District(s) Update
12. Personnel Changes/Retirements
13. Project Closeout
14. Upcoming AGC Events
15. Other
16. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 12:00 noon, TBD

cc: Trish Bullentini-Kuzanek President  
 Dan LeBlanc, Chair  
 Caleb Juve, Vice Chair  
 Travis Brandt  
 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  
 Justin Ivory  
 George Jordy  
 Jim Kock  
 Brian Kulpa  
 Kyle Larkin  
 Verdie Legg  
 Kevin Linderman  
 Mark Liske  
 Tom Massaro  
 Barry McKeegan

Steve Moon  
 Tina Mudd  
 Doug Olsen  
 Dan Peterson  
 Taylor Polan  
 Cale Pressey  
 Max Ravazzolo  
 Brian Roll  
 Mike Rooley  
 Paul Schneider  
 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



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

## MAJOR/CAPACITY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
1-03386	60809	I 15/US 93, Garnet Intch., MP CL 64.29 and US 93 Widening, MP CL 52.00 to 57.00	\$77,000,000					
1-03367	73687	I 15 Starr Ave., Las Vegas, at MP CL 29.375	\$8,000,000					\$35,000,000 Funding by others Total cost \$43,000,000
2-03250	60702	US 95 fm. Ann Rd. to Kyle Canyon Rd. MP CL 86.75 to 92.70 - Pkg 2B. Durango Dr. to Kyle Canyon Rd. (Widening); Elkhorn Rd. (HOV Ramps); Kyle Cyn. (Interchange); Add to Durango (Decorative Rock); Mtrls Site; Flood Control Facility	\$55,600,000					Flood Control Facility Added. \$24.4M Funded by Clark Co. Regional Flood Control Dist. Total cost = \$80 million
3-31146	60766	FLAP - SR 28, fm. US 50 to Country Club Dr. MP DO 0.00 to MP WA 6.12 (GMP #2 - Construct Shared Use Path and Water Quality Improvements.)	\$33,000,000					Contract 3671
2-03283	UNASSIGNED	US 95, SB Ramp Ext. to City Pkwy. MP 0.33 to MP 0.72		\$14,100,000				
4-03389	60748	SR 160 Blue Diamond Rd. Clark Co. fm. West edge of Mt. Springs to beg of Mt. area MP CL 16.51 to MP CL 22.20		\$52,000,000				Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$60,300,000 Adv. w/ 3R project 60785
6-03143	60801	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3C at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Grand Montecito to Tenaya Way. MP CL 88 and CC 215 MP CL 37.00 to 39.00 (System to System Phase)		\$55,000,000				Backup Project
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		\$44,000,000				Cost changed from \$37,900,000 Added Lighting at Major Intersections.
1-03375	73797	I 515 at LV Downtown Viaduct - G-947, I-947, I-947 E/W/R/M/L		\$27,000,000				Scope and cost TBD
6-03143	CONST953D/E	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3D/E at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Gr. Montecito to Tenaya Way. MP 88 and CC 215 MP 37.00 to 39.00			\$109,000,000			Phase 3D with 3E combined
6-03145	73536	I 15, Las Vegas, at the CC 215 Northern Beltway Intch. - New System to System Intch.			\$120,000,000			Funding TBD
3-03178	73803	SR 163, Laughlin, Roundabout				\$2,500,000		Adv. w/ Bridge project 73803
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 395 fm McCarran Int. to Lemmon Dr. Int. widen to add SB lane MP 27.132 to 32.240				\$35,000,000		Adv. w/ 3R proj.
4-03445	UNASSIGNED	SR 159, Charleston Blvd. fm. Lamb Blvd. to Honolulu St. - Intersection Improvements and aux. lanes on I-515				\$35,000,000		CMAR; Cost and Limits TBD from NEPA; Funding TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15 N. - Phase 3 (Speedway Blvd. to Garnet Intch.)				\$82,000,000		Scope & Cost TBD
1-03388	UNASSIGNED	I 15 Hacienda Ave., Harmon Ave. HOV ramps					\$30,000,000	Cost changed from \$190,937,500
<b>SubTotal:</b>			\$173,600,000	\$192,100,000	\$229,000,000	\$154,500,000	\$30,000,000	

## BOND REPAYMENTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
		NEON	\$50,000,000					
		NEON		\$50,000,000				
		NEON			\$50,000,000			
		NEON				\$50,000,000		
		NEON					\$50,000,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

## ROADWAY (3R) PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave., fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd. MP WA 0.00 to 2.65	\$16,350,000					Adv. w/ ADA project (73549) Contract 3660
2-33085	60795	US 6 fm. the jct. w/ SR 318 to 0.30 ME of Murry Street. MP WP 13.71 to 37.47	\$14,700,000					Contract 3661
2-15023	60539	US 50, fm. CH/LA Co. Line to 0.52 ME of SR 305 to 1.030 ME of SR 305 MP LA 0.00 to 23.30	\$12,400,000					Cost changed from \$12,386,822 Removing town portion due to SUE. Adv. w/Safety Project (2-15023).
2-07067	60746	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					Contract 3667
3-31144	73913	SR 877, Franktown Rd., fm. SR 429 to US 395A/SR 429 near Bowers Mansion. MP WA 0.00 to 4.296	\$1,500,000					Cost Will Go Up with Scope Change.
1-19015	60794	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	\$9,000,000					Cost changed from \$11,231,754 Contract 3665
4-03439	73902	SR 159, Charleston Blvd., fm. 2.390 MW of Durango Rd. to an NHS break at Rainbow Blvd. MP CL 16.624 to 21.064	\$4,600,000					Adv. w/ ADA project-Contract 3669
2-03275	73644	US 93 fm. 2.74 miles North of I15 to 14.9 Miles South of SR168 MP CL 57.43 to 68.10 (Includes NB Truck Climbing Lane)	\$8,540,000					Cost changed from \$11,000,000 Limits Shortened. Scope Changed to Roadway Rehab. Includes Scope for Safety (60688)
2-03280	73919	US 95 fm. CA/NV Stateline to 7.790 MN of Loran Station Rd. MP CL 0.00 to 17.423	\$22,100,000					Cost changed from \$20,000,000
1-07126	60788	I 80 fm. 0.36 MW of the W. Carlin Intch. to the beg. of the PCCP near the Carlin Tunnels. MP EL 1.10 to 7.51	\$10,884,367					Backup Project (3R Program Approval 2018)
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					Backup Project (3R Program Approval 2019)
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave., fm. Dean Martin Dr. to Eastern Ave. MP CL 0.01 to 7.30. Phase 2		\$7,900,000				Cost changed from \$12,900,000 Deliver as DBB. No Concrete Lanes. Scope Includes ADA upgrades (73879) RW is Not Included in the Estimate.
4-03454	60800	SR 564, Lake Mead Pkwy IR 515 to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 0.000 to 1.733		\$3,400,000				
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		\$15,200,000				May Accelerate to 2017. FR Cost with State Funds.
3-07090	73911	SR 227, Lamoille Hwy., fm. Boyd-Kennedy rd. to .020 mi E. of Palace Pkwy. MP EL 8.32 to EL 13.84		\$5,300,000				Cost changed from \$5,250,000
2-33086	60810	US 50, White Pine Co., West end Ely, Aultman w/Grt Basin, US 6/US 50 WP 66.263 to MP 68.450, US93 WP 53.639 to 54.467, US 6 Bobcat dr. - Int w/US50/US6 WP 37.529-37.947.		\$26,000,000				Adv. w/ 3R project 60811
1-13059	60781	I 80 fm. 3.76 MW of Mote Interchange to 1.06 MW of the HU/LA Co. Line. (Eastbound Only)MP HU 54.95 to 60.33		\$7,600,000				
2-33086	60811	US 50, White Pine Co., fm intersection of Ruth/Kimberly east of Ely, MP 61.495 to 66.263		\$4,000,000				Adv. w/ 3R project 60810
2-31233	74077	US 395, Reno, I80 to N. McCarran Blvd. Intch., WA 25.731 to WA 27.064		\$16,800,000				Adv. w/ misc. project
3-03184	60785	SR 160, Pahrump Valley Rd., fm. 1.030 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to the CL/NY Co. Line. (Eastbound Only) MP CL 21.723 to 43.293		\$21,500,000				Adv. w/ Major project 60748
4-31250	74079	SR 28 fm 0.242 mi North of E. Lakeshore Blvd to the NV/CA Stateline MP WA 5.217 to MP WA 10.990		\$3,500,000				
3-03186	74074	SR 156, Lee Canyon Rd. fm US 95, CL 0.00 to CL 17.592, and SR 157, Kyle Canyon Rd., 0.068 west of SR 158, Deer Creek Rd., CL 0.00 to CL 3.538		\$10,700,000				
2-23066	73928	US 6/95, Tonopah, fm. 1000' N. of Cutting St. to jct. w/ US 95 and fm. jct. w/ US 95 to 1500' E on US 6. US 95, fm. jct. w/ US 6 to S. ES/NY Co. Line. US 6 MP NY 0.62 to 2.10; US 95 MP NY 107.24 to 108.44			\$17,000,000			Pursuing Complete Street. (3R Program Approval 2018)
4-03443	73937	SR 596, Jones Blvd., fm. S. of US 95 to Smoke Ranch Rd. MP CL 43.007 to 45.038			\$5,000,000			Cost changed from \$5,200,000 Scope includes ADA upgrades (73937).
4-31248	74043	SR 659, McCarran Blvd., fm. I 580 to SR 647, 4th St. MP WA 22.873 TO 22.98 and 0.000 to 6.272			\$9,750,000			
4-03455	74072	SR 612, Nellis Blvd., fm. SR593 Tropicana Ave. to SR 604, Las Vegas Blvd. MP CL 37.880 to 47.307			\$15,000,000			
1-07127	180CONST	I 80 fm. 0.597 ME of the Grays Creek grade sep. to 0.048 MW of the Willow Creek grade sep. MP EL 62.09 to EL 68.978			\$17,500,000			Rescheduled. Old EA (73665) and PCEMS# (1-07118) closed out. New PE EA 74042
1-07125	73793	I 80 fm. 1.040 ME of Moor Intch. to 1.108 ME of Moor Intch. to 1.871 ME of the Oasis Intch. MP EL 83.26 to EL 102.79			\$19,500,000			Adv. w/ 3R project 73794
2-01092	74048	US 50 fm. 4.2 ME of Cold Springs to the CH/LA Co. Line. MP CH 85.961 to 106.845			\$14,300,000			
Not Scheduled		US 95 fm. the MI/LY Co. Line to the LY/CH Co. Line. MP LY 0.000 to 2.822			\$4,400,000			
2-19085	74038	US 50A fm. 0.015 mi. S. of Royal Oaks Dr. to the jct. of SR 427, Main St. MP LY 11.184 to 14.120			\$4,000,000			Adv. w/ ADA project.
Not Scheduled		US 95 fm. 6.492 MN of trailing edge of B-636 to 8.274 MN of SR 267. MP NY 72.036 to 103.552			\$16,800,000			
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			
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			\$13,800,000			
2-23067	74065	US 95, fm 12.16 MN of Beatty to 3.67 MS of NY/ES Co. Line. NY 72.036 to 103.552			\$16,800,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 395 fm. McCarran Blvd. to Lemmon Dr. MP WA 27.200 to 32.400				\$26,900,000		Repair Strategy Change
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		
2-01089	60750	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				\$3,700,000		Scope includes ADA Upgrades (60750)
Not Scheduled		SR 573, Craig Rd., fm. 0.506 ME of Losee to Las Vegas Blvd. MP CL 2.766 to 5.755				\$4,200,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 573, Craig Rd., fm. 0.008 MW of N. Rainbow Blvd. to Decatur Blvd. MP CL 0.316 to 2.260				\$2,800,000		
Not Scheduled		US 93 fm. 0.030 MN of US 93A to 0.096 MS of the LAWPRR Xing. MP WP 112.944 to EL 11.800				\$15,100,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 431 fm. SR 28 to 0.062 ME of Mt. Rose Summit. MP WA 0.000 to 8.130				\$6,000,000		Adv. w/Hydraulic project
Not Scheduled		US 395 fm. 0.037 MS of Waterloo Ln. to First St. MP DQ 20.580 to 22.248				\$6,000,000		
Not Scheduled		I 80 fm. the beg. of the PCCP, 1.779 ME of the trailing edge of I-876 to 1.064 MW to the HU/LA Co. Line. (Westbound Only) MP HU 54.860 to 60.320				\$14,600,000		



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

## ROADWAY (3R) PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
Not Scheduled		US 95 fm. 1.301 MS of Armargosa Valley jct. to 1.472 MS of the Armargosa River. MP NY 28.817 to 56.234				\$14,600,000		
Not Scheduled		US 93A fm. US 93 to 1.999 MN of the WP/EL Co. Line				\$7,600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	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		SR 319 fm. US 93 to 0.140 MW of the jct. with Crestline Rd. to the NV/UT Stateline. MP LN 0.000 to 20.914					\$7,700,000	
Not Scheduled		US 93A fm. 0.945 MN of White Horse Pass to the beg. of FREL59. MP EL 24.919 to 53.325					\$14,700,000	
Not Scheduled		SR 376 fm. 0.275 MN of Carver's Roadside Park to the jct. with US 50. MP NY 53.943 to LA 18.065					\$32,100,000	
Not Scheduled		SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., fm. 0.002 ME of Toiyabe St. to 0.020 ME of Hollywood Blvd. MP CL 5.601 to 6.556					\$460,000	
Not Scheduled		SR 376 fm. US 6 to SR 377. MP NY 0.000 to 36.849					\$25,600,000	
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. the functional class break at Neil Rd. Intch. to the Mill St. Interchange. MP WA 20.718 to 24.468					\$20,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	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 80/I 580/US 395 Various Ramps in Reno/Sparks UL					\$5,000,000	Tentative. Not included in 3R Program List.
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. 0.302 MN of the Moana Intch. to the Mill St. Intch. (Southbound Only) MP WA 22.563 to 23.740					\$13,100,000	
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. 0.302 MN of the Moana Intch. to the Mill St. Intch. (Northbound Only) MP WA 22.563 to 23.499 NB					\$11,000,000	
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. trailing edge of the viaduct to the Glendale Intch. (Northbound Only) MP WA 23.759 to 25.003					\$8,000,000	
Not Scheduled		I 580 fm. Glendale Ave. to the Truckee River. MP WA 25.003 to 25.276					\$4,300,000	
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	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$117,474,367</b>	<b>\$121,900,000</b>	<b>\$158,750,000</b>	<b>\$124,300,000</b>	<b>\$170,288,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

## BRIDGE/STRUCTURES PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program	\$3,000,000					Annual Program
3-31139	73750	SR 447 at Washoe Co. near Nixon B-1351 MP 15.49	\$1,740,000					Cost changed from \$1,350,000
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program		\$3,000,000				Annual Program
3-05056	73800	SR 757, Muller Ln. at Carson River - Replace Structure B-474		\$1,400,000				Re-evaluating design to avoid utilities.
1-27068	60767	I 80 at Fairview Ditch, Replace B-1392E		\$500,000				74021
4-03448	74026	SR 582 at I 515 Ramp, Replace I-1899		\$2,000,000				
3-21006	60770	SR 361 at Petrified Wash, Replace B-425 (off-system bridge)		\$500,000				
1-31238	60784	I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit I-717E/W, I-740E/W, H-844E/W, I-700E/W		\$4,000,000				74046
6-13010	73701	Eden Valley Rd. at Humboldt River - Replace off-system Structure B-1658		\$5,747,000				R/W Acquisition needed
1-03390	60783	I 515, Viking Grade Separation, MP CL 68.50 to 69.00 - MSE Wall Rehab		\$3,000,000				74045
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				CMAR 73799
6-01023	60769	Maine St., Fallon, at I Line Canal - Replace off-system B-242			\$1,500,000			74027
Not Scheduled		SR 396, Cornell Ave. N. of Lovelock, Pershing Co. - Replace B-28 on-system bridge.			\$2,600,000			
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		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			
Not Scheduled		US 50 at Carson River W. of Fallon - Address Scour B-1557			\$600,000			
6-27026	73753	FR PE 01, G-29 Structure Replacement			\$3,200,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 206, Genoa Ln., at Carson River - Address Scour B-1239			\$300,000			
3-07091	74025	SR 226 at Jack Creek, Replace B-639 (off-system bridge)			\$500,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 88 in Douglas Co. - Rehab/Retrofit B-553, B-575, B-580, B-576, and B-627			\$4,000,000			
Not Scheduled		E. Walker Rd., SE of Yerington, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1348 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Six Mile Canyon Rd., Storey Co. - Replace B-2476 off system bridge				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Shady Ave. over Gold Canyon Cr., Dayton, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1711 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US6 at Ralston Wash B-180, MP NY 4.30				\$500,000		
Not Scheduled		Garson Road at I 80, Replace I-770 (off-system bridge)				\$4,000,000		
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program				\$3,000,000		Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Gold Canyon Cr. S. of Silver City, Lyon Co. - Replace B-375 off-system bridge				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Tedford Bridge at Truckee-Carson Canal - Replace off-system B-1707				\$600,000		
3-03178	73803	SR 163 at Colorado River in Laughlin - Widen and Rehab Structure B-1847				\$6,000,000		Adv. w/ Major project
Not Scheduled		I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit and address scour B-716E/W				\$2,000,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 605, Paradise Rd., at Tropicana Wash - Rehab B-1344				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Boulder Highway and Sahara - Rehab/Retrofit I-1449, H-1446				\$800,000		
Not Scheduled		I 15 at Muddy River - Rehab/Retrofit B-781 N/S				\$2,000,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 589, Sahara Ave., at UPRR - Rehab/Retrofit G-1064				\$1,400,000		
Not Scheduled		Dressler Ln., Douglas Co. - Replace B-1600 off-system bridge					\$600,000	
Not Scheduled		I 515 at UPRR and Main Street, Replace G-947					\$80,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Sierra St. at Truckee River B-303 off-system					\$4,000,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$4,740,000</b>	<b>\$27,147,000</b>	<b>\$24,440,000</b>	<b>\$24,200,000</b>	<b>\$84,600,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

## SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
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. Line to 0.52 ME of SR 305 to 1.030 ME of SR 305 MP LA 0.00 to 23.30	\$4,200,000					Cost changed from \$4,210,526 SBC Processing Adv. w/3R Project (60539)
6-00018	60775	SR 667 Kietzke Lane, fm. Mill St. to Galetti Way	\$3,060,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60681	SR 573, Craig Rd. fm. Decatur Blvd. to 5th St. (SMP)	\$3,000,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
6-31218	74051	Multiple Intersections in Dist. II (Sparks) - Signal System Modification. Flashing arrows	\$2,250,000					Design by Traffic Operations
2-03275	60688	US 93 fm. 2.74 miles North of I15 to 14.9 Miles South of SR168 MP CL 57.43 to 68.10	\$3,075,000					Cost changed from \$2,400,000 Adv. with 3R Project (73644)
6-00017	60697	Te-Moak & Duckwater Tribal Lands - Pedestrian & Road Safety Improvements	\$833,549					Contract 3654
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Shoulder widening		\$3,000,000				
8-00266	60679	Second St. fm. Keystone Ave. to I-580. Arlington Ave. fm. Court St. to 6th St. (SMP)		\$3,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60680	Eastern Ave. and Civic Center, fm. US 95 to Cope Ave. (SMP)		\$3,000,000				
Not Scheduled		RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements		\$3,000,000				
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements		\$522,500				
Not Scheduled		RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements on Curves		\$3,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled		RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements			\$3,000,000			
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP). SR 610, Lamb Blvd., fm. Sahara Ave. to Lake Mead Blvd.			\$3,000,000			\$2.85M Federal Funds
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements			\$522,500			
Not Scheduled		Northern Nevada (SMP) SR 659, McCarran Blvd., fm. Greg St. to Baring Blvd.			\$3,000,000			
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP). SR 599, Rancho Dr., fm. US 95 to Cheyenne Ave.			\$3,000,000			
Not Scheduled		RSA Safety improvements Statewide (SEDS)				\$2,000,000		
Not Scheduled		Northern Nevada (SMP)				\$3,000,000		\$2.85M Federal Funds
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP)				\$3,000,000		\$2.85M Federal Funds
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP)				\$3,000,000		\$2.85M Federal Funds
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements				\$522,500		
Not Scheduled		Northern Nevada (SMP) SR 430, N. Virginia St.					\$3,000,000	\$2.85M Federal Funds
Not Scheduled		Southern Nevada (SMP). SR 593, Tropicana Ave.					\$3,000,000	\$2.85M Federal Funds
Not Scheduled		RSA Safety Improvements Statewide (SEDS)					\$2,000,000	Traffic Safety Design Consultants
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$17,718,549</b>	<b>\$15,522,500</b>	<b>\$12,522,500</b>	<b>\$11,522,500</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>	

## PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
8-00223	60668	SR 147, Ped. and ADA Improvements with Roadbed Mod. on Lake Mead fm. Civic Center to Pecos (SED)	\$6,800,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
4-31245	73979	SR 430, Permanent Traffic Signal, Lighting and Ped. Facilities on N. Virginia St., N. of Lovitt Ln. to Hoge Rd.	\$2,000,000					Contract 3664
4-03446	73980	SR 582, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements at Various Locations along Boulder Hwy.	\$3,000,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
2-00012	73988	US 50, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements at Pike St. (MP LY 6.025), Silver State St. (MP CC 13.16), Lakeshore Blvd. (MP DO 3.16).	\$1,150,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	City of Las Vegas Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Rural District 1 Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades		\$500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Rural District 2 Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades		\$500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Rural District 3 Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades		\$1,500,000				
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$12,950,000</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>				



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #6  
6 of 10  
April 24, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
8-00288	60798	State Parks Re-signing Project DISTRICT II	\$570,000					
8-00288	60799	State Parks Re-signing Project DISTRICT I	\$400,000					
8-00288	60797	State Parks Re-signing Project DISTRICT III	\$300,000					
2-03276	60689	US 95 fm. CA/NV Stateline to Boulder City Bypass, MP CL 0.00 to 56.238 - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K1	\$5,000,000					
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.
1-03369	60712	I 15 fm. N of Apex to N of Logandale-Overton Interchange - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H2	\$5,500,000					
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas	\$2,617,056					Annual Program
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks	\$365,040					Annual Program
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				
2-03276	60690	US 95 fm. Bypass to Laughlin - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K2		\$3,000,000				
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				Moved from 2019 60% plans complete. Project will be finalized/scheduled when need/priority identified. Update DL for date change
8-00251	60693	District 3 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A		\$2,000,000				
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas		\$2,617,056				Annual Program
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks		\$365,040				Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Replace High Mast HPS Lighting w/ LED Lighting			\$1,500,000			
8-00250	Pkg. A	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A			\$1,000,000			Moved from 2020 Tentative
1-31219	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Mt. Rose Hwy to Neil Rd., MP WA 15.0 to 20.0 - Install ITS infrastructure - TM Pkg. 2A			\$3,000,000			
8-00250	Pkg. B	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. B			\$1,000,000			Moved from 2020 Tentative
8-00250	Pkg. C	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. C			\$1,000,000			Moved from 2020 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
8-00249	Pkg. A	District 1 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A			\$2,000,000			
1-03325	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas			\$2,617,056			Annual Program
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
4-31236	UNASSIGNED	McCarran Blvd. (SW) fm. I 580 to I 80, MP WA 0.00 to 7.00. - Install ITS devices, TM -Pkg. 7				\$10,000,000		Funding Not Identified
3-03176	UNASSIGNED	SR 160 fm. Pahrump to I 15 - Install ITS devices FAST Pkg. J1				\$5,500,000		
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		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
1-03325	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas				\$2,617,056		Annual Program
1-31205	UNASSIGNED	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks				\$365,040		Annual Program
3-03176	UNASSIGNED	SR 160 fm. Pahrump to I 15 - install ITS devices FAST Pkg. J2					\$3,500,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$15,052,096</b>	<b>\$16,282,096</b>	<b>\$17,482,096</b>	<b>\$52,482,096</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>	



HYDRAULICS/TAHOE PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop (Tahoe)	\$525,000					Consolidated to one year
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program	\$1,000,000					Agreement. Cost increase due to expanded scope.
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop	\$300,000					Agreement
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					
Not Scheduled		Zephyr Cove Cooperative Projects (Tahoe)		\$350,000				Agreement.
2-05128	74040	US 50, Water Quality and Erosion Control near Logan Shoals in Tahoe Basin, MP DO 7.00 to 9.00		\$7,000,000				Cost changed from \$2,560,000 Project added as high priority per Geotech & D2
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program		\$1,000,000				Agreement. Cost increase due to expanded scope.
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop		\$600,000				Agreement
2-05126	73995	US 395, at Martin Slough. MP DO 23.82		\$2,700,000				SBC Processing. Agreement
2-05120	60765	US 50 Spooner Summit to Carson City. MP DO 13.00-14.58 and CC 0.00-7.60		\$4,000,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 Skyland Water Quality and Erosion Control. MP DO 4.50 to Do 7.00						
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 28 Marlette Creek Stream Restoration, Water Quality, and Erosion Control. MP WA 0.00 to WA 1.00			\$2,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 359 fm MP MI 8.3 to 26.7 - Slip line or replace CMPs, upsize culverts to alleviate roadway overtopping.			\$2,900,000			
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program			\$1,000,000			Agreement. Cost increase due to expanded scope.
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop			\$600,000			Agreement
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			\$2,000,000			Cost decreased from scope
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		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.			\$6,000,000			Adv. with 3R Project 60811
3-05059	74052	SR 207, Kingsbury Grade, fm. Daggett Pass to SR 206 jct. MP DO 3.15 to MP DO 11.08 - Pipe Lining, DI Replacement and Erosion Control			\$5,000,000			Delivery and Estimate TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 95 at Jct with SR 361, MP MI 32.6 to MP 25.2 - Slip line or replace CMPs, upsize culverts to alleviate roadway overtopping.				\$5,000,000		
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program				\$1,000,000		Agreement. Cost increase due to expanded scope.
Not Scheduled		US 50 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 13.07				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 431 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP WA 0.00 to 8.00				\$3,600,000		Moved to adv. with 3R project fm. WA 0.00 to WA 8.13
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		
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program					\$1,000,000	Agreement. Cost increase due to expanded scope.
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$6,325,000</b>	<b>\$15,650,000</b>	<b>\$20,500,000</b>	<b>\$14,600,000</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	

STORMWATER PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
1-03391	74059	I 15, fm US 95 to Craig Rd, MP CL 42.88 to MP CL 48.42 Slope Stabilization	\$4,085,000					
9-07036	73972	MY 932, Wells Maint. Yard. SR 223 MP EL 74.90 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard.	\$2,200,000					Cost changed from \$1,000,000 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
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Treatment Control Program		\$1,500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Source Control Program		\$2,000,000				
9-29001	73971	MY 934, Virginia City Maint. Yard. SR 342 MP ST 2.65 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard.		\$1,000,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
9-03037	74006	MY 921, Las Vegas Maint. Station. SR 578 Washington Ave., MP CL 0.503		\$2,500,000				Moved from 2019 District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Elko Maintenance yard			\$3,200,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Source Control Program			\$2,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Treatment Control Program			\$2,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Treatment Control Program				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Maintenance Facility Program				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Offsite Treatment Control Program				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Source Control Program				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Treatment Control Program					\$1,500,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Source Control Program					\$1,500,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Maintenance Facility Program					\$1,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Offsite Treatment Control Program					\$2,000,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$6,285,000</b>	<b>\$9,000,000</b>	<b>\$7,200,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

## LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
1-31233	73943	I 580 at Plumb Lane, SB On-Ramp and Flyover. MP WA 23.62	\$667,500					
2-05123	73926	US 50 at Stateline S. Lake Tahoe - State Entrance Gateway. MP DO 0.05	\$248,750					
4-31244	73942	SR 341 Geiger grade rd. at Veterans Pkwy. - Roundabout Aesthetic Improvements. MP WA 6.06	\$660,000					P5AM does not reflect current SBC Contract 3679
1-31228	60665	I 580 at Damonte Ranch Intch. MP WA 16.98	\$1,600,000					Contract 3679
2-03281	73925	US 93 at Hoover Dam - State Entrance Gateway. MP CL 0.027	\$248,750					
2-07064	73924	US 93 at Jackpot - State Entrance Gateway. MP EL 141.76	\$248,750					
2-31133	73927	US 395 at Bordertown and SR 28 at Crystal Bay- State Entrance Gateways. US 395 MP WA 42.09 and SR 28 MP WA 10.98	\$470,833					
2-05125	73959	US 395 at Topaz Lake - State Entrance Gateway. MP WA 0.005	\$248,750					
Not Scheduled		I 80 at US 95 and at SR 289 Intchs. - Community Gateway to Winnemucca/Recreational to Black Rock Desert		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Russell Rd. Intch. MP CL 9.631		\$2,000,000				Will Require Permanent Erosion Control.
1-31228	60787	I 580 at S. Meadows Pkwy. Intch. MP WA 18.33		\$1,000,000				
2-23066	73928	US 6/95, Downtown Tonopah			\$1,000,000			Adv. w/ 3R project (73928)
2-33086	73650	US 50, Downtown Ely			\$1,000,000			Adv. w/ 3R project (73650)
1-31228	LAND3	I 580 at Neil Rd. Intch. MP WA 20.71			\$500,000			
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Boulder Hwy. Intch. MP CL 14.414			\$1,250,000			
1-31228	LAND1	I 580 at S. Virginia, Patriot Blvd. Intch. MP WA 19.29			\$1,000,000			
Not Scheduled		I 80 McCarran to McCarran- L&A improvements not done in DB				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled		I 80 at SR 305 Intch. - Battle Mtn. Community Gateway and Paint E. & W. Intchs.				\$2,000,000		
Not Scheduled		I 80 at SR 766 Intch. - Carlin Community Gateway and Paint E. Intch.				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Charleston Blvd. MP CL 16.005				\$1,000,000		Additional Funding over the Required 3% L&A Budget.
Not Scheduled		I 80 Pyramid Intch - L&A (paint) and aesthetic improvements					\$1,500,000	
Not Scheduled		I 515/US 95 at Horizon Dr. Intch. - L&A (Paint) Improvements. MP CL 3.553					\$2,000,000	Will Require Permanent Erosion Control
Not Scheduled		I 80 at SR 225 and at FREL17 (Jennings Way) Intchs. - Elko Community Gateways and Paint Structures Through. MP EL 23.273 and EL 25.775					\$2,500,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$4,393,333</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$4,750,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #6  
9 of 10  
April 24, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## ADA PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
1-03387	73983	I 15, Las Vegas, fm. College Dr. to Casino Center Blvd.; I 15, Las Vegas/Mesquite, fm. Primm Blvd. to Mesquite, Sandhill Blvd.; US 95, Las Vegas, fm. Martin L. King Blvd. to Paiute Dr.	\$745,000					Contract 3673
Not Scheduled		US 50A, Fernley, Main St fm Silver Lace Blvd to 400ft W of 7th St.	\$167,800					Complaint Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. at Prater Way	\$150,000					Complaint
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. at Neil Rd.	\$20,000					Complaint Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
1-31235	73984	I 80 & I 580/US 395, Reno, fm. Verdi to Vista Blvd. and fm. S. Virginia St. to Stead Blvd. MP WA 15.91 to WA 33.92	\$470,000					Contract 3668
Not Scheduled		I 15, Primm, Intch. ramps and S. Las Vegas Blvd. at E. Primm Blvd.	\$30,000					Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
4-03439	73902	SR 159, Charleston Blvd., fm. 2.390 MW of Durango Rd. to an NHS break at Rainbow Blvd. MP CL 16.624 to 21.064	\$4,600,000					ADA Upgrades to Adv. with 3R (73902) Contract 3669
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave., fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd.	\$1,700,000					ADA Upgrades to Adv. with 3R (73549) Contract 3660
Not Scheduled		US 93, Jackpot, fm Gurfey Dr. to Poker St.		\$170,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Mina, fm. 6th St. to Eleventh St.		\$330,000				Complaint Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 341, Reno, fm Equestrian Rd. to Veterans Pkwy		\$45,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 28, Incline Village, fm. 0.242 MN of E. Lakeshore Blvd. to the NV/CA Stateline. MP WA 5.217 to 10.990		\$120,000				
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		CC 215/SR 564, Henderson, fm. Stephanie St. to Lake Las Vegas Pkwy.		\$250,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave., fm. Dean Martin Dr. to Eastern Ave. MP CL 0.01 to 7.30. Phase 2		\$5,100,000				ADA Upgrades to Adv. with 3R (73879)
4-03443	73937	SR 596, Jones Blvd., fm. S. of US 95 to Smoke Ranch Rd. MP CL 43.007 to 45.038			\$250,000			ADA upgrades to Adv. with 3R (73937)
Not Scheduled		US 95, McDermitt, fm Jaca Rd. to EUL			\$95,000			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	UNASSIGNED	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 1.801. MP US 95 NY 107.220 to 109.509			\$260,000			
Not Scheduled		US 50A, Fernley, fm. Mull Ln. to SR 427			\$155,000			ADA upgrades to Adv. with 3R (74038)
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 95, Searchlight, MP CL 19.97 to 20.53			\$250,000			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 578, Washington Ave., Las Vegas, fm. I 15 to Las Vegas Blvd.			\$165,000			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		SR 304/SR 305/SR806, Battle Mtn., SR 304 fm. Eastgate Dr. to Forrest Ave., SR 305 fm. I 80 Intch to SR 304, SR 806 fm. SR 304 to Trescott St.			\$285,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 223, Wells, fm. 500ft. S of I 80 to 600 ft. E. of US 93			\$415,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 160, Pahrump, fm. E. Acoma Ave. to Lockspur Ave.			\$195,000			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.			\$60,000			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		US 50, Ely, fm. W. 1st St. to 0.25 MS of the Jct. with US 6 US 93, Ely, fm. US 50 to E. 15th St.			\$1,180,000			ADA upgrades to Adv. with 3R (73650) Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
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, Fallon, fm. 500ft N. of Sheckler Rd. to Keddie St.				\$190,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
2-01089	60750	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				\$785,000		Adv. w/ 3R project (60750) 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 589, W. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, fm. S. Rainbow Blvd. to Las Vegas Blvd.				\$515,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 589, E. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, fm. S. Las Vegas Blvd. to S. Nellis Blvd.				\$515,000		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 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 396/SR 398/SR 854/SR 397, Lovelock, SR 396 fm. S. Broadway Ave. Jct. to N. Broadway Ave. Jct., 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	UNASSIGNED	Winnemucca, US 95 fm 0.071 MW of Fountain Way to Dancing Bear Ln., SR 289 fm Jct with US 95 to I 80 WB on ramp, SR 794 fm Jct with SR 289 to Haskell St., SR 787 fm Jct with US 95 to Jct with SR 294, SR 294 fm Sunny Dr. to SR 787/Hanson St.				\$690,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. Lamb Blvd. to the EUL.				\$2,170,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
1-00028	73982	I 80 Intch. ramps in Winnemucca, Battle Mtn., Elko, Wells, and West Wendover				\$520,000		Scope and Limits TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 445, Pyramid Way, Sparks, fm. Nugget Ave. to Sparks Blvd.				\$380,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 93, Wells, fm. 500 ft. S. of I 80 to SR 223					\$415,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD



**ADA PROJECTS**

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
Not Scheduled		SR 667, Reno, Kietzke Ln., fm S Virginia St to 0.1D MS of Vassar St.					\$375,000	Complaint 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		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
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$7,882,800</b>	<b>\$6,035,000</b>	<b>\$4,320,000</b>	<b>\$8,315,000</b>	<b>\$3,930,000</b>	

**MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS**

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
1-31239	74057	I 80, USA Parkway, MP WA 32.75 - Intch Improvements and Median Widening	\$810,000					Contract 3672
4-31249	74044	SR 445, Pyramid HWY, at Calle de la Plata Rd in Spanish Springs, MP WA 9.75 - Accel and Decel Lanes.	\$1,600,000					Contract 3659
2-05127	74039	US 395 at SR 759 Airport Rd. MP DO 26.03 - Install Signal System	\$600,000					
<b>2-05129</b>	<b>60816</b>	<b>US50 near Logan Shoals Tahoe Basin Douglas county MP DO 8.00 to MP DO 9.00</b>	<b>\$4,211,622</b>					
3-05058	73966	SR 756, Centerville, fm. Waterloo Ln. to US 395 (Bikelanes)		\$600,000				TAP Funding Douglas County
3-19053	73861	SR 828 Farm District Rd. fm. Crimson Rd. to Jasmine Ln. in Fernley. MP LY 0.90 to LY 2.75. 10' wide multi-use path. Phase 2.		<b>\$1,300,000</b>				<b>Cost changed from \$1,153,800 TAP funding (City of Fernley \$173,485); \$650,000 Safe Routes</b>
3-05057	73867	SR 756 Centerville Ln. at Structure B-287. MP DD 3.68		\$600,000				TAP funding (Douglas County)
4-03417	73725	SR 589, Sahara Ave at SR 612 Nellis Blvd. Reconstruct Intersection.		\$1,200,000				State Funded Construction due to Road Relinquishment.
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 395 @ Clear Acre SB on-ramp widening & extension, MP WA 25.731 to 27.20		\$2,000,000				Adv. w/3R project 74077
3-29020	74066	SR439,USA PRKY,Electric Ave. MP 9.67			\$3,000,000			
4-03416	60722	SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Pkg. 2 - 1.5" Mill with 2" PBS and 0.75" OG; Shoulder Widening and Slope Flattening; Drainage Improvements. MP CL 7.35 - 9.67					\$4,500,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Widen Bridge B-638 East Fork Carson River MP 2.96					\$350,000	Douglals TAP project
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$7,221,622</b>	<b>\$5,700,000</b>	<b>\$3,000,000</b>		<b>\$4,850,000</b>	

**DISTRICT BETTERMENT PROJECTS**

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
		District Betterments	\$33,170,033					
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$33,170,033</b>					

**BIKE & PED PROJECT**

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
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			
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>			

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$458,812,800</b>	<b>\$470,836,596</b>	<b>\$533,964,596</b>	<b>\$449,919,596</b>	<b>\$368,168,000</b>
--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

**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. Dollar amount only reflects the project construction cost for the associated program's responsible scope.

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 1-26-17 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 11, 2017

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	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)	CONT MOD STATUS	
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	S	A	A	A		6/10/15			1/19/16	1/19/16		Y	Need crew to complete final documentation before I can continue pick up. 11/16/16			
3554	1	926	LAS VEGAS PAVING SULAHRIA TRISH	US 95 FROM ANN ROAD TO DURANGO DRIVE	\$35,700,000.01	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	S	A	S		9/18/15	10/22/15	10/7/16	5/1/17			Y	Closeout in progress. Partial relief granted, pending district acceptance	1 - Trish		
3576 FM	1	906	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR TRISH CHRISTIANSEN	SR 147 FM 2ME OF EUL OF NLV CL 9.67 TO APPX BOUNDARY LAKE MEAD NRA	\$5,948,497.07	\$50,000.00	A	A	S	A	S	A		1/7/16			2/17/16	2/17/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	3 - Trish		
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	A	N	A	S	A		11/17/15			1/19/16	1/20/16		N	As-Built are completed, will hold for pickup. Closeout Cont Mod is in DRAFT.			
3583 FM	1	926	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP TRISH SUHLARIA	US 95 NW PHASE 3A-CONSTRUCT THE N/E W/S RAMPS & S/B COLLECTOR RD. FOR THE US 95/CC 215 INTERCHANGE & CONSTRUCT APPX. 5500' RCP CONC BOX STORM DRAIN W/ ALL APPURTENANCES	\$39,200.00		N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction on going		
3597 FM	1	903	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO. CONNER TRISH	I-15 IN NORTH LAS VEGAS SEISMIC RETROFIT AND REHAB OF STR H-948, G-949, G-953, AND I-956	\$2,115,550.49	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		7/19/16			11/1/16	11/14/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	5 - Trish & Matt		
3602 FM	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 160 EMERGENCY MEDIAN CROSSEOVERS / PLACEMENT OF CABLE BARRIER RAILS	\$794,000.00	\$42,197.00	A	A	S	A	S	S		1/6/16			2/17/16	2/17/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	2 - Trish		
3605 FM	1	901	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR ALHWAYEK TRISH	SR 593 TROPICANA AVE FROM EASTEN AVE TO BOULDER HWY - COLDMILLING, PLACING PBS & MEDIAN IMPROVEMENTS	\$7,669,990.00	\$50,000.00	N	S	N	N	N	N		10/14/16			11/28/16				N	Crew working on closeout items.		
3607 FM	1	902	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS YOUSUF TRISH	US 95 S OF TONOPAH, US 95 .796 MI S OF DRY WASH B-1478 TO 1.198 MI S OF ESMERALDA/RYE COUNTY LINE WIDEN SHOULDERS & FLATTEN SLOPES; CONST 2 PASSING LNS. WIDEN SILVER PEAK RD (RT TURN LN) LIDA RD (LT TURN LN); PBS WITH OG	\$14,141,141.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction on going		
3610 FM	1	901	LLO INC DBA TRISH ALHWAYEK	I-15 FROM CALIFORNIA STATE LINE TO N OF THE I-215 INTERCHANGE	\$1,305,399.20	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	N	N	A		12/21/16							N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3613 FM	1	906	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR, INC TRISH CHRISTENSEN	SR 160 BLUE DIAMOND RD., CLARK CO., FROM SR 159 RED ROCK CYN RD TO BEGINNING OF MT. AREA-WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LNS.	\$16,458,854.00		N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction on going		
3616 FM	1	902	TRADE WEST CONSTRUCTION YOUSUF TRISH	US 95 IN GOLDFIELD FROM 1ST STREET TO 2ND STREET ES 19.22 TO ES 19.29	\$764,492.88	\$38,224.64	N	N	N	N	N	S									N	Construction on going		
3617 FM	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP CONNER TRISH	I-15 NB, SLOAN TRUCK INSPECTION STATION-REHABILITATE & REPAVE TRUCK INSPECTION STA; UPGRADE CHECK STA SIGNS & LHT & CONSTRUCT TORTOISE FENCE	\$904,953.00	\$47,950.13	A	A	A	A	A	A		6/30/16			6/30/16	7/11/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	4 - Trish & Matt		
3618 FM	1	903	NEV-CAL INVESTORS INC CONNER TRISH	I-15 FROM UPRR SPUR NELLIS TO N OF THE APEX INTERCHANGE	\$1,875,444.31	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	N	N	N									N	Construction ongoing		
3620 FM	1	915	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP STRGANAC TRISH	ON SR-160 CLARK COUNTY BLUE DIAMOND HIGHWAY AT FORT APACHE ROAD AND EL CAPITAN WAY	\$2,441,462.06	\$50,000.00	A	N	S	A	N	S		9/23/16			11/23/16	11/28/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	6 - Trish		

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

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

Department of Transportation  
Construction Contract Closeout Status  
May 11, 2017

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	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)	CONT MOD STATUS
3622 FM	1	915	LLO INC DBA STRAGANIC TRISH	ON MULTIPLE INTERSECTIONS IN DISTRICT 1 CITY OF LAS VEGAS PACKAGE 3 SIGNAL SYTEM.	\$431,982.99	\$6,300.00	A	A	S	S	N	A		12/2/16						Y	Closeout in progress.	7 - Trish	
3574 FM Pilot	2	905	Q & D CONSTRUCTION LOMPA MATT	CRACK SEALING, SPALL REPAIR AND DIAMOND GRINDING	\$12,114,205.11	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	A	N	N		6/17/16			11/28/16	12/2/16		N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3578 FM	2	910	PAR ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS DURSKI MATT	I-580 US 395 US 395A FRCC10 SR 431 AND SR 341	\$3,319,768.45	\$0.00	N	A	A	S	N	N		4/15/16						N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3590 FM	2	904	A & K CONSTRUCTION INC BOGE MATT	US 95 FM JUNCTION SR726 TO 0.822 MS OF TRAILING EDGE OF B-680	\$9,528,946.52	\$50,000.00	A	N	N	N	N	N		10/25/16			12/13/16			N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3591 FM	2	910	Q & D CONSTRUCTION DURSKI DEENA	I-580 @ S. VIRGINIA (SUMMIT MALL); CONSTRUCT LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS	\$1,915,906.50	\$50,000.00	N	N	A	N	N	N		3/31/16		3/31/19				N	Closeout pending plant establishment (3/2019). Rick Bosch recommended waiting until spring to assess status of regrowth. Crew working on other closeout items. <b>**Check with Design in 2017 to reduce Plant Establishment (per Sharon).</b>		
3595 FM	2	907	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION 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	A	A	S	S	N	A		5/13/16	7/18/16		Partial 5/25/16			N	NDEP requires 70% plant cover to be achieved before NOT is issued, unable to access at this time due to flooding.		There may be 2 possible CMs pending. One for Granite on site claim.
3598 FM	2	910	Q & D CONSTRUCTION DURSKI MATT	I580 FM SB OFF RAMP AT N CARSON ST INTERCHANGE TO 0.86 MS FM BOWERS MANSION INTERCHANGE	\$15,167,370.32	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	S	N	N		12/2/16						N	Crew working to request pickup. Additional work performed due to flooding.		
3606 FM	2	905	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION LOMPA MATT	I-80 LOCKWOOD INTERCHANGE RAMP AND FRONTAGE ROADWA09 LOCKWOOD INTERCHANGE FM GRANITE PIT TO LOCKWOOD DR.	\$864,453.04	\$43,222.65	A	A	N	S	N	A		10/21/16			2/7/17			Y	Crew working on corrections.	3-Matt	
3611 FM	2	905	Q & D CONSTRUCTION INC LOMPA DEENA	DIST II MTNC YARD (RENO) DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	\$760,006.15	\$38,000.31	A	A	A	A	A	A		9/12/16			11/28/16	12/6/16		Y	Closeout in progress.	1-Deena	
3623	2	911	Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC ANGEL DEENA	SR 431, MT ROSE HWY, MP 0.268 TO 0.651 CONSTRUCT A TRUCK ESCAPE RAMP	\$4,669,566.69	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	S	N	S				10/26/17				N	Construction on going		
3626 FM	2	910	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL DURSKI MATT	SR447 WASHOE COUNTY GERLACH ROAD MP WA 48.93 TO MP WA 74.65	\$938,382.98	\$46,919.15	N	A	A	A	S	A		7/21/16			9/23/16	9/30/16	2/13/17	Y	Pickup completed. Need EEO before sending qtys to contractor. Closeout CM submitted will be approved after all required items completed.	Done	
3627	2	911	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC ANGEL DEENA	HWY 50 CAVE ROCK WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS	\$6,099,958.57	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	S	N	A				10/21/17				N	Construction on going.		
3636 FM	2	904	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION BOGE MATT	FR PE01, I-80, FRONTAGE ROAD S. OF LOVELOCK, MP PE 4.50 TO PE 16.58.	\$2,951,677.37	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	N	S	A		9/16/16			3/26/17			N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3640 FM	2	910	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION DURSKI MATT	SR 529 S. CARSON ST. FM OVERLAND ST. TO FAIRVIEW DRIVE	\$1,301,374.07	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	S	A		10/20/16			11/28/16	12/6/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	2-Matt	
3643	2	910	Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC DURSKI DEENA	SR443, SUN VALLEY BLVD. @ 6TH AVE @ GEPFORD PKWY & @ SKAGGS CIRCLE. PED SAFETY PROJ FY15	\$1,110,000.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3648 FM	2	904	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL BOGE MATT	SR399, PERSHING	\$1,365,424.11	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	N	N	N		10/31/16			3/26/17			N	Crew working to request 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

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

Department of Transportation  
Construction Contract Closeout Status  
May 11, 2017

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	E E O	L A B	A A B	C P P R	LE or CM	A T S S	A T S S	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)	CONT MOD STATUS
3649	2	911	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO ANGEL DEENA	SHARED USE PATHWATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS	\$4,331,331.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Construction on going		
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	S	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y	5/11/16	6/10/16	9/7/16	11/2/16	11/7/16		Y	Pickup in process. 40% complete.	1-Matt	
3551	3	908	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC TESFAGBR DEENA	ADD 6' SHOULDERS, PASSING LANES, FLATTEN SLOPES, & EXTEND DRAINAGE FACILITIES. PACKAGE 2	\$8,363,636.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		10/9/15	10/14/15		12/10/15	1/5/16		Y	Pending Cont Mod for resolution topsoil/earthwork issue. HQ review complete.	1-Deena	
3563	3	301 ELY	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION HESTERLEE DEENA	US50-5, US93, SR140, SR278, SR292, SR294, and SR305; CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	\$4,824,007.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	N	N	A		7/29/15				9/30/15	9/30/15	7/19/16	Y	HQ closeout completed 7/19/16; spoke w/ Hesterlee re: needing justification for addtl entries in book for screenings, need CPPRs also. Lani emailed Randy regarding outstanding items.	Done, pending payoff	
3604 FM	3	920 WINN	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC SCHWARTZ MATT	I-80 FM 1.065 MW OF HU/LA CTY LN , I-80 HU/LA CTY LN TO 0.93 ME OF E BATTLE MTN INTCHING: SR 304 ALLEN RD	\$11,996,460.05	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N						Partial Relief 12/5/2016			N	Construction on going for ITS elements only.		
3609 FM	3	908	WW CLYDE & CO TESFAGBR DEENA	I-80 FROM .05 MI WEST OF WILLOW CREEK GRADE SEPARATON TO .82 MI EAST OF THE EAST WELLS INTERCHANGE	\$16,394,527.13	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	S	N	S		11/16/16	11/23/16			2/3/17			Y	Closeout in progress. Crew working on corrections. Rec'd 5 labor penalties for prime/subs. Will deduct from retention on Final estimate.	5- Deena	
3631 FM	3	C301	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION LLC AVERETT DEENA	MY 927, NORTH FORK MNTNC YARD @ SR 225 DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS & REPAVE MTNC YARD	\$848,840.59	\$42,442.03	N	A	A	N	S	A		11/18/16							Y	Closeout in progress..	6- Deena	
3633 FM	3	912	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC VACANT DEENA	CHIP SEAL SR 318 LUND	\$1,847,031.30	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	S	A		9/16/16	10/28/16			11/23/16	4/7/17		Y	30-day notice expired. Docu-signed Final Pmt Memo for signature. Pay off on Cut-off 5/19/17.	4-Deena	
3641 FM	3	918	STAKER & PARSON CO. PIERCE DEENA	SR226 DEEP CREEK HIGHWAY	\$2,289,741.77	\$38,101.86	A	A	A	N	S	A		9/14/16	10/20/16			1/5/17			Y	HQ review completed. Crew working on corrections. <b>Semi-final and Closeout CM</b> needs to be made.	3- Deena	
3642 FM	3	918	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC PIERCE MATT	SR 278 EUREKA ROAD	\$1,748,566.55	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		9/30/16	10/14/16			10/27/16	4/11/17	4/12/17	Y	Qtys sent to contractor 4/13/2017. Pay off on Cut-off 5/19/2017	Done	

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

**NDOT Construction Contracts Closed Out  
Feb. 2017 - May 2017**

Item #7B

Contract	Resident Engineer	NDOT/Consultant Project Manager	Original Bid	CCO Amount	% CCO	Total Paid	Total Amount Over/Under Bid Amount	% of Bid Amount	Agreement Estimate (budget)	Total Amount Over/Under Budgeted Amount	% of Budget
3586	JOHN ANGEL	VICTOR PETERS	\$1,160,000.00	\$233,672.69	20.1%	\$1,625,077.76	\$465,077.76	140%	\$1,323,150.00	\$301,927.76	123%
3646	DAVE SCHWARTZ	GREGORY MINDRUM	\$1,494,494.00	(\$4,103.95)	-0.3%	\$1,476,994.26	(\$17,499.74)	99%	\$1,658,277.00	(\$181,282.74)	89%
3603	DAVE SCHWARTZ	JOHN BRADSHAW	\$2,344,007.00	\$164,351.25	7.0%	\$2,527,448.06	\$183,441.06	108%	\$2,587,577.56	(\$60,129.50)	98%
3525	MIKE SIMMONS	JOHN BRADSHAW	\$14,222,222.00	\$395,652.43	2.8%	\$16,218,006.43	\$1,995,784.43	114%	\$15,187,265.00	\$1,030,741.43	107%
3608	LARRY BOGE	KEVIN MAXWELL	\$622,000.00	\$10,669.90	1.7%	\$644,471.37	\$22,471.37	104%	\$706,525.00	(\$62,053.63)	91%
3561	JOHN ANGEL	STEVE BIRD	\$6,354,354.01	\$21,300.21	0.3%	\$6,598,311.76	\$243,957.75	104%	\$6,684,652.00	(\$86,340.24)	99%
3621	JOHN BRONDER	STEVE BIRD	\$3,612,781.22	\$105,098.82	2.9%	\$3,944,665.49	\$331,884.27	109%	\$3,967,089.00	(\$22,423.51)	99%
3587	JOHN ANGEL	STEVE BIRD	\$689,007.00	(\$44,286.15)	-6.4%	\$691,415.72	\$2,408.72	100%	\$757,082.28	(\$65,666.56)	91%
3644	DAVID SCHWARTZ	GREGORY MINDRUM	\$589,007.00	\$0.00	0.0%	\$593,593.30	\$4,586.30	101%	\$677,198.00	(\$83,604.70)	88%
3532	TIM RUGULEISKI	JENICA KELLER	\$13,600,000.00	\$205,279.49	1.5%	\$13,680,763.93	\$80,763.93	101%	\$14,201,021.00	(\$520,257.07)	96%
3564	JOHN ANGEL	PEDRO RODRIGUEZ	\$14,877,619.23	\$0.00	0.0%	\$13,400,255.33	(\$1,477,363.90)	90%	\$14,877,619.00	(\$1,477,363.67)	90%
3601	LARRY BOGE	VICTOR PETERS	\$792,700.00	(\$1,000.00)	-0.1%	\$784,927.82	(\$7,772.18)	99%	\$889,259.00	(\$104,331.18)	88%
3600	ASHLEY HURLBUT	PHILIP KANEGSBERG	\$2,906,000.00	\$553,413.56	19.0%	\$3,395,507.60	\$489,507.60	117%	\$3,097,704.00	\$297,803.60	110%
3635	JOHN BRONDER	JOHN BRADSHAW	\$354,000.54	\$0.00	0.0%	\$365,749.78	\$11,749.24	103%	\$423,391.00	(\$57,641.22)	86%
3596	BERHANE TESFAGABR	BILLY EZELL	\$2,177,777.00	\$275,600.01	12.7%	\$2,211,199.15	\$33,422.15	102%	\$2,394,139.00	(\$182,939.85)	92%
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>\$65,795,969.00</b>	<b>\$1,915,648.26</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>\$68,158,387.76</b>	<b>\$2,362,418.76</b>	<b>104%</b>	<b>\$69,431,948.84</b>	<b>(\$1,273,561.08)</b>	<b>98%</b>
									Number of Projects Over/Under Agr. Est. (Budget)	Projects Equal To or Under Budget	12
										Project Over Budget	3

**Contract No.** 3586  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60628  
**FHWA Project No(s):** NHP-050-1(034)  
**County:** Carson City  
**Location:** US 50 Carson City lower and Central Clear Creek Watershed Storm Drain Project from the Clear Creek interchange to the junction of US 395.  
**Work Description:** Construct Multiple Storm Drains, Drop Inlets, Trench Drains, Slope Flattening, Grading, Concrete Curb and Gutters, and Channel Work.  
**Advertised Date:** March 18, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** April 16, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** May 4, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** June 8, 2015  
**Work Completed:** November 6, 2015  
**Work Accepted:** March 29, 2016  
**Final Payment:** February 10, 2017  
**Contractor:** MKD Construction Inc  
**Resident Engineer:** John Angel

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$1,095,119.72  
**Bid Price:** \$1,160,000.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$1,323,150.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$1,625,077.76  
**Percent of Budget:** 123%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$233,672.69  
**Percent Change Orders:** 20.1%  
**Original Working Days:** 60  
**Updated Working Days:** 88  
**Charged Working Days:** 88  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$3,156.02

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$238,600.87	12.8%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$1,625,077.76	87.2%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,863,678.63	

**Contract No.** 3646  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60742  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-0796(001)  
**County:** Humboldt

**Location:** SR 796 Winnemucca Airport Road and on FRHU 15 Frontage Road

**Work Description:** Cold milling and placing plantmix bituminous surface

**Advertised Date:** June 15, 2016  
**Bid Opening:** July 7, 2016  
**Contract Awarded:** July 27, 2016  
**Notice to Proceed:** August 29, 2016  
**Work Completed:** October 17, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** October 17, 2016  
**Final Payment:** February 10, 2017

**Contractor:** Road & Highway Builders LLC  
**Resident Engineer:** Dave Schwartz

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$1,213,041.86  
**Bid Price:** \$1,494,494.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$1,658,277.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$1,476,994.26  
**Percent of Budget:** 89%  
**Total Change Orders:** -\$4,103.95  
**Percent Change Orders:** -0.3%  
**Original Working Days:** 35  
**Updated Working Days:** 35  
**Charged Working Days:** 27  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$950.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$62,861.35	4.1%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$1,476,994.26	95.9%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,539,855.61	

**Contract No.** 3603  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60659  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-140(14)  
**County:** Humboldt  
  
**Location:** Sr 140 Denio Rd/Adel Rd/ Oregon Rd. MP Hu 14.94 To 34.00 and MP Hu 74.00 To MP Hu 110.11  
  
**Work Description:** Patch, chip seal  
  
**Advertised Date:** July 8, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** July 30, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** August 18, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** September 21, 2015  
**Work Completed:** August 28, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** November 10, 2016  
**Final Payment:** February 15, 2017  
  
**Contractor:** Sierra Nevada Construction Co.  
**Resident Engineer:** Dave Schwartz

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$2,429,587.74  
**Bid Price:** \$2,344,007.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$2,587,577.56  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$2,527,448.06  
**Percent of Budget:** 98%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$164,351.25  
**Percent Change Orders:** 7.0%  
**Original Working Days:** N/A  
**Updated Working Days:** N/A  
**Charged Working Days:** N/A  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$2,500.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$116,759.96	4.4%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$2,527,448.06	95.6%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$2,644,208.02	

**Contract No.** 3525  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73615, 73546  
**FHWA Project No(s):** IM-080-4(084), BR-080-4(083)  
**County:** Eureka  
**Location:** I-80 from 0.771 Miles East of the Trailing Edge of I-883 to the Beginning of Asphalt, 0.846 Miles West of Emigrant Pass Interchange and on I-80 Near Dunphy, Multiple Structures  
**Work Description:** Dowel bar retrofit, profile grind, saw and seal joints, seismic retrofit and rehabilitation of structures and scour mitigation of structure.  
**Advertised Date:** August 29, 2012  
**Bid Opening:** October 25, 2012  
**Contract Awarded:** December 10, 2012  
**Notice to Proceed:** March 1, 2013  
**Work Completed:** March 11, 2015  
**Work Accepted:** August 14, 2015  
**Final Payment:** February 28, 2017  
**Contractor:** Road & Highway Builders LLC  
**Resident Engineer:** Mike Simmons

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$14,386,015.57  
**Bid Price:** \$14,222,222.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$15,187,265.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$16,218,006.43  
**Percent of Budget:** 107%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$395,652.43  
**Percent Change Orders:** 2.8%  
**Original Working Days:** 230  
**Updated Working Days:** 283  
**Charged Working Days:** 283  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$60,321.27

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$916,943.18	4.9%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$64,007.79	0.3%
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$1,532,229.09	8.2%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$16,218,006.43	86.6%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$18,731,186.49	

**Contract No.** 3608  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73798  
**FHWA Project No(s):** STP-0115(001)  
**County:** Churchill

**Location:** SR 115 Harrigan Road at L Line Canal

**Work Description:** Replace existing structure B-100

**Advertised Date:** July 29, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** August 27, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** September 15, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** October 19, 2015  
**Work Completed:** April 25, 2017  
**Work Accepted:** December 2, 2016  
**Final Payment:** February 24, 2017

**Contractor:** MKD Construction INC  
**Resident Engineer:** Larry Boge

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$522,808.16  
**Bid Price:** \$622,000.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$706,525.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$644,471.37  
**Percent of Budget:** 91%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$10,669.90  
**Percent Change Orders:** 1.7%  
**Original Working Days:** 70  
**Updated Working Days:** 77  
**Charged Working Days:** 76  
**Liquidated Damages:** N/A

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$173,813.81	18.5%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$22,385.32	2.4%
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$98,695.28	10.5%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$644,471.37	68.6%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$939,365.78	

**Contract No.** 3561  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60609  
**FHWA Project No(s):** NHP-050-2(013)  
**County:** Carson City, Lyon  
**Location:** US 50 from 0.343 Miles East of Deer Run Road to the CC/LY County Line; US 50 from the CC/LY County Line to 0.499 Miles East of the Junction with SR 341.  
**Work Description:** 2 3/4" Mill and 2" Plantmix Bituminous Surface with 3/4" Open Graded Wearing Course. 4" Mill and 4" PBS in Lane #2 Eastbound and Westbound.  
**Advertised Date:** January 29, 2014  
**Bid Opening:** February 27, 2014  
**Contract Awarded:** April 14, 2014  
**Notice to Proceed:** May 19, 2014  
**Work Completed:** November 7, 2014  
**Work Accepted:** September 2, 2015  
**Final Payment:** February 28, 2017  
**Contractor:** Granite Construction CO  
**Resident Engineer:** John Angel

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$7,226,630.85  
**Bid Price:** \$6,354,354.01  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$6,684,652.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$6,598,311.76  
**Percent of Budget:** 99%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$21,300.21  
**Percent Change Orders:** 0.3%  
**Original Working Days:** 110  
**Updated Working Days:** 110  
**Charged Working Days:** 101  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$1,000.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$430,933.08	6.1%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$6,598,311.76	93.9%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	<hr/> \$7,029,244.84	

**Contract No.** 3621  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73733  
**FHWA Project No(s):** NHP-093-4(020)  
**County:** White Pine

**Location:** On US 93 north of McGill from 3.61 miles south of Success Summit Road to 5.74 miles north of Success Summit Road

**Work Description:** Cold milling and placing plantmix bituminous surface with open graded surface

**Advertised Date:** January 6, 2016  
**Bid Opening:** February 4, 2016  
**Contract Awarded:** February 23, 2016  
**Notice to Proceed:** March 28, 2016  
**Work Completed:** August 12, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** September 9, 2016  
**Final Payment:** February 27, 2017

**Contractor:** WW Clyde & CO  
**Resident Engineer:** John Bronder

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$4,508,615.63  
**Bid Price:** \$3,612,781.22  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$3,967,089.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$3,944,665.49  
**Percent of Budget:** 99%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$105,098.82  
**Percent Change Orders:** 2.9%  
**Original Working Days:** 75  
**Updated Working Days:** 75  
**Charged Working Days:** 61  
**Liquidated Damages:** N/A

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$84,122.62	2.0%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$266,926.22	6.2%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$3,944,665.49	91.8%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$4,295,714.33	

**Contract No.** 3587  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73903  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPF-050-2(026)  
**County:** Lyon  
**Location:** US 50 From Boyer Lane To Pinto Lane And From Onyx St To The Jct Of Us 95 In Silver Springs. Mp Ly 19.17 To Ly 20.19 And Ly 26.25 To Ly 29.24

**Work Description:** Construct Fence With Cattle Guards At Various Locations.

**Advertised Date:** March 18, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** April 9, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** May 4, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** June 8, 2015  
**Work Completed:** October 23, 2017  
**Work Accepted:** January 29, 2016  
**Final Payment:** February 27, 2017

**Contractor:** Sierra Nevada Construction INC  
**Resident Engineer:** John Angel

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$754,354.44  
**Bid Price:** \$689,007.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$757,082.28  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$691,415.72  
**Percent of Budget:** 91%  
**Total Change Orders:** -\$44,286.15  
**Percent Change Orders:** -6.4%  
**Original Working Days:** 50  
**Updated Working Days:** 50  
**Charged Working Days:** 42  
**Liquidated Damages:** N/A

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$6,836.15	0.9%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$411.68	0.1%
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$73,723.91	9.5%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$691,415.72	89.5%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$772,387.46	

**Contract No.** 3644  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60741  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-0293(002)  
**County:** Humboldt

**Location:** SR 293

**Work Description:** Chip seal and seal coat

**Advertised Date:** June 1, 2016  
**Bid Opening:** June 23, 2016  
**Contract Awarded:** July 12, 2016  
**Notice to Proceed:** August 15, 2016  
**Work Completed:** September 26, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** February 27, 2017  
**Final Payment:** March 24, 2017

**Contractor:** Sierra Nevada Construction CO.  
**Resident Engineer:** David Schwartz

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$659,370.89  
**Bid Price:** \$589,007.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$677,198.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$593,593.30  
**Percent of Budget:** 88%  
**Total Change Orders:** N/A  
**Percent Change Orders:** N/A  
**Original Working Days:** 30  
**Updated Working Days:** 30  
**Charged Working Days:** 26  
**Liquidated Damages:** N/A

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$32,746.97	5.2%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$593,593.30	94.8%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$626,340.27	

**Contract No.** 3532  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60544  
**FHWA Project No(s):** STP-015-1(151)  
**County:** Clark

**Location:** I 15, Las Vegas, At F Street

**Work Description:** Re-Open F Street Under I 15 To Traffic

**Advertised Date:** January 10, 2013  
**Bid Opening:** February 21, 2013  
**Contract Awarded:** April 8, 2013  
**Notice to Proceed:** May 13, 2013  
**Work Completed:** October 24, 2014  
**Work Accepted:** October 1, 2015  
**Final Payment:** March 28, 2017

**Contractor:** Las Vegas Paving Corporation  
**Resident Engineer:** Tim Ruguleiski

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$12,124,268.14  
**Bid Price:** \$13,600,000.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$14,201,021.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$13,680,763.93  
**Percent of Budget:** 96%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$205,279.49  
**Percent Change Orders:** 1.5%  
**Original Working Days:** 335  
**Updated Working Days:** 335  
**Charged Working Days:** 335  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$3,448.50

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$1,765,117.41	11.4%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$13,680,763.93	88.6%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$15,445,881.34	

**Contract No.** 3564  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60590  
**FHWA Project No(s):** STP-0207(006)  
**County:** Douglas

**Location:** SR 207, Kingsbury Grade, from the junction with US 50 to 3.866 miles east of US 50. MP DO 0.00 to DO 3.866.

**Work Description:** Pulverize 13-inch depth, 8-inch roadbed modification, place 5-inch plantmix bituminous surface overlay, and construct stormwater quality improvements.

**Advertised Date:** March 12, 2014  
**Bid Opening:** January 29, 2014  
**Contract Awarded:** March 11, 2014  
**Notice to Proceed:** April 14, 2014  
**Work Completed:** October 15, 2014  
**Work Accepted:** November 3, 2015  
**Final Payment:** March 31, 2017

**Contractor:** Q&D Construction INC  
**Resident Engineer:** John Angel

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$14,101,765.99  
**Bid Price:** \$14,877,619.23  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$14,877,619.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$13,400,255.33  
**Percent of Budget:** 90%  
**Total Change Orders:** N/A  
**Percent Change Orders:** N/A  
**Original Working Days:** 200  
**Updated Working Days:** 200  
**Charged Working Days:** 125  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$4,119.96

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$717,584.59	5.1%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$13,400,255.33	94.9%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$14,117,839.92	

**Contract No.** 3601  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73762  
**FHWA Project No(s):** BR-0019(022)  
**County:** Lyon

**Location:** Nordyke Road over the east fork of the Walker River in Lyon County

**Work Description:** Replace Bridge B-1610

**Advertised Date:** July 1, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** July 30, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** September 3, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** September 21, 2015  
**Work Completed:** March 3, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** December 6, 2016  
**Final Payment:** April 3, 2017

**Contractor:** Q&D Construction INC  
**Resident Engineer:** Larry Boge

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$947,101.18  
**Bid Price:** \$792,700.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$889,259.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$784,927.82  
**Percent of Budget:** 88%  
**Total Change Orders:** -\$1,000.00  
**Percent Change Orders:** -0.1%  
**Original Working Days:** 70  
**Updated Working Days:** 70  
**Charged Working Days:** 51  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$1,000.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$205,064.86	19.1%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$2,137.83	0.2%
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$81,179.47	7.6%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$784,927.82	73.1%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,073,309.98	

**Contract No.** 3600  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73940  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SP-HQ-0702(068)  
**County:** Carson City  
**Location:** MY 922, Carson City Maintenance Yard, At Fr CC05 MP CC 0.127.

**Work Description:** Drainage Improvements And Repave Maintenance Yard.

**Advertised Date:** June 17, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** July 9, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** July 31, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** August 31, 2015  
**Work Completed:** June 10, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** December 7, 2016  
**Final Payment:** May 5, 2017

**Contractor:** Q&D Construction INC  
**Resident Engineer:** Ashley Hurlbut

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$3,493,429.51  
**Bid Price:** \$2,906,000.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$3,097,704.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$3,395,507.60  
**Percent of Budget:** 110%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$553,413.56  
**Percent Change Orders:** 19.0%  
**Original Working Days:** 120  
**Updated Working Days:** 124  
**Charged Working Days:** 110  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$1,000.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$70,440.51	1.8%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$391,563.43	10.2%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$3,395,507.60	88.0%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$3,857,511.54	



**Contract No.** 3596  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73742  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPF-093-5(023)  
**County:** Elko

**Location:** US 93 in Elko County

**Work Description:** Wildlife Safety Crossing

**Advertised Date:** June 3, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** June 25, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** July 2, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** August 3, 2015  
**Work Completed:** August 17, 2015  
**Work Accepted:** April 7, 2017  
**Final Payment:** May 5, 2017

**Contractor:** Remington Construction LLC.  
**Resident Engineer:** Berhane Tesfagabr

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$1,974,814.87  
**Bid Price:** \$2,177,777.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$2,394,139.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$2,211,199.15  
**Percent of Budget:** 92%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$275,600.01  
**Percent Change Orders:** 12.7%  
**Original Working Days:** 80  
**Updated Working Days:** 81  
**Charged Working Days:** 81  
**Liquidated Damages:** N/A

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$68,081.38	2.6%
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$310,713.25	12.0%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$2,211,199.15	85.4%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$2,589,993.78	

Open Contract Status 5/15/2017

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	Contract Modification Amount	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	1% Budget	2% Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	RESIDENT ENGINEER	COMMENTS
3546	I 15, DRY LK. MILL, PBS & TRCK CLIMBING LN	\$ 37,235,208.00	\$ 35,650,000.00	\$1,471,987.11	\$ 38,116,052.39	102%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	VICTOR PETERS	STEVE CONNER	1.4M in Change Orders - Tortoise Fence and Traffic Control
3550	SR 227, IDAHO ST, COLDMILL & PBS	\$ 20,616,055.00	\$ 19,656,656.00	\$361,961.55	\$ 19,678,172.65	95%	99%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	STEVE BIRD	CASEY KELLY	
3551	US93, CURRIE TO JCT 232, FLATTEN SLOPES	\$ 8,956,862.00	\$ 8,363,363.00	\$0.00	\$ 8,758,313.77	98%	100%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JIM CERAGIOLI	MIKE MURPHY	
3554	US 95, ANN RD TO DURANGO PCK 2A	\$ 37,306,043.00	\$ 35,700,000.01	\$1,048,651.97	\$ 36,074,409.00	97%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JENICA KELLER	ABID SULAHRIA	
3563	US50,US93,SR140,SR278,SR292,SR294,SR305	\$ 5,349,866.00	\$ 4,824,007.00	\$0.00	\$ 4,952,289.58	93%	91%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	CHRISTOPHER PETERSEN	RANDY HESTERLEE	
3574	I-580,MOANA TO TRUCKEE RIVER	\$ 12,936,849.00	\$ 12,114,205.11	\$269,172.48	\$ 12,105,624.75	94%	100%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	VICTOR PETERS	SAM LOMPA	
3576	SR 147, TO APPROX L. MEAD NRA	\$ 5,948,497.07	\$ 5,553,726.00	\$8,512.70	\$ 5,692,049.59	96%	100%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	LORI CAMPBELL	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3577	US95, N. OF FRCL34 TO TRAILING EDGE I1075	\$ 23,642,334.99	\$ 22,120,000.00	\$57,549.19	\$ 22,429,160.40	95%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	KEVIN MAXWELL (DESIGNER)	STEVEN CONNER	
3578	I-580, WIND WARNING SYSTEM	\$ 3,319,768.45	\$ 3,123,589.00	-\$83,940.76	\$ 2,805,102.58	84%	68%	PAR ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS INC	RODNEY SCHILLING	BRAD DURSKI	
3580	US93, BOULDER CITY BYPASS PART 1	\$ 91,345,809.04	\$ 82,999,999.00	\$18,591,282.51	\$ 76,935,096.64	84%	67%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	ANTHONY LORENZI	TIMOTHY RUGULEISKI	ROW, Utility, Earthwork, Additional Bridge and Resequencing Contract Modifications
3583	US 95, NW PHASE 3A	\$ 46,140,382.00	\$ 39,200,000.00	\$1,775,657.89	\$ 37,255,695.13	81%	82%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JENICA KELLER	ABID SULAHRIA	
3585	US395, CARSON CITY FREEWAY	\$ 44,149,197.28	\$ 42,242,242.00	-\$849,907.66	\$ 35,050,457.06	79%	98%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JEFF LERUD	ASHLEY HURLBUT	
3590	US95, PASSING LANES & SLOPE FLATTENING	\$ 9,995,996.00	\$ 9,323,000.00	\$545,044.28	\$ 9,775,339.13	98%	98%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	LORI CAMPBELL	LARRY BOGE	
3591	I580 AT SO. VIRGINIA, LANDSCP & AESTHETICS	\$ 2,110,249.03	\$ 1,915,906.50	\$5,000.00	\$ 1,740,296.03	82%	55%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	PAUL SHOCK	BRAD DURSKI	
3595	US 395, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB STRUCS	\$ 1,814,935.00	\$ 1,625,625.00	\$449,875.33	\$ 2,034,773.36	112%	85%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	ASHLEY HURLBUT	Extensive Structure Repair Work
3597	I15, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB STRUCS	\$ 2,259,404.00	\$ 2,050,050.00	\$170,501.27	\$ 2,144,468.97	95%	100%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	STEVE CONNER	
3598	I580, RDWY REHAB WIDEN & SEISMIC RETROF	\$ 15,910,059.62	\$ 14,823,785.92	\$1,132,625.62	\$ 15,305,966.61	96%	93%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KEVIN MAXWELL	BRAD DURSKI	
3602	SR160, INSTALL CROSS OVERS & CABLE RAIL	\$ 899,660.00	\$ 794,000.00	\$12,881.94	\$ 775,755.47	86%	84%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JOHN BRADSHAW	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3604	I80, COLD MILL,RUBBLIZING,DENSE & OPEN GR	\$ 12,163,746.00	\$ 11,696,696.00	\$298,507.06	\$ 11,653,249.59	96%	99%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	VICTOR PETERS	DAVID SCHWARTZ	
3605	SR596, COLD MILL, PLANTMIX & ISLAND IMPR	\$ 8,228,878.00	\$ 7,669,990.00	-\$43,289.43	\$ 7,272,974.77	88%	98%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	DEVIN CARTWRIGHT	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3606	I80, LOCKWOOD INTERCHANGE RAMPS	\$ 921,701.00	\$ 816,816.00	-\$56,572.12	\$ 740,085.39	80%	95%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	PHILIPKANEGSBERG	SAM LOMPA	
3607	US95, SHOULDER WORK & PLANTMIX SURFAC	\$ 15,161,921.00	\$ 14,141,141.00	-\$393,756.63	\$ 13,297,486.73	88%	87%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	VICTOR PETERS	SAMI YOUSUF	
3609	I80, COLD MILL AND OVRLY W/LEVELING COU	\$ 17,559,989.00	\$ 16,394,527.13	\$229,072.34	\$ 16,542,917.29	94%	88%	WW CLYDE & CO	KEVIN MAXWELL	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3610	I15, REPLACE HIGH MAST LOWERING SYS	\$ 1,342,987.00	\$ 1,247,920.00	\$13,304.00	\$ 1,242,642.00	93%	92%	LLO INC DBA	ERIC MACGILL	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3611	RENO MAINT YARD IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 810,407.00	\$ 715,006.15	\$65,582.00	\$ 753,421.67	93%	80%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	PHILIP KANEGSBERG	SAM LOMPA	
3613	SR160, WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 17,636,208.00	\$ 16,458,854.00	\$986,590.28	\$ 15,774,173.32	89%	91%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	LUIS GARAY	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3614	I80, CONCRETE SUBSTRUCTURE REPAIR	\$ 2,559,554.00	\$ 2,554,554.00	\$0.00	\$ 1,991,688.32	78%	17%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JENICA KELLER	BRAD DURSKI	
3615	I80, SAFETY OVER XINGS & FENCING	\$ 15,501,359.00	\$ 14,076,436.07	\$334,025.38	\$ 8,669,268.93	56%	58%	WADSWORTH BROTHERS CONSTRUCT	JOHN BRADSHAW	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3616	GOLDFIELD VISITOR CENTER FACILITY	\$ 814,708.00	\$ 712,369.19	\$0.00	\$ 677,277.34	83%	100%	TRADE WEST CONSTRUCTION INC.	KEVIN MAXWELL	SAMI YOUSUF	
3617	I15, REHAB AND REPAVE TRUCK INSPEC STA	\$ 1,022,699.00	\$ 904,953.00	\$0.00	\$ 820,684.20	80%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	PHILIP KANEGSBERG	STEVE CONNER	
3618	I15, INSTALL ITS INFRASTRUCTURE	\$ 2,002,657.00	\$ 1,812,321.10	\$124,119.60	\$ 1,807,901.98	90%	100%	NEV-CAL INVESTORS INC.	RODNEY SCHILLING	STEVE CONNER	
3619	SR604, REHAB & CONCRETE BUS LANES	\$ 18,509,645.00	\$ 17,295,592.71	\$0.00	\$ 6,312,433.85	34%	42%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	KEVIN MAXWELL	TONY COLAGIOVANNI	
3620	SR160, INSTALL SIGNAL SYS & PED FACILITIES	\$ 2,512,805.00	\$ 2,373,106.00	\$696.34	\$ 2,237,253.98	89%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	STEVE BIRD	MARTIN STRGANAC	
3622	LV VAR LOCS, SIGNAL SYS MODS YELLOW ARR	\$ 459,422.00	\$ 390,983.00	\$0.00	\$ 364,535.00	79%	100%	LLO INC DBA	JONATHAN ALLEN	MARTIN STRGANIC	
3623	SR431, CONSTRUCT TRUCK ESCAPE RAMP	\$ 5,002,630.00	\$ 4,669,566.69	\$2,865.96	\$ 4,831,984.13	97%	98%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KENT STEELE	JOHN ANGEL	
3626	SR447, CHIP SEAL WITH FOG SEAL	\$ 1,000,647.00	\$ 888,498.00	\$0.00	\$ 796,064.47	80%	42%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	PHILLIP KANESBERG	BRAD DURSKI	
3627	US 50, CAVE ROCK WATER QUALITY IMPR	\$ 6,399,809.00	\$ 5,687,013.00	-\$138,242.17	\$ 6,006,251.89	94%	79%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	DEVIN CARTWRIGHT	JOHN ANGEL	
3628	US6, COLDMILL STRESS RELIEF W/OPEN GRAD	\$ 23,186,173.00	\$ 21,800,000.00	-\$1,000.00	\$ 8,537,556.80	37%	46%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	SAMI YOUSUF	
3629	I15, MILL & OVRLY, PCCP WIDENING, SEISMIC	\$ 35,284,201.00	\$ 33,800,000.00	\$696,907.58	\$ 11,521,647.33	33%	32%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	VICTOR PETERS	STEVEN CONNER	
3630	SR160, WIDENING 2 LANE TO 4 LANE HWY.	\$ 3,751,290.00	\$ 3,494,000.00	\$22,699.85	\$ 2,981,947.00	79%	97%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JOHN BRADSHAW	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3631	N FORK MAINT YARD, DRAINAGE IMPROVS	\$ 904,911.00	\$ 799,999.00	-\$4,597.69	\$ 744,762.32	82%	93%	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION LLC.	GREGORY MINDRUM	TRENT AVERETT	
3632	I580, BRIDGE DECK & APPRO SLAB REHABS	\$ 1,632,145.00	\$ 1,485,485.00	\$0.05	\$ 515,033.48	32%	46%	THE TRUESDELL CORPORATION	ROBERT BRATZLER	BRAD DURSKI	
3633	SR318, CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,115,404.00	\$ 1,788,149.81	\$0.00	\$ 1,659,256.25	78%	93%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	ROBERT BRATZLER	JOHN BRONDER	
3634	US93, CLOVER VALLEY CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,475,398.00	\$ 2,254,007.00	\$310.50	\$ 1,800,335.53	73%	81%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	PHILIP KANEGSBERG	REGINA MARLETTE' PIERCE	
3636	FRPE01, OVERLAY & REPAIR COLUMNS	\$ 3,383,194.00	\$ 2,775,775.00	\$284,125.02	\$ 3,103,524.63	92%	57%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	ROBERT BRATZLER	LARRY BOGE	
3637	SR667, PED LIGHTING & ADA IMPROVS	\$ 1,311,923.00	\$ 1,094,007.00	\$0.00	\$ 160,826.72	12%	8%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	VICTOR PETERS	LARRY BOGE	
3639	SR317, ROAD REPAIR & DRAINAGE IMPR	\$ 3,979,295.00	\$ 3,393,465.12	\$0.00	\$ 2,911,209.71	73%	95%	MEADOW VALLEY CONTRACTORS INC	STEVE BIRD	STEVE CONNER	
3640	SR529, MICRO SURFACE, PATCH & PED IMPR	\$ 1,388,805.00	\$ 1,244,007.00	\$0.00	\$ 1,119,524.90	81%	91%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	STEVE BIRD	BRAD DURSKI	
3641	SR226, PLACING PLANT MIX BIT SURFACE	\$ 2,445,315.00	\$ 2,221,469.91	-\$94,804.47	\$ 1,859,517.90	76%	97%	STAKER & PARSON COMPANIES	GREGORY MINDRUM	REGINA PIERCE	
3642	SR278, PLACING PLANT MOX BIT SURFACE	\$ 1,866,705.00	\$ 1,686,686.00	-\$10.44	\$ 1,625,527.10	87%	93%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	GREGORY MINDRUM	REGINA M PIERCE	
3643	SR443, PED, LIGHTING AND ADA IMPR	\$ 1,240,647.00	\$ 1,110,000.00	-\$4,074.96	\$ 1,043,170.57	84%	93%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	LORI CAMPBELL	BRAD DURSKI	
3645	SR372, CONST ROUNDABOUTS	\$ 4,336,034.00	\$ 4,046,000.00	-\$51,065.30	\$ 2,876,352.06	66%	75%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JOHN BRADSHAW	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3648	SR399, COLD MILL PLANTMIX & CHIP SEAL	\$ 1,559,269.00	\$ 1,311,311.00	\$0.00	\$ 1,354,851.42	87%	93%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	GREGORY MINDRUM	LARRY BOGE	
3649	SR28, WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	\$ 4,385,572.00	\$ 4,331,331.00	-\$568.27	\$ 3,891,589.93	89%	84%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	TYLER WOOD	JOHN ANGEL	
3650	SR159, PED AND ADA SAFETY IMPROVS	\$ 2,592,771.00	\$ 2,363,900.00	\$0.00	\$ 351,466.30	14%	44%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	LORI CAMPBELL	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3651	I80, COLD MILL, PLANT MIX & OPEN GRADE	\$ 11,432,678.00	\$ 10,449,000.00	\$0.00	\$ 1,257,905.27	11%	34%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	VICTOR PETERS	DAVID SCHWARTZ	
3652	US95A, COLD RECY & TRUCK CLIMBING LN	\$ 8,208,696.00	\$ 7,654,000.00	\$0.00	\$ 865,392.13	11%	21%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	ROBERT BRATZLER	LARRY BOGE	
3653	US395, INSTALL ITS INFRASTRUCTURE	\$ 9,577,272.00	\$ 8,940,908.32	\$0.00	\$ 187,899.50	2%	8%	PAR ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS INC	JOHN DICKINSON	BRAD DURSKI	
3654	TE-MOAK TRIBE PED UPGRADE	\$ 1,091,870.00	\$ 969,000.00	\$0.00	\$ 127,448.79	12%	0%	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	LORI CAMPBELL	REGINA PIERCE	
3655	SR160, COLD MILL OVERLAY & SFTY IMPROVS	\$ 9,295,897.00	\$ 8,666,666.00	-\$38,753.84	\$ 2,382,477.81	26%	24%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	KEVIN MAXWELL	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3656	US50, COLD SPRINGS ITS IMPROVS	\$ 2,090,557.00	\$ 1,904,408.50	\$0.00	\$ 159,639.00	8%	5%	TITAN ELECTRICALCONTRACTING	RODNEY SCHILLING	LARRY BOGE	
3657	US50, INSTALL ITS SMART ZONE & FIBER OPTIC	\$ 2,509,653.00	\$ 2,300,587.50	\$0.00	\$ 235,382.13	9%	8%	TITAN ELECTRICALCONTRACTING	RODNEY SCHILLING	JOHN BRONDER	
3658	SR877, COLD MILL & PLACE PLANTMIX	\$ 1,585,464.00	\$ 1,424,000.00	\$0.00	\$ 49,692.55	3%	10%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	VICTOR PETERS	ASHLEY HURLBUT	
3659	SR445, ACCEL & DECEL LANES PYRAMID HWY	\$ 794,870.00	\$ 694,000.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	STEVE BIRD	SAM LOMPA	
3660	SR648, ROADBED MOD PYRAMID AVE	\$ 15,494,605.00	\$ 14,242,242.00	\$0.00	\$ 298,301.65	2%	6%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	VICTOR PETERS	BRAD DURSKI	
3661	US6, COLD IN PLACE RECY & PLANT MIX	\$ 14,781,768.00	\$ 13,595,595.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	ROBERT BRATZLER	JOHN BRONDER	

Open Contract Status 5/15/2017

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	Contract Modification Amount	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	<sup>1</sup> % Budget	<sup>2</sup> % Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	RESIDENT ENGINEER	COMMENTS
3662	SR169, ROADBED, PLANTMIX & OPEN GRADE	\$ 1,553,493.00	\$ 1,397,000.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	STEVE BIRD	SAMI YOUSUF	
3663	US6, CHIP SEAL AND FLUSH	\$ 991,339.00	\$ 879,879.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	GREGORY MINDRUM	SAMI YOUSUF	
3664	SR430, PED IMROVS & NEW TRAFFIC SIGNAL	\$ 1,477,974.00	\$ 1,328,328.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	VICTOR PETERS	BRAD DURSKI	
3665	I80, COLDMIL, PLANT MIX & OPEN GRADE	\$ 10,154,853.00	\$ 9,084,084.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	VICTOR PETERS	MIKE MURPHY	
3666	US93, MICROSUFACE & PED UPDATES	\$ 473,371.00	\$ 400,529.01	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	ROBERT BRATZLER	SAMI YOUSUF	
3667	US93, COLD MILL, PBS & OG, PAVE SHOULDER	\$ 9,818,149.00	\$ 8,989,989.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JOHN BRADSHAW	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3668	I80, ADA REMEDIATION, RAMPS & PED IMPRO	\$ 1,248,138.00	\$ 1,121,099.70	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	ROBERT BRATZLER	SAM LOMPA	
3669	SR159, COLD MILL & PLANT MIX W/GRD SURF	\$ 5,724,585.00	\$ 5,265,000.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	CHRISTOPHER PETERSON	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3670	SR341, SCRUB SEAL W/SEAL COAT	\$ 407,017.00	\$ 341,007.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%		SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	GREGORY MINDRUM	JOHN ANGEL	
3671	SR28, SHARED USE PATH, WATER QUAL IMPRO	\$ 36,202,178.00	\$ 36,177,177.00	\$0.00	\$ 398,072.01	1%		GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	NICHOLAS JOHNSON	JOHN ANGEL	
3672	I80, USA PARKWAY INTERCH & MEDIAN IMPRO	\$ 689,060.00	\$ 599,000.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	STEVE BIRD	SAM LOMPA	
3673	I15, ADA REMEDIATION, RAMPS, BUTTONS	\$ 1,133,866.00	\$ 1,014,304.16	\$0.00	\$ -	0%		UNICON LLC	ROBERT BRATZLER	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
		\$ 744,125,352.48	\$ 691,023,894.61	\$27,198,926.06	\$ 487,441,628.75						

<sup>1</sup> % BUDGET = Total Paid to Date /Agreement Estimate

<sup>2</sup> % TIME = Charged Working Days to Date / Updated Working Days