



**Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group  
Notice of Public Meeting  
1263 South Stewart Street  
Third Floor Conference Room  
Carson City, Nevada  
September 11, 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. Approval of June 12, 2017 Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting minutes (Discussion/For Possible Action)
6. Presentation/Discussion of the consultant selection process (advertisement of RFP through notice to proceed) used for full administration of construction projects and augment of construction crews statewide (Informational Item Only).
7. 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 – Resident Engineer's project assignments
    - Item 5 – Unbalanced Bidding
    - Item 6 – List of active agreements for Construction Division and Project Management Division
    - Item 7 – Update on Design Build Contracts
  - B. Requested Reports and Documents
8. Projects Under Development (5-year Project Plan)
9. Briefing on Status of Projects under Construction (Discussion only)
  - A. Project Closeout Status
  - B. Summary of Projects Closed
  - C. Projects Closed, detail sheets
  - D. Status of Active Projects
  - E. Partnering/Dispute Process Update (Verbal)
10. Public Comment (Discussion Only) - No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes unless the Committee elects to extend the comments for purposes of further discussion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
11. Closed session to receive information from counsel regarding potential or existing litigation (Discussion Only)

## 12. Adjournment (Possible Action)

### Notes:

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

This agenda is posted at [www.nevadadot.com](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 for project management consultants, are they conforming to your 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 in. 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 been terrible. Everybody has

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

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 thank 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]

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Chairman Len Savage	Dennis Gallagher	Dale Keller	Ryan Hornback (Dist II)
BJ AlMBERG	Sharon Foerschler	Pedro Rodriguez	Boyd Ratliff (Dist III)
Frank Martin	Stephen Lani	Denise Inda	Brian Pearson (Dist II)
Reid Kaiser	Jeff Freeman	Mario Gomez (Dist I)	Greg Novak, FHWA
John Terry	Darin Tedford	Thor Dyson (Dist II)	Chris Koeing, Kiewit
Tracy Larkin	Cole Mortensen	Mike Fuess (Dist II)	Seth Alexander, Ames

---

Savage: Let's wait until Member Martin...

Foerschler: He's there. [crosstalk]

Speaker: Thanks... [inaudible]

Dyson: In the corner, the upper -- make some noise, Frank.

Kaiser: You're looking at Elko right there. [laughter]

Martin: I can see you. I just -- Len, I just sent you a text. Bonnie is competing at the South Point, so you don't have my undivided attention for about the next five minutes, okay? [laughter]

Savage: You got it, Member Martin.

Martin: But I'll listen as intently as I can. [laughter] And again, I apologize to everybody for not showing up on the telephone last week like -- or last month -- last what -- in March like I was supposed to.

Savage: Well, let's go ahead and open up the meeting, the June 12th, 2017 Construction Working Group Meeting along with the Consultant Group Meeting. Welcome, everybody, here in Carson City. Welcome, Member Martin, in Las Vegas. I'd like to begin with welcoming BJ AlMBERG as a new CWG Board Member, and Dennis Gallagher, if you'd like to...

Gallagher: Yes. I would -- some of you may recall when this Committee was created. The Governor, I think, volunteered both Len and Frank to serve on it, and the then Controller and the current Controller volunteered to step into the former Controller's shoes onto the Committee. The Controller has indicated that he is

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

willing to give up sitting on this Committee, and his replacement will be BJ Almberg. The Governor just didn't recognize today that BJ had truly, for the first time, volunteered to serve on the Committee. So, welcome, BJ, and we'll make sure that the Governor recognizes your volunteer service on this Committee next month at the Board Meeting.

Almberg: Well, thank you. Like I say, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. You know, it's an honor to come back and work with NDOT staff. I have been fortunate enough with -- there is a -- obviously, your guys' project over on Aultman Street. So, there is some staff that I deal with quite regularly on different things that are going there. It's a pleasure to be there, and I'm sure that is a reflection of the rest of the staff that's here. So, I thank you for this opportunity. Maybe later on I won't be thanking. Maybe I won't be so proud of it, but at least at this point in time while we're young and naive, we're thankful for it.

Savage: Thank you, BJ, and welcome aboard. I know your perspective, your advice, and your experience will be well-suited for this Board, because at this level, we try to look into a lot of different things, and from all different departments, we roll up our sleeves, openly discuss. Contractors are here. Headquarters is here. Districts are here. It's a level that we're able to talk very openly to try to improve what we have here at the Department, for the best value of the people of Nevada, and we have a great group, and we thank you again for everyone attending, and I'd like to get started. If anyone has -- I know we have public comment first, I apologize. Any public comment here in Carson City? Or Las Vegas, any public comment. None here in Carson City. Is there any public comment in Las Vegas?

Menzel: They can hear us.

Savage: Is there any public comment in Las Vegas, Member Martin?

Martin: No, sir, none.

Savage: Thank you.

Dyson: There's other people as well. Elko is on here. I can see.

Savage: Elko, I'm sorry. The screen keeps changing, so I..

Ratliff: No public comment in Elko.

Savage: And who's attending from Elko? I'm sorry.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Ratliff: Boyd Ratliff, the ADE for the Elko Sub-District, and Brian Pearson, one of our PSIs.
- Savage: Thank you, Boyd and Brian. Welcome.
- Ratliff: Thank you.
- Savage: Okay, with that said, we'll go to Agenda Item No. 3. Comments from the Working Group? Do we have any comments here in Carson City?
- Kaiser: I think we're due in September to have another discussion over overhead percentages and consultants. So, I know Bill gave a good presentation a while back, but I think we need another presentation maybe to go into the details a little bit more.
- Terry: I mean, there's not much we can do about it.
- Kaiser: I know there isn't, but I think -- you know, and again, I'm not the person to talk about these overhead percentages, but maybe -- John has a lot of experience in it, because John was a consultant at one time, and he knows probably a little bit more about it, you know, and I know there are still some questions from the Board Members in regards to the overhead percentages, and so forth. And so, you know, maybe we either could have a presentation on it or we could add that to -- create a new item under old business.
- Savage: You know, going back, because I know it was a very in-depth presentation -- I think it was Mr. Terry. It was very in-depth, and then accounting was here. Auditing was here. Mr. Hoffman was there. So, I would definitely like to have BJ review some of that history on that particular meeting, because it was...
- Kaiser: I think BJ has...
- Almberg: Well, I have the packet.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Almberg: Bill gave me the packet that was presented and I come back and read it. Obviously, there's some questions that still come from there, and I haven't 100% grasped the concept behind there, why there's a big difference in there. And so, you know, I expressed today, you know, exactly some of my confusion or concern of what's going on in there, more concerned of just the disparity of, you know, are

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

we paying for extravagance within a very large [inaudible] rate. I don't know if we are or not.

Terry: Years ago, many years ago, this Department tried to cap consultant overhead rates. [crosstalk] That was shot down by the feds that we can't have a cap.

Almberg: Okay. I mean, that was the question that I had conversation with Bill Hoffman in the past, is can we make something that's acceptable.

Larkin: I suggest we just do a short presentation in September and then not put it as a regular item, because as John pointed out, we can explain it to you, but there's no reason to keep bringing it up when we can't change it.

Savage: And that's -- personally speaking, I think we all have a difficult time seeing the difference between the levels of overhead.

Terry: I've never seen a spread that far...

Savage: The spread was huge. Normally, it's between 140% and 160%.

Terry: 146%, yeah.

Savage: I mean, we've been generally close to, but for BJ's knowledge and experience, and again, reminding us, I think it'd behoove us all to revisit it a little bit, and again, I don't know if we need to have every—have a standing agenda item, but let's revisit it and ask the questions and openly debate it and discuss it and try to have different, consultants possibly justify some of that, because it is audited. That's what I got. At the end of the day, they get into their books. They go back, and they have to openly substantiate that overhead cost or whatever [inaudible] we may not agree with it. I don't think [inaudible] but it is what it is [inaudible] so September... [inaudible]

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: Any other comments here in Carson City, open comments on CWG, either construction or consulting?

Almberg: I got some comments.

Martin: I have one, too.

Almberg: Go ahead, Frank.



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: Member Martin, go ahead.

Martin: Well, comment number one, Bonnie made it to the second go around, so we're all happy there. [laughter] I just wanted to ask Reid, we focus on these overhead line items, and so on. How much of that changes after the selection is made and you go into the negotiation phase? Do you talk about the rate, and do you examine the 1.92? Do you examine that? How does that work? What component -- do those rates change when you get into the negotiation phase and they get down to what we would determine to be a more reasonable level when they are -- as somebody said about the penthouse office versus the first-floor office. How does that work, Reid, in that process after you selected XYZ engineering and you sit down with the principles and say, "Hey, what's going on? I need to see your audit."

Kaiser: Frank -- again, Reid Kaiser for the record. I'm probably not the best person to answer that. I have never negotiated one agreement with NDOT in 28 years. So, John would probably [crosstalk] back here.

Terry: So, typically, on the design side, we tend to do our own estimate of hours, and we compare ours to hours of consultants. Then we deal with labor rates and other directs. Usually, the biggest other directs are their subconsultants. Typically, we ask internal audit or the last audited overhead rate, and we simply use it, and we do not negotiate the overhead rate.

Martin: You do not?

Terry: No. If, and this is the vast majority of our design contracts, our cost plus fixed fee, which in theory means we pay their actual costs, cost plus fixed fee with an amount not to exceed. So, essentially, we're negotiating the amount not to exceed, and then we pay their actual cost, their actual cost, what they actually pay their people multiplied by their actual audited overhead rate, and that's essentially what we do. I have never known of us to -- years ago, we tried to say 160 is it. That's all we'll accept. But that was shot down by the feds, and I don't think we've ever gone there again. We always use their actual audited overhead rate on cost plus fixed fee.

Martin: And who does that audit, John?

Terry: It's a -- again, we don't -- very large, like the one today, was Kimley-Horn. National engineering firms have to have -- because they work on federal contracts, have to have their FAR rates audited every year. So, typically, we're a

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

year, year-and-a-half behind. We take the last audited rate that was done probably by one of the big three accounting firms and approved by either another DOT or by the federal government, and then we use that rate. Then we go through the whole project, and at the end of the project, we go back and look -- and it goes in their agreement as provisional overhead rate based upon the last. And then at the end of the project, we ask for an audit, and the auditors go through, audit lots of stuff, including the overhead rate, and then they apply their actual overhead rate. In fact, even if it's a multiyear contract, they apply the actual overhead rate for every year through there, and then we settle up. We may owe them money. They may owe us money based upon that final audit, but those overhead rates are audited by a big three accounting firm or these major firms and accepted by the feds and by other DOTs and by us.

It gets a little trickier if it's a local firm that's only in Nevada. Then we might have to -- if they're new, we might have to negotiate a provisional rate and then get their stuff audited at the end, because they might not have an audited rate from the previous year. So, that's my explanation of it, but we negotiate cost. Sure, we originally set up our budgets based on perhaps a percentage of construction or some other method. That's just there for budgeting purposes. We don't use percent of construction or whatever. We negotiate hours and tasks and then multiply those times their labor rates and [inaudible] I don't know if that answers your question, Frank.

Martin: We're getting closer. Thank you. [laughter]

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler [phonetic] for the record. I can speak of what we do in the construction division. So, we have overhead rates that are supplied by the consultant and/or internal audit, and when we move forward with the agreement, that's the overhead rate that we use. At the end of the agreement, internal audit goes back through to determine what their actual overhead rate is, and like John said, there could be adjustments up or down depending where that falls in. We pay hourly rates that are loaded. That includes their overhead. So, we don't do a fixed fee. We pay for the hours that we get, and we do negotiate what their profit is, and depending on complexity of job and risk to the consultant if they're on a full administration, so they're supplying everything just like a whole construction crew, we'll usually allow them a little higher profit margin. Around 12% is about as high as we go. If they're an augmentation and they're just supplying staff to work with our resident engineers, we try to keep that profit at 10%.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

We also have a range of values that we're comfortable paying hourly rates for based on the level of staff that we're utilizing, and if they come in too high, we just say, "No, we're not going to pay it." We have also started negotiating out a full cost per hour so we don't have separate costs anymore for vehicles and cell phones. Their hourly rate is their hourly rate. That's it. So, you're going to see a little bit change in methodology the way that we're doing things, and some of that was driven by doing our on-call programs, agreements. We have one in each district so that the construction crews have the flexibility to get staff during the peak times when they might just need somebody for a month or two, maybe a little bit longer, and those rates are all-inclusive. It's an hourly rate. They come with everything they need to do their job, their truck, their phones, everything, and we only pay the hours that they work and then apply the applicable profit to it, and that's it. So, we're pretty straightforward in that regard, I believe. I don't know if that answers your question, but that's on how the construction division does it.

Terry: Perhaps the biggest difference between the two is design where we think we have our arms around the scope and how many plan sheets you're going to prepare and how many documents you're going to prepare. It's cost plus fixed fee. The fee is negotiated. While we may say it's 10%, it's just negotiated. Then it goes in as \$50,000. It doesn't matter if they finish in half the man hours and spend half the budget. We'll pay them that \$50,000. That's all we'll pay them for profit. So, the difference is they pay their profit built in. If they had a \$2-million agreement and they ended up only spending a million, that's all they pay them. We would pay them the full fixed fee, but we have an amount not to exceed. That's how almost all design agreements are done.

Savage: So, during the auditing process, they'll actually look at the consultant's payroll? Do they dig that finite to look at that?

Terry: Yeah, every invoice maybe turn in, timesheets... [crosstalk]

Savage: Timesheets along with the payroll, distribution.

Terry: But usually, the audit finds things like some subconsultant or some direct cost was not allowable or, you know, they charge too much for reimbursed travel or something. Usually, the vast majority of the settling up at the end is one or two things that weren't allowable and this adjustment for overhead rates.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Almberg: How do we, with our construction contracts -- or not necessarily construction. What you were discussing was more of a construction consultant contract. You're the consultant saying, "Hey, we negotiate out this fee. This is what we get."

Terry: Well, I'm talking consultant design. She's talking consultant administration by design firms.

Almberg: Okay, so, now when it comes down, we're talking about that, and they're out there working and doing stuff, and we're paying them basically a T&M by the hour not to exceed. How do we control the man hours that they have there?

Foerschler: They are managed -- Sharon Foerschler for the record. If it's an augmentation, they work for the resident engineer, and the resident engineer manages that staff like they do their own staff. If it's a full administration, the resident engineer from the consultant works for the assistant district engineer, and they manage the agreement just like they would -- or the hours I should say, we manage the agreement. They manage it just like they would one of their construction crews. So, they're responsible for approving and verifying all the hours that are worked.

Almberg: The reason I ask the question is because I see some consultants out there working on some NDOT projects and doing things where I feel there's an excess of men out there doing that. You know, I have some situations where there's five guys standing around, and I'm not sure what they're all doing. One might be taking notes. One may be taking pictures. One may be surveying or doing something, where I personally felt there was excessive man hours out there, and I think that's something that we need to control, because watching and seeing some of the things that I'm discussing here is actually things that I do in my own personal business, and I never, ever, ever have had that many people out there going and doing some of these things. Sure, I might have less staff out there doing it. It may take them several days longer to do it, but in long term, I think it's a little more -- you know, it probably would come back to be cheaper for us if we somehow controlled these man hours instead of basically letting them basically stack the deck so that they make sure that, hey, I got enough exceed price to get that done. I got to put five guys out here on this job to be able to get my billings up to my not-to-exceed amount.

Foerschler: We don't let the consultant have that control. That's up to NDOT staff to manage. So, the consultant -- I mean, our agreement might have four inspectors, four testers, and an assistant RE for an augmentation. We will only utilize the staff we need. So, just because their agreement says they have nine people, you may not

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

have nine people out there, but that is up to the districts. The construction office manages the agreement, procures the consultant, and then we leave it up to the districts to manage the staff as needed for the construction contracts.

Dyson: So, Member AlMBERG, Thor Dyson, District Engineer. We do -- just like Sharon Foerschler stated, we do manage the consultants for construction administration. They'll be involved in our monthly meetings, construction meetings. They'll be involved in pre-con meeting. They'll be involved in weekly meetings, and we keep tabs on what we need as far as their services are concerned. When the peak of the construction is happening, we're going to have, you know, peak usage of those consultants depending on the type of work. If it's a lot of testing, we're going to have our testers out there. It's a real struggle. I want to state that there are times where we know we have some upcoming work, and if we cut loose the consultants, it will be difficult just getting that qualified person back. We try to manage that very carefully, and if we're done, we're done, completely done, let them go, but if there's opportunities for additional workloads, we're too premature in cutting loose those individuals, that could be problematic. So, it's a real balancing act, our workload, and what I have done is if the agreement is good for, you know, several different projects, we'll move those individuals within the project or possibly have a consultant agreement with Loomis [phonetic] on-call, because we have such a shortage of personnel for testing and inspection and other aspects, because our workload all of a sudden has just ramped up, and so we have this on-call agreement. And so, we're addressing some of your concerns by bringing them on, cutting them loose, bringing them on, cutting them loose. We just got to balance it.

AlMBERG: Well, like I said, I'm not doubting that you guys are watching whatever. More of just a question is can that be happening where they're basically trying to stack the deck, but what you're telling me is no, because we are in control, and we're watching what's going on. And so, I just see some things that just raise the question that, hey, are these guys trying to stack the deck in their favor coming in and saying we need this or need that.

Foerschler: That comes from our staff, not that the consultants won't try to keep their...

AlMBERG: No, for sure.

Foerschler: Understand that as well.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: Any other comments from Working Group here? Any future agenda items that anyone can think of they would like to be on the...

Almberg: Well, I'll go back and take my turn now of things. This was kind of Frank's stuff that he had asked there, but a couple of things. Reid, this is to you that we have discussed in the past, and I just haven't heard back the status of where you are or what you're doing. That was on some of our rumble strips.

Kaiser: Okay. Reid Kaiser: for the record. I met with Ken Mammen [phonetic] from our safety division and also Randy Hesterlee, [phonetic] and Darin Tedford I think was at this meeting, and we sat down and talked about the rumble strips, and what's going to happen is we are going to set up a project that's in District 3, will be handled by Randy Hesterlee. And we're going to try different types of rumble strips and so that we can get some in the pavement and monitor how the pavement handles their installation and how they deal with the elements over time, and we'll move forward from there, because there's quite a few different types of rumble strips that you can install depth-wise, width wise, and they come in -- you know, it just depends on whatever -- every state would like to have. So, Randy is going to organize a small contract to go out and install those and kind of call that a test section, see what works best for that.

Almberg: Will that be on the -- NDOT's doing from Ely to 23 miles south?

Kaiser: No, I think Randy was going to install that in the Eureka area somewhere. I can't remember the exact location. I got the notes up in my office, but I'll get you that information.

Almberg: Okay, yeah, because that, like -- that's something I always felt was an issue. I mentioned it quite a few times driving back and forth across Highway 50. Our center lines are pretty beaten up from them. The other question that I had is also [inaudible] we discussed was some of our passing lanes.

Kaiser: Denise, are you going to update your passing lanes for BJ?

Inda: Yeah, I mean, I can give you a quick summary. I can give you something more in writing if you'd like as well. I'm a little shorthanded, so I haven't -- we haven't gotten to that just yet. We did a summary of -- we reached out to all of the other AASHTO member states, the traffic engineers, to find out what the practice is across the United States, and there's not a lot of states that do that, and we were surprised. And several of the states that do do that -- and what we're talking

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

about, because you might not be familiar with BJ's original question, was there are some states where if you have a passing lane, say, in an area, you know, that -- area of elevation, so it's a passing lane -- truck passing lane kind of a thing for vehicles ascending up a mountain or something like that. In some states, it's actually legal to use that passing lane on the descending side as well where they could legally use that to pass. We don't do that in Nevada currently, and BJ was asking us why we didn't consider that, because it might be valuable, useful in areas where vehicles descending would like to get by, and if there's no obstructing traffic, you know, that would be good for them.

Oregon is one of the states that does that, and so we found that some states do it. Not a lot of them do, and based on the questions that we were asking the member -- the AASHTO member groups, a lot of folks, including Nevada, would be concerned that if I am -- if I'm driving, you know, along a road, I come across -- I'm behind a slow-moving vehicle. I have a passing lane. I'm going to move over, and I'm going to be in that passing lane. If another vehicle unexpectedly is coming into my passing lane coming down, you know, if there is some obstruction of sight, it's very hard to differentiate -- if that's my passing lane, then I should -- you know, the way we do it now, it's specifically restricted to the uphill -- well, to the direction of traffic where we intend to provide that passing lane. And so, there were just concerns that if you -- depending on the number of vehicles that you might have there, if you're coming down and your vision is obstructed and you pull out to pass that vehicle, you come straight up into another vehicle that's already in the passing lane. And I can provide you a much more concise description of that.

We just -- based on all of the -- you know, it wasn't something that we were really considering in the past, but when we looked at all of the other states and their justifications and explanations, we didn't feel like there were compelling reasons to move in that direction, especially with several states moving away from that practice, and it basically boils down to safety concerns. And I don't know, John, if you have any familiarity with that or if that's something you've been a part of discussing.

Terry: No, just as the Chief Engineer, I can't imagine we would allow that. I just -- I think that's crazy. I think the person in the passing lane expects that he's got his own passing lane and he doesn't have to be aware of other traffic, and I just cannot imagine us going to that.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Almberg: I also reached out, and I talked to Wyoming, and I talked to the gentleman in your position in Wyoming, and he was the opposite of you. He come in here, and he basically says, "We almost exclusively do that." And he says, "In fact, I can't even think of a situation where we have four-lane passing lanes." And so, I called him specifically because the reason I was even turned on to looking at it was because I went on vacation, and I drove up through Wyoming, and I thought it was a blessing to go through there and not have to wait forever. Either way, you're going to come and do this. You know, I understand your concern. You know, that's -- you know, my thought process in the least, that seems very hesitant to coming and step out there and go do that stuff, but frankly, after I had that conversation with him, he was on the opposite side of the fence. He was very much pro, and in fact... [crosstalk]

Terry: I know him.

Inda: And I can...

Almberg: And in fact, he said to reach out and feel free to call him and have that discussion with him.

Inda: And he -- for better or for worse, he's in the minority, but what I can do is I can provide the information that we have compiled to read, and he can share that with you, because it might be of interest to you just kind of to see the range of responses from the member states and their concerns and approaches just to give you a broader perspective on that if you...

Almberg: Well, I mean, that's...

Inda: ...if you'd like.

Almberg: You know, I just -- you know, strictly from that standpoint being on Department of State that I basically represent and actually live in, those are things that I feel would be very beneficial to our side of the state, and quite frankly, other areas. Highway 93 and 318 is a major north-south trucking route, and being a person that drives quite regularly from Vegas or anywhere else, it does become a hassle at times trying to get by these trucks. And I'm looking strictly from the standpoint that if we can go to a three-lane passing lane situation instead of a four, we can obviously get more miles done for the same dollars.

Terry: Clearly, it'd have to be striped differently.



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Speaker: Yeah.

Savage: Yeah, I just had one episode. I was up in Oregon on a [inaudible] highway, and I'm in the slow lane. There's a passing lane next to me. Going up a hill, big diesel tractor trailer coming down, and another guy decides to pass.

Inda: Right.

Savage: So, now I'm in the slow lane. I got two diesels coming straight at me, and I'm going, "Holy smokes." Don't fail me now here. So, I was a little nerve-racky, so I might be on the other side just on recent experience, but I think it's a study that we can take a look into and see where we go, because I know there's pros and cons... [crosstalk]

Inda: There are. There are, and I think we...

Savage: It is a different day out there.

Inda: We are definitely more on the conservative side here thinking about the what-ifs and the liabilities and those sort of practices. One thing I would be -- I would not recommend doing is creating -- is being inconsistent throughout the state. I think that would affect driver expectation if we said, well, in the rural areas, that's acceptable, but in the urban areas, you know, it might -- you know, we might not do that. I think we would need to -- I think we would need to maintain some consistency so that drivers know what to expect whether they're -- you know, no matter which side of that passing lane they're on, because that was one of our biggest concerns, was kind of what -- Len [phonetic] is accurate.

Savage: So, it's something we can look into. Anything else, BJ?

Almberg: No, that's it.

Savage: Any other comments about future items here at the CWG? I have one, Reid.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: I was meeting with Robert, and this meeting was last week, about procurement. We have visited procurement as far as the checklist that had Admin Services utilize this in what the Department does for procurement.

Kaiser: Okay.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Savage: I know that's a broad statement, but you might be able to [inaudible] and figure out where we want to go with that.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Savage: Any other topics for future meetings that you'd like to be discussed?
- Terry: I think perhaps maybe this group is the right one to give a summary of -- the recently passed CMAR Bill did have some other requirements in there that we're going to have to change our CMAR process slightly. It wasn't nearly as onerous as the other CMAR Bills that were floated around the legislature, but this one did have some specific things that I believe we're going to have to add to ours. So, perhaps once we get our arms around it -- I'm not even sure if the Governor signed it yet, but we'll have to give you a summary. Perhaps this group is the right place to summarize what that changes in our procurement and administration of CMAR jobs.
- Savage: Sounds good, John.
- Kaiser: Okay, I'll talk you, John, about that, and it's appropriate for maybe September.
- Terry: Yeah, I think we just got to take our time and sit down and look at the bill and then look at our Pioneer Program and see where we have to tweak it.
- Kaiser: Sounds good.
- Terry: Yeah, but probably in three months we'd be good. Okay.
- Savage: Okay. If there's nothing else, we'll move to Agenda Item No. 4. It's going to be a little tricky on this one. Dennis, since the Controller is not here and Member Martin was not present and -- it's always something new.
- Gallagher: A lot of pressure on you, Mr. Chairman.
- Savage: Oh, I can make it. I have a few comments for corrections, but just some thought about formal approval. I mean, it's not a major issue.
- Gallagher: We could hold this over to next month. That way, BJ will be -- he's already official, but if you want to wait and be conservative, but you don't have to be, we could postpone it; otherwise, you could take a motion on it today and approve it.
- Savage: No, I'd like to...

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Gallagher: And we recognize...

Savage: I'd like to defer, because I think it's important -- there was a lot of issues that came up with Member Martin's concerns, and I think if both him and BJ take the time to at least read the minutes, it will be beneficial for everybody, because I know [inaudible] made some key points at the last meeting. As far as the corrections, I only have a couple. On page 2, three from the bottom, it was -- my tongue was very thick at the time. Instead of "and project management consultants, are they informing you up to standards," it should say, "and for project management consultants, are they conforming to your standards?" The Controller emailed, I think, us, Reid, on page 3, the bottom paragraph, one, two, three -- five lines down. "The labor pool that might be in," rather than "and the jobs that are there."

This is a good one, page 24. Cole, [phonetic] I'm taking the liberty to change the word of "tasting dirt" to "testing dirt".

Mortensen: I think I might have actually said tasting.

Mortensen: It was tasting. [laughter]

Savage: Did you say tasting?

Mortensen: I believe I -- it was a shameless poke at a geotechnical engineer. [laughter]

Savage: Boy, that was -- my apologies. [laughter] Okay, "tasting" remains in both sentences. Page 33, briefly, second to last paragraph, second sentence, it says, "I think Ruth Borrelli..." [phonetic] It should say, "I thank Ruth Borrelli." That's all I have at this time, and we'll wait until the next meeting to review and approve the minutes of April 10th, 2017.

Gallagher: And Mr. Chairman, is it appropriate at that time to indicate at that time that the vote for approval is being made with the understanding that neither Member AlMBERG or Martin were present, but -- you know, unless you want to make a motion and vote all by yourself, that would be appropriate.

Savage: I'll follow your directive, Mr. Gallagher.

Gallagher: I'll be [inaudible] provided.

Savage: Thank you. Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5...

Martin: Hey, Mr. Chairman?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: Yes, Mr. Martin.

Martin: On page 1, bottom paragraph, the passing of Pierre Gezelin, [phonetic] I was deeply saddened by that as well. I didn't realize that he had passed away. I worked with him on a couple issues a few years ago and always found him to be very knowledgeable. So, we lost a valuable asset there.

Savage: Yes, indeed. Thank you, Mr. Martin, truly missed. Any other comments or discussions on the meeting minutes? We'll move on to Item No. 5, Old Business. Item No. 1, the NDOT DBE.

Larkin: Basically, it's just -- I'm Tracy Larkin, Deputy Director. There's really nothing new to report. There's several things with the disparity study that will come out later on this year, and at that time, I think... [inaudible]

Savage: Sounds good, Tracy. Thank you. Item No. 2, As-Builts.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, Assistant Director for Operations. As of May 19th, we're at working day 137 of 300 on our project on Las Vegas Boulevard in North Las Vegas, and RE has been meeting with the contractor monthly to go over the as-builts to make sure he's complying with the requirements.

Savage: Sounds good, Reid. Item No. 3, CMAR Change Orders and Agreements.

Kaiser: Okay, there was -- looks to me like four changes from the April meeting, and we do have an ICE. [phonetic] It looks like -- oh, wait a minute, a PCS agreement on the Charleston Boulevard project. We have ICE consultants that's been added to the Verdi [phonetic] Bridges. That amount has changed. There was one change order on the Tropicana escalators. Again, that was with the ICE, and then we do have GNP number two [inaudible] for the bike path at the Lake Tahoe on State Route 28. Are there questions in regards to these? I know there was a discussion back in April about shared savings on CMAR projects and how NDOT does not do that. I don't know if we wanted to...

Savage: I would like to talk about that a little bit. I know Member Martin was not present. Again, just to reiterate a little bit, we got in a pretty deep conversation -- maybe we talk about it next meeting, too, after Member Martin has time to review those meeting minutes on April 10th, because it was a good discussion about that shared savings, and it's important, I think, that BJ has a chance to review that, too. So, let's talk more in depth I think at the next meeting regarding the shared savings concept and versus other DOTs, because I know Chris from Kiewit brought up the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

point about ADOT at that time, too, regarding shared savings and certainly talked about risk. And it's important that we were all seeing it from the same perspective.

Terry: Perhaps if before that next meeting you could give us an example of what you're talking about, because I can tell you our contracts are in no way set up to do anything like that. For the most part, our contracts are set up to pay planned quantities. We pay them as we go off of measured quantities, but there is no -- we have no mechanism set up for that. So, I'd like some information of how they're doing that, because that would be a complete change to how we're doing these.

Mortensen: [inaudible] if I may -- for the record, Cole Mortensen, Assistant Chief of Project Management. After our discussion at the last meeting, I kind of chased that down a little bit, and apparently, we chose not to go that direction early on because of the process that we actually have in place that we have brought on board the ICE to also do an independent check on the quantities available. The contractor puts together their quantities, and our engineers put together their quantities, and if there is a situation where we have concern about a quantity overrun, what we've done in practice and we're doing it right now on the SR-28 project, is there they have concern about the micro-piles and the length of micro-pile that they may be using.

So, what we did is we agreed on a quantity based on the plans and what we had expected and then put in the risk reserve a sum of money to accommodate any additional quantity that may be necessary so that the contractors are compelled to try to bid an additional quantity in there. The other side of that, too, at least from my understanding, is in the vertical industry when you start talking -- I mean, you guys obviously are probably more versed than I am in that regard. There's a certain percentage of waste or loss based on just how the project is coming together. You may think, you know, you need 12 feet of pipe in one spot, but you've got eight-foot lengths, so you're purchasing two eight-foot pipes, and four feet of one is disappearing and going somewhere else. That type of thing -- you know, I can see that being bid in as a risk for the contractor when they bid together, but we're trying to accommodate for that up front and utilizing the risk reserve to facilitate that process.

We also maintain the Value Engineering Proposals. So, if we get into a spot where there's an idea that come up -- or the contractor comes up with, I believe

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

that we would entertain sharing the savings with them on a proposal that added value to the project that reduced the overall cost.

Savage: And it's open for discussion. I mean, John, to answer your question directly on the vertical side, and I'm thinking of this escalator project that we have, it's things that we don't get into too often. I know your quantity-based, and it's something I just wanted to look into, because there is a carrot out there, because we're based on trust and qualifications for -- and selecting on a particular project for the vertical side of what that can be, but it's an open-book transparent. At the end of the day, the lump sum GMP was \$1 million. Based on how we went after that job to complete that job, we had a shared savings within the language that could be 70-30, 60-40, 50-50. So, the owner got money back, and the contractor got money back. It wasn't all one way.

Terry: Give me an example of the basis of the shared savings.

Savage: The shared savings, well, the shared savings is if we tell the owner that this project is going to be \$1 million and we have better ideas during the construction of that project and there's a cost savings due to the method of how that was constructed -- for example, we went from one material to another material, not compromising the end of the -- the end result of the project, but everyone realizes that that was less expensive. So, both people gained in that cost savings. It wasn't just the contractor at the loss of the owner. It was a shared savings.

Terry: I think in that case if it was a change like that, it would fall under our Value Engineering, which we have in all design bid -- or design build, design bid, build, and CMAR, because we would deal with that under Value Engineering, which ours are always 50-50 [inaudible] we could change it if we wanted to. So, we do have Value Engineering in there. So, if you said such and such roof is equal to another roof, but it's cheaper, I think in that case, we would fall under our Value Engineering Proposal. He'd give us a proposal in this, and savings would be 50-50. I thought you were talking about if the quantities just came in under, but that's a different situation. Okay.

Savage: No, it was mainly on...

Terry: I understand now. So, we'll look into it some more before the next meeting, then, okay.

Savage: And any input, you know, we can get from, you know...

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Kaiser: I thought that was part of the discussion, though, was if, like, the quantity came in at 70% because they figured out some -- there was maybe a quantity bust or something like that, that, you know, right now we pay the contractor 100% of that item, and since they didn't do that work, then we would share in that 30% that wasn't done.
- Terry: Right, and the way we deal with that, I guess, is if we're doing a true CMAR, we're truly paying it based on planned quantities, it goes both ways. If they have to put in more, we don't pay them for it. If they put in less, they don't get it. So, that's kind of where the shared, to me, is there if we assume the plan quantities are as accurate as we think they are, but we can talk about it more -- share some examples before next meeting and have some more discussion on it, yeah.
- Mortensen: On the CMAR projects that we've run so far, I'm not aware of any major quantity underruns that they've run into, and I think a lot of that is just from the nature of the projects that we have and process that we go through and having the ICE sit there with us along with the engineers and contractors. You're talking about three different groups coming up with a quantity estimate. Generally, we're fairly close. I can't recall having one that underran, you know...
- Rodriguez: Pedro Rodriguez, NDOT Project Management. Kingsbury, there were underruns in regards to flagging, but all of that was included in the risk reserve as Cole explained. We were able to complete the project one season versus three. So, we -- the Department received the benefit of the entire savings there.
- Savage: That's a good example. I didn't realize that. Chris, you were going to say something.
- Koenig: Chris Koenig with Kiewit. I think the way the Department -- it matters when you negotiate your GMP, too. So, the further along the design is when you negotiate the GMP, the further along the quantities are, and especially with the ICE having to double check. But if there were reason to negotiate the GMP at, say, 30% or 60% design, then the risk of quantity growth or underrun is higher than if you negotiated a GMP at, say, 90% or 100%.
- Savage: Yeah, exactly.
- Koenig: And I think really we're talking about two different things. We're talking about quantity growth, which comes with CMAR or design build, compared to

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

alternative or constructability ideas or changes that would come up, and I think that we need -- the system that's set up generally covers all of that.

Savage: Thank you, Chris.

Martin: Len?

Savage: Yes, Member Martin?

Martin: So, help me understand your VE. For me, VE happens -- VE, Value Engineering, is a hugely overused and poorly used term most of the time. We, down here, prefer a term called Value Analysis, and we make an analysis on what the value of the alternative materials is bringing to the job and to the owner, but for me, the VE term says that you have designed a job that you figured out you can't afford to build, so now you got to Value Engineer stuff out of it so you can afford to build it. I think I'm hearing John Terry say that your Value -- what you're calling Value Engineering is going through as the job is being designed, discussing construction methods, practices, and procedures and determining what brings the best value, and maybe the old line thinking is different and the new line thinking figures out a way to make things more cost effective. One of the things I was really happy -- I mentioned before taking a tour around the Project NEON where I could today. One thing I was really happy to see is using the prestressed concrete beams, and I had questioned that many years ago and found out there was a, quote-unquote, bridge engineer who said that would never happen in the state of Nevada.

Well, you go outside of the state of Nevada, there's a lot of prestressed concrete beams in the bridges, and so those are the kind of things in our world -- I know what you're talking about, Len. The difference in the piping sometimes because one particular manufacture wants a different -- wants their chiller into that building. They're going to give you a better number than when you first was designing a job, and that shared savings on the savings on that chiller or on the piping, that's truly a shared savings. So, I'm trying to get my head around and listen to the conversation, what you're really talking about on this Value Engineering deal. Like I said, in the vertical world, Value Engineering comes in when the developers figured out that the dream can't be built, and you can't get a return on it, so he decides to do something different, generally, what the contractor told him to do in the first place. But...

Savage: You're spot-on, Frank.



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Martin: ...I guess I'm biased when it comes to this.

Savage: No, you're spot-on, because I know personally, we've lost a lot of work through VE, because the contractor will say, "Oh, we can do it this way. Oh, it's going to last" -- weld a pipe, for example. "We're going to weld a pipe." They're going to put plastic pipe in. "Well, we don't feel good about the system." But the owner buys off on that, and that's just an example, but John...

Terry: There are differences, and to be honest with you, these very long, boring meetings that the legislature often had to do with when they try and write especially CMAR legislation that covers both. For instance, in your world, sometimes the general contractor will give a bid on a building where it's just how many square footage of a Class A office, and that's practically the way he bids on it. They develop all the plans later. We don't do that. I mean, our guys are bidding off 90%-plus plans, you know, on a CMAR type thing, so it is a lot different. We have -- just to confuse it even more, we have two types of Value Engineering. When we're developing plans, we are required -- what is the latest? Is it \$25 million? Any project over \$25 million, during the design phase -- big debate where in the design phase, but somewhere in design phase, you have to do an independent Value Engineering analysis and justify why you didn't incorporate those Value Engineering things into the design. That's a separate thing that's done there in the design phase.

We don't have to do that in the design build, and then our Value Engineering, as we call it, it's just that. If the contractor wants to propose something different -- and those usually happen in two ways. One, he bids the job the way it's bid, and the first day that he's awarded the job, he comes up to us and says, "Well, I have a Value Engineering Proposal that I want to change these pipes to plastic," or whatever, and those savings are 50-50, or sometimes he's what, maybe a quarter of the way into the job and he wants to change something. He makes a proposal. That's how our Value Engineering -- design build, does anybody know if we ever here done a major VE on a design build? When I worked in Utah, we did a major VE as a part of the design build where we changed something dramatically and we split the savings with the owner. So, anyway, our VE is in every -- and I believe every state does it, too. It's in every design bid build, design build, and CMAR contract that if they come up with an idea, that the savings are 50-50. So, that sounds different than what Frank is describing in the earnings.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Kaiser: Yeah, I've -- Reid Kaiser. I've been involved in quite a few Value Engineering Proposals, and they're always clean, and we get 50, they get 50, and there's never any issues. We accept them if we think they're good proposals. You know, a good example of that is Thor and I worked on a project on a pyramid interchange. The wall at the eastbound offramp, that was Value Engineering by the contractor, cut off a lot of time, saved a lot of money. We went with it. So, they've been very successful for NDOT.

Savage: Sounds like that might be the shared savings, is the VE.

Dyson: VEP.

Savage: VEP?

Tedford: Proposal.

Dyson: Value Engineering Proposal is what we call it. Thor Dyson, District Engineering, and Mr. Kaiser is right. We've done a lot of VEPs with the contractor. Sometimes it's us. Most of the time, it's them, because their creativity is extensive, because they're building the job, and when they produce that VEP, a lot of times it's a win-win for everybody involved, particularly, the motoring public.

Savage: Sounds good, Thor. Thank you. Frank, is there anything else?

Martin: No, sir. We beat this horse.

Savage: Chris from... [laughter]

Koenig: I think John hit on that -- again, it's about when you negotiate the GMP. Your CMAR contractor ought to bring you all of those values during the upfront constructability, and there are no shared savings. You know, you should be getting that kind of value of these ideas in preconstruction services. That's what it's all about, and then it's not shared. If I were the owner and the day after I negotiated a GMP the contractor came with this great idea to split the savings, my first question would be, why didn't you bring this up yesterday, the day before when you negotiated the GMP? Clearly, there are times when you negotiate the GMP. You're out there, and somebody comes up with -- you know, the foreman is finally on the job, and the guy with the best idea finally says, "Hey, why don't we do it this way?" And that's -- you know, then that's when you share it, but I think -- not to miss the point of the value in CMAR, is getting that input up front.

Savage: Thank you.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Martin: Well, from where I sit, and we do a lot of CMAR work, it's one thing to be awarded a CMAR contract and go through the preconstruction piece of it. Mostly what happens during the preconstruction piece is you wear out a lot of subcontractors in the pricing scenarios, and then -- right, Len?

Savage: I was thinking it. You said it. [laughter] Thanks for...

Martin: And then when you are finally awarded that project and truly awarded it -- because in the way the current CMAR law works, is you're only awarded the precon. You're not awarded the project, because you stand a chance of losing that project. If you don't meet the expectations of the owners, they can put that puppy out on the street at the drop of a hat. So, things change, and Chris, things change in our world when the community, both material suppliers, subcontractors, et cetera, find out you really do have the job instead of it just being a maybe. Things change, and where we find the shared savings deal works out really, really well generally is in our -- not necessarily CMAR, but cost of the work plus a fee type of work, which is basically what CMAR comes down to. The way that CMAR is run here in the state of Nevada is a little bit different than that, but things change the day that the contract is signed in the community and the way the job is viewed. Sometimes projects are just not viewed.

When they're in that precon deal, sometimes -- especially when you're in a busy, busy market like we are now, sometimes projects, when they're in that precon piece, there's a certain amount of speculation that the job is not real. It wouldn't happen, I think, with NDOT, because we got a better reputation than that, but with some of the other agencies, maybe so.

Savage: Thank you, Frank. Anything else from anybody here at the table? One question on CMARs. We talked about warranty last time, and this has always been a concern of ours, but does the contractor on a design build or a CMAR project stand behind the warranty, and have you had an instance here at NDOT where the contractor has had to go back and warranty faulty workmanship on a design build and CMAR project?

Mortensen Cole Mortensen for the record. I am not aware of any work that we've had to go back and warranty on a design build... [inaudible]

Savage: That's good to hear, because where this question comes from is last month's meeting with -- or two months ago, we talked about the flexibility a little bit in the Silver Book and the Department taking that risk, and I thought we agreed upon it's

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

not all about the Department taking that risk. It's a shared risk between the contractor and the Department, and the contractor has to be able to warranty that variation that was discussed. Did I understand that right?

Mortensen: I may be a little confused by your question. I did get a chance to go back and look at our recent design build contracts, and generally speaking, we'll require the contractor to warranty their work for a year after final acceptance, and I believe it's two years for stabilization. Now, I would imagine that anything above and beyond that, we would have to show that there was neglect or something that, you know -- some wrongdoing from an engineering standpoint or a contractor and [inaudible] standpoint, but I'm not aware of that happening.

Savage: That's good. That was the question I had. Thank you, Cole.

Kaiser: Now, that's different than our design bid build. We don't warranty -- the contractor doesn't warranty anything. He has to get through to the District acceptance on his work. After the District accepts the work, then that's when our maintenance staff takes over the maintenance of the contract.

Savage: And I know we talked about this before again and again, but I still to this day do not understand how the contractor cannot warranty that work after a year point just like they do on design and CMAR projects if it's...

Martin: That's exactly right. I don't get that piece. I got a whole staff that lives with a building for a year after we finish, and, Len, I know you got a whole department that does the same thing.

Savage: Yeah, we have majority ownership in the field. [laughter]

Kaiser: And I think some of that probably stems from by the time the contractor is done and working days are over, you know, it can be six to nine months before the District goes out and reviews the job. So, a lot of times there's a very lengthy time period between those, but we don't warranty our work, and I can't -- I can't remember -- I'm sure there's an instance where it ever come back to bite us.

Savage: But I would love to hear from maintenance to think -- how would maintenance take on some of the workmanship that may not be up to speed, because it's not about the inspectors that we had or the [inaudible] we felt it was good at that time, but for whatever reason, it didn't hold for a year.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Kaiser: And a lot -- and a lot of that responsibility lies with the districts, because the REs work for the districts, and also, when I was an RE, I always had that in the back of my mind, that whatever I build on this job, our maintenance guys have to maintain. So, if there's some drainage issues, even though they built it to plan and I think there's going to be some maintenance problems, you know, I'd spend an extra \$5,000 to go fix it to make sure that, hey, a bunch of sediment doesn't go into this D.I. and clog it, you know, things like that. And I'm assuming, you know, with the districts, they do the same thing with their training for their REs.

Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Everybody's heard this, to pull a cliché, design designs it, construction builds it, and maintenance and the public live with it. And so, we do several things in the process of a project. In the very beginning of the project, a lot of times we request the project. A lot of times, there's a mutual agreement from everybody that the project is needed. That's when we really make an effort at the district level -- and I have here in the back my Assistant District Engineer, Mike Fuess, [phonetic] and Ryan Hornback, [phonetic] who helps out Mike Fuess on maintenance issues and runs the maintenance portion of the District. We get involved early in the early designs, the 30%, 60%, 90% submittals. We look at those. Project management is generally very good to incorporate maintenance input and comments. Sometimes our comments are taken seriously, certainly when there's money that can be saved or money available. Sometimes it's not going to happen because of budget issues, but nonetheless, we were given the opportunity to do not only a PDFS, Preliminary Design Field Survey, but also some comments on each of these various levels as the project progresses through design. Once it gets through design and goes out to bid, then it relies upon, like Mr. Kaiser: stated, that the RE and the respective district will be required to check and ask, you know, not only on his own or her own had -- you know, is this project going to be going well for maintenance and the public, but, you know, not -- and for them as well.

So, my maintenance supervisors tend to drive through the project, because they're interested in what's being built on their section of roadway, and I encourage them to comment to the RE if they're not getting satisfaction, to comment to the District Office, whereupon the Assistant District Engineer for Maintenance, Mike Fuess, or the Assistant District Engineer in my case, Rick Bosch, [phonetic] for the construction will then step in, or myself, and we'll say, "Hey, we have a deficiency in the plans. We need to make this correction. We probably should have an LOA or we should have some change order to correct a deficiency that maintenance doesn't want to accept," because the last thing we want is to have a

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

project and there's a piping issue, and maintenance is out there always addressing an accident that happens every rainstorm or a snow and ice melt where the water is running across the roadway in a wrong direction and we have freeze-thaw issues, which then is black ice and potential accidents.

So, in reality, once a project is done, it kind of sits in a holding pattern. Contractor says they're done. The RE doesn't say their done just yet. They have a punch list, correct? Checklist? Is that correct, Steve, a checklist of items, and that punch list is developed by the RE, and typically, the RE will talk with maintenance staff and say, "Hey," you know, "do you see anything?" They'll talk with their own construction crew staff, develop this punch list, hand it to the contractor, and I think it's 30 days. So, yeah, Mr. Contractor, you have 30 days to correct all these deficiencies that you didn't fix. You didn't tighten all the bolts in the guardrail. You didn't paint this certain section correctly, or et cetera, et cetera.

After that 30-day punch list item has passed, the RE goes back out, reviews what was accomplished by the contractor, and typically, the contractors get everything done on that punch list. Then that's when -- what's called a District Relief of Maintenance, and when District Relief of Maintenance goes out, we will go out. Typically, the RE, the -- does the contractor go out as well with the Relief of Maintenance?

Speaker: Not always, no.

Dyson: Not always. So, Relief of Maintenance involves the RE, the Assistant District Engineer, maybe someone from the construction office. Generally, we try to have someone from maintenance, although we're not always available if there's other issues, and they go and review the job and look for any other deficiencies that they can find on the project. And generally, they find something and ask the RE to direct the contractor to clean that up. Once that's done, then the official District acceptance letter is prepared by my staff, and either my Assistant District Engineer signs it or I sign it, and when that happens, it's done. There's no warranty. We own it. We live it. We deal with it.

Savage: Okay, thank you, Thor, and Mike and Ryan, I welcome you to the meeting. Thank you for attending.

Dyson: Mike, do you want to add to that at all? Mike Fuess, you want to...

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Fuess: Very little, because for the most part, we do really well with asphalt and concrete. What typically hits us pretty hard is the other things, the landscape, electrical, electronics. We spend a ridiculous amount of money replacing locks, small stuff within the first year. It adds up, but typically, the asphalt and concrete is pretty darn solid.
- Savage: Yeah, and I would expect that. The incidentals or whatever you want to call it go along with the project, but still, it costs money. Mr. Terry.
- Terry: Again, that's where we're kind of struggling with the way we've always done it, that we don't do warranties, is we're starting to do more electrical stuff. We're starting to do more complex electrical stuff, which the more standard in the industry for that kind of equipment is to provide warranties for the electrical components. And so, the other area we're starting to run into pushback, as you know, you been around, we're getting a lot request to turn over roads. When we're done with construction, is to relinquish them to other entities, Clark County in particular. "Where is my one-year warranty when you turn that road over to us?" We got to keep telling them we don't do warranties, and they say, "We ain't taking it without a warranty." So, we do have to keep looking at this issues, because we're starting to run into some areas where the way we've always done it is running into some issues, and I'd say specifically in those two areas, complex electrical components and requests from agencies that we're turning roads over to, to have a warranty as a part of the turnover package.
- Fuess: Mike Fuess. The other thing we've noticed is that some of the -- some of the appliances we buy now come with warranties.
- Terry: Right.
- Fuess: And we've been struggling, because the warranties aren't always conveyed to us in maintenance. So, we don't always know that there's a warranty, and if the warranty isn't properly conveyed to us, we're not, in fact, exercise the warranty.
- Savage: Chris, you...
- Koenig: Chris with Kiewit. I can't see a differentiation between alternative delivery CMAR, design build, and bid build of why a contractor wouldn't warranty their work for a year. I did a quick verification. Your sister departments, UDOT and ADOT, both have one-year warranties on bid build work.
- Savage: Thank you, Chris. Sharon, you started to say...

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler for the record. I just wanted to add that, you know, the Department performs acceptance testing on many of our materials, and we don't accept contractors' work unless it falls within our specifications, and we have mechanisms in place if they don't. Say, for instance, they're putting down plant mix and they don't meet our requirements, we can either take a liquidated damage, let them leave it in place. It depends on the severity of the deficiency, if you will. We can make them rip it out if there are costs to replace it. So, we do have measures in place for some stuff. Like John was saying, you know, the ITS stuff, we're doing more of that. That's a little grayer area in so far as the warranties, but the Department does perform acceptance testing, and that's what we base payment on.

Savage: Right.

Foerschler: So, we're pretty prescriptive in this is what we want. This is the mix we want. You'll meet this criteria. If you don't, we will penalize you in whatever is appropriate or corrective action.

Martin: In our world, it's very, very similar to that. That's why we have building inspectors, and that's why we have special inspectors that come out. They test the concrete. They inspect the framing. They inspect the electrical and everything else, and then in our world, we have a final walkthrough like, I think, Reid, you were talking about or somebody was talking about, and from the point of that final walkthrough, we got to guarantee our systems for a year. That's landscaping. That's electrical. That's air conditioning. It's every system in that building right down to if we get a roof leak or we have a failure in the foundation. It don't make any difference how many inspections you go through during the course of the job. We still have to warranty the work, and I can't understand a world where a contractor wouldn't warranty their work. I just heard from a gentleman sitting back in the back about landscaping, electrical, and all this kind of stuff.

I was sitting here talking with [laughter] yeah, with Mario. God, I just -- anyway, if you had a warranty period, it would reduce the strain on your maintenance department hugely, because a lot of these systems, probably your maintenance department don't have the expertise to work on, and it gives you a year to learn about them during the warranty period. I just see all kinds of advantages, but yet I continue to hear the resistance. We just don't do it that way. We never have, and so why should we start?



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Savage: Your point is well made, Frank, and I think it's just -- you know, we're broadening our scope of work for highways to roads, to elevators. I mean...
- Terry: Hopefully, no more elevators.
- Savage: But that warranty, hopefully, is an extended warranty, but I don't know what that warranty is [inaudible] but I think this discussion needs to continue on the next CWG -- BJ, would you like to say...
- Almberg: Well, just a quick question to Thor. You come in and just explained that when you guys do an additional punch list, as you call it, walkthrough, they got 30 days to fix it. Then, you know, what's the timeframe where you come back and what you would describe when you guys basically go out and do your last inspection and call it off from that point forward. It's ours.
- Dyson: It depends on -- Thor Dyson for the record. It depends on the size of the job and the complexity of the job. I can state that we're not opposed to warranties. I don't want it to sound like that District and maintenance personnel are against warranties. It's just another added insurance level, a level of insurance saying here's the work. We did the work. We think it's good work, and we're back in a year, or whatever timeframe, to make sure the work is good. We would love that, and particularly with landscaping, Mr. Mike Fuess mentioned that landscaping was something -- not this year, because we had a lot of water, but other years, depending on soil type and water, lack of water, it's very tough to get landscape to really take off, and without really good, diligent maintenance, landscaping may not really take off the way we want to see it. So, the contractor, you know, if they want to provide the warranty for us, that's outstanding. I don't know -- it's a bigger issue than me. I don't know if it needs Board approval, legislator approval. I don't know how that works.
- Savage: I think we should talk about it again in further detail at the next -- at the next upcoming meeting. It's a healthy discussion.
- Kaiser: Reid Kaiser again for the record. We can do a little research and see what other states are doing and see what we come up with.
- Savage: Sounds good. Let's move on to Agenda Item No. 4, NDOT staff update.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Savage: And Ms. Allison Wall...

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Kaiser: Actually, I'm going to handle this one today. I want to thank the three districts. They supplied me some good information, and the information at the very top of this item where it says, "Vacancies, April 18th, 2017," that's information I did get from our human resources division, and I made a presentation at legislature about our vacancies, and so forth. So, that is information I presented to them. As you can see, the District 1 construction, there's 14.5% -- not a half-percent, but 14 vacant positions in District 1 on the construction side of the house and maintenance. There's 16 vacancies out of 182 were an 8% vacancy rate. In District 2, there's eight vacancies for roughly a 12% vacancy rate, and for the maintenance side, there are 17 vacancies for a 10% -- or 11% vacancy rate. And in District 3, there's ten vacancies for a 20% vacancy rate on the construction side, and in maintenance, there's seven vacancies for 5% vacancy rate.

For engineering positions here at NDOT, there's 64 vacancies for 13% vacancy rate. So, there's definitely some areas it looks like statewide where we are hurting in vacancies, and unfortunately, on the construction side, when we get those vacancies on the construction crews, they got to be -- deal with consultants. We've got to get our work done. So, those are costly. Thor, Mario, and Boyd, did you guys want to comment on any of these vacancies or anything? Feel free to step in here.

Dyson: Yeah, so, Thor Dyson, District 2. It's very time-consuming dealing with the vacancies. We spend a lot of time going through the bureaucracy that's placed upon us by DHRM, Department of Human Resource Management. We've got to go through all these different steps to recruit, to go through applications, and then to do the interviews, and then once you make your selection, go through the whole process to get them on board, officially signed up. And to be blunt about it, it sucks the life out of us, because we're having supervisors and supervisor 2s and staff to spend so much time on interviewing, we're getting less work done maintenance-wise out in the field. So, that's problematic.

If we do successfully get someone, recruit them, and retain them, a lot of times we train them up and then they're gone. I know this happens a lot in Las Vegas as well as in District 2, where we train the staff up for operating equipment, doing maintenance activities, and then they'll leave, and then we're right back in the same boat. One of the pieces of information I can offer you is that our worker 3s in maintenance, but also in construction, are journey level individuals. They're the core of our workforce. They're the ones that get the work done. They're the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

meat and potato -- meat and potato type man or woman that's running the show for us.

They have -- we have 50% of these individuals that have three years or less of experience, and that's problematic, too, because they don't know the job as well. They don't know what's expected of them as well. They're not a seasoned journey level individual that, you know, can deal with the issues out on the highway. They're not a seasoned technician that can, you know, be left alone for a period of time, and we have confidence in that they are doing a good job testing, inspecting, and dealing with the contractor and taking care of the small issues that occur right there and then, same with maintenance.

You know, they're careful with equipment. They're not damaging equipment, and they know what's expected of them. So, there's the vacancy rates, like Mr. Kaiser: had stated. There's also the experience level, and we're putting people into situations where a lot is being asked out of them to accomplish with minimal experience and sometimes in some cases minimal training. Mike Fuess, do you want to add or comment to that?

Fuess:

I would. Actually, as important as the vacancy rate is our retention rate. So, as Thor said, quite a few of our staff do not have the experience that we would like to see. In fact, we crunched some numbers and found out for our maintenance worker 3 position, 75% of them have been with us six years or less. It takes roughly five years to become a maintenance worker 3, a journey level employee. So, the 75th percentile years of service is six years or less, which means 75% of them have been with us six years or less. There was a time when you had to be with us 15 years or so to become a lead worker, and someone had to retire or die before you moved into a supervisor position. We're moving people into lead worker and supervisor positions with five years or less experience with the state, and that is amazing.

We immediately need to somehow figure out how we're going to step up our training program in order to create the caliber of journey level employee we want, and somehow, we have to figure out how we're going to create a proper staff that we can move into the higher leadership positions. We had one super 2 vacancy, a regional supervisor position we filled this year. Within the next year, the remaining four super 2s, regional supervisors, have told us they're going to move on, and I don't know where we're going to find four regional supervisors. The

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

retention is a big deal. Training is a big deal, and the vacancy rate is a huge deal for us, and we're struggling.

Dyson: So, on the -- Thor Dyson. With the construction area in District 2 -- in fact, in 2012 during the recession and other issues, we got rid of one entire construction crew based on, you know, the lack of workload, and now the workload is back. So, I'm down a crew to begin with, and then with these eight vacancies which almost makes up an entire crew -- so, effectively, I'm down two crews for construction QAQC in the District, and that's what Mr. Kaiser: had stated, that we are using a lot of consultants, and we have more on-call consultants. But, you know, the hard efforts -- work efforts by Sharon and her group, Steve and others in the construction office, we've got these on-call consultants to assist us with testing, inspection, and other aspects of construction administration. It is costly.

Kaiser: And one more item on that is the compensation. You can see it by the numbers that I put down there. You know, we're the -- and I know there's nothing we can do with it. You know what I mean? We did get a 3% pay increase as of July 1st through this legislature for the next two FY years [inaudible] years. So, you know, maybe we'll be able to entice our staff to stay longer, but we are the lowest paid group.

Larkin: But on the other side of that -- Tracy Larkin, Deputy Director. As Thor -- I'm sorry, as Reid said, it's really outside of NDOT's ability to change a compensation, but I will tell you that I am dealing with numerous grievances, resolution conferences and stuff that are killing my time because of this issue, and most of these are the employees who are in their last ten years, five years on their -- most of them will basically have gone through the recession, and because they didn't get the merit raises for five years -- we have a lot of them that have been with us 15, 20 years, and they are at a step 2 or 3, can't -- and that's a significant chunk of change over there. And there is a lot of inequities around there, and I know there's a lot of efforts within the Department to try to minimize them, but we can't. We're talking over 800 -- basically, about 800 positions that are [inaudible] spent a long time [inaudible] so, basically, new people coming on. In order to bring them on, we try to give them advanced steps so that we can actually get people on board to work for us; however, what we're telling the employees who made it through the recession, well, poor you. Suck it up. You know, and it's the wrong message that we're sending.

Dyson: Member Savage, Mike Fuess has an additional comment.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: Yes, Mike.

Fuess: So, as our staff leaves, we ask them why they leave and where they're going, and just like Tracy said, is that they're going for more money and better benefits, and the complaint we're hearing is, in many cases, especially the maintenance worker series, that they don't -- they simply don't get paid enough to make ends meet. And every time the legislature meets -- it's not my place to knock them, but every time the legislature meets, we may get raises, but there's money missing out of their check one way or another. Either they're paying more for medical or they're contributing more for their benefits, and somehow, somehow, there's less money there instead of more.

The inflation rate is getting them, too. The inflation rate is roughly 2.2%. It depends on how you look at it for this last year. So, they're leaving us to go to the city of Reno, which would pay 25% to 50% more plus pay all of their medical insurance and give them way better insurance and do 100% contribution defers. And some of these other agencies are 25% to 50% more, similar benefits. The supervisor from Virginia City left us to work for Nevada Energy for less stress. He doesn't have round-the-clock responsibilities, and he's making \$10 more per hour with better benefits. That's the common recurring argument we keep hearing again and again, and again as we lose the staff for maintenance.

Len: It's disheartening. So, I don't understand the legislature issues, but this is a monetary side -- are we funded by the Highway Department for salaries and compensation or is it general... [inaudible]

Kaiser: Through the Highway Fund.

Larkin: We have general funding.

Kaiser: Yeah. We're through the Highway Fund, but the powers that be don't like to give us any different pay increases than people who have come out of the general fund, because then it sends the wrong message.

Len: So, it's very disturbing, and we just can't put our heads in the sand, I mean, because it's about the future generations, and we have to do something to fix it. I mean, so, this has to stay on the agenda, and we have to figure out -- I mean, I've seen it on the public -- on the private side as well. You know, different contractors from different areas are coming in and cherry-picking, cherry-picking, cherry-picking, and it's very frustrating. It's very frustrating. It's a west coast

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

economic drive right now that's causing a lot of this. It's a good thing, but as a department, we have to really look from the outside in, debate it. The Director, the Deputy Director, Mr. Hoffman -- Tracy is here today as well, other Deputy Directors here, we have to really review this and figure out how we're going to combat and retain some of the people that we have, and I don't know the answer. I don't know if anybody knows the answer, but we're not going to find the answer if we just brush it off the table and never talk about it again. So, I take it, it has to remain at the table for open discussion, and whether it's -- you know, I look at the construction side with the PIL office that we've had. You know, the best defense is a strong offense, and they've come a long ways. And are we marketing it correctly? What are the benefits. What are the good things with the Department? Let's talk about the goods. We'll talk about the challenges, but we'll also talk about the good things.

Larkin: We have groups, actually...

Savage: We do?

Larkin: ...to be looking at specifically workforce development and retention, and they basically are a group of about 17, 20 that are just brainstorming, put these things together.

Savage: And this is Headquarters?

Larkin: Right here, yes. It includes the districts.

Len: That's a good deal. We're not doing our job if we don't try to find a solution. So, there's an answer out there, and I want to know what it is. It's a sad day when we have such good people to lose them to other jurisdictions for whatever that's worth.

Dyson: So, Thor Dyson. Years ago, if I remember correctly, in the administration under Kenny Guinn, [phonetic] and the Director, Tom Stephens, wasn't there an increase -- I'm trying to remember. It was, like, a 20% or 25% boost to certain groups.

Kaiser: That was for Engineers.

Foerschler: 10%... [inaudible]

Dyson: It was more than that, and I'm trying to remember who initiated that and how that...

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Kaiser: Actually, I think that Tom Stephens initiated that in one of his budgets, because we were losing a lot of engineers to the other entities, and I think he implemented -- I think it might have been 20% or 25% pay increase of engineering [inaudible] leave out all the maintenance and the technicians and those kind of people. So, there was some hard feelings, but yeah, there was a pay increase, and I think...

Foerschler: And the NACs.

Kaiser: Yeah, I think there was also some -- there has been discussions on that previously, but it's -- we don't want to go down that same path that's choosing a selected class to get a certain pay increase.

Savage: No, it's the big picture. You know, I look at the crew augmentation, the administration. We had the consultants that we're paying. You know, we're losing crews. Like Thor mentioned earlier, it's costing. It's costing the state more money to outsource that, and I understand we have to outsource, because we don't have the sources inside.

Kaiser: And I know that there have been discussions with the Governor's Office since we are out of Highway Fund, giving NDOT staff across the board certain pay increase, but again...

Savage: It's a hard one.

Kaiser: It's a hard sell, you know?

Savage: And understandably so.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: But we have to really -- I'm glad, Tracy, to hear you say that, "I hope this Committee meets weekly." [laughter] Monthly.

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler for the record, and I know I've bent Reid's ear. Our construction program that we're augmenting with consultants, it's extremely hard for me to swallow the invoices that I've signed, and I have expressed concern with Reid. We're running over a million dollars a month on consultants, and, you know, you look at the wages and understanding there's, you know, a different thought process or a different perspective on the consultant side because you don't have job security that we have, but it's extremely difficult. We've got a job, and I'm not going to say which one it is, that we're augmenting, and that agreement is \$300,000 to \$350,000 a month for one firm, for one augmentation, not even a full

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Admin and it just -- you know, I sign my name to authorize the payment, and it's difficult, very difficult to see that kind of expenditure go out when we could have qualified staff in-house and be more effective in my opinion. And like Thor mentioned, we lost an entire construction crew in Reno, District 2. We lost one in Las Vegas. We used to have a construction crew in Ely, over time that they just disbanded through attrition.

So, we've got less people. We've got a larger program, and it's very difficult for the construction crews to see these consultants come on board that are making two and three times more an hour than they are. It's a morale killer. That's my two cents.

Savage: No, but I think, Sharon, your point is well made, because if we can have the proof in the pudding, say listen, Mr. Director, or listen, Governor, whoever it might be, this is what we're spending. This is what we could be doing the project for, and this is where we're at today. Where are we acting, we have some major concerns, and it's going to affect us in the long run if we don't try to take care of it. That's the bottom line.

Kaiser: We will put those numbers together for the next legislature, request that.

Foerschler: It's going to be at \$18 million this year just on construction.

Savage: That's a long ways away.

Kaiser: It is.

Savage: You know, so, let's see what we can do in the interim. There's no silver bullet. We understand that. We've got to figure a way. BJ, your view, do you have an answer?

Almberg: I wish I did. I mean, it's hard to sit back in here and recognize how much we're paying out for the consultants because we don't have the staff to do it, and that money would obviously come in here. If you could take that money, bring it back into NDOT, distribute it through staff, additional employment, it would make a huge difference.

Kaiser: Agree with you 100%

Savage: Any other comments on Agenda Item No. 4? Moving on to Agenda Item No. 5, the... Resident Engineer's project assignments.



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Kaiser: Okay. What I have here is just the project assignments for use of the districts and their Resident Engineers. Right now in District 1, we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven REs working in projects in Las Vegas, one in Tonopah. In District 2, one is in Fallon. Two are in Reno. One is in Carson City, and one is in Tahoe. And then in District 3, we have an RE in Wells, one in Ely, one in Elko -- two in Elko, and one in Winnemucca. Are there any questions in regards to the District assignments? The schedules, thanks to our construction office, do look the same.

Savage: They look the same. [crosstalk]

Foerschler: Steven's job. I delegate it.

Savage: So much easier. I mean, again, it's evident right there on page 4 or 5, I believe, where you don't have any available REs for the District 2 -- the last four items.

Kaiser: Yeah, we're all very busy. We don't have an RE in Ely right now. I think the Assistant District Engineer is running that crew.

Dyson: So, Thor Dyson. I just want to add that a lot of times the consultants, for doing construction administration or augmentation, they're working on one job. Our current Resident Engineers for NDOT have anywhere from seven to eight projects, and as you know, you know, one project has, in some cases, as much paperwork -- a small project may have as much paperwork as a big project. You've got all these required steps and processes and procedures. So, it's daunting to have tons of work and the REs handling seven, eight, nine projects a shot, and like Ms. Sharon Foerschler had stated, it's a morale buster when the crew is managing multiple jobs and they're seeing the consultants making two or three times as much as they are and they're managing one job at that time. So, you know, we're getting it done. We're doing what we can do, but the oversight is not as thorough as I'd like it to be. You know, I always fall back on to what gets monitored, gets accomplished, and that's what inspectors and testers on the construction crews do.

They monitor and review and inspect and ensure and do QAQC and try to avoid a warranty, you know, a warranty issue I should say. We don't have warranties. [laughter] But, you know -- so, it just kind of all steamrolls, and it -- when you just go do -- when you do [inaudible] maintenance and District acceptance, on the front end, you didn't have enough staff to review things appropriately because

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

your crew has seven and eight jobs, and everybody is spread real thin. It just sort of steamrolls.

Savage: It does steamroll, and it even gets into my safety at the end of the day, you know? Everyone, the men and women, are pushed to the end degree, and we never want to jeopardize the livelihood of that person. I'm talking about the oversight of the REs of what they're doing on these different projects. We really have to, again, look at that to ensure that we're getting the value for the Department as well as the understanding of what that RE can achieve on a day in, day out basis. It's not easy.

Larkin: Excuse me, I need to go... [inaudible]

Savage: Thank you, Tracy. So, as far as the additional REs, I mean, if you need REs to do the work and you don't have the REs, you got to outsource those people as well [inaudible] is crazy.

Dyson: Thor Dyson again. We're required to do that for FHWA, and certainly if it's a federal project, we're required to monitor and make sure federal dollars are used appropriately. So, we have to have an RE, and we try to augment our projects, our federal projects, or have full administration on our federal projects, because it means that much to FHWA to have an RE dedicated, a crew dedicated or augmented to that particular federal job.

Savage: So, let me understand. So, the budget has been set for the next two years, so there are no available requests for RE crews within the department. Is that a fair statement?

Terry: Yes.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: Okay. I wasn't quite sure how that worked. So, we're set for the next two years.

Kaiser: We're set for the next two years. We can request new people next legislature in 2019.

Almberg: You're set for the next two years based on the staff we have now?

Kaiser: The current staff we have now.

Almberg: Based on all the staff.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Terry: Actually, I think we were approved for Department-wide -- I think it was 16 new positions scattered throughout the Department, but none in the construction side budget processes and stuff, and we can't hire any of those until October, but that's the total of our whole 1,800... [inaudible]
- Almberg: So, all these positions that...
- Terry: None of them were a construction crew.
- Tedford: Mr. Chairman?
- Savage: Yes, Darin?
- Tedford: Darin Tedford, Materials Division. We don't mean we're set like we have enough. We mean we're set like we can't get any more. [laughter]
- Almberg: We're set before we have -- even though we have lists of a bunch of positions that we need, we can't fill them.
- Tedford: If we said we needed more crews, we couldn't get those approved until the next legislature. So, the number of people we have is set, and the only way we're going to get more is if Sharon gets a mass consultant.
- Savage: Item No. 6, Unbalanced Bidding, there doesn't seem to be anything at this time. Item No. 7, list of active agreements.
- Kaiser: This is the same list from the previous meeting. It's just all the Xs have been eliminated thanks to Claudia fixing my spreadsheet.
- Savage: Thank you, Claudia.
- Kaiser: So, I don't know if you guys have any questions over the numbers that were presented there.
- Savage: I do have a question. Again, I really thank you for the summary, because it's a quick snapshot, very helpful, very informative, very transparent, but are there any matters of concern from any of the construction consultants not being able to form your work to meet our schedules in advance?
- Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler for the record. We're on the brink of finding out going into this construction season. So, the staff that we have on board make their own agreements. We're going to be fine, because they've known for a while now what our needs are, what our challenges are going to be on the on-call. So, as the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

resources out in the industry are being tapped into, you know -- we can get staff. We just don't want the warm bodies, and that's our theory, is we're not going to get the most qualified staff, because they're not out there.

Savage: But I heard you first say that the ones that they're committed to, they have guaranteed the Department that they'll be on time and give us the services that we require for the projects that we've already engaged.

Foerschler: Yes.

Savage: And then the on-call, again, I compliment the Department for going to that type of system regarding the flexibility of who's available based on what their workload is. It gives us a little more flexibility, but it's a concern of yours, Sharon.

Foerschler: Yes, and there are substitutions that happen on our fully executed agreements with staff we currently have on board with the consultants, because people move around, but there's more of a -- how do I say it -- solid plan on the full admins and the augmentations that they count on. They know what the work schedule is. They know when we're going to need staff, for how long we're going to need them. The on-call is a little bit gray in that respect from that perspective. And then coupled with what's going on in California, we're afraid we might lose a lot of staff over there with the increase that they're looking at. We're hearing from the consultant side at least for construction. I don't know about design, if you guys are experiencing the same thing, but the pickings are getting slim.

Savage: And I'd just like you all to know that [inaudible] the same on the private side, trying to find the qualified people, the 18 qualified people [inaudible] warm bodies, and that's why, you know, our personal philosophy is, on the business side, is to take care of the people who have gotten us where we're at today, and I'm hoping that some of the vendors and the contractors feel the same way about NDOT, because there's a lot of work out there. But through thick and thin, NDOT will always be here, and I think the good contractors realize that. I hope the consultants can see the same thing. I believe they do, but it's worth mentioning here at this level, and I'm hoping that they can hear that, because NDOT will be here for the next hundred years, and some other projects won't be. But at the time, we had to face the reality we're losing people [inaudible] near the bay area or Phoenix or Salt Lake, or Las Vegas. This is a Vegas country here. I got to be careful, but we're all being challenged, and it's about the people communicating and ensuring with those vendors that they cannot oversell and underperform. It's death. It's death for them, and it's death for us, and I think it's

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

important that everybody talks about that throughout the Department from the ground up, because it's reality. Any other comments on that matter?

Mortensen: This is Cole Mortensen, Project Management. I have to agree wholeheartedly to, I think, some of the issues that we've seen, especially on recent procurements, because we're seeing the same basis time after time, after time on these proposals. And the question then becomes as you're working on this job over here for us, and, you know, I just saw you on two other proposals, from the industry we get, well, you know, we've got to go after work. If we don't go after work, we're going to -- we're going to fail. But from our perspective, it's really tough when you have somebody telling you that, oh, yeah, we're going to -- we're going to get it done for you, and yet they're committed -- they've overcommitted themselves through proposals of work to the RFPs that we've found out there. So, we're seeing the crunch, too... [inaudible]

Savage: Because the people -- the vendors and the contractors are really -- they tell you, "No, I can't take care of you right now." I got a full plate. I'm not able to give you the quality of service that you should have.

Mortensen: Or they give us somebody that just isn't qualified.

Savage: Well, that's the work, but they still -- we still have the standards.

Dyson: Or, Member Savage -- Thor Dyson. I have an interesting story where we went out for RFPs for proposals on I-80 job east of Fernley, and it was suggested by one of the firms that we really didn't need an RE out on that job, because they were committed to another job that the Department was -- has them employed at. So, they were basically insinuating a proposal that, you know, this project doesn't need a full-time RE, and of course, you know, they weren't selected because the I-80 project, which is a multimillion-dollar project to address I-80 issues, paving east of town -- east of Fernley, does require an RE, does require a full crew. And to insinuate that it doesn't was erroneous.

Savage: Yeah.

Dyson: So, there's a lot of -- like Mr. Cole Mortensen stated, you know, they're going to -- and I don't have the business. I don't understand fully that whole side of things, but there is -- you know, you're either really busy or you're not, and you're trying to balance the workload -- you'll take out all the work you can and then spread it out. Contractors do that as well. They'll bid three or four jobs, and then they'll

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

come to us and the Department and say, "We want to delay the notice to proceed on this job." And it's not necessarily because they have a good reason. It's because it's not fitting their schedules, because they got too much work. We're seeing some of that.

Kaiser: And Len and BJ, just so you understand, the first sheet is the construction agreements, and the second sheet has all the project management agreements, all the consultants that have been listed -- are listed.

Savage: So, even on that matter, the project on the second page, so the reason why [inaudible] down there, they're the contractor at the bottom.

Kaiser: Right.

Savage: And then Granite [phonetic] is on here, too, I noticed. They're both being contracted.

Kaiser: Those projects, CMARs are handled through agreements.

Savage: Okay, those... [inaudible]

Kaiser: Right?

Speaker: Yeah.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: Okay. Any other questions on Agenda Item No. 7? Agenda Item No. 8, update on Design Build Contracts.

Mortensen: Well, we have a presentation. I'll turn it over to Dale and Pedro. Is this the end of the presentation? We're done. To run through their perspective projects. One of the things that I would like to mention is that we do have the RFP out on the street for the I-15 Garnett Interchange at 93. We anticipate getting proposals in for those Wednesday.

Savage: Thank you, Cole, and thank you for attending today from Project Management, got the fresh air, and Dale, welcome from Las Vegas.

Keller: Good afternoon. All right, we'll get going. So, for the record, Dale Keller, NDOT Project Manager from Project NEON. So, we'll quickly go through where we are at with Project NEON. So, we are roughly 35% of the contractual value that's been earned to date. That puts us just over \$200 million. Big picture-wise,

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

we're on schedule, on track where we need to be. As I mentioned at the Board Meeting this morning, our design is roughly 100% complete, which is great news for all the design build projects. We want to make sure that the design is complete. There's less errors when you have the complete design, so that's great news. [inaudible] we'll see -- you'll see an update construction, 17 to 18 has always been the busiest time and where the most money is going to be spent on construction. So, you'll see that number catch up and will definitely be a lot more construction going on here in the next two years.

Here's our earned value curve. Here's what the yellow was projected versus what blue is. What Q has been trying to do -- and I know Chris just left. We had that kind of a saddle hump in there that was projected earned value curve is, and that's more based on where our contractual limitations are. So, Q is trying to do their best to smooth out that one nice bell curve. So, you'll see some of that work get pushed toward that January-February time period and keep those resources and keep their craft on the projects here and not have to let people go and try to hire people back on. So, that's what they've been working to, and as you can tell, majority of work is coming up this summer as well as summer of '18.

So, here is the Change Order Status. All the changes on this sheet is what was seen three months ago. So, one through 14, those were executed. As you can tell, the last date on there is from January 11th. So, I'll skip to the next page.

Savage: Hang on one second, Dale, question for you. For example, on that item 12, Elimination of Courtesy Patrol, the one with \$400,000... deduct

Keller: Yes. So, you want more detail?

Savage: Yes, I mean, how did that -- was that a line item during the original bid?

Keller: It was. So, actually, it was a commitment in QA's proposal. So, at bid time, they said, "Hey, we'll provide you a courtesy patrol." That included tow truck services at end of each side when we pack lanes on US-95 and I-15, working through traffic operations and our freeway service patrol. That felt it was an overlap of responsibilities, and what we agreed to were Traffic Ops. They could increase the freeway service patrol, rather a NEON footprint, in more efficient matter. So, we went back to their [inaudible] documents and [inaudible] and pulled out \$400,000 with that budgeting for courtesy patrol. So, this is one where I took at a solution. Even though they said, "Hey, we can help you with this," NDOT, we said, "Well, we're better off suited and know how the area functions more with our freeway

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

service patrol." So, Traffic Operations is leading that, leading the increase in service.

Savage: And we got back the original amount that they had stipulated on there?

Keller: 100%, no shared savings here. This is a deduction scope.

Savage: Right.

Keller: So, we would have 100%... deduct

Savage: All right. Thank you.

Keller: If you can tell on six, one question came up [inaudible] a lot of Value Engineer Proposals that came through, the high dollar amount. We have one here at six that was roughly -- that was our savings back, was roughly \$100,000. So, on a \$560 million contract, it was very small, some things we see, but still a savings. There is another one that we're working through right now as a proposal to see if it's something worth pursuing. So, since the last three months, we have three executed change orders, kind of really -- just want to comment zeroing out there - - or a \$100,000 increase takes us total to roughly just under \$12 million executed change orders so far. Questions, comments on change orders? Any questions on Project NEON. That was really short and simple.

Savage: None here. Member Martin, any questions on NEON?

Martin: Yeah. I'm wondering on the change orders, what's the driving factor? If you can go back to those slides. I couldn't read them from where I'm at, but I see a lot of Xs where it's owner-directed. Does that mean it's something -- additional work you guys have requested of Kiewit?

Mortensen: Board Member Martin, this is Cole Mortensen of Project Management. One of the things that actually accounts for a couple of the change orders that you see in there is that we'd actually had an idea, a concept change for us during the procurement process, and we found ourselves in a situation where we couldn't change the RFP, and that's specifically to the MLK. You'll see the MLK ramp modification there, and there's -- I think there's another one up there. Anyway, point being is that we turned around and we requested that Kiewit incorporate those changes into the project afterwards, and the only way to really do that is to do it by change order, because otherwise -- we had to have an understanding of how it might impact their schedule costs, that kind of thing. So, a lot of the



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Department-directed change orders there have something to do with that, where it wasn't in our original -- contractor original agreement, but the need for it has come up.

Martin: Okay, I get that. So, the 515 viaduct repairs for \$2.9 million...

Mortensen: Correct, we -- that was...

Martin: All of this stuff could -- anticipated with your normal job visits and all that kind of stuff?

Mortensen: Correct. Some of these came up after the fact, after we had already issued the RFP. The viaduct repair, there was a portion of that northbound viaduct there on the I-515 that was basically deteriorating at alarming rate, and rather than continuing to have our maintenance crews out there kind of causing traffic congestion, potentially causing issues with our lane restrictions on NEON, we chose to change order in Project NEON so that we didn't have any issues with another contractor working in the same area and what that does to the incentives packages and the schedule that we have on NEON.

Martin: Got you. And item number 11?

Mortensen: Item number 11 was a situation where we had differences of opinions on the engineering of the drilled shafts and what the Department was comfortable with using or allowing from a design standpoint. This is one of those areas that we had talked about earlier where you end up having arguments over engineering judgment and who's right and who isn't, and so rather than accepting work that we weren't comfortable with, we executed a change order to have them include additional lengths on the drill shafts based on what we can allow through the contract.

Keller: And to be frank, this is one -- you know, you talk about the challenge and going through design build project, and every day is not going to be a great day, right? So, everything is, you know, challenges. You have different opinions, and this is one, I think, the major one. I think we both worked together, partnered together with and found a solution that worked best for the department, kept the project on schedule, and right now, we've kind of -- knock on wood, has been going through these drilled shaft constructability concerns and issues. Actually, it was a high risk. Now I think it's a very low risk, and that says something both to NDOT and to Kiewit.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Martin: Okay, so, if I hear, it's just two engineers that couldn't agree to meet in the middle.  
[laughter]

Keller: That's a good way of boiling it down.

Mortensen: And at the end of the day, considering a project like this has an overhead rate of about \$100,000 a day, it was getting to a point where the Department was potentially at risk over continuing to allow this issue to languish and impacting their schedule, and so when you start talking about time equaling money, you know, in two weeks -- if we let it go another two weeks, the Department could have been at risk for another \$10 million. [inaudible]

Martin: I get it, Cole, and one of the advantages that I see in the design build, and I'm certain Len feels the same way -- my screen just went black, is...

Savage: You're looking better up here. [laughter]

Martin: ...is the utilization of the contractors' capabilities. So, how do you feel about -- Dale, how do you feel about 2% at 35% complete?

Keller: Actually, really well. One of the things that we talked with our partners at FHWA one of their measures of this project is on track or not is that 2% of growth a year. So, we're under that 2% of growth in a year of the contract. So, by their averages and averages of what we see, I think we feel comfortable and confident where we are today. There is some significant change orders that could be forthcoming at the additional scope that we're adding to the contract. So, we're going through some negotiations there, but all of that we can discuss as we execute those change orders upcoming, but I feel confident there's no thing that's going to be out there hanging out there that's going to really blow up on the side that's going to change our cost or schedule at this time.

Mortensen: If I could add to... oh, go ahead.

Martin: I'm sorry, no, go ahead, Cole.

Mortensen: What I was going to say, if I could add to -- you know, we've done a number of things on NEON so far that I think the Department as a whole should be very proud of. Getting the right of way sooner was huge for the Department that we kept very visible with our team to make sure that we got that done and that we didn't delay the contractor in any way, shape, or form based on our right of way. The other was the comment that you had earlier in the Board Meeting. We made

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

it very clear to CH2M Hill and to our staff that we didn't want any design submittals to delay the project, and really, the statistic that we had discussed there was really more of an encouragement for our staff and for CH2M Hill to continue to strive to get better and to knock those days out. When you start talking about 1,400 days' worth of review that we cut out of there, it starts eliminating any liability to the Department to have a design review cost delay to the project and ultimately cost the Department in the end. So, we've tried to be really aware of those areas where we can eliminate risk, and right now, having gotten all the way through the design process and having gotten all the right of way turned over to the contractor, we've really limited those areas that we could possibly be on the hook for delay.

Martin: So, what are you -- what's your swag on total changeovers, 5% to the end?

Keller: That's high, that's way high. Right now -- John?

Terry: We'll have more. I think the work -- probably the biggest ones are behind us, but who knows. No, I think we'll be way less than that just because it's such a big job. We're not going to 5% on \$560 million.

Martin: So, where I was going with that is, is that in my experience with design build, almost all of the change orders happen during the design period of the job and not during the construction, unlike design bid builds, where all the change orders happen during the construction. Is that what you're looking forward to?

Terry: I think for the most part, yes. The only issue is it's a three-plus-year job. There might be more owner-added things that come up as three years go by.

Keller: And one thing that we've done, too -- you kind of note on some of these change orders, like, number three is design work for MLK ramp modification. Then you see down the line, we actually execute number seven for ramp modifications. So, there's ones that we've progressed the design. So, if we come to terms on the cost of that work to be done, incorporating the scope of the job, it's there for us to do. So, we're not going down a route where we don't have the design and the we don't have the construction [inaudible] project. So, we've been -- I think John has been a very good advocate for getting the design, pay for the design. We can have that record for another project down the road if need be.

Martin: Okay. All right. Good job, guys.

Mortensen: Thank you.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: Yeah, it's a great job, you know, from the Department. The largest project we ever had. The time and effort that you guys have spent on this project and with the contractor and the engineer, CH, speaks volumes. I mean, it's not over. We've got a long ways to go, long ways to go, and there's going to be Murphy popping his head out and we know that, somewhere, somehow.

Keller: One thing to note, too, might be good for the Board Members to understand for construction purposes, we're open to, one, the interim/milestones recall. We have 60 interim/milestones that have incentives associated with it. So, right now, we have the US-95 interim/milestone that we're currently under the clock with, \$6 million. It's 300 days. Right now, Kiewit is tracking about 30 days ahead of schedule for that milestone. That means they're going to be off US-95 30 days sooner than what we thought, which is terrific. So, they're tracking around about half -- meeting half that incentive. So, right now, they're hitting all their milestones, going to hit that 30-day early interim/milestone completion, so that's also good news.

Savage: I think those incentives are very accurate.

Keller: Yeah, what Thor said, if you monitor it and you check into it, they're going to make sure they hit it.

Savage: Thank you, Dale.

Keller: Thank you.

Kaiser: Thanks, Dale.

Rodriguez: Afternoon.

Savage: Hello, Pedro.

Rodriguez: Pedro Rodriguez, NDOT Project Management, managing the USA Parkway Design Build. We have a bit more information since our last meeting. The majority of those things are the same. If you look down at the bottom, scheduled completion is about 85%. Construction is about 70%. Design, as I mentioned before, we're already approaching 90%. We're at 98%. There's very little left to do there. With the scheduled completion at 85%, I want to add that we recently started paving, and the numbers on here don't reflect that. So, these are based off the invoices we last received. Overall cost completion, we're about 74%. So, that

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

explains the 98% of the design completion. All we're really waiting for here are [inaudible] into the completion of the record drawings.

Construction overall, as I mentioned, is going well. All work areas have already received paving. Over this last month, we've laid down approximately another seven miles in the first course of paving. That's since I last heard [inaudible] progress with the paving. We're expected to go into the next northbound section and then come back into the other courses. The Work Area 1 is pretty much complete with the exception of a few items that we need to touch up in regards to L&D, punch list items as well. Work Area 2, again, nearing completion through that as well. I don't know if I have any more to say in there. All earth work has been completed, slopes completed, basis down, and again, we started paving again.

Kaiser: Did you guys notice any effect from this last winter? You know, I mean, was there any areas of ponding? Did you have to change any drainage facilities, add drainage facilities or anything?

Rodriguez: Good question. Our design implemented quite a bit of aggregate base into the project, and because of the limitation of all that aggregate base, we weathered pretty well.

Kaiser: That's good. So, the drainage -- all the drainage flowed. So, when you guys hand it over to maintenance, they're not going to be out there having to change any DIs.

Rodriguez: If I had the little crystal ball, I'd say no, but for the most part, again, what we saw with the weather throughout this last season seems to show promise for the life expectancy of the...

Kaiser: I mean, if you can handle this one, or you think you can handle just about anything that area is going to throw at it.

Rodriguez: I think so.

Savage: But what I'm hearing you say is it was -- we're thankful that the contractor was far enough long where things didn't get destroyed.

Rodriguez: Well, not necessarily. Some stuff did erode, but it's because of the already placed aggregate, like the medians, et cetera, that resisted that erosion further. So, we did have an effect on -- the weather did have an effect on USA Parkway, but we were luck enough, again, with the advancement of the construction that already

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

taken place by Ames, that we didn't feel that it's badly as you probably...  
[crosstalk]

Savage: That's my point. Thank you.

Alexander: So, I'll just wrap it up, Pedro, if you don't mind, and for the record, Seth Alexander with Ames Construction. So, those of you who have [inaudible] very rocky site. One of the things that we're very proud of is we're able to keep working all through January. We have a total of three lost working days. We're able to keep the project on schedule where we're extremely confident we're going to open it up on schedule now.

Savage: Well, Seth, I got to compliment you for persevering through the winter. You know, it's nice to hear that the contractor didn't have an excuse, you know, and not micromanaging or saying things, but I do see -- I know in some past projects we've had, the contractors always had an excuse. So, I thank Ames. Thank you, sir.

Alexander: Thank you.

Savage: Thank you, Pedro.

Rodriguez: This line here shows, again, our repeat of what we had last Construction Working Group meeting. The change orders that have occurred on USA Parkway, we added one more, I believe, to this list here, which is the addition of regulatory speed reductions on US-50. There's one more that's in the works right now that we expect to be added, which is the installation of additional conduits on USA Parkway down near the 50 intersection. And as Seth mentioned, again, I'll repeat what I said at the last meeting, even with the addition of all this, including our installation of the [inaudible] conduits for the fiber, we've been able to maintain a substantial completion date for the contract this fall.

Savage: That's huge.

Rodriguez: Any questions on those?

Almberg: I got a quick question. Some of the things that was just discussed, the weather and the winter that we had and some of the erosion, is there any change order associated with mother nature? I mean, I don't see none there.

Rodriguez: No, none that have come up. And that's it. Here's an overview of the extension of the project there. Again, we're into our Work Area 3, or the connection with USA

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Parkway at US-50 roundabout has already had some curb and gutter -- the concrete pours there. So, traffic should be open September 8. I'm going to try not to say that, but open to the public September 8th.

Kaiser: That's a long run.

Rodriguez: 18 miles total.

Savage: Are there warning flashers before that roundabout?

Rodriguez: The last change order I mentioned there, Member Savage, is the speed reduction, so it's going to decrease the speed from what it's at down to 45 regulatory, and there's advisory speed signs right before you get to the roundabout, 25 miles per hour, but no flashers. That's standard practice for a roundabout.

Savage: I just worry about the old rancher that hasn't turned 50 in five years coming in at midnight.

Rodriguez: That's true, and I guess the good thing right now in regards to the traveling public, we have a **SHU** [phonetic] plan that's going around the roundabout right now that's reduced down to 25. So, already we're getting the public used to driving 25 miles per hour through there.

Savage: Okay. How fast were you going? [laughter] Good answer. Thank you. [crosstalk] Thank you, Seth, appreciate it. Okay, moving on. 5B, Requested Reports and Documents.

Kaiser: Yeah, we just attended one AGC meeting this last quarter, and that was on April 14th.

Savage: Okay. We can move on to Agenda Item No. 6, Projects Under Development, 5-year Plan. Again, very worthwhile forms here, page 1 through 10. Are there any questions or comments? There was -- you know, a question I had last meeting was on the landscape and aesthetics on page 8 of 10. Every budget was \$1 million or \$2 million, and I just had a hard time understanding why. And I know they're budgets. They don't all have to be the same, and I think that's just something we need to look into. I don't expect an answer right now. I just...

Terry: I'll just say I agree with you, but they do, to an extent, design to budget. I mean, on those projects, we do sort of give them a budget, and they put in enough landscaping to meet the budget. So, they [inaudible] they do try to go to a budget.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: That's concerning to a point where we are short of funds, but I know we need landscape and aesthetics as well. So, we'll leave it up to the Department to try to look at the most needs. [inaudible] when I -- originally, I specifically remember that that budget was a \$1-million budget, and I don't know how it went from \$1 million to 1.6.

Speaker: Is that combining...

Terry: There was scope added that was specifically asked through the front office and even through the Governor's Office to add more to that project so we could do so. We added scope to that project.

Savage: Is that project in [inaudible] or is it -- has it been bid?

Terry: I think it's close.

Dyson: I think it's out.

Terry: I think the -- is it [inaudible] we haven't bid it yet? I think it's... [inaudible]

Dyson: I saw something on my email coming through.

Terry: It's 'about that, I think. I'll get back to you if I hear otherwise.

Savage: The status on the top three, the Plum Lane, state line, have those been bid?

Terry: No.

Savage: Geiger [phonetic] Grade, at Veterans, [phonetic] roundabout aesthetics, none of those have been bid.

Terry: No. If you remember a few months ago when you saw some landscape architecture consultant agreements, that's the work on these.

Savage: Oh, okay.

Terry: So, they still got developed.

Savage: Okay. Any other questions on Agenda Item No. 6? Member Martin, BJ?

Martin: No, sir.

Savage: Moving on to Agenda Item No. 7, Briefing on Status of Projects under Construction, Project Closeout.



Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Foerschler: Happy to answer any questions you guys have.
- Kaiser: Back down to three sheets.
- Savage: I just wanted to know on page 1, how many Trishes are there or is that an acronym? [laughter]
- Freeman: No, there's just one of her.
- Foerschler: There's one Trish, and she resides in Las Vegas.
- Kaiser: But she'll...
- Savage: She's on page 1 on every line.
- Foerschler: She's in District 1.
- Savage: Okay. [laughter] So, thank you, Sharon and Steven and Jeff. Again, major progress on Closeout. So, I thank you... [inaudible]
- Kaiser: 15 projects this last quarter, that's a lot of work. Good job.
- Foerschler: Our electronic documentation system is very effective in closing out contracts. We don't have to balance all of the little orange field books anymore. The system does it for us.
- Savage: That's huge.
- Foerschler: So, it's really good.
- Savage: That's good to hear. That's a good ROI, you know, that we never hear about or we never see.
- Foerschler: Yeah, we got legislatively approved budget to move forward with our next phase of E-construction, which is the materials [inaudible] that's going to be huge as well in piggybacking with the materials lab to do all of that electronically. So, we have seen vendor demonstrations. We've seen the existing software we have is [inaudible] we have decided to join hands with design, who's going out to replace their financial piece, the PSAMS [phonetic] piece, acronyms for -- I don't even know what all PSAMS does, but to put RFP out to see if we can get a system for the budget we got approved for that can give us more functionality across the department. And as you saw in Kim's presentation this morning, we have all these silos. We're trying to streamline that process. So, instead of us just moving

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

forward with AASHTO and not thinking outside that box, we're going to see what we can get, if we can get more functionality out of this and a price tag solution. That will meet more needs for the Department.

Savage: That's interesting. And Darin, since you're here, a question; has the use of drones been utilized in the materials and testing divisions at all with any DOTs at this point?

Tedford: Other DOTs, I'm not aware of, but the first things that come to mind, we're looking at using them for bridge inspection so we don't have to hang the ladder truck underneath and then the guys under there have lanes closed even. We attempted to go out and use one. I wasn't directly involved with it, but on the US-95 south of Fallon, we went to go out to use it to try to survey in elevations aerially so that we could tell where the low spots were to put the culverts underneath. That was attempted, and I know that you can go out and you can measure stockpiles with them. So, you can measure stockpile quantity with that same type of -- it's like lidar. Lidar sets a point on a bridge, whatever high spot it can get close, and maps everything, basically, by laser distancing it and puts it in a computer. But if you can do that from a drone, then you can fly over something and measure stockpiles. We do that. That's always a battle with -- or challenge with whatever stockpiles we have that we pay by the stockpile or pay by cubic yards of material, but that can be an advantage in the future, too. So, there's all kinds of potential, and what Sharon is talking about is if you picture half the materials division function is working for the RE, the Resident Engineer, doing testing that he can't do in his mobile labs. Samples come in. We test and we report back to them, and it's 90% paper right now. So, if we can do that with this system and do it electronically and piggyback on the electronics just the [inaudible] already, then that's a huge increase in efficiency.

Savage: Thank you.

Dyson: Would that be for [inaudible] and stuff, too?

Tedford: For everything.

Savage: Any other questions or comments on Item B? Move to Item C, Projects Closed, detail sheets. My only comment is, again, another compliment, minimal changeovers, minimal changeovers on the majority of the projects. The first page [crosstalk] what's that?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Foerschler: I said that goes to John, too. His crew is designing it.

Savage: Yeah, a lot of in-house design.

Dyson: So, Member Savage, Thor Dyson. We, you know, also want to state to the Director's Office that it's been exciting in the fact that when contractors have an issue, they don't go right to the Director's Office. If they do, they send them back to the District, to the RE and say, "Hey," you know, "everybody has talked to you, worked on this issue." And a lot of times these change orders can be resolved at the lowest level. These issues, they'll become change orders, and so there's a more consistent message from the Director's Office or the Construction Office dealing with potential change orders developed out in the field. I mean, there's always going to be change orders, but they've been significantly reduced because of pushing the issue back down to the RE and giving them a chance to solving it, and then if they can't -- District, and if they can't, then back up to the Construction and Director's Office. Wouldn't you agree, Sharon and Reid? I mean...

Kaiser: Yeah. They don't call me -- they don't call me anymore. [laughter] It's really nice.

Savage: Thank you. John... [inaudible]

Terry: Well, and then if they can resolve the change orders early and effectively, we don't mind paying more if it's for concrete and asphalt, you know? We don't want these change orders to linger for so long, that we end up having to pay half the value of the change or just delays and other things. You know, so, if we can get...

Kaiser: It's definitely a huge issue.

Terry: If we can get them and pay for the actual items and not pay for all the delay stuff, that helps everybody.

Savage: Oh, it's absolutely true, and it was evident today at the Board Meeting on the litigation. You know, kudos to all of you. Litigation costs are down, John, you know, and that's because of the good design, the communication that you have between the districts and Headquarters and with no walls, no fences. It's a two-way street, and [inaudible] the lowest common dominator. It's a big deal.

Dyson: Member Savage, I think that dovetails right into number E -- or letter E. You would see that the partnering and dispute process is very quiet as well... [inaudible]

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Almberg: Yeah, I got a question.

Savage: Yes, BJ?

Almberg: On these sheets here, I guess I can't -- I don't understand how these numbers add up. You got a bid price here on page 1 of 15, \$1.16 million. We got it at every budget [inaudible] and that's our budget we're putting in place to handle any change orders [inaudible] project, and then we have a final payment amount of \$1.6 million and a total changeover of \$230,000, but how do these numbers add up? I mean, how do you -- how do you get the 20% change order? I'm trying to run that number, and I don't see anywhere where I can get 20%

Foerschler: So, what we measure is total change order dollars against the budget, so the agreement estimates our budget. So, that's what we build in. We take the engineer's estimate during project development. They place contingencies in there, and that becomes our budget.

Almberg: Correct.

Foerschler: Then we take the bid price...

Almberg: Okay.

Foerschler: Okay, and that's what the contractor bid, although there's budgetary items that the contractor has not bid on, nor does he see, so contingencies for asphalt escalation, for letters of authorization, those sorts of things. So, we measure our change orders against our agreement estimates, see if we're within budget.

Kaiser: But I think -- so, your question -- you got your bid price and you have the change orders, and it looks to me on that job it's, like, what, \$1.3?

Almberg: Yeah, \$1.39.

Kaiser: And the delta there between what is final contract payment is probably your over and above 100% bid quantities. So, your bid quantities that we paid over 100%, that will make up that other delta, \$300,000 probably for this job.

Terry: Even though they bid one quantity, we pay actual.

Kaiser: We pay actual quantities.

Almberg: Okay, so, that's -- I'm just saying these numbers weren't quite adding up here.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Foerschler: Base range.
- Almberg: So, what you're saying, if we have 1,000 feet of curb and gutter, but they install 1,200 feet of curb and gutter...
- Kaiser: We pay for the -- what the actual...
- Almberg: You pay for what they install. That's not considered an actual change order.
- Kaiser: No.
- Almberg: Now I understand. I couldn't get these numbers to add up. I'm not sure what's going on here.
- Savage: Any other questions on 7C? 7D, Active Projects, any questions or comments -- comments or questions on 7D?
- Foerschler: So, for the record, Sharon Foerschler. Frank, you weren't at the last meeting, and I just wanted to point out on the active contracts spreadsheet, if you compare it to previous months or CWG packets, you're going to notice a little bit of a change in what we're reporting, and we used to have a column called Updated Contract Amount, and that is now gone due to some limitations within our electronic documentation. So, we have -- you'll still see the budget. You'll see what was bid. You'll see the contract modifications. Those are the change orders. That's what our new system calls them, contract modifications, and then you'll see total pay to date. So, the information is still there, but if you put it right next to two CWGs ago, you're going to notice a little bit difference in what we're reporting, because updated contract amount, whenever we put in -- updated contract amount, let me see if I can explain this as cleanly as possible, included all the contingencies because of the way our system reports.
- So, whether the contingency was expended or not, it would show in an updated contract amount, and we thought that was a little misleading when you're looking at numbers. So, that's why we went to total pay to date. So, just to FYI, if you want to look at the side-by-side, if you have any questions, let me know, but there is a little bit of a change.
- Martin: All right, thank you. I appreciate you pointing that out.
- Savage: Thank you, Sharon.
- Foerschler: You're welcome.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

- Savage: 7E, Partnering/Dispute, Thor made a good point, litigation may be down because of partnering. Is that your comment?
- Dyson: There's always -- Thor Dyson. There's always partnering going on informally and formally, and, you know, we're having good sets of plans. We're having good communication. The process is being followed. It's not being jumped by contractors or by NDOT staff, and it seems to be effective, and we do see the disputes...
- Savage: Who's in charge of partnering now from the Department?
- Foerschler: Well, it falls out of our office.
- Savage: Yeah, it was Lisa.
- Foerschler: Lisa retired, and we're in the process of trying to fill her position.
- Savage: So, I'm glad to hear it's successful, because...
- Foerschler: These two guys are in charge of it right now. [laughter]
- Savage: For every finger that's pointing...
- Foerschler: But it is running smoothly. We mentioned at the last CWG that we had our national conference in April -- or was it May? [inaudible] at the time, and that went very well. It's kind of business as usual in that regard. We haven't had any hiccups or any real issues.
- Savage: Good. Okay, any other comments or questions on Agenda Item No. 7? We'll move to No. 8, Public Comment. Anybody here in Carson City or Las Vegas?
- Martin: Nobody here, sir.
- Savage: Okay. I'll take a motion to close the -- or no, we're not going to close the session.
- Gallagher: Mr. Chairman, there's no reason to close the meeting. There is nothing new to report.
- Savage: Good news, Mr. Gallagher. Then we'll take a motion to adjourn.
- Almberg: Move to adjourn.
- Martin: So move.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group Meeting  
June 12, 2017

Savage: Meeting closed. Thank you, everyone.

Kaiser: See everybody in September.

Savage: Have a good summer.

Foerschler: You, too.

[end of meeting]

---

Representative

DRAFT



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

## MEMORANDUM

September 05, 2017

**TO:** Department of Transportation Board of Directors  
Construction Working Group

**FROM:** Rudy Malfabon, Director

**SUBJECT:** September 11, 2017 Construction Working Group Meeting

**Item #6:** NDOT Consultant Procurement Process for Construction Division –  
*Informational Item Only*

---

### **Summary:**

The Transportation Board approves a multitude of agreements authorizing NDOT to spend millions of dollars. NDOT works hard to ensure the consultants selected to enter into these agreements represent the most qualified firms to complete the services requested in the Requests for Proposal (RFPs) as required by 23 CFR, 40 USC and NRS 333. A presentation summarizing the process NDOT Construction Division follows when hiring consultants for crew augmentation and project full administration will be useful to provide a general understanding of how consultants are selected.

### **Background:**

NDOT Construction Division enters into numerous consultant agreements each year to assist with the administration of our construction projects statewide and to augment our district construction crews with appropriate staffing to administer their numerous projects. These services include project supervision, inspection, testing, scheduling, surveying and office support.

NDOT seeks to hire firms that will most competently complete the tasks detailed in the Request for Proposal (RFP), and to ensure that the procurement is fair, open, and competitive for all qualified firms. The Agreement Services section of the Administrative Services Division employs Program Officers to facilitate the evaluation and selection of consultants, ensure procedures are followed consistently during each procurement, and monitor compliance with procurement laws and regulations. They liaise with the Construction Division to educate them on selection procedures and guide the procurement from preparing the RFP to executing the agreement.

### **Analysis:**

The Construction Division has prepared a presentation to describe the consultant procurement process.

### **Recommendation:**

Informational item only.

### **Prepared by:**

Sharon Foerschler, Chief Construction Engineer  
Jenni Eyerly, Administrative Services



**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

September 2017: Tracy will give an update on workforce development.

June 2017: Nothing new to report.

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 02: As-Builts  
**Start Date:** Monday, September 14, 2015  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 2017

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

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

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

September 11, 2017: Still meeting monthly, nothing new to report.

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, September 11, 2017  
  
**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 50%  
  
**Total Work:** 0 hours  
**Actual Work:** 0 hours  
  
**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

September 11, 2017 (changes highlighted in yellow)

- Discussion item 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)

- Outstanding change order request to repair damaged effluent line owned by Incline Village, estimate at \$1 million. NDOT's contractor will repair the damage and IV will pay for repairs.
- 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)

June 12, 2017:

- 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: Resident Engineer's project assignments  
**Start Date:** Monday, September 12, 2016  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 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.







CREW	CONTRACT/EA	WORKING DAYS	DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATE	BID AMT	STATUS	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2019	2019	2019	2019	2019	2019	2019	2019					
							Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug						
DISTRICT II WORK PROGRAM																																					
<b>904 - LARRY BOGE</b>																																					
	3688	30	SR 722, 1/2" Chip Seal, MP CH 0.00-16.62, VSS International	\$ 890,000	\$ 694,120	09/11/17 NTP																															
	3677	30	US 50, 1/2" Chip Seal w/ Seal Coat, MP CH 42.50-60.52, VSS International	\$ 890,000	\$ 796,120	06/22/17 BID																															
	3637	80	SR 667, Kietzke Lane, SR 430, N. Virginia Street/Morraine Way & Talus Way, Pedestrian Safety & ADA/SNC	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,094,007	07/11/16 NTP																															
	3652	120	US 95A to US 50A near the Fernley High School, 3" CIR w/ Truck Climbing Lane and Passing Lanes, A&K	\$ 9,550,000	\$ 7,654,000	04/03/17 NTP																															
	3656	110	US 50, Cold Springs Maintenance Station, ITS Smart Zones, MP CH 12.0 to CH 82.0/Titan Electric	\$ 1,967,415	\$ 1,904,408	05/01/17 NTP																															
	60775		SR 667, Kietzke Lane, from Mill Street to Galletti Way, Install Complete Streets	\$ 3,060,000		08/30/17 ADV																															
	60767		I-80 at Fairview Ditch, PE 21.50 to PE 21.80, Replace Structure B-1392E	\$ 500,000		11/15/17 ADV																															
	60751		US 50, Slope Flattening, Fourmile Flat, MP CH 43.00-46.1	\$ 390,000		05/09/18 ADV																															
	60827		SR 397, Cold Mill and Overlay and 1/2 Chip Seal with Seal Coat, MP PE 10.81 to ??	\$ 235,611		Summer 2018																															
	60828		SR 398, Replace 48" Culvert	\$ 221,989		Summer 2018																															
	60769		Maine Street, Fallon, at L Line Canal, Replace Structure B-242, Off System Bridge, MP CH 0.00 to CH 0.10	\$ 1,500,000		11/15/18 ADV																															
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 20,255,015</b>	<b>\$ 12,142,655</b>																																
<b>905 - SAM LOMPA</b>																																					
	73750		SR 447, Washoe County near Nixon, Scour Mitigation/B-1351, MP 15.49	\$ 1,879,271		05/09/18 ADV																															
	3668	130	I-80, Reno, Verdi to Vista Blvd. & US 395/I-580 S. Virginia St. to Stead Blvd., ADA Ped Ramps, Q&D Const.	\$ 1,362,419	\$ 1,121,100	06/12/17 Start																															
	60791		US 395A, Chip Seal, WA 0.00-16.50, Bowers Road	\$ 1,300,000		Summer 2018																															
	60771		I-80/US 395 Ramp Paving, Mustang Truck Station, 4th Street, Stead Blvd.	\$ 536,021		02/28/18 ADV																															
	73988		US 50, Pike St. LY 6.025, Carson City, Silver State St. CC 13.16, Lakeshore Blvd. DO 3.16, Ped Safety Project	\$ 880,000		??????																															
	3659	40	SR 445, Pyramid Highway, Calle DE LA Plata, Construct Accel/Decel Lanes, MP WA 9.75/A&K Earth Movers	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 694,000	06/12/17 NTP																															
<b>HDR AUGMENT</b>	3625/DB		SR 439 USA Parkway from US 50 to I-80 MP LY 26.85 to WA 32.74/Extend Roadway/Ames Construction	\$ 84,000,000	\$ 75,923,220	03/07/16 NTP																															
	3672	50	I-80 at USA Parkway, Interchange Improvements and Median Widening on SR 439, MP WA 32.75/Q&D Const.	\$ 890,000	\$ 599,000	06/12/17 NTP																															
	74066		SR 439, USA Parkway, at Electric Avenue, Widen Intersection and Install Signal System MP ST 9.67	\$ 3,175,000		01/03/18 ADV																															
<b>CONSULTANT AUGMENT</b>	74077		US 395, Reno, I-80 to McCarran Blvd, MP WA 25.731 to 27.064, 5% Slabs Replacement, Crack Repair, etc.	\$ 4,000,000		12/06/17 ADV																															
<b>CONSULTANT AUGMENT</b>	73920		I-80, Washoe County, CA/NV Stateline to Keystone Interchange, Coldmill, Dense and Open Grade	\$ 40,000,000		12/13/17 ADV																															
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 139,072,711</b>	<b>\$ 78,337,320</b>																																
<b>907 - ASHLEY HURLBUT</b>																																					
	3675	30	SR 208 and SR 338, 1/2" Chip Seal, (SR 208 MP LY 12.90-28.20) (SR 338 MP LY 20.80-30.90)/SNC	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 1,037,007	08/21/17 NTP																															
	60789		US 50, East of Dayton, from Chaves Rd. to Roy's Rd., MP LY 13.68 to 19.75/Install Street Lighting	\$ 712,000		09/05/18 ADV																															
	3695	200	SR 207, Kingsbury Grade, Drainage Project, from Daggett Pass to SR 206, MP DO 3.15 to 11.08	\$ 5,310,000	\$ 4,433,000	09/06/17 NTP																															
	3694	80	US 395 at SR 759, Airport Road, Install Signal System, MP DO 26.03/Johnson, Stephanie Accel/Decel Lanes	\$ 3,222,270		09/07/17 BID																															
	3658	50	SR 877, Franktown Road, 1" Mill and 2" Fill from WA 0.00 to 1.4, 1" Mill and 3" Fill WA 1.4 to 4.296/A&K	\$ 2,556,271	\$ 1,424,000	05/01/17 NTP																															
<b>PARSONS AUGMENT</b>	3585	350	Carson Freeway, Package 2B-3/Road & Highway Builders	\$ 49,814,851	\$ 42,242,242	06/15/15 NTP																															
<b>CONSULTANT AUGMENT</b>	60715		US 50, Lyon County, Roy's Road to Junction with US 95A, Widen to 4 Lanes/Drainage, LY 19.90 to 29.44	\$ 44,000,000		04/18/18 ADV																															
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 106,915,392</b>	<b>\$ 49,136,249</b>																																
<b>910 - BRAD DURSKI</b>																																					
	3664	65	SR 430, North Virginia Street, Permanent Traffic Signal, Lighting, and Pedestrian Facilities, Granite Const.	\$ 2,213,237	\$ 1,328,328	05/23/17 NTP																															
	3679	100	I-580 Damonte/SR 341 Gelger Landscape Project, Construct Landscape and Aesthetics, MP WA 16.98 & 6.06	\$ 3,200,000		08/21/17 NTP																															
	826-17	40	SPR17-A/I-80, 200 feet west of Sparks Blvd. Overpass, Install Weigh In Motion, WA 18.83/Titan Electrical	\$ 620,000	\$ 597,658	05/15/17 NTP																															
	73943		I-580, Plumb Lane Interchange, Landscape and Aesthetics, MP 23.62	\$ 745,000		09/28/17 BID																															
	3653	250	US 395, Washoe County, I-80 north to State Line, ITS Infrastructure, PKG 4, WA 25.75-42.15/Par Electric	\$ 9,550,000	\$ 8,940,908	04/10/17 NTP																															
	60716 CMAR		I-80 Truckee River, Verdi, Bridge Scour Repair/GMP #2 G-772 E/W/Granite Construction	\$ 7,000,000		12/28/17 ADV																															
<b>CA GROUP AUGMENT</b>	3660	180	SR 648, Glendale Avenue, WA 2.70-WA 5.36, Reconstruct Roadway/Granite Construction	\$ 19,501,188	\$ 14,242,242	04/24/17 NTP																															
	3632	90	I-580 Bridges, G-1233 N&R, I-1149, I-1086. On US 395, Bridge over Ninth Street I-1172/Truesdell Corp.	\$ 1,850,000	\$ 1,559,759	07/18/16 NTP																															
	3689	15	SR 659, McCarran Blvd., Slurry Seal, Mayberry Drive to Greensboro Drive, MP WA 1.71 to 5.91/SNC	\$ 950,969	\$ 459,007	09/06/17 NTP																															
	74051		Multiple Intersections in Sparks, Signal Modifications w/ Flashing Arrows and Ped Countdown Timers	\$ 2,272,500		Summer 2018																															
	73946		I-580, Washoe County, Neil Road to Moana Lane, ITS Infrastructure, Reno Package 1, MP WA 20.00-22.00	\$ 4,015,000		11/22																															

DISTRICT III WORK PROGRAM							2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2017	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018
CREW	CONTRACT/EA	WORKING DAYS	DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATE	BID AMT	STATUS	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov		
<b>908 - BERHANE TESFAGABAR</b>																									
<b>DCS AUGMENT</b>	<b>3615</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>CONSTRUCT SAFETY OVER CROSSINGS AND FENCING I-80 at Pequops</b>	\$ 9,550,000	\$ 14,076,436	03/14/16 NTP																			
	<b>3667</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>US93, Elko 12.8 miles north of Cattle Pass to south of SR 229, Coldmill / Overlay / Pave Shoulders</b>	\$ 7,950,000	\$ 8,989,989	05/15/17 NTP																			
	<b>73982</b>		<b>I80 Winnemucca, Battle Mtn, Elko, Wells, Westwendover ADA</b>	\$ 520,000		8/12/17 DOC																			
			<b>Total</b>	\$ 18,020,000	\$ 23,066,425																				
<b>912 - MIRAK MEHARI</b>																									
	<b>3657</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>US 50 - Austin, Eureka &amp; Ely Maintenance Stations, ITS Smart Zone Access Fiber Optics</b>	\$ 1,956,251	\$ 2,300,587	02/13/17 NTP																			
	<b>3661</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>US 6 from SR 318 to Murry Street Ely, 3" CIR w/ 2" Overlay</b>	\$ 13,716,971	\$ 13,595,595	05/02/17 NTP																			
	<b>73634/60539</b>		<b>US50 CH/LA to SR 305, Mill &amp; Overlay Slope Flattening</b>	\$ 16,597,348		8/14/17 DOC																			
	<b>73650/60810</b>		<b>US50 Ely - Complete Streets</b>	\$ 26,000,000		3/21/18 DOC?																			
			<b>Total</b>	\$ 58,270,570	\$ 15,896,182																				
<b>918 - REGINA PIERCE</b>																									
	<b>3634</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>US 93 SR 225 Chip Seal</b>	\$ 3,211,802	\$ 2,254,007	7/1/2016 NTP																			
	<b>3647</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>US 93 Chip Seal</b>	\$ 890,000	\$ 883,007	7/1/2017 NTP																			
	<b>3654</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>Off System Safety - Tribal Lands Te-Moak - Battle Mtn, Elko, South Fork, Wells, Duckwater</b>	\$ 659,973	\$ 969,000	5/1/2017 NTP																			
	<b>3676</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>SR 278 Chip Seal with Seal Coat</b>	\$ 745,000	\$ 614,120	7/1/17 NTP																			
	<b>3682</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>US93 WP Chip Seal with Seal Coat</b>	\$ 1,271,861	\$ 1,165,893	8/21/17 NTP																			
	<b>3685</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>SR 225 EL Chip Seal with Seal Coat</b>	\$ 806,009	\$ 856,007	8/21/17 NTP																			
	<b>3686</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>SR 278 2" Overlay Betterment</b>	\$ 2,000,218	\$ 2,373,373	9/25/17 NTP																			
	<b>3687</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>SR 226 EU 2" Overlay Betterment</b>	\$ 1,422,267	\$ 1,818,818	9/25/17 NTP																			
	<b>73930</b>		<b>I80 West Carlin Interchange to Tunnels</b>	\$ 2,215,000		8/7/17 DOC																			
	<b>73911</b>		<b>SR227 Lamoille Highway, Mill and Overlay</b>	\$ 5,217,000		11/22/17 DOC																			
			<b>Total</b>	\$ 18,439,130	\$ 10,934,225																				
<b>920 - DAVE SCHWARTZ</b>																									
	<b>3604</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>I 80 from 1.065 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 I</b>	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 11,696,696	05/23/17 NTP																			
	<b>3651</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>I 80 from 1.776 miles east of the Humboldt Interchange to 0.516 miles west of the Dun Glen Interchange</b>	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 10,449,000	04/15/17 NTP																			
	<b>60778</b>		<b>SR 305 - Chip Seal (District Contract)</b>	\$ 1,426,903		5/3/2017 Adv																			
	<b>73789</b>		<b>I80 East Winnemucca Interchange, Mill and Fill</b>	\$ 7,685,000		8/23/17 Doc																			
	<b>73701</b>		<b>Eden Valley Bridge Replacement</b>	\$ 5,400,000		12/6/17 DOC																			
	<b>60781</b>		<b>I80 Humboldt County Mote Interchange to HU/LA EB only - Rubblize and Overlay</b>	\$ 7,600,000		12/13/17 DOC																			
			<b>Total</b>	\$ 49,111,903	\$ 22,145,696																				
<b>301 - TRENT AVERETT</b>																									
	<b>839-17</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>Install drainage and reconstruct roadway.</b>	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 1,980,210	05/01/17 NTP																			
	<b>833-17</b>		<b>Extensive damage due to heavy flooding including erosion of shoulders and under pavement in various locations and wash</b>	\$ 745,000		02/14/17																			
	<b>829-17</b>		<b>SR 225, Emergency Repairs 28.5-37.00</b>	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	02/17/17																			
	<b>Q3-087-17-301</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Slope Paving Exit 298 I-80</b>	\$ 250,000		summer																			
	<b>73972</b>		<b>Wells Maintence Yard Rehab</b>	\$ 2,245,000		6/15/17 Adv																			
	<b>60665</b>		<b>Ruby Valley Maintenance Yard Rehab</b>	\$ 500,000		8/23/17 Adv																			
			<b>Total</b>	\$ 6,190,000	\$ 2,230,210																				
<b>CONSULTANT ADMIN</b>																									
			<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$ -																				
<b>NO RE ASSIGNED</b>																									
<b>NO RE AVAILABLE</b>	<b>73973</b>		<b>Ely Maintenance Yard Rehab</b>	\$ 545,000		1/24/18 Adv																			
<b>NO RE AVAILABLE</b>	<b>73634</b>		<b>US50, SR305 thru Austin, Storm Drain and Paving</b>	N/A		8/15/17 ???																			
			<b>Total</b>	\$ 545,000	\$ -																				
			<b>Grand Total</b>	\$ 150,576,603	\$ 74,272,738																				

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 05: Unbalanced Bidding  
**Start Date:** Monday, September 14, 2015  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 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 06: 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**  
**PAID-TO-DATE**  
 Calendar Year 2013 - 2016

Service	2013	2014			2015								2016										
	Construction Management	Construction Admin.	Construction Management	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	P042-15-040	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	P707-16-040	P708-16-040	P778-16-040	P348-16-040	P617-16-040	P635-16-040	P545-16-040	P636-16-040
Contract #	3546/3576/3580	N/A	3580	N/A	N/A	N/A	3619	3585	3583	3625	3624	3624	3609 & 3615	3629	3583	3662 & 3655	3658	3651	N/A	3660	N/A	3665	N/A
Federal Fund Participation	0%	0%	95%	0%	0%	100%	0%	95%	95%	0%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	70%	70%	70%	0%	0%	0%	95%	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	District 3 - I 80	I-15 Craig to Speedway	US 95 Phase 3A	District 1	District 2	District 3	IA Testers in each District as needed	Glendale	LPA Dist 1	I-80 Fernley	LPA Dist 2
Execution Date	13-Nov-2013	18-Dec-2014	29-Apr-2015	30-Dec-2015	29-May-2015	31-Aug-2015	5-Apr-2016	10-Aug-2015	7-Aug-2015	23-Mar-2016	12-Jan-2016	17-May-2016	22-Jun-2016	20-Oct-2016	7-Aug-2015	2-Mar-2017	15-Mar-2017	4-Apr-2017	17-Nov-2016	11-Apr-2017	28-Nov-2016	17-Apr-2017	29-Nov-2016
Termination Date	30-Jun-2018	31-Dec-2017	31-Dec-2018	30-Jun-2019	15-Apr-2019	31-Dec-2017	June 30, 2018	30-Sep-2017	31-May-2017	31-Jan-2018	30-Jun-2020	30-Jun-2020	31-Oct-2017	31-Aug-2018	31-May-2017	30-Apr-2018	30-Apr-2018	30-Apr-2018	31-Dec-2017	15-Jun-2018	31-May-2019	31-Mar-2018	31-May-2019
Agreement Total:	\$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	\$999,057	\$760,719	\$509,580	\$297,489	\$2,085,151	\$298,110	\$1,795,644	\$298,600
Total PAID-TO-DATE per Agreement:	\$1,230,664	\$194,396	\$6,527,325	\$163,256	\$73,769	\$211,684	\$2,172,315	\$2,944,128	\$2,164,001	\$3,315,987	\$4,052,747	\$1,601,982	\$1,562,611	\$1,197,227	\$374,808	\$0	\$3,508	\$81,125	\$4,350	\$619,206	\$0	\$548,476	\$66,750
Total PAID-TO-DATE per Firm:																							
4 Leaf Consulting	\$528,548.78																						
ACI	\$52,167.24																						
Atkins	\$376,858.98	P	\$194,396	s	\$36,458	P	\$146,006																
Aztec	\$1,880,862.52																						
B & E	\$1,230,664.44	P	\$1,230,664																				
CA Group	\$1,667,006.00																						
CDM Smith	\$1,502,070.83																						
CEEC	\$1,027,618.38																						
CM Works	\$273,187.36																						
CME	\$278,917.94																						
DCS	\$10,695,068.54																						
Dispute Resolution Board	\$73,769.01																						
Earth Safety Dynamics	\$197,117.80																						
HDR	\$1,911,751.49																						
Horrocks	\$152,478.90																						
Jacobs	\$0.00																						
Kleinfelder	\$25,356.65																						
Konakis Engineering	\$19,950.00																						
Lumos & Associates	\$3,507.50																						
McArthur & Associates	\$151,256.43																						
Ninyo & Moore	\$411.54																						
NOVA	\$94,993.89																						
Parsons	\$2,944,128.15																						
QCTS	\$252,774.84																						
RHA, LLC	\$211,683.91																						
Slater Hanifan Group	\$895,336.42																						
Stanley	\$13,340.00																						
TaylorMade	\$45,750.00																						
TriCore Surveying	\$54,007.50																						
URS (AECOM)	\$2,539,017.23																						
VLM&G	\$7,500.00																						
WCRM	\$4,492.50																						

<sup>1</sup> Master Agreement amount \$1,000,000.00  
 P = Prime  
 s = sub consultant



**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 07: Update on Design Build Contracts  
**Start Date:** Monday, January 16, 2017  
**Due Date:** Monday, September 11, 2017

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

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

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

September 11, 2017/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 (.

**NDOT/Industry Liaison Meeting  
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 13, 2017  
AGC Office – 5400 Mill Street, Reno**

**AGENDA**

1. Introductions
2. Review of minutes from the Tuesday, March 14, 2017
3. 2017 Legislative Recap
  - a. Highway Fund Additions and Subtractions
  - b. CMAR
  - c. Bidders Preference
  - d. State Infrastructure Bank
  - e. Public Private Partnerships
  - f. Apprenticeship Bill
  - g. Other bills of significant interest
4. Charter Review
5. Certified Payroll Reporting
  - a. Job Close Out
  - b. Contract Compliance
6. Summer Flooding
  - a. Emergency Work
7. Regrowth of Vegetation
  - a. Stormwater Permit – Close out of Construction
8. NDOT Succession Planning – Potential Retirements
9. 2017 Meeting Dates
  - a. Tuesday, September 12, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.
  - b. Tuesday, December 12, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.
10. Open Discussion
11. Adjourn

Rudy Malfabon Co-Chair  
Marc Markwell Co-Chair  
Jeanette Belz  
Rich Buenting

David Gaskin  
Scott Hiatt  
Bill Hoffman  
Reid Kaiser

Kyle Larkin  
Lance Semenko  
Sean Stewart  
John Terry

Tracy Larkin-Thomason  
Bill Wellman



**AGC/NDOT COMMITTEE**  
**11:30 a.m., Friday, June 16, 2017**  
**NAM Training Room**

Item #7B

**AGENDA**

1. Self-Introductions
2. Review minutes of previous meeting dated Friday, April 14, 2017
3. Highway Fund Update – **Rudy Malfabon**
  - a. Federal Funding Outlook
  - b. Legislative Recap
4. Personnel Changes/Retirements – **Rudy Malfabon**
5. Twelve Month Project List – **John Terry**
  - a. I-80/US-395 System Maintenance and Repair
6. Truck Driver Prevailing Wages on Backhaul – **Sonnie Braih/Teresa Schlafter**
7. NDOT Stormwater Division – **Alan Tinney/Mike Simmons**
  - a. BMP Manual
  - b. Working Group Meeting Date
8. Workforce Development Update – **Tracy Larkin-Thomason**
9. DBE Program
  - a. Disparity Study – **Sonnie Braih**
  - b. DBE Goal – **Sonnie Braih**
10. District(s) Update – **Thor Dyson**
11. Project Closeout – **Sharon Foerschler**
12. Upcoming AGC Events
13. Other
14. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for TBD

cc: Lance Semenko, President  
Caleb Juve, Chair  
Brett Amesbury, Vice Chair  
Travis Brandt  
Chris Burke  
Jack Byrom  
Jim Cain  
Daniel Caldwell  
Sergio Callegari  
Mark Casey  
Matt Cates  
Jason Clack  
Shane Cocking  
Fred Courrier  
Marty Crew  
Emma Crossman  
Don Crowell  
Randy Cunningham  
Bill Damell

Jon Del Santo  
Vance DeMars  
Jim Dodson  
Ruedy Edgington  
Jeff Freeman  
Jason Fritz  
Robert Gelu  
Louis Ginocchio  
Shane Glenn  
Dan Gotta  
Matt Gotta  
Mike Grock  
Kevin Hamilton  
Will Hellickson  
Tom Herschbach  
Scott Hiatt  
Ross Hiserodt  
Craig Holt  
Fallon Honeycutt

Justin Ivory  
George Jordy  
Brandon Kingsolver  
Jim Koch  
Brian Kulpa  
Kyle Larkin  
Dan LeBlanc  
Verdie Legg  
Kevin Linderman  
Mark Liske  
Tom Massaro  
Barry McKeegan  
Steve Moon  
Tina Mudd  
Greg Novak  
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  
Ray Taft  
Kathleen Taylor  
Jack Tedford  
Dave Titzel  
Tom Van Dam  
Ron Weber  
Marc Wheeler



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## 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; Contract 3683
2-03250	60702	US 95 fm. Ann Rd. to Kyle Canyon Rd. MP CL 86.75 to 92.70 - Pkg 2B/5. Durango Dr. to Kyle Canyon Rd. (Widening); Elkhorn Rd. (HOV Ramps); Kyle Cyn. (Interchange); Add to Durango (Decorative Rock); Mtrls Site; Flood Control Facility	\$60,600,000					Cost changed from \$55,600,000 Flood Control Facility Added. \$24.4M Funded by Clark Co. Regional Flood Control Dist. Total cost = \$85 million Contract 3692
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
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		\$41,200,000				Cost changed from \$52,000,000 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				Added Lighting at Major Intersections.
6-03145	73536	I 15, Las Vegas, at the CC 215 Northern Beltway Intch. - New System to System Intch.			\$120,000,000			Funding TBD
2-03283	UNASSIGNED	US 95, SB Ramp Ext. to City Pkwy. MP 0.33 to MP 0.72				\$14,100,000		Moved from 2018
1-03388	UNASSIGNED	I 15 Hacienda Ave., Harmon Ave. HOV ramps				\$30,000,000		Moved from 2021
4-03445	UNASSIGNED	SR 159, Charleston Blvd. fm. Lamb Blvd. to Honolulu St. - Intersection Improvements and aux. lanes on I-15				\$35,000,000		CMAR; Cost and Limits TBD from NEPA; Funding CMAQ
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		Moved from 2019 Phase 3D with 3E combined
1-03375	73797	I 515 at LV Downtown Viaduct - G-947, I-947, I-947 E/W/R/M/L				\$27,000,000		Moved from 2018 Scope and cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 at SR 593 Tropicana - Operational Improvements					\$150,000,000	Moved from 2022 Scope and Budget TBD
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$178,600,000</b>	<b>\$140,200,000</b>	<b>\$120,000,000</b>	<b>\$215,100,000</b>	<b>\$150,000,000</b>	

## BOND REPAYMENTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
		NEON	\$18,650,326					Cost changed from \$50,000,000
		NEON		\$26,737,375				Cost changed from \$50,000,000
		NEON			\$26,734,625			Cost changed from \$50,000,000
		NEON				\$21,612,750		Cost changed from \$50,000,000
		NEON					\$32,791,000	Cost changed from \$50,000,000
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$18,650,326</b>	<b>\$26,737,375</b>	<b>\$26,734,625</b>	<b>\$21,612,750</b>	<b>\$32,791,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## 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	\$14,300,000					Cost changed from \$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	\$13,500,000					Cost changed from \$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 near Austin town Limits, MP LA 0.00 to 23.30	\$11,200,000					Cost changed from \$12,400,000 Removing town portion due to SUE. Adv. w/Safety Project (60539). Contract 3691
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	\$8,989,989					Cost changed from \$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	\$1,400,000					Cost changed from \$1,500,000 Contract 3658
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					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	\$5,300,000					Cost changed from \$4,600,000 Adv. w/ ADA project (73902) Contract 3669
2-03280	73919	US 95 fm. CA/NV Stateline to 7.790 MN of Loran Station Rd. MP CL 0.00 to 17.423	\$20,000,000					Cost changed from \$22,100,000 Contract 3681
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	\$9,900,000					Cost changed from \$10,884,367 Contract 3693
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	\$9,200,000					Cost changed from \$8,400,000
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				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		\$40,000,000				Cost changed from \$15,200,000 May Accelerate to 2017. FR Cost with State Funds. SBC forthcoming for cost
2-33086	60810	US 50, White Pine Co., West end Ely, Aultman w/Grt Basin, 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 21.960 to NY 0.9500		\$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			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	60803	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
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			Moved from 2018
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			\$22,500,000			Cost changed from \$19,500,000
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 LADWP at Currie 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 DO 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 fo the HU/LA Co. Line. (Westbound Only) MP HU 54.860 to 61.380 and LA 0.00 to 3.20				\$14,600,000		



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## 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		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. US 6 to SR 377. MP NY 0.000 to 36.849					\$25,600,000	
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		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		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	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 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					\$1,500,000	Cost changed from \$460,000
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>\$102,789,989</b>	<b>\$141,400,000</b>	<b>\$167,050,000</b>	<b>\$124,300,000</b>	<b>\$171,200,000</b>	

## 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	\$1,300,000					Cost changed from \$1,740,000
		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 (PE)
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				74029 (PE)
6-13010	73701	Eden Valley Rd. at Humboldt River - Replace off-system Structure B-1658		\$5,747,000				R/W Acquisition needed
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 (PE)
1-03390	60783	I 515, Viking Grade Separation, MP CL 68.50 to 69.00 - MSE Wall Rehab		\$3,000,000				74045 (PE+RW)
Not Scheduled		SR 278, N. of Eureka, Eureka Co. - Replace B-478 on-system bridge (dbl rcb).			\$200,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 396, Cornell Ave. N. of Lovelock, Pershing Co. - Replace B-28 on-system bridge.			\$2,600,000			
6-01023	60769	Maine St., Fallon, at L Line Canal - Replace off-system B-242			\$1,500,000			74027 (PE+RW)
		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			
1-31227	60716	I 80 at Truckee River and UPRR near Verdi - Construct Scour Countermeasures for Structure G-772 E/W. (GMP #2)			\$7,000,000			Moved from 2018 CMAR 73799
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		E. Walker Rd., SE of Yerington, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1348 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Garson Road at I 80, Replace I-770 (off-system bridge)				\$4,000,000		
Not Scheduled		Gold Canyon Cr. S. of Silver City, Lyon Co. - Replace B-375 off-system bridge				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US6 at Ralston Wash B-180, MP NY 4.30				\$500,000		
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program				\$3,000,000		Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Tedford Bridge at Truckee-Carson Canal - Replace off-system B-1707				\$600,000		
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>\$4,300,000</b>	<b>\$20,147,000</b>	<b>\$31,440,000</b>	<b>\$18,200,000</b>	<b>\$84,600,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## 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	\$1,500,000					Cost changed from \$1,300,000 Contract 3694
2-15023	60539	US 50, fm. CH/LA Co. Line to 0.52 ME of SR 305 to 1.030 ME of SR 305 near Austin town Limits, MP LA 0.00 to 23.30	\$4,200,000					SBC Processing Adv. w/3R Project (60539) Contract 3691
6-00018	60775	SR 667 Kietzke Lane, fm. Mill St. to Galetti Way	\$3,060,000					Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60681	SR 573, Craig Rd. fm. Decatur Blvd. to 5th St. (SMP)	\$3,000,000					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					Adv. with 3R Project (73644) Contract 3684
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				Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60680	Eastern Ave. and Civic Center, fm. US 95 to Cope Ave. (SMP)		\$3,000,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 95, fm. Jct. of Amargosa Valley N. to Beatty NDOT Maint. Station. MP NY 30.34 to NY 80.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening		\$2,000,000				Cancelled Project 60685
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements- Wrong Way Driver Signs on I 80		\$1,500,000				Cost changed from \$3,000,000
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements		\$500,000				Cost changed from \$522,500
Not Scheduled		RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements on Curves		\$1,500,000				Cost changed from \$3,000,000 Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	CLRS on multiple chip sealed roadways		\$1,500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Pedestrian Safety Improvements on Stewart St, Carson City		\$500,000				
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	Safety Design Consultants
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$17,918,549</b>	<b>\$16,500,000</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
4-31245	73979	SR 430, Permanent Traffic Signal, Lighting and Ped. Facilities on N. Virginia St., N. of Lovitt Ln. to Hoge Rd.	\$1,300,000					Cost changed from \$2,000,000 Contract 3664
4-03446	73980	SR 582, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements at Various Locations along Boulder Hwy.	\$3,000,000					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), Pedestrian Safety Project	\$750,000					Cost changed from \$1,150,000 Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Rural District 2 Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades (SR160 at Postal Rd. - Pahrump)		\$500,000				
8-00223	60668	SR 147, Ped. and ADA Improvements with Roadbed Mod. on Lake Mead fm. Civic Center to Pecos (SED)		\$3,000,000				Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$6,800,000 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Rural District 1 Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades		\$500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Rural District 3 Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades (Various locations in Winnemucca)		\$1,500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	City of Las Vegas Ped. crossing and ADA upgrades		\$2,000,000				
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$5,050,000</b>	<b>\$7,500,000</b>				



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 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					Delivered as a 3 Quote.
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 MP CL 59.00 to MP CL 94.00 - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H2	\$3,000,000					Cost changed from \$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
2-03276	60689	US 95 fm. CA/NV Stateline to Boulder City Bypass, MP CL 0.00 to 56.24 - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K1		\$3,000,000				Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$5,000,000
1-31220	73946	I 580, Washoe Co. fm 0.45 miles N. of Damonte Ranch Pkwy to Moana Ln. MP WA 17.43 TO WA 22.56, RENO PKG 1 - Install ITS infrastructure.		\$4,000,000				Cost changed from \$2,000,000 *SBC Forthcoming on COST TO NDOT to make \$4,000,000 official
2-03276	60690	SR 163, FM US 95 to AZ Stateline. MP CL 0.00 to MP CL 19.207		\$1,063,454				Cost changed from \$3,000,000
1-03369	60713	I 15 fm. Logandale to AZ Stateline - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H3 MP CL 94.00 to MP CL 123.77		\$2,000,000				Cost changed from \$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				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
8-00250	Pkg. A	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A			\$1,000,000			Tentative
Not Scheduled		Replace High Mast HPS Lighting w/ LED Lighting			\$1,500,000			
8-00250	Pkg. B	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. B			\$1,000,000			Tentative
1-31219	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Mt. Rose Hwy to 0.45 MN of Damonte Ranch Parkway, MP WA 14.95 to 17.43 - Install ITS infrastructure - TM Pkg. 2A			\$1,000,000			Cost changed from \$3,000,000
8-00250	Pkg. C	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. C			\$1,000,000			Tentative
1-25001	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Mt. Rose to College Pkwy. - Install ITS Infrastructure, WC Pkg. 1			\$3,000,000			Tentative
1-25002	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. College Pkwy. to Fairview - Install ITS Infrastructure, WC Pkg. 2			\$2,000,000			Tentative
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>\$7,252,096</b>	<b>\$15,845,550</b>	<b>\$15,482,096</b>	<b>\$52,482,096</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## HYDRAULICS/TAHOE PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
Not Scheduled		Zephyr Cove Cooperative Projects (Tahoe)	\$350,000					Moved from 2018 Agreement.
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop (Tahoe)	\$525,000					Consolidated to one year
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program	\$1,000,000					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					
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program		\$1,000,000				Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop		\$600,000				Agreement
2-05126	73995	US 395, at Martin Slough. MP DO 23.82		\$2,900,000				Cost changed from \$2,700,000 SBC Processing. Agreement
2-05120	60765	US 50 Spooner Summit to Carson City. MP DO 13.00-14.58 and CC 0.00-3.00		\$7,000,000				Cost changed from \$4,000,000
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.		\$9,000,000				Moved from 2019 Cost changed from \$6,000,000 Adv. with 3R Project 60811
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 Skyland Water Quality and Erosion Control. MP DO 4.50 to Do 7.00			\$2,500,000			Cost changed from 5-
3-21007	UNASSIGNED	SR 359- Remove and Replace all CMP with RCP facilities and install scour outlet protection Mineral County, MP MN 8.30 to MN 8.80, MN 13.10 to MN 13.30, MN 15.50, MN 17.30, MN 21.70, MN 26.70			\$2,900,000			
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			
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program			\$1,000,000			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			
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop			\$600,000			Agreement
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
Not Scheduled		US 50 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 13.07				\$1,000,000		Combined with future 3R to come out of Complete Streets
Not Scheduled		SR 431 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP WA 0.00 to 8.00				\$2,000,000		Cost changed from \$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
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	Moved from 2019 Contract 3695
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$6,375,000</b>	<b>\$20,500,000</b>	<b>\$11,000,000</b>	<b>\$13,000,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</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	\$4,000,000					Cost changed from \$4,085,000 Contract 3690
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	Source Control Program		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Treatment Control Program		\$1,500,000				
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
9-07036	73972	MY 932, Wells Maint. Yard. SR 223 MP EL 74.90 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard.		\$2,200,000				Moved from 2017 District Contract-Cost TBD
9-03037	74006	MY 921, Las Vegas Maint. Station. SR 578 Washington Ave., MP CL 0.503		\$2,500,000				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	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	Maintenance Facility Program					\$1,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Offsite Treatment Control Program					\$2,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Source Control Program					\$1,500,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Treatment Control Program					\$1,500,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$4,000,000</b>	<b>\$11,200,000</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

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## 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	\$951,117					Cost changed from \$667,500 SBC Forthcoming
4-31244	73942	SR 341 Geiger grade rd. at Veterans Pkwy. - Roundabout Aesthetic Improvements. MP WA 6.06	\$872,875					Cost changed from \$660,000 Contract 3679
1-31228	60665	I 580 at Damonte Ranch Intch. MP WA 16.98	\$1,819,363					Cost changed from \$1,600,000 Contract 3679
2-33086	60810	US 50, Downtown Ely		\$1,000,000				Moved from 2019 Adv. w/ 3R project 60810
Not Scheduled		I 80 at US 95 and at SR 289 Intchs. - Community Gateway to Winnemucca/Recreational to Black Rock Desert		\$2,000,000				
2-05123	73926	US 50 at Stateline S. Lake Tahoe - State Entrance Gateway. MP DO 0.05		\$248,750				Moved from 2017
1-03393	UNASSIGNED	I 515 at Russell Rd. Intch. MP CL 9.365 to CL 9.874		\$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				
2-03281	73925	US 93 at Hoover Dam - State Entrance Gateway. MP CL 0.027		\$248,750				Moved from 2017
2-07064	73924	US 93 at Jackpot - State Entrance Gateway. MP EL 141.76		\$248,750				Moved from 2017
2-05125	73959	US 395 at Topaz Lake - State Entrance Gateway. MP WA 0.005		\$248,750				Moved from 2017
2-23066	73928	US 6/95, Downtown Tonopah			\$1,000,000			Adv. w/ 3R project (73928)
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			
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			Moved from 2017
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 515 at Charleston Blvd. MP CL 16.005				\$1,000,000		Include with 4-03445-Additional Funding over the Required 3% L&A Budget.
Not Scheduled		I 80 at SR 766 Intch. - Carlin Community Gateway and Paint E. Intch.				\$1,000,000		
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>\$3,643,355</b>	<b>\$6,995,000</b>	<b>\$4,220,833</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>	





# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## ADA PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
1-03387	73983	I 515, 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.	\$1,100,000					Cost changed from \$745,000 Contract 3673
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	\$1,100,000					Cost changed from \$470,000 Contract 3668
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. at Neil Rd.	\$20,000					Complaint Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. at Prater Way	\$150,000					Complaint
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	\$5,300,000					Cost changed from \$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		SR 341, Reno, fm Equestrian Rd. to Veterans Pkwy		\$45,000				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		US 93, Jackpot, fm Gurley Dr. to Poker St.		\$170,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
3-19057	74097	US 50A, Fernley, Main St fm Silver Lace Blvd to 400ft W of 7th St.		\$250,000				Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$167,800 Complaint 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)
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		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		US 95, Searchlight, MP CL 19.97 to 20.53			\$250,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
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 50, Austin, fm. Stokes Castle Rd. to 3rd St.			\$165,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
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		SR 595, S. Rainbow Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. W. Tropicana Ave. to Westcliff Dr.			\$500,000			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 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 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 322, Pioche, Main St. fm. Railroad Ave. to Cedar St.			\$160,000			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 659, McCarran Blvd. (East), Reno, fm. US 395 North to S. Virginia St.				\$320,000		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	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 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 445, Pyramid Way, Sparks, fm. Nugget Ave. to Sparks Blvd.				\$380,000		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		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		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. Ramp at Jennings Way, I-906, EL CO, MP 25.79				\$184,000		Cost changed from \$520,000 Scope and Limits TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Fallon, fm. 500ft N. of Sheckler Rd. to Keddie St.				\$190,000		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



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

## ADA PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
Not Scheduled		US 93, Wells, fm. 500 ft. S. of I 80 to SR 223					\$415,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. Losee Rd. to Civic Center Dr. and Pecos Rd. to Lamb Blvd.					\$2,170,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 612, N. Nellis Blvd, Las Vegas, fm. E. Russell Rd. to E. Charleston Blvd.					\$970,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 667, Reno, Kietzke Ln., fm 5 Virginia St to 0.10 MS of Vassar St.					\$375,000	Complaint Tentative - ROW/Utility Impacts TBD
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$9,400,000</b>	<b>\$6,285,000</b>	<b>\$4,320,000</b>	<b>\$7,979,000</b>	<b>\$3,930,000</b>	

## MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
2-05129	60816	US50 near Logan Shoals Tahoe Basin Douglas county MP DO 8.00 to MP DO 9.00	\$5,200,000					Cost changed from \$4,211,622 Contract 3680
2-05127	74039	US 395 at SR 759 Airport Rd. MP DO 26.03 - Install Signal System	\$1,250,000					Cost changed from \$600,000 Contract 3694
1-31239	74057	I 80, USA Parkway, MP WA 32.75 - Intch Improvements and Median Widening	\$600,000					Cost changed from \$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.	\$694,000					Cost changed from \$1,600,000 Contract 3659
3-05057	73867	SR 756 Centerville Ln. at Structure B-287. MP DO 3.68		\$600,000				TAP funding (Douglas County)
3-05058	73966	SR 756, Centerville, fm. Waterloo Ln. to US 395 (Bikelanes)		\$600,000				TAP Funding 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.		\$1,300,000				TAP funding (City of Fernley \$173,485); \$650,000 Safe Routes
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
4-03417	73725	SR 589, Sahara Ave at SR 612 Nellis Blvd. Reconstruct Intersection.			\$2,000,000			Moved from 2018 Cost changed from \$1,200,000 State Funded Construction due to Road Relinquishment.
3-29020	74066	SR439,USA PRKY,Electric Ave. MP 9.67			\$3,675,000			Cost changed from \$3,000,000
3-03178	73803	SR 163, Laughlin, Roundabout				\$2,500,000		
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	Douglas TAP project
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$7,744,000</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>	<b>\$5,675,000</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</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					
		District Betterments		\$32,956,259				
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$33,170,033</b>	<b>\$32,956,259</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>			

## Freight Projects

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	NOTES
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-80 Truck Climbing Lanes at Emigrant Pass		\$11,700,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-80 Truck Climbing Lanes at Pequo Summit		\$3,500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Truck parking spaces, facilities and ITS			\$500,000			Adv. w/ 3R project 73793
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	EnForce Regulatory Inspection Station			\$500,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-80 Safety Improvements (eastern Truckee Canyon) (Waiting on Traffic Study)			\$7,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	EnForce Regulatory Inspection Station			\$1,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-80/SR306 Interchange Improvements				\$1,200,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-80 Exit 176 Improvements: realign intersection at Pilot Travel Center				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	North Virginia Street Improvements from Parr Blvd to BUS395				\$9,700,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-15 Widening, Speedway to Garnett Intch. Phase III, NEPA Study				\$1,000,000		NEPA Study
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Upgrade US95 to 4-lane divided highway from Kyle Canyon to Tonopah, NEPA Study I-11 Done in-house				\$200,000		NEPA Study
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	EnForce Regulatory Inspection Station				\$500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I80/SR306 Interchange Improvements				\$1,200,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I80 Exit 176 Improvements				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-15 between Exit 100 Carp Elgin and Exit 112 Riverside Rest Area					\$3,498,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I-15 NB, MP 122.7 to MP 123.7					\$5,868,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>				<b>\$15,200,000</b>	<b>\$9,000,000</b>	<b>\$16,800,000</b>	<b>\$9,366,000</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>\$400,893,349</b>	<b>\$467,966,184</b>	<b>\$416,645,054</b>	<b>\$493,496,346</b>	<b>\$486,237,000</b>	



## NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

July 27, 2017 PDC Mtg.

### 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 4-24-17 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 August 14, 2017																								
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	CP	PR	LE or CM	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	RPU	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	
3546 CMS	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	Closeout in progress.	1 - Trish	
3554 CMS	1	926	LAS VEGAS PAVING SULAHRIA TRISH	US 95 FROM ANN ROAD TO DURANGO DRIVE	\$35,700,000.01	\$50,000.00	A	A	S	S	A	S			9/18/15	10/22/15	10/7/16	5/18/17			Y	Closeout in progress.	3 - Trish	
3576	1	906	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR RISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 147 FM 2ME OF EUL OF NLV CL 9.67 TO APPX BOUNDARY LAKE MEAD NRA	\$5,948,497.07	\$50,000.00	A	A	S	A	S	A			1/7/16			2/17/16	2/17/16		Y	Crew working on corrections.	5 - Trish	
3577	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		Y	Closeout in progress.	4 - Trish	
3580	1	916	FISHER INDUSTRIES RUGULEISKI TRISH	US 93 BOULDER CITY BYPASS PT 1; SILVERLINE TO FOOTHILLS RD.	\$82,999,999.00	\$0.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N		Construction ongoing	
3583	1	926	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP SUHLARIA TRISH	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	\$39,200,000.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N		Construction ongoing	
3597	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	7/20/17	Y	Final qty's sent to contractor on 7/27/17. payoff on 8/27/2017.	Done	
3602	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 160 EMERGENCY MEDIAN CROSSOVERS / 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	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	A	S	N	S	N	N			10/14/16			11/28/16			N		Crew working to request pickup.	
3607	1	902	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS YOUSUF TRISH	US 95 S OF TONOPAH, US 95 .796 M I S OF DRY WASH B-1478 TO 1.198 M I 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 ongoing	
3610 FM	1	901	LLO INC DBA ALHWAYEK TRISH	I-15 FROM CALIFORNIA STATE LINE TO N OF THE I-215 INTERCHANGE	\$1,305,399.20	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	S	N	A			12/21/16						N		Crew working to request pickup.	
3613 FM	1	906	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR, INC CHRISTENSEN TRISH	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	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N		Construction ongoing	
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 ongoing	
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	7/20/17	Y	Final qtys sent to contractor on 7/21/17. payoff on 8/21/2017.	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

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

Department of Transportation Construction Contract Closeout Status August 14, 2017																							
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	E O	L A B	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)
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	A	A	N	S	N	S			12/29/16			7/7/17			N	Crew working to request pickup.	
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
3622 FM	1	915	LLO INC DBA STRGANIC 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	Crew working on corrections.	7 - Trish
3630	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 160, FROM RAINBOW AVENUE TO CALVADA BLVD	\$3,494,000.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N			6/2/17						N	Crew working to request pickup.	
3639R	1	906	MEADOW VALLEY CONTRACTORS INC CONNER TRISH	SR 317, RAINBOW CANYON, FROM 1 MIKLE NORTH OF ELGIN TO THE JUNCTION OF US 93 REPAIR ROADWAY DAMAGE AND CONSTRUCT DRAINAGE STRUCTURES	\$3,393,465.12	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	N	S	S			6/7/17			7/7/17			Y	Closeout in progress.	8 - Trish
3645	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 372 AT BLAGG ROAD AND AT PAHRUMP BLVD - CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUTS.	\$4,046,000.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction ongoing .	
3662	1	902	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP YOUSUF TRISH	ROADBED MODIFICATION AND PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE WITH OPEN GRADE	\$1,397,000.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction ongoing .	
3663	1	902	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL , INC YOUSUF TRISH	US 6 CHIP SEAL & FLUSH	\$879,879.00	\$46,483.89	N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction ongoing.	
3674	1	901	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR ALHWAYEK TRISH	I-515 AT BOULDER HWY, EASTERN AVE AND LAS VEGAS BLVD INTERCHANGE RAMP	\$903,861.00	\$45,193.05	N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction ongoing.	
3574 FM Pilot	2	905	Q & D CONSTRUCTION LOMPA MATT	CRACK SEALING, SPALL REPAIR AND DIAMOND GRINDING	\$12,114,205.11	\$50,000.00	S	A	N	A	N	A			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			6/28/17			N	Crew working to request pickup.	
3585	2	907	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS HURLBUT DEENA	US 395 CARSON CITY FREEWAY; CARON STREET TO FAIRVIEW DRIVE	\$42,242,242.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N									N	Construction ongoing	
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	A	N	N	N	N			10/25/16		N/A	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). "Check with Design in 2017 to reduce Plant Establishment" (per Sharon)	
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	Crew working to request pickup.	
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.	

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 August 14, 2017																								
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	E E O	L A B	A B	C 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)	
3606 FM	2	905	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION LOMPA MATT	I-80 LOCKWOOD INTERCHANGE RAMPS AND FRONTAGE ROADWA09 LOCKWOOD INTERCHANGE FM GRANITE PIT TO LOCKWOOD DR.	\$864,453.04	\$43,222.65	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		10/21/16			2/7/17	8/9/17	8/9/17	Y	Final qtys sent to contractor on 8/14/17, payoff on 9/14/2017	Done	
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	A					10/26/17				N	Construction ongoing		
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	A	A	A	A	A	A			7/21/16			9/23/16	9/30/16	2/13/17	Y	Final qtys sent to contractor on 8/8/17, Possible payoff on 9/8/2017	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 ongoing.		
3636 FM	2	904	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION BOGE MATT	FR PED1, I-80, FRONTAGE ROAD S. OF LOVELOCK, MP PE 4.50 TO PE 16.58.	\$2,951,677.37	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A			9/16/16			3/26/17	7/21/17	7/19/17	Y	Final qtys sent to contractor on 7/24/17, payoff on 8/24/2017	Done	
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	A	A			10/20/16			11/28/16	12/6/16	8/2/17	Y	Final qtys sent to contractor on 8/10/17, payoff on 9/10/2017	Done	
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	A	A	N	S	N	S			5/12/17			5/25/17			Y	Scheduled pickup on Friday 8-25-17.		
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.		
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	SUSPENDED 5-8-17 until 2018, due to remaining work overlapping contract 3671 work zone.		
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	A	A	A	A	A	A			5/11/16	6/10/16	9/7/16	11/2/16	11/7/16	7/17/17	Y	Working on contract qty issues.	Done	
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			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	
3604 FM	3	920 W/INN	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC SCHWARTZ MATT	I-80 FM 1.065 MW OF HU/LA CTY LN , 1-80 HU/LA CTY LN TO 0.93 ME OF E BATTLE MTN INTCHING: SR 304 ALLEN RD	\$11,996,460.05	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	A			6/5/17	7/5/17		7/13/17			N	Crew working to request pickup.		
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	S	A			11/16/16	11/23/16		2/3/17			Y	Closeout in progress.	2- Deena	
3631 FM	3	301	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION LLC AVERETT DEENA	MY 927, NORTH FORK MNTNC YARD @ SR 225 DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS & REPAVE MTNC YARD	\$848,840.59	\$42,442.03	A	A	A	A	A	A			11/18/16			3/10/17	7/27/17		Y	Final qtys sent to contractor 7/6/17. Payoff 8/28/17	Done	
3634 FM	3	918	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION PIERCE MATT	US 93 FM SR 232 CLOVER VLY RD TO IR 080 @ I- 921 & 5.537 MN OF ELKO ST TO NV/ID ST LN SR 225 MTN CTY HWY DUCK VLY RESERVE	\$2,317,547.07	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N										N	Construction ongoing	

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  
May 2017 - Aug. 2017**

Item #9B

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
3642	REGINA M PIERCE	GREGORY MINDRUM	\$1,686,686.00	(\$10.44)	0.0%	\$1,675,516.66	(\$11,169.34)	99%	\$1,866,705.00	(\$191,188.34)	90%
3633	JOHN BRONDER	ROBERT BRATZLER	\$1,788,149.81	\$0.00	0.0%	\$1,709,256.25	(\$78,893.56)	96%	\$2,115,404.00	(\$406,147.75)	81%
3611	SAM LOMPA	PHILIP KANEGSBERG	\$715,006.15	\$65,582.00	9.2%	\$791,421.98	\$76,415.83	111%	\$810,407.00	(\$18,985.02)	98%
3563	RANDY HESTERLEE	CHRISTOPHER PETERSEN	\$4,824,007.00	\$0.00	0.0%	\$4,952,289.58	\$128,282.58	103%	\$5,349,866.00	(\$397,576.42)	93%
3641	REGINA PIERCE	GREGORY MINDRUM	\$2,221,469.91	(\$175,751.19)	-7.9%	\$1,816,673.04	(\$404,796.87)	82%	\$2,445,315.00	(\$628,641.96)	74%
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>\$11,235,318.87</b>	<b>(\$110,179.63)</b>	<b>-1.0%</b>	<b>\$10,945,157.51</b>	<b>(\$290,161.36)</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>\$12,587,697.00</b>	<b>(\$1,642,539.49)</b>	<b>87%</b>
									Number of Projects Over/Under Agr. Est. (Budget)	Projects Equal To or Under Budget	5
										Project Over Budget	0

**Contract No.** 3642  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60731  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-0278(011)  
**County:** Eureka

**Location:** SR 278, Eureka Road

**Work Description:** Placing plantmix bituminous surface

**Advertised Date:** June 16, 2016  
**Bid Opening:** June 16, 2016  
**Contract Awarded:** July 11, 2016  
**Notice to Proceed:** August 15, 2016  
**Work Completed:** October 14, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** April 11, 2017  
**Final Payment:** May 19, 2017

**Contractor:** Road & Highway Builders LLC  
**Resident Engineer:** Regina M Pierce

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$1,558,303.23  
**Bid Price:** \$1,686,686.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$1,866,705.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$1,675,516.66  
**Percent of Budget:** 90%  
**Total Change Orders:** -\$10.44  
**Percent Change Orders:** 0.0%  
**Original Working Days:** 30  
**Updated Working Days:** 30  
**Charged Working Days:** 28  
**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>	\$59,206.76	3.4%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$1,675,516.66	96.6%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,734,723.42	



**Contract No.** 3633  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60661  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-0318(009)  
**County:** Multiple

**Location:** SR 318 Lund

**Work Description:** Chip Seal

**Advertised Date:** March 30, 2016  
**Bid Opening:** April 28, 2016  
**Contract Awarded:** May 25, 2016  
**Notice to Proceed:** June 27, 2016  
**Work Completed:** September 16, 2017  
**Work Accepted:** April 7, 2017  
**Final Payment:** May 25, 2017

**Contractor:** Intermountain Slurry Seal Inc  
**Resident Engineer:** John Bronder

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$2,330,616.71  
**Bid Price:** \$1,788,149.81  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$2,115,404.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$1,709,256.25  
**Percent of Budget:** 81%  
**Total Change Orders:** N/A  
**Percent Change Orders:** N/A  
**Original Working Days:** 60  
**Updated Working Days:** 60  
**Charged Working Days:** 56  
**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>	\$92,944.70	5.2%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$1,709,256.25	94.8%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,802,200.95	

**Contract No.** 3611  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60698  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SP-MS-1201(019)  
**County:** Washoe

**Location:** My 921, Reno Maintenance Yard, Sr 667

**Work Description:** Improve Yard Drainage, Install New Wash Station and Sander Rack

**Advertised Date:** August 5, 2015  
**Bid Opening:** August 27, 2015  
**Contract Awarded:** September 15, 2015  
**Notice to Proceed:** October 19, 2015  
**Work Completed:** December 23, 2015\*  
**Work Accepted:** December 6, 2016  
**Final Payment:** June 22, 2017

**Contractor:** Q&D Construction Inc  
**Resident Engineer:** Sam Lompa

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$1,069,675.67  
**Bid Price:** \$715,006.15  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$810,407.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$791,421.98  
**Percent of Budget:** 98%  
**Total Change Orders:** \$65,582.00  
**Percent Change Orders:** 9.2%  
**Original Working Days:** N/A\*  
**Updated Working Days:** N/A\*  
**Charged Working Days:** N/A\*  
**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>	\$114,574.55	12.6%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$791,421.98	87.4%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$905,996.53	

\*This is a Completion Date contract. The Work Completed date was recorded as September 12, 2016 in the EDOC system in anticipation of a contract modification to extend the completion date to construct a wash station at the yard. The contract modification was cancelled however, the completion date was not changed back to December 23, 2015 in EDOC.

**Contract No.** 3563  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60597  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SP-000M(200)  
**County:** Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, White Pine  
**Location:** US 50 MP WP 3.00-25.32; US 93 MP WP 0.00-11.00; SR 140 MP HU 56.09-74.00; SR 278 MP EU 0.00-20.23; SR 292 MP HU 65.58-68.52; SR 294 MP HU 0.00-8.00; SR 305 MP LA 51.70-69.35.

**Work Description:** Chip Seal of Existing Roadway.

**Advertised Date:** February 19, 2014  
**Bid Opening:** March 13, 2014  
**Contract Awarded:** May 6, 2014  
**Notice to Proceed:** June 9, 2014  
**Work Completed:** July 29, 2015  
**Work Accepted:** October 7, 2015  
**Final Payment:** August 14, 2017

**Contractor:** Sierra Nevada Construction Inc  
**Resident Engineer:** Randy Hesterlee

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$4,855,763.30  
**Bid Price:** \$4,824,007.00  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$5,349,866.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$4,952,289.58  
**Percent of Budget:** 93%  
**Total Change Orders:** N/A  
**Percent Change Orders:** N/A  
**Original Working Days:** 80  
**Updated Working Days:** 80  
**Charged Working Days:** 73  
**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>	\$151,122.02	3.0%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$4,952,289.58	97.0%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$5,103,411.60	

**Contract No.** 3641  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60720  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-0226(003)  
**County:** Elko  
  
**Location:** Sr 226, Deep Creek Highway

**Work Description:** Placing Plantmix Bituminous Surface

**Advertised Date:** May 25, 2016  
**Bid Opening:** June 23, 2016  
**Contract Awarded:** July 19, 2016  
**Notice to Proceed:** July 19, 2016  
**Work Completed:** November 18, 2016  
**Work Accepted:** June 9, 2017  
**Final Payment:** August 11, 2017

**Contractor:** Staker & Parson Companies  
**Resident Engineer:** Regina Pierce

**Project Performance:**

**Engineers Estimate:** \$2,123,047.77  
**Bid Price:** \$2,221,469.91  
**Agreement Estimate (Budget):** \$2,445,315.00  
**Final Contract Payment Amount:** \$1,816,673.04  
**Percent of Budget:** 74%  
**Total Change Orders:** -\$175,751.19  
**Percent Change Orders:** -7.9%  
**Original Working Days:** 35  
**Updated Working Days:** 35  
**Charged Working Days:** 34  
**Liquidated Damages:** \$203,969.13

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Right of Way:</b>	N/A	N/A
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$112,044.30	5.8%
<b>Final Contract Payment Amount:</b>	\$1,816,673.04	94.2%
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,928,717.34	

Open Contract Status 8/14/2017

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	
3574	I-580,MOANA TO TRUCKEE RIVER	\$ 12,936,849.00	\$ 12,114,205.11	\$269,172.48	\$ 12,545,721.42	97%	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	\$20,951,359.10	\$ 86,193,571.05	94%	76%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO		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	\$ 40,088,604.15	87%	95%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JENICA KELLER	ABID SULAHRIA	
3585	US395, CARSON CITY FREEWAY	\$ 44,149,197.28	\$ 42,242,242.00	-\$309,532.66	\$ 40,809,535.95	92%	113%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JEFF LERUD	ASHLEY HURLBUT	
3590	US95, PASSING LANES & SLOPE FLATTENING	\$ 9,995,996.00	\$ 9,323,000.00	\$542,209.28	\$ 9,849,316.12	99%	99%	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	\$169,495.51	\$ 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	\$ 15,482,248.36	97%	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	\$92,739.06	\$ 11,727,949.59	96%	100%	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 RAMP	\$ 921,701.00	\$ 816,816.00	-\$56,572.12	\$ 740,085.39	80%	95%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	PHILIPKANEGBERG	SAM LOMPA	
3607	US95, SHOULDER WORK & PLANTMIX SURFAC	\$ 15,161,921.00	\$ 14,141,141.00	-\$388,732.83	\$ 13,372,991.73	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	\$392,113.03	\$ 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	
3613	SR160, WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 17,636,208.00	\$ 16,458,854.00	\$986,590.28	\$ 16,486,029.87	93%	95%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	LUIS GARAY	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3614	I80, CONCRETE SUBSTRUC 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 KING & FENCING	\$ 15,501,359.00	\$ 14,076,436.07	\$334,025.38	\$ 10,756,892.42	69%	79%	WADSWORTH BROTHERS CONSTRUCT	JOHN BRADSHAW	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3616	GOLDFIELD VISITOR CENTER FACILITY	\$ 814,708.00	\$ 712,369.19	-\$1,000.00	\$ 685,077.34	84%	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 KANEGBERG	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	-\$1,000.00	\$ 10,207,766.47	55%	57%	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	\$865.96	\$ 4,835,450.25	97%	98%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KENT STEELE	JOHN ANGEL	
3626	SR447, CHIP SEAL WITH FOG SEAL	\$ 1,000,647.00	\$ 888,498.00	-\$1,000.00	\$ 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	\$ 6,033,087.09	94%	83%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	DEVIN CARTWRIGHT	JOHN ANGEL	
3628	US6, COLDMILL STRESS RELIEF W/OPEN GRAD	\$ 23,186,173.00	\$ 21,800,000.00	\$21,200.00	\$ 8,919,450.46	38%	67%	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	\$ 19,047,656.79	54%	46%	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	\$ 3,410,962.96	91%	100%	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	-\$999.95	\$ 565,033.47	35%	46%	THE TRUESDELL CORPORATION	ROBERT BRATZLER	BRAD DURSKI	
3634	US93, CLOVER VALLEY CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,475,398.00	\$ 2,254,007.00	\$310.50	\$ 2,087,392.08	84%	93%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	PHILIP KANEGBERG	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	\$ 924,660.72	70%	8%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	VICTOR PETERS	LARRY BOGE	
3639	SR317, ROAD REPAIR & DRAINAGE IMPR	\$ 3,979,295.00	\$ 3,393,465.12	\$23,874.38	\$ 3,532,902.09	89%	100%	MEADOW VALLEY CONTRACTORS INC	STEVE BIRD	STEVE CONNER	
3640	SR529, MICRO SURFACE, PATCH & PED IMPR	\$ 1,388,805.00	\$ 1,244,007.00	-\$355.28	\$ 1,119,524.90	81%	91%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	STEVE BIRD	BRAD DURSKI	
3643	SR443, PED, LIGHTING AND ADA IMPR	\$ 1,240,647.00	\$ 1,110,000.00	-\$4,074.96	\$ 1,045,946.33	84%	95%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	LORI CAMPBELL	BRAD DURSKI	
3645	SR372, CONST ROUNDABOUTS	\$ 4,336,034.00	\$ 4,046,000.00	-\$51,065.30	\$ 3,582,275.12	83%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JOHN BRADSHAW	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3647	US93, CHIP SEAL AND SEAL COAT	\$ 994,718.00	\$ 883,007.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	GREGORY MINDRUM	REGINA PIERCE	
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	\$ 1,346,562.83	52%	94%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	LORI CAMPBELL	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3651	I80, COLD MILL, PLANT MIX & OPEN GRADE	\$ 11,432,678.00	\$ 10,449,000.00	-\$1,000.00	\$ 4,173,387.03	37%	57%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	VICTOR PETERS	DAVID SCHWARTZ	
3652	US95A, COLD RECY & TRUCK CLIMBING LN	\$ 8,208,696.00	\$ 7,654,000.00	-\$5,000.00	\$ 4,643,306.04	57%	63%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	ROBERT BRATZLER	LARRY BOGE	
3653	US395, INSTALL ITS INFRASTRUCTURE	\$ 9,577,272.00	\$ 8,940,908.32	\$168,412.00	\$ 1,365,775.01	14%	30%	PAR ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS INC	JOHN DICKINSON	BRAD DURSKI	
3654	TE-MOAK TRIBE PED UPGRADE	\$ 1,091,870.00	\$ 969,000.00	\$53,777.56	\$ 722,845.92	66%	83%	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	LORI CAMPBELL	REGINA PIERCE	
3655	SR160, COLD MILL OVERLAY & SFTY IMPROVS	\$ 9,295,897.00	\$ 8,666,666.00	\$189,145.59	\$ 6,208,362.89	67%	58%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	KEVIN MAXWELL	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3656	US50, COLD SPRINGS ITS IMPROVS	\$ 2,090,557.00	\$ 1,904,408.50	\$0.00	\$ 396,151.57	19%	40%	TITAN ELECTRICALCONTRACTING	RODNEY SCHILLING	LARRY BOGE	
3657	US50, INSTALL ITS SMART ZONE & FIBER OPTIC	\$ 2,509,653.00	\$ 2,300,587.50	\$0.00	\$ 558,144.42	22%	27%	TITAN ELECTRICALCONTRACTING	RODNEY SCHILLING	JOHN BRONDER	
3658	SR877, COLDMILL & PLACE PLANTMIX	\$ 1,585,464.00	\$ 1,424,000.00	-\$46,802.00	\$ 362,775.69	23%	54%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	VICTOR PETERS	ASHLEY HURLBUT	
3659	SR445, ACCEL & DECEL LANES PYRAMID HWY	\$ 794,870.00	\$ 694,000.00	\$0.00	\$ 616,264.92	78%	83%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	STEVE BIRD	SAM LOMPA	
3660	SR648, ROADBED MOD GLENDALE AVE	\$ 15,494,605.00	\$ 14,242,242.00	\$850.00	\$ 5,851,470.20	38%	42%	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	\$ 3,624,122.94	25%	42%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	ROBERT BRATZLER	MIRAK MEHARI	
3662	SR169, ROADBED, PLANTMIX & OPEN GRADE	\$ 1,553,493.00	\$ 1,397,000.00	\$0.00	\$ 1,438,882.68	93%	96%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	STEVE BIRD	SAMI YOUSUF	
3663	US6, CHIP SEAL AND FLUSH	\$ 991,339.00	\$ 879,879.00	-\$35,594.02	\$ 745,224.53	75%	100%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	GREGORY MINDRUM	SAMI YOUSUF	
3664	SR430, PED IMPROVS & NEW TRAFFIC SIGNAL	\$ 1,477,974.00	\$ 1,328,328.00	-\$15,189.90	\$ 158,987.62	11%	22%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	VICTOR PETERS	BRAD DURSKI	
3665	I80, COLDMIL, PLANT MIX & OPEN GRADE	\$ 10,154,853.00	\$ 9,084,084.00	-\$1,170.00	\$ 3,096,299.83	30%	44%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	VICTOR PETERS	MIKE MURPHY	

Open Contract Status 8/14/2017

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
3666	US93, MICROSURFACE & 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	\$571,332.00	\$ 2,690,963.60	27%	41%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JOHN BRADSHAW	BERHANE TEFAGABR	
3668	I80, ADA REMEDIATION, RAMPS & PED IMPRO	\$ 1,248,138.00	\$ 1,121,099.70	\$0.00	\$ 486,607.39	39%	28%	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	\$ 340,239.04	6%	6%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	CHRISTOPHER PETERSON	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3670	SR341, SCRUB SEAL W/SEAL COAT	\$ 407,017.00	\$ 341,007.00	\$0.00	\$ 265,580.17	65%		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	\$ 4,549,476.80	13%	24%	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%	0%	UNICON LLC	ROBERT BRATZLER	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3674	I515, COLDMILL & PLACE PLANTMIX	\$ 964,331.00	\$ 861,861.00	\$0.00	\$ 793,744.16	82%	63%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	GREGORY MINDRUM	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3675	SR338/208, CHIP SEAL W/SEAL COAT	\$ 1,120,567.00	\$ 1,037,007.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	DAVE PARTEE	ASHLEY HURLBUT	
3676	SR278, CHIP SEAL W/SEAL COAT	\$ 699,248.00	\$ 614,120.00	\$0.00	\$ 469,145.61	67%	43%	VSS INTERNATIONAL DBA	GREGORY MINDRUM	REGINA PIERCE	
3677	US50, CHIP SEAL W/SEAL COAT	\$ 893,988.00	\$ 796,120.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	VSS INTERNATIONAL DBA	DAVE PARTEE	LARRY BOGE	
3678	SR163, PAVE MEDIAN DITCH	\$ 351,100.00	\$ 279,279.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	VICTOR PETERS	TIMOTHY RUGULEISKI	
3679	I580/SR341, LANDSCAPE AND AESTHETICS	\$ 2,692,238.00	\$ 2,453,794.50	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	JOHN LETOILE	BRAD DURSKI	
3680	US50, SLOPE REPAIR & STABIL, EROSN CNTL	\$ 5,593,028.00	\$ 5,222,222.00	\$0.00	\$ 641,944.50	11%	8%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JOHN BRADSHAW	JOHN ANGEL	
3685	SR225, CHIP SEAL W/SEAL COAT	\$ 958,067.00	\$ 856,007.00	\$0.00	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	DAVE PARTEE	REGINA PIERCE	
		<b>\$ 745,804,940.48</b>	<b>\$ 692,791,993.24</b>	<b>\$31,076,009.26</b>	<b>\$ 552,016,342.03</b>						

<sup>1</sup> % BUDGET = Total Paid to Date /Agreement Estimate  
<sup>2</sup> % TIME = Charged Working Days to Date / Updated Working Days