



**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 12, 2016 – 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 June 6, 2016 Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting minutes (Discussion/For Possible Action)
5. Presentation/discussion on NDOT's Right of Way acquisition process (Informational Item Only). *This item will explain the process NDOT is required to follow when acquiring land for projects.*
6. Old Business (Discussion Only)
 - A. CWG Task List
 - Item 1 - Contractor Prequalification
 - Item 2 - NDOT Disadvantaged Business Process and Work Force Development
 - Item 3 - As-Builts
 - Item 4 – CMAR Change Orders and Agreements
 - Item 5 – NDOT Staff Update
 - Item 6 – Resident Engineer's Project Assignments
 - Item 7 – Unbalanced Bidding
 - B. Requested Reports and Documents
 - C. Update on DCS Staffing
7. Projects Under Development (5-year Project Plan)
8. 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)
9. 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.
10. Closed session to receive information from counsel regarding potential or existing litigation (Discussion Only)
11. Adjournment (Possible Action)

Notes:

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

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

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

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

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
310 Galletti Way
Sparks, Nevada

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1951 Idaho Street
Elko, Nevada

Governor's Office
Capitol Building
Carson City, Nevada

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Chairman Len Savage	Jeff Freeman	Denise Inda
Controller Ron Knecht	Steven Lani	Thor Dyson
Frank Martin	Darin Tedford	Mary Martini (Las Vegas)
BJ AlMBERG (Guest)	Megan Sizelove	Mario Gomez (Las Vegas)
Reid Kaiser	Lisa Schettler	Kevin Lee (Elko)
John Terry	Jenni Eyerly	Paul Schneider (FHWA)
Dennis Gallagher	Teresa Schlaffer	

Savage: Good afternoon everyone. I'd like to welcome everybody to the Construction Work Group here in Carson City. I see that we have Kevin in Elko. In Las Vegas we have Mary—

Martini: And Mario.

Savage: And Mario, hello, welcome. Welcome everyone. Also would like to welcome Member Martin in Carson City, it's always nice to have you here Frank.

Martin: It's always a pleasure to see your face. [laughter]

Savage: The Controller and I appreciate it. We'd like to welcome our other Board Member, for a brief while, BJ AlMBERG. He's in the audience on his way back to Ely, thought he'd just take a few moments before he heads back. So, I thank you BJ for taking the time.

AlMBERG: No problem, thank you.

Savage: So, with that, let's go ahead and get started. Public comment, anybody here in Carson City that would like to make public comment? Anybody in Las Vegas or Elko, public comment?

Martini: None here.

Lee: None here in Elko, thanks.

Savage: Thank you Mary, thank you Kevin. With that being said, let's go to Agenda Item No. 3, Comments from the Construction Working Group. Any comments from Board Members or Staff, please speak now.

Kaiser: None here.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Martini: None here.

Knecht: I'll be brief. That's it. [laughter]

Savage: Well, Mr. Controller, you had mentioned earlier, possibly moving the start time 45 minutes after the Transportation Board Meeting because it is a little bit rushed during the 30 minutes, so let's move it to 45 minutes.

Kaiser: Okay, will do.

Savage: For the next meeting.

Knecht: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Savage: Anything else in Las Vegas on comment or in Elko?

Martini: No comments from Las Vegas.

Savage: Kevin, do you have anything in Elko?

Lee: No, thanks.

Savage: Okay. Moving along, Agenda Item No. 4, has everyone had a chance to review the Meeting Minutes of March 14, 2016? And, if there are any comments, please state them.

Knecht: Mr. Chairman, I've got two items here. One is on Page 5, the two paragraphs from me, the bottom part of the page, the second paragraph, third line, I probably was mumbling that day or something. I said, when we raise questions like that, it's not to cast dispersions upon anybody's integrity, actually that should've been aspersion. So the 'DI' should be replaced by an 'A'. I don't know, maybe we don't want to cast dispersions on anybody.

And on Page 11, in my two line comment there at the top, provisions in the professional engineers, mode of ethics, that would be Code of Ethics, instead of mode.

Savage: Is that all Mr. Controller?

Knecht: That's all I have at the moment.

Savage: Member Martin?

Martin: I have no comments, no sir.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Savage: With those corrections, I'll take a motion.

Martin: Move to approve the meeting minutes.

Knecht: Second.

Savage: All in favor? [ayes around] The meeting minutes are passed with the revisions as noted. Moving to Agenda Item No. 5, a presentation and discussion, updates made to NDOT's Consultant Procurement Process, information only. Mr. Kaiser.

Kaiser: Jenni Eyerly from our Administrative Services Division will give this presentation.

Eyerly: Good morning, good afternoon actually.

Savage: Good afternoon Jenni.

Eyerly: I put together a lot of information in the informational item memo. I did want to just hit some of the highlights of that and then open it up to any questions that you might have. We had a significant change to 23 CFR 172, which is the Consultant Procurement Procedures outlined by Federal Highway Administration. They went into effect May 22nd of last year, we had a year to update our procedures. I want to say, it took every bit of a year to get it to the point where it needed to be updated in compliance with that new rule. It wasn't that there were a lot of significant changes, it was just that we really needed to go through it with a fine tooth comb and make sure that we had everything in there that we needed. In all seriousness, it was about a three to four month effort of workshops and revisions and discussions with FHWA on that process. That is one of the reasons for changes.

The other is that we made some internal process improvements. We looked at things like, where we used to have a prequalified list of consultants that we would send out RFPs to. So, they had to—everyone that was interested would send in their firm's resume and experience and we would evaluate them as to whether we thought they were eligible to bid on a proposal, on RFPs. A lot of times, they would just sit on the list and it would cause a lot of work for internal staff and work for consultants that may not even come to fruition. We looked at combining and we have it now combine that pre-qualification with the proposal.

So, in the RFP it states, the minimum qualifications for that particular project. Then each firm submits their qualifications and we evaluate those based on a

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

specific project. We've found that to be a much better use of our time and the consultant's resources, in that process.

We did get some feedback from some consultants on our procurement processes and we got some comments on our RFP. We made some modifications to the checklist and tried to group like items together. We tended to have things in multiple sections which could be very confusing for people. We made some changes there.

I think in this group, we've been talking for a while now about the consensus process and moving to consensus evaluations where Committee Members can speak with each other about strengths and weaknesses they see in the proposal. We found that some projects and project managers like that process and it works well. Others, just a straight individual proposal evaluation can work just fine. It really depends on the nature of the project and perhaps what the project manager is looking for in that particular procurement. It does give them an opportunity to talk about it amongst themselves.

One significant change I want to highlight in the Federal Regulation Update was that we now need to state whether we're going to procure just with proposal evaluations or if we're going to move to an interview, or if we're going to do our proposal evaluations and then see where the scoring is and if we've got two really close firms, then we might move to an interview. Now we have a definite proposal evaluation, a definite interview or a let's wait and see what the scores do.

Savage: And that's stipulated in the agreement.

Eyerly: That is in the RFP—

Savage: In the RFP—

Eyerly: Yeah, right up front in the proposal. So, generally, a really simple kind of run of the mill project that we're looking for would probably go to just a straight proposal evaluation. Something that's much more complex or we really want to dive in and see, perhaps a demonstration or the capabilities of the team members and how they might work together and have more of a back and forth, would go to interview. Then, there's those in between that it depends if we have a clear winner at the proposal stage or not.

Savage: So, is it mandatory to have that interview or is it an option of the Department?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Eyerly: It's an option. But, if we state in the RFP that we're going to go to interviews, then we have to go to interviews.

Savage: Then it has to.

Martin: That seems—that process seems a little subjective because—and maybe it should be. I'm not saying, it's subjective, it's wrong. When something is objective it's clearly fine black and white, subjective, ugh, let's see if we can change the outcome somehow or another. The subjective piece is something that I was—struck me as being—you know, unless you do it on every RFP or every RFQ, say tell up front that there's going to be interview or no interview, then you don't leave the subjective, but to have somebody propose and then after they propose, 25 days after you received their proposal to ask them to prepare for an interview just seems to be a little subjective. I don't know how you all feel about that.

Eyerly: So that's what we actually—that's our current process. Before this update, was that we would put out the RFP and be silent about how we would do the evaluation. So that firm had no idea whether they were going to end up with an interview or not and so that's what happened. There was time delay and then they're planning on making travel arrangements and coming here. While it is still subjective in terms of the judgment of the project manager and the Director's Office and looking at the nature of the project in some cases, in others, we know we don't have time to go to interview or the type of project it is doesn't warrant an interview. We want to be able to tell those firms, we don't expect you to show up. There's others where we know we want to go to interviews. So, likewise, we wanted to let them know, prepare ahead of time to be here, basically, if you're in the top ranked proposals.

For those ones in the middle, we didn't want to tie our hands where if we did a proposal evaluation and they were so close that we had time and the nature of the project warranted to where we would go to interviews, we didn't want to exclude that ability.

Martin: Right. Okay, I got a better understanding now, thank you.

Eyerly: You're welcome. The other point I wanted to highlight was the on-call process. We did have an on-call process years ago here at NDOT. It was incredibly cumbersome. It was even more involved than the pre-qualification process but similar where we had a list of disciplines and pros would submit on each discipline. So, one engineering firm might submit 10 copies of 10 proposals, so they're putting forth 100 proposals to get considered for this on-call process. We

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

did away with that several years ago. It wasn't compliant with federal requirements at that time and with this new federal rule update, we were able to work through a different on-call process that we believe will be more efficient for the Department. We worked with FHWA to make sure it's compliant with the regulations, but it will give us that flexibility to be able to procure services at short notice.

One of the examples that comes up is sub-service utility work where we know that on all of our projects, or many of them, we're going to need sub-service utility services, but we don't have a definition of the project itself in time to actually go through the full RFP process, or the cost of the services might be \$25,000 or \$50,000 and we just need somebody that we can kind of pull off the list and send them out to a project. The biggest change to that process is, we're going to put out an RFP for our on-call services. In that RFP, we state how many firms we're going to hire and we define the general scope of the project. It's going to be sub-service utility work either maybe in Northern Nevada or statewide, whatever we might choose. Then as projects come up, the project manager will go through a secondary selection process where they look at the availability of the firm and then perhaps any specialty experience they might have if there's nuances with a particular project. They'll go through that secondary evaluation process. It's a lot quicker than the RFP. The RFP is to get us firms that we believe are adequately qualified to perform the work. We're not looking at trying to rank anybody in terms of their overall qualifications. In that secondary review it really is just, which of your team members are available right now on this particular project and then is there anything specific to this project that we're looking for. The firms will be ranked—

Martin: That could be in all the disciplines, engineering, little short-term—this is kind of like, what I think in our industry Len is called a JOC, Job Over Contract. Is that—

Eyerly: Yes. So we're looking at like, right-of-way, bridge, roadway design, traffic ops. There's a bunch of—a wide variety of disciplines and we've worked with the Assistant Directors to basically set some guidelines about when we're going to use on-call and when we're going to use a regular RFP.

For example, in construction, if we're doing crew augmentation, those are generally less dollar amount than a full construction administration. Those on-call services will be used for a lot of the crew augmentations where they're pretty straightforward and we kind of have some kind of a framework for what they

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

generally are. Then the full administration projects, which are larger, will generally go out as an RFP, in and of themselves.

Knecht: Quick question, Mr. Chairman, Jenni, just to make sure the record is clear. The on-call process always involves at least a second and third set of eyes, or is it ever the case that the person who is going to be overseeing that makes the choice unilaterally?

Eyerly: The initial choice is made by Committee as to who gets on the on-call list.

Knecht: Right.

Eyerly: Then the project manager, with the approval of their division head, so there's two sets of eyes on the secondary selection.

Knecht: Thank you.

Dyson: It's not like a list and then—you don't pull the first one off and then they drop down and you pull the next one, it doesn't work that way?

Eyerly: No, and that was the problem that FHWA had with that whole process.

Dyson: All right. So you're cool now with the new class.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser for the record. The consultants like the other way better because we were actually able to distribute the work a little better.

Dyson: We did it that way, right? Thor Dyson for the record.

Kaiser: But, we can't do that anymore.

Dyson: So, that's changed.

Kaiser: That's changed.

Savage: Are we restricted to the amount of on-call consultants for that one division?

Eyerly: In terms of the number of firms we choose?

Savage: The number of firms.

Eyerly: We're not restricted, but we don't want to open it up too wide because every firm on the list is going to get each project. So you don't want to really be picking between 10 firms every time you have a project coming up. Because that kind of

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

defeats the purpose of on-call. You want a small number of highly qualified firms that you know you can rely on to get that work done.

Savage: Yeah, there's a fine line there I think Jenni, with all due respect, because you need competition up there. You want to have that pool of consultants deeper, rather than thinner, in my mind, that are all qualified, okay. Because this one—like we had talked at the T-Board, they have a lot of work in progress. He may be really good or she may be really good at this one task, but are they really the best choice at this time? So, I think the deeper quantity of qualified consultants in every category is important rather than just two or three, in my personal opinion. It gives you more to choose from.

Eyerly: I think that's something we can consider at the RFP stage because that's where we determine how many firms we're going to get—how many firms we're planning to get on the on-call list as of the result of the RFP is defined upfront.

Savage: Exactly.

Eyerly: I guess a flipside to that would be that, in the past we've had lots of firms on an on-call list and then only two or three of them would get work out of the process. We're trying to find that balance between, as you said, having enough in the pool that we have the resources available to us, but not so many that we've got a lot of firms who are wasting their time—seeming like we're wasting their time.

Savage: Yeah, there's a fine line there. It's just a matter of who gives us the best value of what this Department and the taxpayers need. A couple of questions I have, does this require T-Board approval?

Eyerly: No. This is an informational item.

Savage: This is informational only for us, but does this have to go to—

Kaiser: Changes in the process?

Savage: Yes.

Kaiser: I don't think so.

Savage: No, okay. And, the other question, if you can expand a little bit, maybe I wasn't listening because I was looking at some of the papers, but on the former employee on the Board of Examiners, right now we have a state law, I believe it's two years with an exception that the Director's Office has the ability to overrule that. I'm not quite sure on what this new proposal is.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Eyerly: Sure.

Savage: And the pros and cons that go with it.

Eyerly: Sure. This actually, this has come up a couple of times with consultants that had proposed on our projects. There's an NRS, as you said, that requires if a former state employee has worked for the state within two years, they're not entitled to basically sign a contract or work on another project for the State of Nevada. It's the Board of Examiners that need to approve any exceptions to that. The Director's Office makes the decision of whether or not they're going to submit that employee to the Board of Examiners or not.

Savage: Okay.

Eyerly: In the past couple of years, we've been working through the implementation of this new regulation and it's changed a couple of times which has caused some of our consultants some frustration because we've had times where we've been sending everybody. If they were listed on a proposal, we were sending to them. We had other times where we said, I don't think we want to go through this process any more so we're not going to do that. So, we've had some consultants getting kind of caught in the middle during their proposal evaluations or during submission of their proposals because they're listing former state employees and there was uncertainty as to how they were going to be treated. Were they going to be taken to the Board of Examiners, were they not going to be?

In turn, our Committee Members had confusion because they may have evaluated a proposal last time where nobody was going to the Board of Examiners and now they're on a new Committee and they're maybe assuming that it's the same thing. That nobody is going to be going.

What we did is, we standardized the process and we basically are instructing the Committees to evaluate all proposals as if that employee were to be approved. Regardless of whether they end up going to the Board of Examiners or not, or they end up getting approved or not, the purpose of that evaluation is to look at that state employee. There's language in our RFP and in our agreement that says, any time you substitute somebody, it's at our approval and it has to be equivalent or better. That's why we felt confident telling our Committee Members to evaluate based on that particular employee because we know we're either getting that employee or someone better.

Savage: That sounds really good in theory.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Martin: Yeah. Really good in theory.

Savage: Really good, but how practical it is, it's going to be difficult, I believe, to overview.

Kaiser: Well, fortunately so far, the Board of Examiners has not declined anybody the opportunity to work for us, when we've taken them there. We have not had to deal with that.

Savage: But this is going to open the door a little bit for those consultants to possibly put a retired NDOT person on their list because in the past it's been two years, end of story.

Kaiser: Right.

Savage: So now they may think, well they might be able to get an exception because this is a precedent to the fact that it could put the Board of Examiners in a precarious position, in my mind.

Eyerly: Member Savage, I just wanted to point out, we have had people in the past that have been submitted on proposals. So the submitting of a former employee isn't new to us. It's just our handling of it that changed a little bit and now we've standardized it. We've also received an indication from the Governor, through the Board of Examiners, in some comments and feedback he's given us when we've taken employees requesting this exception, that in general, if an employee is submitted as part of a proposal for a firm that's competing for an award, that he tends to support that exception because that employee is now employed with a firm that just happens to be competing for our work.

I took an employee of mine to the Board of Examiners and we were doing a direct agreement with that person, rather than them being employed through a firm on a proposal and it was a whole different experience. They wanted to know a lot more about that particular situation. It seems like, at least right now, the temperature of the Board of Examiners is that if it's someone who competed fair and square for a proposal in a competitive state, versus being a former employee and we need their skills and we're requesting that we hire them directly, they're taking the latter a little more—they're looking at it a little more intensely than they are the first one.

Savage: Because it's all about minimizing any protest, is what it's really about. Minimizing protests from the secondary or third proposer, who is not apparently

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

successful. We have to be aware of that as well. And, does the FHWA have this same provision in other DOTs?

Schneider: I don't know.

Eyerly: I think to minimize the protests, we would look at that in terms of their request for substitution. That's where we need to balance that interest of, if for whatever reason the former employee doesn't come to work on that project, it's the request for substitution at the equivalent or better that the Department needs to really look at, the possible protest in what another competing firm might have to say about that if we don't get that employee.

Savage: That's my only concern. It just needs to be very clear. There's always an opportunity that someone will take this road. This Board [inaudible] I'm sure you've been thorough within the Department. So, when does this go into effect and when does FHWA have to actually approve this new format?

Eyerly: They approved this the week before May 22nd. We had a year to get it done so— [crosstalk] It was the 19th or somewhere around there.

Schneider: 16th.

Eyerly: Oh, there you go. The 16th, whew, we made it. It technically was in effect May 22, 2015. If we were doing those things in the last year, they were compliant and okay. Our NDOT system and procedures were approved May 16th. That's what we're operating under going forward.

Savage: That's all I have. Any other questions Controller or Member Martin?

Martin: I just—this consensus process, I need to understand that just a little bit more. What it basically does is, as I understand it, it allows the selection committee to do what we're not allowed to do, when we're—if Len and I are proposing on the same job, we're not allowed to talk to one another because that's called—

Savage: Collusion.

Martin: Collusion. And so, what—so, explain to me how this is different in that situation. Because if Len and I are the only two guys going after a job, we can talk to one another and figure out, except for it being against the law, figure out which one of us is going to get the job and which one of us are going to get paid for not getting the job.

Eyerly: Sure.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Martin: So, tell me what's different between what I just described and this consensus? Because consensus, collusion, both begin with C's. [laughter]

Eyerly: Well, let me clarify, that begins with C too. [laughter] On the proposal side, we do have very strict rules about communication. It's very clear in the RFP that the proposers are not permitted to talk with each other. They're actually not permitted to talk with people within the Department other than the Agreement Services Designated Representative during the procurement. That's the proposer's side.

On the Department's side, we're looking for the most qualified firm. In recent years, we had rules in place where proposers had to individually score proposals and that was it. We took whatever score they gave us. In some circumstances and depending on the project and on the project manager, we got a lot of feedback about wanting to be able to talk to other members of the evaluation committee. Because what one person saw in a proposal as a weakness another might see as a strength, and they wanted that opportunity to really use the expertise on a panel and be able to bring out those particular issues that they might see.

The process is mediated, for lack of a better word, by Agreement Services. We have a representative in the room, and I think Paul is shaking his head. FHWA comes and observes the consensus meetings. Sometimes we even have legal in there, just making sure that we are following the process adequately and that the outcome is truly a consensus of the group.

There's a process now where in a consensus, they still perform their individual proposal evaluations and they provide that as a starting point so we still have that on the table. Then there's ability to discuss what they see in their proposals so that if someone might have scored it perhaps not giving enough weight to a certain section or not realizing that something that was said was an issue, it can come out.

Martin: So Len is a heck of a salesman and he just absolutely convinces me that I've viewed this thing all wrong and I need to go with his guy. That's the door you're opening right there.

Eyerly: That can happen in a consensus process, that is absolutely—

Savage: No need to use me as the example. [laughter]

Eyerly: Well, you're already—no, never mind.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

[crosstalk]

Eyerly: That can happen in consensus, and that needs to be balanced out by—you've got five people on a panel, so it's usually not a one to the other. There's five people whose opinions can be put forward. It's not perfect. We're all human. We have opinions. We have—sometimes people are more overbearing than others. The representative from Administrative Services is there to make sure that everybody has a voice and that everybody has an opportunity to speak to their concerns, give their reasons for the score they gave and then help the group to work through those kinds of discussions.

Kaiser: Now, on our committees that review these proposals, it is required that we have somebody from outside of NDOT on this committee for selecting the consultant. It is good that we are able to discuss some of the history or maybe some of the—with some of these consultants, because the individual there may not be familiar with any of them. Also, they may have history or they may see something we don't see. I think it does help us on a review process, being able to discuss amongst ourselves each of the proposals.

Dyson: Thor Dyson for the record. I agree with Mr. Kaiser completely because I've been—I've sat on these consultant committees. Typically there's a wide range of individuals that are on the consultant committees that, some have five years, eight years, 15. In my case, I have 25, 26 years with the Department and had various opportunities to work with different consultants and when you get their proposal, they're not always straightforward. If you happen to have worked on a job, specifically with that particular design-build team, consultant, contractor team and they're not being forthright, that won't ever come up in a consensus if I know something that is erroneous in the proposal, I won't have an opportunity to inform them, oh by the way, rest of the committee, are you aware that, da, da, da, da. Go verify that issue, do you still want to do that? And, like Mr. Kaiser said, we do have members of the RTC, the cities, City of Reno, Sparks, for District 2 to participate in these committees. We can provide them information, they can provide us information that we're just completely unaware of on these. And, we can get that vetted out in a consensus meeting.

To Member Martin's point of view, if you had someone with a very, very strong leadership personality in a key position, they could do a heck of a sales job and hijack the consensus. I've experienced that a little bit too and it can get disconcerting.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Savage: Thank you Mr. Dyson, thank you Mr. Kaiser. Jenni, is there a moderator or independent referee that sits in these consensus?
- Eyerly: Yes, from Agreement Services.
- Savage: From Agreement Services.
- Eyerly: Yes.
- Savage: Okay. And does everyone sign a non-disclosure?
- Eyerly: Yes.
- Savage: At the beginning?
- Eyerly: Yes.
- Savage: And do they sign any type of code of ethics criteria?
- Eyerly: We all have a code of ethics as employees of the state.
- Savage: And they're signing that document before they're going into this consensus group?
- Eyerly: We call it a jury letter, but it basically outlines their responsibilities for participating in this particular committee. It's a more stringent—it's a specific document, rather than our general code of ethics, but each member of the committee signs that.
- Savage: That's good. It can be very healthy, it can be very dangerous, I mean, we all know that. It's up to the people and it's up to us to try to ensure that everything is straight.
- Martin: I always thought collusion was good. Okay. I forget, we're on recording.
[laughter]
- Savage: Will you call the Sherriff please? [laughter] Anything else Jenni?
- Eyerly: Unless there's any more questions?
- Savage: Any other questions or comments from Las Vegas? Elko? Or here in Carson City?
- Martini: One comment, this is Mary Martini, District 1, Las Vegas. One of the areas that I particularly like about the consensus is the differing perspective. The various

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

members are generally picked because they come from a broad background. Someone from environmental, for instance, will see things differently than the engineers and the designers. You get to listen to the other perspectives in a way that gives you more of a 360. So, while it's possible for somebody to bull dog a consensus meeting and run away with it, I think that it's far more likely that you get a better decision and a more well-rounded one.

Savage: Thank you Mary. Any other comments from Las Vegas or Elko? How about Carson City? Does anybody have anything to say in Carson City? Thank you Jenni.

Eyerly: You're welcome.

Savage: We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 6, the Presentation and Discussion of NDOT's 2016 Resident Engineers meeting held up in Elko.

Kaiser: Reid Kaiser. Just to give you guys a quick briefing on our RE meeting. It was held March 8th, 9th and 10th in Elko this year. This is annual meeting and it rotates among the three districts on where it is held. What the RE meeting is, is an opportunity for the Resident Engineers to discuss amongst themselves any problems with some of our specifications or plans or issues that they're running into.

As an example, stormwater. Our stormwater specifications are fairly new. Now that they've been using them for a year, they've been able to go through them and discuss any problems that they may have ran into. It gives them an opportunity to discuss what worked good, what didn't and what we need to change. It's also a good opportunity for them to get to know each other. They spend three days together. They go out for dinner at night. It's a good time for everybody to understand what they're dealing with and spend time together dialoging what's going on in their projects.

Something that I was encouraged about this year is, we have some fairly new assistants coming up. We had some positions and as an Assistant Resident positions that these new employees have taken. They had a lot of comments. They spoke up and weren't bashful and wanted to make some changes. That's encouraging to see that and kind of brings a little life back into some of the programs sometimes. It was encouraging to see that.

Some of the biggest topics that we talked about this year were reducing speed limits through our construction work zones; safety for our REs and for our

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Assistant REs and for the crew and also for the contractor is their number one priority. We have certain requirements that we want them to follow when they lower the speed through their work zone. That was discussed quite a bit at the meeting. Equipment for the crews, trucks, that was discussed quite a bit. There was a lot of discussions on the RE's role in our CMAR and design-build projects. We are rewriting our construction manual and we're going to hopefully outline that a little better so that there's a real clear understanding on the role on those kinds of projects. Utilities continue to be a problem for us but I don't know if there's ever anything we can ever do about that. It's been the same for me for the last 25 years. I'm sure you guys probably run into that in your guy's—

Martin: Are you talking about the existing utility situation?

Kaiser: Yeah.

Martin: In your construction projects?

Kaiser: Yeah.

Martin: Right now, you still have your own staff preparing the as-builts, right?

Kaiser: Yes.

Martin: Is there a correlation between our staff preparing the as-builts versus the conflicts that we run into?

Kaiser: I don't think so. I think the utilities are—typically they're in way before we ever go and build the project.

Martin: Oh, I see what you're saying. You're talking about in a green field construction situation. I know over at the Meadowood Mall Interchange that Meadow Valley did, there was huge amounts of utility conflicts, power lines, sewer lines, all that kind of stuff. Well, the Meadowood Mall Interchange had been there for a long time, so we should've known where all that stuff was.

Kaiser: We should have, but you know, there's a lot of times that utility companies tell us where they're going to put them and then they run into different field conditions or something and then they change and they don't always track them best themselves. It's something we constantly run into.

Those are some of the high points. I gave you guys pretty much all the information, all the issues that we talked about. Do you guys have any questions that you'd like to ask myself or any of us?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Savage: Just a couple of comments Reid. I want to thank you and the REs and headquarters for really getting together. It's quite clear that the new leadership we have here in Carson City supports the Resident Engineer. I think that was a problem with the earlier Administration. I think it's important that we listen to them and you guys have done that here and tried to incorporate some of their ideas. They're the ones out there. They're the ones out there fighting the fight every day. It's good to see some of the ideas that they have and that you're listening. I think that's very important.

A couple of things. It's, like you said, number three, it's very important that the environmental support is earlier and timely. It's critical in today's day and age. The REs are very concerned about that.

Item No. 5, the 3557, who was the Engineer on record on 3557? Does anybody know?

Kaiser: I am not familiar with that contract number.

[crosstalk] The Carlin Tunnel Bridge Replacements.

Lani: 3557 was the Dunphy Bridge Replacements, 3537 and 3540 were the Carlin Tunnel Bridge Replacements. That was an inside design, NDOT designed the Dunphy project in house.

Savage: Inside? Inside, okay. Then No. 32, I was a little confused on this because in my mind, CMAR is just a method of delivery. I wasn't clear on why and how it would affect the technical engineering and construction? I didn't understand that. Because it's just a method of delivery is all it is. How would it really affect where the RE is coming from?

Kaiser: Well, the CMAR projects and the design-build projects, they're administered—there's a certain set of guidelines for the design-bid-build projects that we have to adhere to. Okay. That's administered through our Construction Division. Well, the CMAR and the design-build are administered through our Project Management. Okay. So, we try to administer them through the Construction Division so they are set up that way but like on our design-bid-build projects, the contractor is not required to come up with quantities and yet, quantities are how the RE tracks certifications, the number of tests they do on the materials that they're being used on the compactions on the dirt and so forth. Sometimes there's a breakdown. That's what they're requesting is, where is their involvement and how are they supposed to administer something where it's not like a design-bid-

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

build project. They're set-up to administer a design-bid-build project where it's very clear what the quantities are, what the processes are. And that is what we're working on, what I mentioned earlier. We're coming up with those guidelines in our Construction Manual rewrite, to hopefully alleviate some of those questions.

Savage: Oh, okay. So that's where that's coming from.

Kaiser: That's where that's coming from.

Savage: I understand now.

Dyson: Thor Dyson for the record. There's been a lot of internal lively debate to figure out the definition of roles, the definition of past aments and like Mr. Kaiser said, the quantities and from the district's level, the district's perspective and the RE's level, we want to be able to survive an audit if FHWA or state auditors come in. There's a check written to a contractor or design-build team, but there's no logical explanation what the check is, I want to be able to and the REs want to be able to say, that check was written for this, these things. Here's how many guard rail feet, how many feet of fence, how many yards of concrete, etc., etc. That's what we're trying to work out.

Kaiser: And there's different guidelines for these types of contracts, coming from the FHWA to us. So, it's not real clear to REs. Again, they're used to design-bid-build.

Savage: Are the quantities disclosed on the design-build contract from the contractor? Because they have the take off.

Martin: It's not designed yet, so they don't have a take off. I know exactly—forgive me for interrupting Mr. Chairman. I know exactly what you're talking about because I face the same thing in my office. If I have a guy that is phenomenal, taking a set of drawings from the Clark County School District, he can build every school, every design. Then I turn him in, try to turn him into a CMAR, or a design-build guy, it's two different worlds. If you're trying to manage the process with the same people, it can be done, but good luck.

What I'm not understanding about this thing, where design-build, CMAR and not so much design-bid-build, but where design-build and CMAR have—you're expecting X number of miles of lane. It's got to conform to all your specifications and all that kind of stuff. In the end, does it really matter what your quantity was, because if they propose \$250,000, \$250M, for the road going from here to that end of the table with all the interchanges and everything else, in the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

end, you've got that. What do you care about the quantities for? I think that's an old way of trying to exert control.

One of the advantages of design-build, in your business, if you've got a better way of designing a mechanical system and you propose \$79,000 and the other guy proposes \$69,000 or \$89,000, as long as I'm cool, I don't care how you got there. That's—that now, you've got to meet the specifications on material qualities and all those kinds of things. I'm not discounting that. But, when you have an end goal, down there is \$250M and you start down here at zero. By the time you get there, if you paid out \$250M, why does it matter how you got there if you got everything here that you wanted as far as material quality and product quality and you got a road going from here to there with all the interchanges and everything else that was in your specification? Those quantities, to me, under the design-build or a CMAR, I can't see how they're important, because the reason the guy got the design-build, Kiewit, is because he figured out a different way to do it and his quantities are going to be much different than anybody else's is. That's where he used the design-build process. Kiewit used it to their advantage on Project NEON. Beat the tar out of some of the top performers in the State. Once we get that product and it meets your requirements, do we really care what happened in between here as long as we get to there?

Savage: So my only concern Frank would be the past—

Martin: The past—

Savage: Where's the foundation—

Martin: That's—that's—

Savage: [crosstalk]

[crosstalk and laughter]

Martin: We have a schedule of values that breaks it down. You guys have a schedule of values, but you tie everything to the quantity. Not to value. And you tie it to quantity. If you tie it to value that we're going to have—and the contractor is giving it to you, we're going to have 897,000 cubic yards of [inaudible]. Okay. Once you get 50% of that road done, you're getting a bill for 445,000 cubic yards of dirt right? Ain't that right? That's the way it should be. The same way in your business. You give me a schedule of values for the piping, for the duct work, for the grills, for the mechanical and for the units. I don't care how much I pay along

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

here, I do care that you deliver the units and I pay you for the units, the mechanical units.

Savage: You also owe 5%.

Martin: [crosstalk]

Savage: The Department doesn't own 5%.

Martin: No, that's the problem. That's why I'm not understanding, you've got an old way of thinking here, design-bid-build. That's what everyone of these REs. If you're taking a round peg and sticking it in a square hole of design-build, it ain't going to work without some indoctrination.

Kaiser: That's the plan. When we come up with this language, we'll run it through our project management and make sure it's in line with the program they set forth to run the CMAR and the design-bid-build or the design-build projects. Make sure that it does comply with both [crosstalk]

Terry: John Terry, Assistant Director. As somebody who has worked on a lot of design-build, I'll tell you, you've identified just what's happening in the heavy highway construction design-build. Years ago, it was design-build, was a completely different entity and it was done differently. The powers that be at DOT and we're not the only one, have dragged it back closer to being like design-bid-build. The biggest reason being, construction QA or QC or whatever you want to call it to draw that line. We now do acceptance testing. When we did acceptance testing, we didn't use to. The early design-builds, the contractor was responsible for that and we just audited it. Now we do acceptance testing. Our guys say, well we have to test every asphalt, every ton and this every so many tons, so we need quantities. Now they've dragged quantities out of us. There was no real need for quantities before. We paid on a cost loaded developed schedule, percent complete, work breakdown structure. Not quantities as DOTs do them. More over the years, as DOTs have gotten uncomfortable with that, they've tried to drag it back closer to what it was for design-bid-build.

Martin: Make it fit in the box.

Terry: That's part of it, you know. To me, the big thing is, years ago, all the early design-builds usually had a maintenance component, or had a tolling and a maintenance component. So then, we didn't care if you gave us three inches of asphalt, you gave us eight inches of asphalt. You had to maintain it for 20 years, you had to deal with it. Then when we said, now design-bid-build is, as soon as

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

it's done, remember we don't really do warranties, we take it over and so we're going to take it over, we're saying, you've got to do it our way. So, we've kind of dragged them back from a performance back to, you've got to do it our way. Design-build has sort of evolved. I think we can get through these relatively minor issues and we're still going to pay on a cost load, percent complete basis. They sort of dragged it back closer to the way a design-bid-build is, that's what is causing the [crosstalk] in my opinion.

Martin: So my fear as a Board Member, is that at some point in time, you continue down this path. We heard the gentleman make the presentation on the Garnet Interchange and the widening, doing design-build, because it delivered six months earlier. We continue down the path of this antiquated unit thinking, you're going to pull the design-build back to the exact same kind of schedule and costs as you do with design-bid-build. When you do that, my belief is, you open yourself up to a huge amount of risk due to, as we see on our contracts, change orders. Because we get the quantities wrong. On a design-build, you don't have to worry about whether the quantities are wrong. But, you keep going down this path, you're going to drag the contractors to say, there is no point in me using my innovation. I'm going to go back to the design-bid-build world and you're going to end up paying.

Terry: Right, we don't want to drag it to the point where—

Martin: You're going to slow the project delivery [crosstalk]

Terry: We don't want to drag it to the point where you told me how to do it. I did it your way and now you have to pay because that didn't work.

Savage: Yeah, that's right.

Terry: We don't want to go there.

Martin: But you're getting there. Every time you go back to this unit deal, you're getting there.

Terry: I think we're managing, but it's caused a lot of un-comfort, that's my—I will tell you, the other part is CMAR. CMAR should have essentially the same quantities as design-bid-build, but we in design-bid-build would give the resident engineer a contingency and a way to deal with change orders of a minor amount and then a change order process. Versus, CMAR, we negotiate with the contractor and we set money aside in a risk reserve for already identified risks. So we don't pay that

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting

June 6, 2016

upfront, but we pay it if we hit it. Utilities being a big one, different site conditions, etc.

We internally have had some issues with when is it a risk reserve, when is it a change order and how do we deal with that. I think other than that CMAR is pretty close to design built there.

Kaiser: Pretty close.

Savage: Thank you John. Thank you Member Martin. The comments are well made.

Tedford: Chairman Savage, can I add on to that?

Savage: Yes.

Tedford: Darin Tedford with Materials Division. One of the issues and Member Martin, you hit on it exactly is the material quality. You said our \$250M job, as long as we get to the end and have the material quality that we want, why do we care about quantities, 100% agreed. The trick is, whether it's Paul's money or NDOT money, that we've established in the design-bid-build process how often we have to sample materials so that they're comfortable reimbursing us or we're comfortable spending our money on quality material. We have those frequencies established based on quantities, on bid unit prices and bid items. I don't think that's a big deal and I don't think we have to derail a design-build process too much. It's a matter of figuring out what would change in our Construction Manual so that the resident engineer, so Thor's guys can know how often they need to sample so that we can accept the job. Whether we prepare the memo that says, everything was tested in accordance and met our specs, except for these things that we dealt with and therefore, were requesting reimbursement or therefore, we're suggesting that we close out the job and make all the payments. That's kind of where we're stuck. Like everybody said, that's not a huge deal but it is the basis of the feds accepting the job from us and reimbursing us the money that we already spent.

Savage: Thank you Darren. Thank you again Member Martin, John Terry. It's all very healthy discussions. It's good to hear that everybody's got their sleeves rolled up and trying to make it better, rather than move backwards.

Moving backwards, on No. 38, I noticed the value was \$500 for the REs, has that limit been raised [inaudible] or are they going to have to issue 10 POs to get the \$5,000?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Kaiser: I can't answer that. I'm not sure on that.
- Dyson: So, I can speak for District 2. I'm sure Mary and Kevin have maybe a slightly different version. I have what's called an Authorization Memo that I submit to all my staff in supervisory roles that can buy supplies, equipment. We're talking things like, well it can range from a couple of dollars all the way up to \$10,000. I think I have—I believe I have authority up to \$10,000. The real big purchases would have to come from Reid and the Director's Office, as far as large quantities of material or for maintenance for example.
- So, different people have different categories, different levels of what they can purchase. It doesn't mean that they, the REs won't get what they asked for, but if it exceeds \$500, they need to get either my assistant's approval, or myself, before they go out and spend—and it's actually construction's money, it's not District 2's money. I just limit the—I have to watch my budget and I want to make sure like, right now as we're in budget mode, trying to get to the end of the fiscal year, June 30th is our fiscal year for the state. I've got financial management and the budget dudes, dudettes —I should say, ladies, watching me closely and I don't want to overrun that dollar amount too quick.
- Savage: So long, I guess, Thor—and thank you for the explanation, how long has it been \$500 for the REs?
- Dyson: Quite a while.
- Kaiser: I think it's been quite a while.
- Dyson: Yeah, quite a while.
- Kaiser: Hats, vests, survey, you know, construction stakes, that kind of stuff.
- Dyson: Tape measures.
- Savage: It just sounds like they could use a little larger source. [crosstalk] I don't know if it was 1960, 1970s, when the \$500—[crosstalk and laughter]
- Dyson: I can speak from experience. It's all fairly 1990s. [crosstalk] From experience, but I mean, the Director's Office and the accounting and the financial is okay with it and I'm willing to go up higher—
- Savage: I thought I'd bring it up. I mean, we just spent \$500 talking about it. So, we'll move on. Do we have any other questions or comments from anybody?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Martin: I had Item No. 39.

Savage: Yes sir.

Martin: This makes logical sense, but there's no response. Every place else there's a response, well almost every place else, there's response. Item No. 39, why can't the field lab crews obtain and use Bio-T Max to clean their asphalt equipment anymore? The Materials Division uses this method to clean and preserve their equipment.

Lani: Steven Lani, Assistant Construction Engineer. Questions 35 to the end were submitted by the REs either at the meeting and/or after the deadline for the initial publication. What you received in your copy is the responses that were effectively the meeting and the compilation immediately after. That's why it's still in draft mode. The rest of that is still being compiled. So anything from 35 on, if you back up a couple of pages, were all late submittal questions or questions that were discussed openly at the meetings, so the formal responses are still being compiled.

Martin: This one seems to make good logical sense, I mean.

Tedford: Darin Tedford, Materials Division. In the past, we had issues on contracts where behind the paper samples of hot mix asphalt would come in and exhibit mysteriously low-test results. One of the instruments that the testers use in the field and that they would claim with Bio-T Max is a splitter. So, they bring in their sample, make sure its hot and split it down in the representative sizes to be burned off, checked for gradation. Half of it gets sent to Materials Division for acceptance testing and it came to be apparent they were using high dosages of things like, Bio-T Max which used to be Tri-Flow or something else that are actually solvents of asphalt. So, they're instructed at this time not to use the solvents and other materials for cleaning and lubricating the equipment.

Martin: Is the solvents degrade the test?

Tedford: Yes.

[crosstalk]

Tedford: Same thing when we make sure, or we usually make sure the contractors aren't using No. 2 diesel to keep the asphalt off their shovels and their rakes and everything else that comes—

Dyson: The truck beds.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Tedford: The truck beds. There's release agents for the truck beds they're supposed to use in limited quantity, not puddled in the bottom, that kind of thing.
- Martin: But I see the Materials Division uses this stuff.
- Tedford: Yeah.
- Martin: Your Division.
- Tedford: Well, in that case, basically we're cleaning the instruments—
- Martin: I'm just being facetious.
- Tedford: I know, but I can reply, using it sparingly and also washing and sometimes running them—we clean our asphalt testing equipment, we put it through the furnace to cook all the asphalt off of it and wash it with soap and water.
- Knecht: Real quickly Mr. Chairman, I'd like to concur with Member Martin's advocacy on behalf of value and Mr. Terry's somewhat advocacy on behalf of performance and the resistance to backsliding to the old paradigm. I would suggest that your so right that I might make you both honorary economist but that would probably turn you around and you'd go the other direction, so I don't—
- Martin: You want that job too John?
- Terry: No.
- Martin: No? [laughter] Thank you.
- Savage: Okay, with that being said, are there any other comments, Las Vegas, Elko or here in Carson City?
- Martini: One thing I was going to offer to the group, this is Mary Martini, District Engineer for Las Vegas. The discussion around design-build is not unique to Nevada. There's a technical bulletin from FHWA that provides a lot of information. If you can't sleep at night and you really need something to read, I think Lynette Russell sent it to the group, the internal group, but if any of the members of the CWG would like it, we can forward it to you. It provides more of that data. The other DOTs are struggling with the same issues around how much the QA and other data keeping gets you away from the cure—you know, you have a contract in order to build to provide this product at this amount of money.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

The other thing I would add to that discussion that we didn't discuss was the analysis of change order. That does bring in other items, not to discuss now but just to put into the record. Thank you.

Savage: Thank you Mary. Any other comments here in Carson City? Well, thank you every one again, and we'll move on to Agenda Item No. 7, Old Business. Mr. Kaiser.

Kaiser: Okay. Item No. 1, Contractor Pre-Qualification. Our Steering Committee has come up with a draft contractor past performance rating sheet and its been updated. We have or are going to send it out to the REs very soon. Our Committee has approved it so now it's the next step to have the REs approve it. Then after that, we'll take it to the AGC for approval.

Should I just keep going?

Savage: Yes.

Kaiser: On the item, any questions, No. 1?

No. 2, NDOT DBE Process, nothing new to report this quarter.

Item No. 3, As-Builts. As you had talked about earlier, Frank, or Mr. Martin, we have put that written into our requirements, into a contract that's a roundabout they're building out in Pahrump, so that's still moving forward.

[crosstalk about out of order on agenda]

I got messed up, I'm sorry. I got 3 and 4 backwards on the Agenda. My mistake.

Martini: Question. My understanding is that we're doing the as-builts on Las Vegas Boulevard, not in Pahrump.

Kaiser: That's right. You're right. I can't even read my own writing. No, it's on Las Vegas Boulevard.

Martini: It looked like Mr. Freeman was ready to correct you but I got to it first.

Kaiser: Yeah. That's okay. Okay. Item No. 4, CMAR Projects. NDOT has three CMAR projects. There have been no change orders to report in regards to those three CMAR projects. I have all the agreements written down for those. Are there any questions in regards to those three CMAR projects?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Savage: The only question I had is, are we getting the service and the value from the Independent Construction Estimators? How is that going? We typically use Stanley Consultants is what I've seen and the Atkins Group, I think [inaudible] that they've got on their ICE. I just want to make sure that the Department is getting the service we expect.
- Terry: John Terry, we pay a lot of money for it. I can say that. It's costing us some money but we don't really have the ability ourselves to do production based estimates to control the contractors estimates. I believe, as we—you've seen our phases of estimates where we do that—eventually we are getting the contractor's estimate down lower. Sometimes we're raising the risk reserve, but we're getting the contractor's estimate down. I would say we're getting better estimates from our CMAR contractors and we have better feeling for those estimates, but we're paying quite a bit of money for these nice estimates. No doubt about it. It's another one of those things we're sort of locked into. We're not internally developing the ability to do these types of estimates. We're kind of relying on consultants on every CMAR job, we have to have a separate ICE. I think we're getting value out of it, we're just spending some money on it. And it slows the process a bit too.
- Savage: Yeah. Are there other independent cost estimators besides Stanley?
- Terry: Yeah, we've used others, I'm just not sure. Stanley has done the majority.
- Schlaffer: Atkins.
- Terry: And Atkins.
- Savage: Okay. Just thought I'd ask that question, thank you Mr. Terry.
- Kaiser: Are they a requirement of CMAR projects?
- Savage: Yes.
- Terry: Pretty much, we're locked into it for now.
- Savage: Back to you Mr. Kaiser.
- Kaiser: Okay. Item 7A5, Consultant Agreements. I've got a spreadsheet of all the consultant agreements that the Construction Division and the Project Management Division have entered into in the last six months. Are there any questions on either one of those spreadsheets?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Savage: I have a few. First of all, I want to thank you for developing this. I think this is the first sheet or summary we've seen in this spreadsheet, is that correct?
- Kaiser: I think we had one last September or maybe it was December CWG.
- Martin: I've seen something but I don't remember what it was.
- Savage: And this is a good start. I really think it's a good start. I just had a couple of questions. Is this construction and project management?
- Kaiser: Construction is the first sheet and the second page is the project management. That's why there's two different formats. Then the third page is a continuation of project management.
- Savage: So it'd be nice to have one format.
- Kaiser: Yeah. I'll work on that. [laughter]
- Savage: I thought that might be the answer. [laughter]
- Kaiser: Somebody might get some extra work down there in Construction.
- Lani: Which format do you like?
- Savage: I like the construction one. But that's my opinion. I mean, Member Martin or the Controller can certainly speak up or anyone here at the table. All this is is a quick snapshot, like we've done with the contractors. It's been very beneficial. Quick snapshot. Quick [crosstalk]
- Kaiser: It's a matter of me getting a hold of them so they can put it in that format. I'll take care of it.
- Savage: The paid to date, through what date? There's nothing on this one about 2016, correct?
- Kaiser: Yeah, there's some—no, there isn't. There is no 2016. Although, a lot of these agreements will be for 2016 contracts.
- Savage: We have approved at the T-Board in the last six months major consultant agreements.
- Kaiser: Well, the NEON agreement was approved in 2016. I think the must be the—is this the advertised date?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Lani: It's based upon the agreement, fiscal approval date. So if you look, the NEON—a couple of the big NEON—NEON testing, USA Parkway crew augmentations that have just recently been approved, you know, you're talking on \$15M and two \$5M construction augmentation agreements. You look at those, those are actually 2015 agreements, technically by the way Agreement Services is indexing their numbers. That's why they show up under 2015.
- Martin: But it's money being expended in 2016.
- Lani: Correct. These are categorized based upon the year that the agreement is indexed, not necessarily the year the money is being expended.
- Martin: So the expended date includes monies paid through today or through last month.
- Lani: The date on the bottom of the form is 05/24/16, correct.
- Savage: I think it's a good start. I think it's something that we can certainly work towards.
- Kaiser: We will.
- Savage: Try to drill down more with it. I didn't see, for example, on the project management, I didn't see anything about the Spaghetti Bowl. The CA Group is currently doing that traffic study. That's not on there.
- Terry: Yeah, I wonder why not.
- Savage: So, that's something to look into.
- Kaiser: Well, this says just the agreements that have been entered into in the last six months. That agreement is older than six months ago. I think that was entered into, what last summer some time. These are just the last six months agreements from Project Management. Construction put all their agreements the last three years.
- Eyerly: I think that was run out of Design.
- [crosstalk]
- Kaiser: I'm not quite sure why.
- Eyerly: The Design [crosstalk] run out of Design.
- [crosstalk]
- Terry: That's a good catch, I don't know why that's not in there.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

[crosstalk]

Savage: It's not about me catching it. It's just about trying to take a quick snapshot. Like the contraction contract, work in progress format that you used back in 9A, if we can get something similar to that.

Kaiser: Okay.

Savage: Just work in progress.

Martin: Yeah, that's the close out documents.

Savage: Right, close out status. One of the things that I saw on the Louis Berger, US-395 Carson Highway, we're almost, I'd say 95% paid to Louis Berger for that work. I would think that we're good on final design.

Terry: Well, when we do design consultant agreements, we keep them open during construction to address shop drawings and issues that come up in the field. We tend to not close out design agreements until construction is complete. We may never spend that money.

Savage: That makes sense. Okay. That's all I had. Member Martin or Controller?

Martin: I'm good.

Savage: Mr. Controller?

Knecht: No.

Savage: Do we have any comments from Las Vegas or Elko or here in Carson City?

Martini: None in Las Vegas.

Savage: It's a good start. Thank you Kevin, thank you Mary. Back to you Mr. Kaiser.

Kaiser: Okay. Item No. 6, Unbalanced bidding. There's nothing new to report. If you see any of these items that you would like for me to remove from the agenda I can. Or, I can leave them on there and when something does come up, I can add it to the notes.

Savage: I think that's the reason they're there. I understand there is no work in progress.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: Like, unbalanced bidding is a good example, but it's nice to—

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Kaiser: Okay.
- Savage: Because we look at it every 30 days. You guys look at it every day. So, it's a good reminder for us.
- Kaiser: Okay. Okay, Item No. 7, NDOT Staff Update. Kimberley King who gave the presentation last March has moved back up to Juno, Alaska. We did hire a new Human Resources Manager. I didn't want to burden that new individual with this task, her first Construction Working Group. We'll get you updated numbers at the September CWG.
- Savage: Very good. Is it getting any better, I heard you say new blood?
- Kaiser: Well, yeah, I was—
- Savage: [crosstalk] –Resident Engineers?
- Kaiser: Yes, I mean, on that respect it is. They took them from our construction office or materials division. It was good for them, it might be a set back for somebody else.
- Savage: So, we'll look forward to that in September.
- Martin: It's called poaching. [laughter]
- Kaiser: Okay, Item 7B, Requested Reports and Documents. There was a number of AGC meetings we attended. Are there any questions in regards to any of those items we have in the packet? A lot of it is the same information we're going through today.
- Savage: Just one comment. Maybe this is for Megan. I saw the comment about the eDocs and the field manager. Are you having good success with that?
- Megan: We are—well, we haven't gotten any recent feedback, so no news is good news, from the contracting community. We have I would say at this point, six or seven different contractors that have contacted us to get information to sign up with the read only version. And that was the intent of putting it on the AGC's agenda to try to get information out to them. So far they all seem pleased with the ability to have more transparency, information of the contract.
- Savage: Thank you Megan. Mr. Kaiser.
- Kaiser: Okay. That completes Item No. 7.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Savage: Okay. If there are no other comments, we'll move to Agenda Item No. 8, Projects Under Development, the Five-Year Project Plan.

Terry: John Terry, Assistant Director. I didn't make any real presentation but I'll give you the same disclaimers we give every time we talk about the five-year plan. We don't have this much money. This is how much money, this is how many jobs we get ready to go out. This is what our designers are working on, whether they be consultants or our internal staff. The Over Program, that worked intentionally because things happen. With that, maybe I move to this current year. Today's Board Meeting we actually advertised—you know, we awarded two of our biggest in-house design jobs this year. I believe those two totaled like \$50M. We are right in the middle of, kind of our peak period this year of delivering projects. It will start slowing down through the summer. Then we get to federal kind of shut down period in the fall for a month and a half, two months.

We're looking real good for obligating our federal money this year. This year is looking good. Looking beyond that, there's some placeholders in there. They're not all real jobs in there. As you get out a few more years, especially in the major projects. I'd maybe add to that, a lot of things that were talked about at the Board Meeting are showing up on here. We now have a specific ADA Program. We have a specific landscaping and aesthetics program. We have Stand Aside Safety Projects. We have set aside pedestrian safety projects. They've all been populated in here within the last year. Again, they're a little over allocated. While we struggle with pedestrian safety on the rather aggressive schedule we had early on because we knew we were going to run into electrical and other issues, we're now starting to deliver a lot of those as well.

With that, I'll open it up to any questions.

Savage: I want to thank you Mr. Terry for being so receptive to the team who put these numbers in pedestrian safety. This is a major concern of the Board.

Martin: I have one question. The last one, [inaudible] Project, this is the one up in Tahoe?

[crosstalk]

Terry: Yeah, what do we call that, other?

Martin: Yeah, I don't know what to call that. There's not a lot of miles or roadway for us to wave our flags at, but that's not really our money. We're spending somebody else's money, aren't we?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Terry: It's a mixed bag. There's our money. There's some fed money. There's some Central Federal Lands money that is federal money that we wouldn't have gotten. There is some of our money as well. It's a mixed bag on that project. I don't know if you've got any more to add to that Paul.
- Dyson: Private money.
- Terry: Private money.
- Schneider: Washoe County money.
- Terry: Washoe County money, but there is some of our money in it. Yeah, I don't know which of these categories it actually fits into.
- Savage: If the—
- Martin: Community Service—
- Terry: Some of the work that we threw in, which was the water quality work, was work we would've done otherwise, that will play into this. The majority of the bike path—in other words, what others were going to do, that had money that we absorbed it and are delivering with ours.
- Savage: Because in May, I did ask for a list of funding sources. I never did get that. [crosstalk] I asked for it. And maybe—that was when Carl Hasting was speaking, I think and a lot of other—[crosstalk]
- Terry: Yeah, we should add that to Old Business and report on that.
- Martin: You gave us a list, I think it was almost nine—
- Savage: I didn't see a list.
- [crosstalk]
- Martin: He rattled them off—[crosstalk]
- Savage: He rattled it off.
- Martin: Like seven or eight or something like that, but nobody knew where the dollars were really coming from. And, more importantly, really what the total dollars were.
- Savage: Yeah.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Terry: It's in the [inaudible], but we could get—we should put that in old business and report [inaudible]. You did ask that question.
- Savage: And then, is there anything on this list with the Spaghetti Bowl and North Valleys? I couldn't find it.
- Terry: We had a place—I believe we just put a placeholder in the capacity, projects—
- Kaiser: I believe there's also some Traffic Operations projects listed in here. Is that right Denise?
- Inda: Yeah, I'm scrolling down to see. No, it should be still listed under—hang on. Yeah, the first—Page 5 of the Five-Year Plan, that's the Traffic Operations page. The first item on that list is the US-395 North Valleys ITS Project. That one is in direct response to Rudy wanting to get our project out soon.
- Terry: But we have placeholder for the bigger Spaghetti Bowl, but I believe it is 2021 or beyond. It does not show up on here.
- Savage: Okay. Thank you Mr. Terry for the Five-Year Plan. Any other questions or comments from anyone? If not, we'll move on to Agenda Item No. 9, briefing on the status of projects.
- Kaiser: Well, this last quarter, we closed out eight projects. I'd like to note that we closed out 3409, that's been hanging out there for a long time. Thank goodness that's now behind us, from the Construction Office anyway. I don't know if it is legally.
- I want to thank our Construction Office. They continue to work hard. We're down to two and half pages now. A little under two and a half pages.
- Martin: A little under two and a half pages.
- Kaiser: Yeah. So that's a real step forward in getting our projects closed out. We haven't heard anything from contractors complaining, at least I haven't, in a long time. So, that's nice.
- Martin: Just kind of curious here, under contract number—I'm looking here, like on Page 2, Contract No.—and underneath it, it says, FM, does that mean it's my job or? [laughter] Are you volunteering me for something Reid? See, underneath the job number it says FM.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Sizelove: That's just identifying if it's a field manned contract or if it's a conventional—or, legacy contract. It's internal—internally we know what it meant.
- Martin: Whew. [crosstalk] I didn't remember volunteering for that one. [crosstalk]
- Savage: On that same note, where do you differentiate between project management and construction? How can we tell by just looking at the snapshot?
- Kaiser: I'm not sure.
- Savage: On Page, Item 9A, there's two and a half pages of contract status, projects in progress.
- Freeman: For the record, this is Jeff Freeman, Chairman Savage. Construction Division will close out traditional design-bid-build projects and CMAR projects that run through our tracking system. The design-build projects go somewhere else. The close out process is through project management as well. We'll close out design-bid-build, CMARs and project management closes out design builds.
- Savage: But Jeff, my question is, where can I see that this project is with Project Management, CMAR, design-build or if it's design-bid-build? Is there a symbol or?
- Freeman: We note down CMARs, if you look down on—
- Kaiser: 3541.
- Freeman: 3541 is a CMAR, so we have—
- Savage: Right, I see the CMAR.
- Freeman: Design-builds aren't tracked on this.
- Savage: Why not?
- Freeman: We don't close those out. That's—project management closes them out. This is just what we close out. So, we don't—we don't gather the paperwork. We don't submit the as-builds. We don't audit it. That's what this is for, to track—to make sure we have all the certificates, we get done our audit. That's not our function in design-builds. So, we don't track it.
- Savage: But I remember other projects—I mean, not other projects—other task booklets where Amir's name for example is on some of these [inaudible]

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Speaker: [inaudible]
- Savage: What's that?
- Terry: We used to have [inaudible]
- Savage: We used to have them on there.
- Freeman: Those are major projects where he's listed as Project Manager. But, if it's a design-build project that's run through project management, they track payment, they do the close out. This is one for Construction Division.
- Kaiser: So like when 3580 which is the Boulder City Phase 1, when you guys get ready to close that out, that will have Amir's name on it?
- Tedford: Or the project manager.
- Kaiser: Well, I know, but he's the project manager on. So that wouldn't then?
- Freeman: No, that would list the REs who were tracking payment. Where you will see Amir's name show up is in the current projects. 9B, sheets down, that's where you'll start seeing who in project management or consultant design-build.
- Savage: Maybe I'm missing something here, but I mean, shouldn't we have all the projects?
- Tedford: Can I add, Darin Tedford for the record. When we had two lists before of the construction and the project management projects, you only had one list. There's not the other list is what Jeff is saying. There should be another list. It just isn't—that's the design-build projects. They don't get closed out the same. You're basically missing a list because it comes from Project Management.
- Savage: Just in this packet though but we've had it before.
- Tedford: For design-builds?
- Savage: Yes.
- Tedford: In the close out?
- Savage: In the—this isn't just close out, this is—
- Tedford: I think your 9A is close outs.
- Savage: 9A is not just close outs, I'm confused.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Tedford: Well, 9A is—

[crosstalk]

Freeman: 9A is close outs and the Construction Division has never tracked a design-build close out.

Eyerly: We haven't had a design-build to close out since—

[crosstalk]

Kaiser: No, we had Mesquite.

Eyerly: It's been a while though, since we've been able to add one.

Martin: What about 15-South?

[crosstalk]

Dyson: --longer ago.

Martin: That was a few years ago too.

Sizelove: And if I could, maybe add some additional clarification here. In the past, we have had a column that was specifically calling out the project manager in the event that like, Mr. Freeman suggested is that, if it was one of the larger projects, [inaudible] we would identify who that was, but not all projects have a project manager from the Project Management Division. So, in the interest of trying to clean up our form from the Construction Division standpoint, we eliminated that column, for close out block. This log --only has CMAR and the conventional delivery projects which is what we track through the Construction Division.

Lani: Steven Lani—part of the close out process which you're looking at on your 9A attachment are effectively contracts that are run through the Contract Administration, through the field manager and Legacy Systems. The design-builds are effectively an agreement that are paid off of a payment voucher system. They are not—they follow a separate process. They're under an agreement as opposed to a conventional construction contract. So, maybe that's part of the confusion as to why design contracts and closeout status are not on this attachment.

Savage: That makes sense.

Lani: Does that help a little bit?

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Savage: That helps, yeah. Yeah.

Lani: Whereas CMAR is under conventional construction contract

Savage: Yeah, that makes good sense. Thank you Megan. Any other questions on 9A? We'll move to 9B, Summary of Projects Closed.

Martin: 3409, you said you were done with it in the construction but not in the legal, is there something going on Dennis?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher. We've been contacted by a counsel representing one of the subcontractors. We expect there may be a legal action filed, but nothing yet.

Dyson: Thor Dyson, for the record. Is that a District 2 Project?

Martin: No, 1. District 1.

Martin: We can move it out there. [laughter]

[crosstalk]

Dyson: I'll take all I can get. [laughter]

Kaiser: Any questions on 9B?

Savage: Just congratulations, eight projects closed out.

Martin: That's awesome.

Savage: That's really, really nice.

Martin: That's one of the best months we've had, isn't it? Best quarters?

[crosstalk]

Kaiser: It's getting up there, yes. It's getting harder to get these things closed out because we're getting so few of them.

Martin: Yeah, I noticed there's just a couple that go back to '13 and '14.

Savage: I also noticed the cost savings too on the second to right column there. The total amount over and under budget. Just like to note the cost savings on three or four different projects. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 out of the 8 projects, NDOT has an overall cost savings on 6 out of 8 projects. Again, compliments to all the Divisions.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

- Martini: One comment regarding Capriati. Just an FYI, currently under the provision 4, quotes under \$250, there's a list of contractors that can propose on that work. Capriati is still on that list and has recently been proposing on our quotes. We are in the process of deciding how to address Capriati for future work.
- Savage: Point well made, Mary. I think that's a legal question to be discussed at a later point. Any other comments or conversation on Item 9B? With that, we'll move on to 9C, Projects Closed, and the details. This is backup from the previous section 9B. [pause] Any comments or questions from anyone? Okay. We'll move on to Agenda Item 9D, Status of Active Projects.
- Martin: The red is where you run into a dollar and/or schedule issue, right?
- Freeman: Correct.
- Kaiser: Yeah.
- Martin: And the yellow is just watch it.
- Freeman: We think it could be.
- Martin: So out of all of these that got reds on them, are most of them dollars or most of them scheduling? And, sometimes I know mostly they're tied together.
- Kaiser: Why would 3580 be red?
- Freeman: 3580 is Boulder Bypass.
- Kaiser: Yeah.
- Freeman: And, I'm pretty sure we're going to use up all the contingencies.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Martin : Pretty soon what?
- Freeman: We're going to use up all the contingencies on Boulder Bypass.
- Lani: Some of these, on like 3580, the adjusted contract bid amount, which includes the bid amount, plus or minus any authorized change orders to date already exceeds the original agreement estimate budgeted amount. So, even though we have not certainly expended that, we already anticipate that if we were to fully utilize all the funding within the change orders that are out there to date, we will in fact exceed the budgeted amount for the contract.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Martin: So, what's driving the change orders on that one? Because it can't be what, 35-40% complete?

Freeman: Yeah, we're around there.

Freeman: Mostly utilities, yeah. It's all mostly utilities.

Martini: This is Mary Martini, District Engineer in Las Vegas. The Phase 1 Project has several large change orders, either in process of executing or have been executed. One addresses those [inaudible] utility concerns. Two, addressed the division or work between Phase 1 and Phase 2, to eliminate the overlap between two different contractors. The third one is to address some items in the bridge that will address maintenance, future maintenance. Those are the large ones.

Savage: Who is the Engineer of Record on that project?

Kaiser: NDOT is.

Savage: [pause] I don't have any further questions or comments, anything further Frank or Mr. Controller?

Martin: No, nothing.

Savage: Any other comments or questions here in Carson City? Las Vegas? And Elko? Okay, we'll do a quick Item No. E, Partnering/Dispute process. Lisa.

Schettler: Good afternoon. Lisa Schettler. So, we finished up our training this year for DRT and contractor, NDOT staff and also for potential DRT candidates. We're going to offer the training again early next year. It really increased our pool of candidates for future DRTs to choose from that are trained specifically in Nevada. Another thing we've done is, on the NDOT website, we have both Partnering and the Dispute Resolution pages. The list of partnering facilitators and the list of DRT candidates along with a link to their resume. So both contractors and NDOT people have access to that list and they can, in their selection process, read the resumes and whatnot. We're trying to put that in and our candidate list has increased quite a bit with our recent training.

Also, for our FHWA/NDOT partnering project, we had a meeting recently with our expert panel and we refined our agenda for the upcoming conference. It's going to be a half a day of pre-conference training on Monday, September 26th. Then a day and a half conference that will address innovative and effective partnering practices. We're moving forward with that.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Our next Nevada AGC Meeting up here in the North is currently scheduled for June 17th. That's all I had, any questions?

Martin: Are we having—a few years ago or so we were having issues with partnering not going very deep. Are we having better luck getting our REs bought into the partnering and the contractors getting bought into the partnering now then what we had at that point in time? I just remember a conversation going back, this was quite a while ago, that partnering was not extremely successful for us.

Kaiser: Steve or Jeff could probably comment on this, and Mary and Kevin and Thor. Just from my perspective, I would have to say it is because I'm not hearing a whole bunch of issues out in the field. They're not getting elevated to me, so that's telling me that they're solving them. That they're probably still having them because construction has issues. And so, they're solving them on the job or at the district level. I'm not hearing about it, that's a good sign in my opinion.

Savage: But you're not saying you don't have anything to do. [laughter] No, that's good. It's good to hear there is passion and engagement from the contractors because it's all the legal costs that we want to avoid at the end of the day. It's good to hear that Frank.

Martin: It is.

Savage: Thank you Lisa.

Dyson: Thor Dyson from District 2. I think partnering is working quite well. There are some lively discussions at times on various jobs for various reasons. Some of those are inherit to NDOT and some of those are inherit to the contractor. I can very clearly tell you, I'm very pleased to tell you that we're working through the issues and resolving as many as we can at the lowest level.

I also think with the economy improving and the projects are being bid and there's less controversy on the projects, I'm not sure I'm articulating this very clearly, but it seems like, we're getting off—we're getting good plans. Whether they're consultants or they're from in-house designers. We're also getting some good team work from the contractors and NDOT staff as well.

So, partnering is needed, particularly on the complex and tricky projects. We've got to have it. It should occur on all projects, informally as well as formally.

Knecht: Question on that last comment Thor, you said with the economy improving, we're second longest continuous expansion. It's been the weakest but it's also been the

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

second longest in many decades. Some people think in the labor statistics from Friday tend to suggest that we may be at the end of it. Will things get worse if the economy gets worse?

Dyson: Potentially. There are certain projects, when economic times are difficult, the contractor will potentially bid a job where they, how can I put it politically correct—they'll low ball the bid to get the job to keep the iron moving and their people working. And so you see less of that, there's less controversy.

I think the struggles we're facing right now at NDOT is having the staffing and resources, the people, the expertise to manage the jobs and the contractors are having staffing and resources from individuals to man their jobs. So, therein lies the real difficulties now and we realize that, you know, we need to help them and they need to help us because we're shorthanded on both sides of the fence.

Savage: Thank you Mr. Controller. Thank you Thor. That just—something comes to my mind. I think in today's T-Board Meeting, we saw a couple of areas where there were only two proposers on some of the consultants. Contractors were still getting three or four different bids with the contractors. I think it's important that the Department look at it internally and possibly reach out to some people that we haven't seen bids from or proposals from on the consultant side. I know things are getting busy out there but it's nice to have that pool. It's nice to know as a contractor and probably a consultant that, hey we're still welcome to NDOT. The door is open. We'd like to see your RFP, whatever it might be. I'd hate to get down to just two submittals. Just a comment.

That being said, are there any other comments in Carson City? Las Vegas? Mary?

Martini: We're good.

Savage: And, Elko, any comments?

Elko: No additional comments.

Savage: Okay. So, we'll go to Agenda Item No. 10, is there any public comment in Carson City, Las Vegas or Elko? No there is not. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 11, do we have a motion to—I take that back Mr. Gallagher. We don't need to close the session because there's no—

Gallagher: No items for discussion.

Transcript of Nevada Department of Transportation
Construction Work Group Meeting
June 6, 2016

Savage: No items for discussion. We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 12 for adjournment, is there a motion to adjourn?

Martin: So moved.

Knecht: Second.

Savage: Second, all in favor, aye. [eyes around] Thank you everyone, have a good day.

[end of meeting]

DRAFT



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

MEMORANDUM

August 26, 2016

TO: Department of Transportation Board of Directors
Construction Working Group

FROM: Rudy Malfabon, Director

SUBJECT: September 12, 2016 Construction Working Group Meeting

Item #5 : Presentation on Right of Way Process – *Informational Item Only*

Summary:

Whenever Federal funds are used in a project involving the acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of real property, a Federal law known as the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (URA) applies. The purpose of the URA is to provide uniform, fair and equitable treatment for persons whose real property is acquired or for persons displaced as a result of a Federally funded project or activity.

The URA establishes minimum standards for federally funded programs and projects that require acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of real property and displaced persons from their homes, businesses or farms. The government-wide regulations implementing URA are at 23 CFR Part 710 and 49 CFR Part 24

Background:

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (the uniform Act), became effective January 2, 1971. For the first time, the United States had adopted measures to be uniformly applied whenever the federal government acquired real property or when property acquisition involved the use of federal funds. The Act sets minimum standards of benefits and compensation for relocation advisory and financial benefits, and established basic standards and requirements for appraisal and acquisition to be followed in acquiring real property.

Analysis:

The Right of Way Division has prepared a brief presentation to describe its federally approved processes for the acquisition or property, relocation of businesses, persons, non-profits and farms implemented to ensure compliance with the URA on Federally funded projects and projects on Federal Highway System roadways.

Recommendation:

Informational item only.

Prepared by:

Ruth Borrelli, Chief Right-of-Way Agent

	SUBJECT	STATUS	DUE D...	M...	DIN FOLDER	C?
☑	Item 01: Contractor Prequalification	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	8:45	N...	☐
☑	Item 02: NDOT DBE Process and Workforce Development	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	9:26	N...	☐
☑	Item 03: As-Builts	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	9:28	N...	☐
☑	Item 04: CMAR Change Orders and Agreements	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	9:28	N...	☐
☑	Item 05: NDOT Staff Update	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	8:42	N...	☐
☑	Item 06: Resident Engineer's project assignments	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	9:42	N...	☐
☑	Item 07: Unbalanced Bidding	In Progress	Mon 9/12/...	10:...	N...	☐

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 01: Contractor Prequalification
Start Date: Thursday, February 19, 2015
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 75%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

Draft revised Contractor Past Performance Rating to be presented to contractors at our September AGC meetings.

Contractor Past Performance Rating

Contract Number:		Resident Engineer:			Date:	Score: 0.00
Contractor Name:				Route:	County:	District: Choose one...
Notice to Proceed Date:	Work Starting Date:	Contract Working Days:	Working Days Added by Change Orders:		Working Days Charged:	Completion Date:
Construction Engineering \$ to Date:		Liquidated Damages Assessed (\$):	Total # of Change Orders:		Total Change Order (\$):	
Description of Work:			Award Amount (\$):		Final Payment Amount (\$):	

Notes: Check the corresponding box for each line item. When the "N/A" box is checked for an item, the associated points are removed and subtracted from the Points Total for the section. In addition, these points do not factor into the rating for the section or the overall score, as reflected in each item's Rating.

I. Numerical Rating								
A. Administration/Management/Supervision (15 Points Total)	N/A	Inadequate	Below Std	Standard	Above Std	Superior	Points	Rating
Efficient management of Subcontractors and Suppliers. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Sufficient labor force for the project requirements. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Project was equipped properly. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Items of deficiency and/or incomplete work were addressed timely and in accordance with Subsection 104.05 and 108.09 of the Specifications. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor's Quality Control (Q/C) plan was submitted and in a timely manner. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Material Certifications were submitted and in a timely matter. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Section A Total							0.0	0.00 %
B. Quality of Work (25 Points Total)	N/A	Inadequate	Below Std	Standard	Above Std	Superior	Points	Rating
Contractor Q/C and testing results were submitted in a timely matter. (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor was effective in implementation and utilization of their Q/C Plan. (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor maintained control over material consistency. (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor maintained control over material placement. (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor workmanship required zero rework. (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Section B Total							0.0	0.00 %
C. Progress of Work (15 Points Total)	N/A	Inadequate	Below Std	Standard	Above Std	Superior	Points	Rating
Preliminary and Baseline Schedules were submitted in accordance with Section 108.02 of the Specifications. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Weekly look ahead schedules accurately represented the ongoing work. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor provided an accurate 2-3 week look ahead. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Monthly updates (for project over 120 working days) were submitted timely and accurately represented the ongoing and upcoming work. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Subcontractors and Material Deliveries were scheduled appropriately. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Schedules accurately matched workflow and material availability. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Section C Total							0.0	0.00 %

D. Compliance with Laws and Contract Requirements (15 Points Total)	N/A	Inadequate	Below Std	Standard	Above Std	Superior	Points	Rating
Payroll was submitted weekly and per specification. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Requests to Sublet and/or Request to Utilize Service Providers submitted prior to needing subcontractors. (1 pt)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Prompt payment was made to subcontractors. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Contractor submitted a DBE Utilization Plan. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
DBE goal was met and well documented. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Good faith effort was made and documented appropriately. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
DBE Utilization Plan was followed and updated regularly. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Section D Total							0.0	0.00 %
E. Public Safety and Traffic Control (15 Points Total)	N/A	Inadequate	Below Std	Standard	Above Std	Superior	Points	Rating
Contractor's submitted Safety Plan was implemented, followed and updated timely and appropriately. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Project site was maintained in a clean and safe manner. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
The project was free of any jobsite accidents. (4 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Traffic Control Supervisor was available and responsive. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Daily T/C Work Zone reports were submitted timely and accurately. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Section E Total							0.0	0.00 %
F. Environmental Compliance (15 Points Total)	N/A	Inadequate	Below Std	Standard	Above Std	Superior	Points	Rating
The NOI with SWPPP was filed in a timely manner. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
The SWPPP was accurately maintained throughout the project. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
BMPs were installed and maintained effectively. (3 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Project was free of suspensions due to non-compliance. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Dust was adequately controlled on project and Air Quality was monitored. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
All Biological Clearances were obtained and reports were completed. (2 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
The project was free of formal environmental complaints from stakeholders. (1 pt)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.0	0.00 %
Section F Total							0.0	0.00 %
II. Narrative Rating (10 BONUS points at the Resident Engineer's discretion)								
Superior Elements Enter comments, select points (1 - 10) and a description of the contractor's overall superior performance for criteria not addressed above.							Points	Rating
							<input type="checkbox"/> 0	0.00 %
							<input type="checkbox"/> 1	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 3	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 5	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 7	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
							<input type="checkbox"/> 9	
<input type="checkbox"/> 10								
TOTAL SCORE (NUMERICAL RATING + NARRATIVE RATING, CANNOT EXCEED SCORE OF 100)							0.00	%

III. Reasons for 'Inadequate' or 'Below Standard'		
A. Administration/Management/Supervision:		
B. Quality of Work:		
C. Progress of Work:		
D. Compliance with Laws and Contract Requirements:		
E. Public Safety and Traffic Control:		
F. Environmental Compliance:		
IV. Authentication and Review		
I certify that I have objectively prepared this report, basing it upon data contained in available project records and discussed the report with the contractor.		
<u>Resident Engineer Name (Print)</u>	<u>Resident Engineer Signature</u>	<u>Date</u>
Assistant District Engineer Comments:		
<u>Assistant District Engineer Name (Print)</u>	<u>Assistant District Engineer Signature</u>	<u>Date</u>
Contractor Comments:		
<u>Project Manager or Contractor designee's Name (Print)</u>	<u>Project Manager or Contractor designee's Signature</u>	<u>Date</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> I request a review <input type="checkbox"/> I DO NOT request a review		

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CONFIDENTIAL PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT
CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS

INSTRUCTIONS: Upon completion of a contract this form must be filled out by the Resident Engineer and the District Engineer and then forwarded directly to the Construction Office. In the event there is a change of personnel (RE or DE), fill out this form and submit it as indicated above.

Choose One: Prime Contractor Subcontractor Specialty Contractor

Date of Report: _____ Director's Acceptance Date: _____

Contract No.: _____ Project No.: _____

Description:

Contractor: _____

Address: _____

Amount of Work: _____ Type of Work: _____

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 13 USING THE FOLLOWING PERCENTAGES:

Poor.....0-60% Average.....71-80% Very good or
Fair.....61-70% Good.....81-90% excellent.....91-100%

GROUP 1 - COOPERATION

Note: Each question has a maximum value of 100 percent. Group 1 Rating is the average of total values.

To what degree was the contractor cooperative with:

- 1. The Department?..... 0%
 - 2. County and Municipal Officials?..... 0%
 - 3. Adjacent property owners, considerate of their rights (ingress & egress, noise & dust)?..... 0%
 - 4. Providing protection for the public?..... 0%
 - 5. Equal employment opportunity requirement?..... 0%
 - 6. Safety requirement?..... 0%
 - 7. Others?..... 0%
 - (a)..... 0%
- GROUP 1 RATING (Maximum 100 %)... 0%

GROUP 2 - FURNISHING AND ORGANIZING THE JOB

Note: Each question has a maximum value of 100 percent. Group 2 Rating is the average of total values.

To what degree was the contractor:

- 8. Properly supervising the job?..... 0%
 - 9. Properly manning the job?..... 0%
 - 10. Properly equipping the job?..... 0%
 - 11. Maintaining consistent progress on the job?..... 0%
 - Organizing the job?..... 0%
 - 12. Others?..... 0%
 - (a)..... 0%
- GROUP 2 RATING (Maximum 100 %)... 0%

GROUP 3 - QUALITY OF WORK

Note: Each question has a maximum value of 100 percent. Group 3 Rating is the average of total values.

To what degree was the contractor:

13. Maintaining the quality of work?..... 0%
GROUP 3 RATING (Maximum 100%)... 0%

RE REMARKS (Mandatory)

AVERAGE OF TOTAL VALUES (GROUPS 1, 2, AND 3 MAXIMUM 100 PERCENT) 0%

RESIDENT ENGINEER

DATE _____

DISTRICT REMARKS

DISTRICT ENGINEER

DATE _____

Kaiser, Reid G

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

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 25%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

DBE update will be made at the meeting.

NDOT has been working with the Southern and Northern Nevada AGC, UNR and UNLV to develop strategies to attract young workers to the construction industry. Tracy Larkin has been leading this for NDOT and will give a status update at the meeting.

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 03: As-Builts
Start Date: Monday, September 14, 2015
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 75%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

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

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 04: CMAR Change Orders and Agreements
Start Date: Monday, March 2, 2015
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 50%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

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 05: NDOT Staff Update
Start Date: Monday, March 14, 2016
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 0%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

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

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

Projected Retirements: 423 (24.16%) in next 5 years, 717 (41%) in next 10 years

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

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

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

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

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 06: Resident Engineer's project assignments
Start Date: Monday, September 12, 2016
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

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.

	357 EA 73548	FR EU 02 Dunphy area replace substandard structure G-324 AND B-395	Bradshaw		\$7,835,000.00		N 05/12/2014	Q&D		220	200	4/12/16	100%																										
	73636	US 6 from SR 318 to Ely, WP 13.919 to WP 36.447 3" CIR, 2" PBS, 3/4" OG	Bradshaw	\$16,000,000			FY 2016																																
		US 93 North of McGill WP 66.99 to 75.99		\$6,100,000			FY 2016																																
	EA 73636	US 6 FROM THE JUNCTION WITH SR 318 TO 0.30 MILES EAST OF MURRY STREET. MP WP 13.71 TO WP 36.78 3 INCH COLD IN-PLACE RECYCLE AND 2 INCH PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE WITH 3/4 INCH OPEN GRADED WEARING COURSE.	Bratzler	\$14,828,453			D 11-16-16																																
	73650	US 50 FM INTR RUTH/KIMBERLY RD, APPROX MP WP 61.794, E THROUGH ELY, AND S ON GREAT BASIN BLVD, US 50, TO INTR WITH US 6, APPROX MP WP 68.432; AND US 93 FM INTR WITH US 50, APPROX MP WP 53.639 US 93 N APPROX .63 MI TO APPROX MP WP 54.273. US 50 MP WP 61.794 TO 66.343: COLDMILL 1 1/2", DENSE GRADE 3" PBS, 3/4" PBS OPEN GRADED; US 50 MP WP 66.343 TO 68.432: EXCAVATION 14 3/4", GEOTEXTILE, 8" TYPE 1 CLASS B AGGREGATE BASE, 6" PBS DENSE GRADE, 3/4" PBS OPEN GRADE, TRENCH/WIDEN STRUCTURAL SECTION. US 93 MP WP 53.639 TO 54.273: EXCAVATE 14 3/4", GEOTEXTILE, 8" TYPE 1 CLASS B AGGREGATE BASE, 6" PBS DENSE GRADE, 3/4" PBS OPEN GRADE.	Bradshaw	\$2,775,622			FY 2017																																
	73973	MY 919, ELY MAINTENANCE YARD, US 93 MP WP 54.28, DRAINAGE AND WASH PAD IMPROVEMENTS, REPAVE MAINTENANCE YARD		\$545,000																																			
	3635, 60723	I 80, at structures G-884 and G-885; Install scour mitigation and erosion control on and under structures within UPRR and I-80 Rights of Way	EZELL, BILLY	\$300,000	\$354,000.54			MKD Construction INC.			30																												
	Crew 912 Totals			\$0	\$14,097,781.22																																		

Project ID	Project Name	City	Amount	Start Date	End Date	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP	MP													
301	Averett	3631	MY 927, North Fork Maintenance Yard, at SR 225 Drainage improvements and repave maintenance yard	Angel	\$890,000	B 4/28/16		60	40	8/22/16	70%																																												
			LPA Off system, City of Elko, Jennings Way from Bluffs Way to Sagecrest Dr, Sidewalk, curb & gutter, bike lane striping and landscaping.	Morton City of Elko	\$356,000	A 08/07/2014	TBD	TBD	0		0%																																												
		EA 73972	Wells Maint. Yard Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements	Peters	\$295,000	FY 17																																																	
			LPA Off system, City of Elko, Ruby Vista Dr from Skyline to Ruby View Dr, Golf Course Rd from Ruby Vista to Cedar St, Flagview Dr from Golf Course Rd to Country Club Dr., sidewalk, curb & gutter, bike lane striping from Bluffs Way to Sagecrest Dr.	Morton City of Elko	\$627,500	A 08/08/2015	TBD	TBD	0		0%																																												
			LPA Off system, City of West Wendover, Florence Way Mesa St. to Camper Dr, lighting, pedestrian, bicycle improvements	Morton City of West Wendover	\$2,345,326	A 07/29/2016	TBD	TBD	0		0%																																												
		60655	MY 931, RUBY VALLEY MAINTENANCE YARD, AT SR 229 MP EL 35.45; DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, REPAVE MAINTENANCE YARD		\$500,000																																																		
		60745	US 93, EL CO TO WP CO, EL MP 0.00 TO MP 11.90, EL MP 96.00 TO EL MP 102.20, AND WP MP 112.76 TO WP MP 116.69; 1/2-INCH CHIP SEAL BETTERMENT		\$1,035,592																																																		
		60743	SR 278, EU CO, EUREKA RD/CARLIN RD EU MP 20.23 TO EU MP 35.33; CHIP SEAL AND SEAL COAT-BETTERMENT		\$1,183,455																																																		
		73924	US 93, ELKO COUNTY, AT JACKPOT. MP EL 141.76; INSTALL NEVADA STATE ENTRANCE GATEWAY MONUMENT		\$283,750																																																		
			Fencing projects, various areas, DISTRICT QUOTE, SR225, US93		\$500,000																																																		
			Rock Scaling, Connors and Murray Summits, DISTRICT QUOTE		\$500,000																																																		
			District Support Crew 301 Totals		\$4,513,826																																																		
304	Lindeman																																																						
			District Admin Crew 304 Totals		\$0																																																		
307	Hesterlee																																																						
			District Admin Crew 307 Totals		\$126,095,821																																																		

District 3 totals			#REF!	#REF!																																			
		Future Work																																					
Consultant?		60754, US 50, LA CO/EU CO/WP 60758, CO, FROM AUSTIN 73951 MAINTENANCE STATION 12385, MP LA 24.475 TO MP WP 72.246																																					
			\$2,415,000																																				
		District 3 Future work totals		#REF!																																			

Kaiser, Reid G

Subject: Item 07: Unbalanced Bidding
Start Date: Monday, September 14, 2015
Due Date: Monday, September 12, 2016

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 75%

Total Work: 0 hours
Actual Work: 0 hours

Owner: Kaiser, Reid G

Nothing new to report.

AGC/NDOT COMMITTEE
12:00 p.m., Friday, June 17, 2016
Atlantis Casino-Paradise E Ballroom

AGENDA

1. Self-Introductions
2. Review minutes of previous meeting dated Friday, March 18, 2016
3. NDOT Stormwater Division – **David Gaskin**
 - a. Division Update
 - b. EPA Enforcement Settlement Update
 - c. Changes in Bid Documents to reflect Stormwater
4. FAST Act Update – **Rudy Malfabon**
 - a. Northern Nevada Impact
5. Spaghetti Bowl – **John Terry**
6. Twelve Month Project List – **John Terry**
7. IRI Specifications – **Sharon Foerschler**
 - a. PWL Specifications/Testing
8. B2G DBE Reporting of Third Tier Subcontractors – **Teri Lewis**
 - a. Direct phone number for B2GNow questions for contractors is 602-490-0809
9. Smarter Work Zones – **Paul Schneider**
10. Partnering Program Update – **Lisa Schettler**
 - a. September FHWA Meeting
11. District(s) Update – **Thor Dyson/Kevin Lee/Mario Gomez**
12. Personnel Changes – **Rudy Malfabon**
13. Project Closeout – **Sharon Foerschler**
14. Upcoming AGC Events
 - a. AGC Community Outreach Senior Citizen Toiletry Drive – Monday, 6/13/16 to Friday, 6/12/16
 - b. AGC Safety Awards Celebration – 2:30 p.m., Friday, June 24, 2016
 - c. AGC Mixer Sponsored by Construction Leadership Council – 4:00 p.m., Wednesday, July 27, 2016 – IMBIB Custom Brews
15. Other
16. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 12:00 noon, Friday, September 16, 2016 at TBD

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

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

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

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

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

AGC/NDOT COMMITTEE
12:00 p.m., Friday, June 17, 2016
Atlantis Casino-Paradise E Ballroom

DRAFT MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order at 12:17 p.m. by Chairman Dan LeBlanc and those present introduced themselves.
2. Minutes of previous meeting dated Friday, March 18, 2016 were reviewed and accepted as presented.
3. NDOT Deputy Director Dave Gaskin provided an update on the Stormwater Division.
 - a. Hiring necessary positions is continuous. Current efforts are being made to fill positions in the Districts. All key management personnel have been hired.
 - b. NDEP, NDOT and EPA Officials have agreed to the final consent decree. It is anticipated that the Board of Examiners will approve the recommended settlement at the July 12 meeting. NDOT will be required to pay a find for final settlement.
 - c. Bid Documents are anticipated to be updated to reflect Stormwater requirements. Section 637 of the Silver Book will be updated. It is anticipated that all parties will be encouraged to resolve any issues at the lowest possible level. Pre-job conferences will be encouraged to discuss Stormwater issues.
4. NDOT Director Rudy Malfabon updated members on the recently enacted FAST Act. This act establishes a \$10 million freight program in Nevada. NDOT staff is researching what projects can be established with this funding. NDOT officials have been warned of a potential \$22 billion rescission in transportation funding in FY 2017. It is not known what the specific impact will be to Nevada, but will impact all state DOT's federal funding availability if enacted by Congress. The additional \$30 million allocated by the legislature from DMV fees to the highway fund will begin being deposited in July of 2016. Those additional revenues should allow for some additional projects.
5. NDOT Assistant Director John Terry provided an update on the I-80/US395 Spaghetti Bowl. The transportation board provided guidance to begin environmental processes to rebuild the intersection. The NEPA process will begin next month. It is anticipated that a full Environmental Impact Study will be required. The initial process is anticipated to take a minimum of three years.
6. Mr. Terry provided the NDOT Twelve Month Project List to committee members. Several significant projects in North Nevada were discussed. Mr. Terry discussed the delays in delivering the Glendale Avenue project, but stated many difficulties had been overcome.
7. NDOT Chief Construction Engineer Sharon Foerschler discussed the implementation of IRI Specifications. NDOT is using the FHWA baseline for IRI. NDOT is testing the smoothness of a roadway prior to construction and upon completion for ride specifications. The first three projects (one in each division) have been identified. Due to a three year implementation of the IRI specifications, additional opportunities will be made available to improve the program.
8. Teri Lewis discussed issues with the B2G DBE Reporting of Third Tier Subcontractors. A temporary method for reporting has been created. Contractors should look to report as lower tier subcontractors on the same payment. A direct phone number was provided for contractors to work directly with B2G. Improvements to the software are being researched and a fix will be provided.
9. NDOT Deputy Director Bill Hoffman reported on the Nevada STIC initiative for Smarter Work Zones. The STIC has identified \$100,000 to research technological solutions to improve work zone safety. Improved mobility in work zones is also being considered. FHWA sponsored a webinar for NDOT and interested parties on this topic. Peer exchanges with states utilizing existing technologies are being considered for improved information gathering.

10. Lisa Schettler updated committee members on the NDOT Partnering Program. NDOT is working with FHWA to host a meeting in Sparks on partnering. All contractors members were encouraged to attend the meeting.
11. District II Engineer Thor Dyson provided an update on activities in District II. Mr. Dyson reminded contractors to submit requests for consideration to work on the upcoming July 4th holiday weekend. Anyone witnessing homelessness camps should report them to the district II office. Mr. Dyson stated that he is approximately 40 positions short currently. NDOT continues to experience difficulties filling positions due to the uptick in the construction economy.
12. Ms. Foerschler provided members a list of projects waiting to be closed out. She encourage any member to contact her office with questions on specific projects.
13. Chair LeBlanc reviewed the following upcoming AGC Events:
 - a. AGC Community Outreach Senior Citizen Toiletry Drive – Monday, 6/13/16 to Friday, 8/12/16
 - b. AGC Safety Awards Celebration – 2:30 p.m., Friday, June 24, 2016
 - c. AGC Mixer Sponsored by Construction Leadership Council – 4:00 p.m., Wednesday, July 27, 2016 – IMBIB Custom Brews
14. There being no further business, the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 12:00 noon, Friday, September 16, 2016.
15. The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

cc: Trish Bullentini-Kuzanek
 President
Dan LeBlanc, Chair
 Kurt Matzoll, Vice Chair
 Chris Burke
Jack Byrom
 Jim Cain
 Daniel Caldwell
 Sergio Callegari
 Mark Casey
 Matt Cates
 Jason Clack
 Keith Comphef
 Fred Courrier
Marty Crew
Emma Crossman
 Don Crowell
Randy Cunningham
 Bill Darnell
 Jon Del Santo
 Vance DeMars
 Michele Dennis
 Jim Dodson
Ruedy Edgington
 Jeff Freeman

Jason Fritz
 Robert Gelu
 Maverick Gibbons
 Louis Ginocchio
Shane Glenn
Dan Gotta
Matt Gotta
 Mike Grock
Kevin Hamilton
 Buzz Harris
Will Hellickson
Tom Herschbach
Scott Hiatt
 Ross Hiserodt
 Craig Holt
George Jordy
 Kyle Larkin
 Verdie Legg
Kevin Linderman
Tom Massaro
 Barry McKeegan
Steve Moon
 Tina Mudd
 Doug Olsen
 Dan Peterson

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

Thor Dyson
Sharon Foerschler
David Gaskin
Mario Gomez
Stephanie Lani
Teri Lewis
Rudy Malfabon
Lisa Schettler
Darin Tedford
John Terry

Also present:
Seth Alexander
Brett Amesbury
Melinda Elizondo
Caleb Juve
Craig Madole
Paul Schneider
Jaisha Webb

NDOT:
Rick Bosch
Michele Dennis

NDOT/Industry Liaison Meeting
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 21, 2016
AGC Office – 5400 Mill Street, Reno

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Review of minutes from the March 22, 2016 meeting
3. Stormwater Enforcement Settlement Update
4. FAST Act/NDOT Funding
 - a. TRIP Report
5. Spaghetti Bowl
6. Licensing of Subcontractors Performing Specialty Work
7. Workforce Development
8. 2017 Legislative Priorities
9. Staff Update
10. 2016 Meeting Dates
 - a. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 20, 2016 – Need to reschedule
 - b. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, December 13, 2016
11. Open Discussion
12. Adjourn

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

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

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

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

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Meeting was called to order by Co-Chairman David Gaskin at 10:00 a.m. and those present introduced themselves.
2. Minutes from the previous meeting dated December 1, 2015 were reviewed and accepted as presented.
3. NDOT Deputy Director David Gaskin provided an update on the NDOT Stormwater Division. Management employees have been hired and are in place. Hiring has begun for positions to be located within the District Offices. Training is being developed for specialized modules. The Advisory Committee on Transportational Stormwater Management met for the required oversight as provided in enabling legislation. NDOT has developed a website for the division and is beginning public outreach. NDOT will be developing an asset management system for all Stormwater assets. NDOT is tracking all maintenance within existing systems.
4. Reid Kaiser discussed the NDOT Percent Within Limits Program. A meeting was held on February 22 on the issue. Dispute testing is being considered. NDOT is performing all acceptance testing. Meetings are ongoing in regards to mix design. Three projects will be awarded during the upcoming construction season featuring the PWL requirements. A contract has been awarded in District Three. NDOT has expressed the intent to utilize PWL on all jobs with greater than 25,000 tons of paving. A tiered approach to tightening PWL restrictions is being considered. Currently only dense grade paving is being considered.
5. Tracy Larkin-Thomason discussed the AGC/NDOT working group focused on workforce development. NDOT is considering the creation of construction camps focused on 4th through 6th grade children. Currently, NDOT is considering hosting one camp in Northern Nevada and one in Southern Nevada. It is anticipated that these camps will provide exposure to the skilled trades. Externships are being considered for 11th and 12th grade students to expose construction management opportunities to students. Ms. Larkin-Thomason will be providing statewide apprenticeship numbers to committee members.
6. Sharon Foerschler updated members on Dispute Resolution Teams. Currently, NDOT is planning on using DRT's on all construction projects over \$10 million. DRT's have not been implemented, yet. The contract is being finalized and forms are being developed for implementation of the DRT's. A pool of six DRT members will be considered with NDOT picking one member, the contractor picking one member and a collaborative choice will be made for the third member. Some complex projects below the \$10 million threshold will have DRT's assigned for construction. Training in all three districts is scheduled to occur in the upcoming months for DRT members. Reciprocity will be allowed for DRT training received in other states.
7. NDOT Director Rudy Malfabon discussed NDOT funding and projects. Bonds have been sold for the Project Neon design-build project. NDOT intends to maintain a minimum highway fund balance of \$120 million. USA Parkway is going to be a state funded project. Litigation is pending for the Project Neon right of way procurement. Settlement is anticipated in the fall. The Glendale project in Northern Nevada has been delayed due to on street parking and for the request to transfer the road to the City of Sparks. An on call list of

consultants and designers is being utilized to assist in delivering projects faster without federal funding. Bridge maintenance projects will be a priority for future funding.

8. Mr. Kaiser discussed NDOT hiring TetraTech to assist with the Naturally Occurring Asbestos in Southern Nevada. It is NDOT's intent to have a geologist test rock formation to determine potential locations of NOA. Ten sources in Clark County have been identified where NOA is not present.
9. Ms. Larkin-Thomason discussed the expansion of training acceptance for flagger certifications. Training programs may request their programs be reviewed for certification of NDOT projects. NDOT continues to accept LTAP, AASHTO and NDOT in-house training.
10. Mr. Mafabon provided an update on key staff. Ruth Bartelli has been named the Right of Way Division Chief. NDOT is broadening internships for multiple positions. NDOT continues to experience difficulty in hiring due to the limited people available.
11. Under other business, Mr. Kaiser noted that NDOT will be modifying prequalification requirements. Contractors past performance rating will be considered. Resident Engineers are reviewing the requirements prior to sending to AGC for comment. Ms. Larkin-Thomason discussed changes to DBE tracking. A utilization plan of when DBE's will be used will be required. Ms. Foerschler stated that NDOT will provide a list of projects to be completed in the next ten years if Fuel Tax Indexing is passed in Clark County..
12. The 2016 Meeting Dates were reviewed.
13. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:44 a.m.

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

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

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

**NEVADA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT MEETING
July 27, 2016**

AGENDA

1. Plans for 2017 Construction Camp (6,7, & 8 grades)
 - a. intent is to introduce construction
 - b. Pilot in process
 - c. Southern Nevada -targeted at-risk schools

2. website update

3. Provide accredited development hours to teachers/educators
 - a. topic - construction as a viable career path (e.g. skilled trades, construction management,)
 - b. AGC Reno has a current accredited program with Washoe County School District. 2 days, 15 hours.
 - c. Seek statewide accreditation with school board
 - d. Establish educator externship program in Las Vegas (Clark County) within 12 months
 - e. provide outreach to rural counties - in process

4. Do It 4U - Pre-apprenticeship program (18+)
 - a. Classroom instruction of math and soft skills
 - b. Pilot program with RTC, NDOT, contractor, union
 - c. Working with Foundation for Independent Tomorrow (FIT) to screen applicants- in process - training starts July 9, 2016

5. Externships/Internships - 11 and 12 graders
 - a. Expose them to the work environment

6. Construction Management Curriculum – UNLV
 - a. Discuss program with UNLV what would contractors like to see more of?
 - b. Joint recruitment efforts?
 - c. Adopt a school?

RFP 248-16-040 - Contract 3629 - C903 Augmentation - I-15 Craig to Speedway					
DCS Personnel		Horrocks Engineers		Aztech Inspections & Testing (DBE)	
Name	Position	Name	Position	Name	Position
Michael Johnson	Principal Engineer	Lee Jacoby	Inspector IV	Jason Stanton	Tester IV
Tris Bowman	Office Person	Austin Chappell	Inspector IV	Joshua Farrell	Tester IV
Melvin "Manny" Perez	Inspector IV			Michael Jelenek	Tester IV
Bill Johnivan	Inspector IV				
Gary Sliger	Inspector IV				

- Currently inactive (on that project)
- Verifying staff on proposal is actual staff utilized on project
- Will be available by the end of October. (Start of Sept. for Manny)

DCS Personnel as Prime Consultant on Other Projects					
NEON		Boulder City Bypass P1		C908 Augmentation for 3609 & 3615	
Name	Position	Name	Position	Name	Position
Mike Glock	Principal	Michael Johnson	Principal	Mike Glock	Principal
Michael Johnson	Assistant RE	Gina Gonzalez	Office Engineer	Mike Murphy	Resident Engineer
Jage Larch	Inspector IV	Anthony "Zack" Livreri	Inspector IV	Isidro "Paul" Gomez	Office Engineer
Jose Hernandez	Inspector IV	Melvin "Manny" Perez	Inspector IV	Gary DeCarlo	Inspector IV
Christopher Duffy	Inspector IV	Nick Largent	Inspector IV	Charles "Chuck" Bradley	Inspector IV
Maria "Licha" Quintana	Document Control	Brandon Parcell	Tester IV	Dan Howerton	Inspector IV
		Dana Valledor	Tester IV	Val Nance	Inspector III
		Matt Williams	Tester IV	Darren "Mel" Ford	Inspector III
				Brenton Roberts	Tester IV

DCS Personnel as SubConsultant on Other Projects				Aztech Personnel as Prime Consultant	
SR 604 - LV Blvd		USA Parkway		NEON Testing	
Name	Position	Name	Position	Name	Position
Justin Watson	Tester IV	Mike Glock	Office Person	Claire Kohatsu	Principal
Darren "Mel" Ford	Tester IV	John Watson	Tester IV	Jason Clardy	Tester
		Jordan Smith	Tester IV	David McGuire	Tester
				Conrad Waialae	Tester
Matt Wiliams (CEEC)	Inspec/Test IV			Charles Alonzo	Tester

Personnel Notes:

- Darren "Mel" Ford (NOT proposed on 3629) is presently working with C908 in Wells, but will be available no later than the end of October. After which he will be available for SR 604 (which was re-bid).
- Matt Williams (NOT proposed on 3629) is presently working on Boulder City Bypass Phase 1 but is expected to be available for SR 604 as Boulder City Bypass Phase 1 dies down.
- Melvin "Manny" Perez (proposed on 3629) is presently working on Boulder City Bypass Phase 1 but has been confirmed by Tim Ruguleiski to be available at the start of September for 3629.
- DCS has indicated we will receive written confirmations from Tim Ruguleiski regarding Melvin "Manny" Perez's and Matt Williams availability within the next few days.



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7

August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

MAJOR/CAPACITY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
3-23068	60682	SR 160, fm. Rainbow Ave. to Calvada Blvd. MP NY 6.80 to 8.55	\$4,313,987					Completed with an Adv. Date 3/23/16; Contract Number 3630.
1-03352	60725	I 15 N. fm. Craig Rd. to Speedway Blvd. - Pkg. 2A MP CL 48.43 to 53.62	\$37,048,411					Cost changed from \$38,000,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 3/23/16; Contract Number 3629.
3-31146	60730	FLAP - SR 28, fm. US 50 to Country Club Dr. MP DO 0.00 to MP WA 6.12 (GMP #1 - Construct Pakring Areas, Under Crossing and Utility Relocations.)	\$4,824,130					Cost changed from \$28,000,000 CMAR Approval 8/8/16; Contract Number 3649.
		NEON - (R/W AC, PE, Bond & Conversion Payments)	\$73,000,000					
1-03386	I15GARNC	I 15/US 93, Garnet Intch. - I 15/US 93 Intch., MP CL 64.29 and US 93 Widening, MP CL 52.00 to 57.00		\$50,000,000				
6-03143	CONST953B	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3B at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Hualapai to Tenaya Way. MP CL 88 and CC 215 MP CL 37.00 to 39.00 (Relocate Gas Line)		\$14,200,000				
1-03367	73687	I 15 Starr Ave., Las Vegas, at MP CL 29.375		\$10,000,000				\$52M Construction in FRI funding and \$2.9M Earmark; \$15M ROW (Funding TBD)
2-03250	60702	US 95 fm. Durango Dr. to Kyle Canyon Rd. (Widening); Elkhorn Rd. (HOV Ramps); Kyle Cyn. (Interchange); Durango Dr. (Expand Park & Ride); Flood Control Facility - Pkg. 2B. MP CL 86.75 to 92.70		\$80,000,000				Cost changed from \$55,600,000 SBC Processing. Flood Control Facility Added.
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.)		\$23,000,000				Cost changed from \$25,500,000
		NEON - (R/W AC, PE, Bond & Conversion Payments)		\$99,300,000				
4-03389	60748	SR 160 Phase 2 - Blue Diamond Rd. fm. beg. of Mountain Area to 1.24 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to. MP CL 16.51 to 22.20			\$60,300,000			ROW Impacts TBD
2-19070	60715	US 50, Lyon Co., fm. Roy's Rd. to the jct. w/ US 95A. - Widen & Intersection Upgrades. MP LY 19.90 to 29.44			\$37,900,000			Cost changed from \$36,000,000 Added Lighting at Major Intersections. Adv. Nov. 2017
Not Scheduled		I 580 Operational Improvements			\$40,000,000			Scope and Budget TBD
		NEON - (R/W AC, PE, Bond & Conversion Payments)			\$107,700,000			
1-03375	73797	I 515 at LV Downtown Viaduct - Seismic Retrofit G-947, I-947, I-947 E/W/R/M/L			\$14,410,000			Scope Reduced and Moved from Bridge
6-03143	CONST953C	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3C at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Hualapai to Tenaya Way. MP CL 88 and CC 215 MP CL 37.00 to 39.00 (System to System Phase)				\$61,200,000		
6-03145	73536	I 15, Las Vegas, at the CC 215 Northern Beltway Intch. - New System to System Intch.				\$120,000,000		Funding TBD
1-03375		I 515 at LV Downtown Viaduct - Bridge Deck Rehabilitation				\$26,000,000		Cost Dependent on G-947 Replacement New Project to be scheduled for Bridge Deck Rehabilitation
1-03388		I 15 at the Hacienda Ave. and Harmon Ave. Overpasses - HOV Ramps				\$30,000,000		Cost changed from \$40,000,000
4-03445	UNASSIGNED	SR 159, Charleston Blvd. fm. Lamb Blvd. to Honolulu St. - Intersection Improvements at I-515					\$35,000,000	Funding TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15 at SR 593 Tropicana - Operational Improvements					\$150,000,000	Scope and Budget TBD
Not Scheduled		I 80, Sparks, Median Gap Viaduct over Nugget Casino					\$20,000,000	
Not Scheduled		I 15 S. - Phase 2A (Sloan to Blue Diamond)					\$45,300,000	
Not Scheduled		I 15 N. - Phase 3 (Speedway Blvd. to Apex Intch.)					\$82,000,000	
		NEON - (Conversion Payments)					\$25,900,000	
SubTotal:			\$119,186,528	\$276,500,000	\$260,310,000	\$237,200,000	\$358,200,000	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

ROADWAY (3R) PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
4-03430	73780	SR 592, Flamingo Rd., fm. Paradise to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 26.505 to 31.378 (Agreement w/ RTC)	\$9,000,000					Agmt. to Pay \$9M in 2015 & \$9M in 2016 to the RTC
4-25057	60736	SR 529, S. Carson St., fm. Overland St. to Fairview Dr. MP CC 0.38 to 1.99	\$1,597,125					Cost changed from \$1,400,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 4/20/16; Contract Number 3640. Relinquishment
2-33089	73912	US 93, N. of McGill, fm. 3.610 MS of Success Summit Rd. to 5.740 MN of Success Summit Rd. MP WP 66.995 to 76.345	\$4,562,152					Completed with an Adv. Date 1/6/16; Contract Number 3621.
3-23070	60737	SR 160 fm. 0.463 MN of Basin Rd. to 13.544 MN of Bella Vista Dr. at the 2010 NUL of Pahrump. MP NY 11.190 to 27.351 and NY 37.22	\$10,096,000					Adv. with Misc. Project (76921) (Johnnie Curve and Turn Pockets)
4-03428	73781	SR 604, Las Vegas Blvd., fm. E. Carey Ave. to 0.240 MN of Craig Rd. MP CL 32.997 to 37.713	\$21,300,000					Cost changed from \$17,721,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 6/29/16; Contract Number 3619-READV.
2-09041	60726	US 6 fm. the jct. of US 6/US 95 to 1.974 MW of Millers Roadside Park. MP ES 18.815 to 43.892	\$19,155,686					Cost changed from \$21,040,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 3/9/16; Contract Number 3628. Adv. with Safety Project (60671)
2-19081	73639	US 95A(sharedroad US 50A), Lyon Co., fm. the jct. w/ US 50 to 0.015 MS of Royal Oaks Dr. (Includes Truck Lane and Passing Lanes) US 95A MP LY 44.254 to 55.438	\$9,600,000					Cost changed from \$10,900,000 Project split due to differing Scope of Work.
1-27067	73666	I 80 fm. 1.776 ME of Humbolt Intch. to 0.516 MW of Dun Glenn Intch. MP PE 51.38 to 62.49	\$14,300,000					Moved from 2018
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave., fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd. MP WA 2.700 to 5.357		\$16,350,000				Scope includes ADA Project (73549)
2-33085	73636	US 6 fm. the jct. w/ SR 318 to 0.30 ME of Murry Street. MP WP 13.71 to 36.78		\$14,700,000				
1-13058	73789	I 80 fm. 0.345 ME of the trailing edge of H-1256 at the W. Strip Grade Sep. to 0.549 ME of the E. Winnemucca Intch. MP HU 12.023 to 17.354		\$8,400,000				Moved from 2018 Backup Project (3R Program Approval 2019)
2-15023	60539	US 50, fm. CH/LA Co. Line to 0.052 ME of SR 305. MP LA 0.00 to 23.30		\$11,600,000				Cost changed from \$12,060,000 Removing tow portion due to SUE. Adv. with Safety Project (2-15023).
1-07126	73930	I 80 fm. 0.363 MW of the W. Carlin Intch. to 0.274 MW of the W. Portal of the Carlin Tunnels, the beg. of the PCCP. MP EL 1.097 to 7.512		\$5,600,000				Moved from 2018 Backup Project (3R Program Approval 2018)
2-07067	60746	US 93 fm. 12.825 MN of Cattle Pass to 2.691 MS of SR 229. MP EL 30.762 to 43.071		\$9,000,000				
3-31144	73913	SR 877, Franktown Rd., fm. SR 429 then N. to US 395A/SR 429 near Bowers Mansion. MP WA 0.00 to 4.296		\$1,500,000				Cost Will Go Up with Scope Change.
1-19015	73914	I 80 fm. 0.419 ME of the E. Fernley Grade Sep. to the LY/CH Co. Line. MP LY 5.844 to 15.912		\$13,600,000				Moved from 2018
4-03439	73902	SR 159, Red Rock Rd., fm. 1.989 MW of Durango Rd. to an NHS break at Rainbow Blvd. MP CL 17.030 to 21.064		\$4,600,000				
2-03275	73644	US 93 fm. Apex Power Pkwy. to 11 MN of Apex Power Pkwy. MP CL 57.00 to 68.00 (Includes NB Truck Climbing Lane)		\$11,000,000				Cost changed from \$24,400,000 Length Shortened. Scope Changed to Roadway Rehab.
2-03280	73919	US 95 fm. The CA/NV Stateline to 7.790 MN of Loran Station Rd. MP CL 0.00 to 17.423		\$8,800,000				Moved from 2018
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave., fm. Dean Martin Dr. to Eastern Ave. (3R); Eastern Ave. to Boulder Hwy. (ADA) MP CL 0.01 to 7.30. Phase 2			\$26,500,000			Deliver as DBB. Scope includes ADA (73879) No Concrete Lanes. Cost Will Decrease. RW is Not Included in the Estimate.
1-31231	73920	I 80 fm. the CA/NV Stateline to 0.023 MW of Keystone Intch. Includes Frontage Rd. FRWA03 at Garson Rd. Intch. MP WA 0.00 to 12.445			\$13,400,000			May Accelerate to 2017. FR Cost with State Funds.
3-07090	73911	SR 227, Lamoille Hwy., fm. 0.30 ME fo Licht Pkwy. to 0.20 ME of Palace Pkwy. MP EL 11.55 to EL 13.84			\$4,700,000			
2-33086	73650	US 50, in Ely, fm. 0.165 ME of Ruth/Kimberly Rd. to US 6. US 93 fm. the jct. w/ US 50 to 0.634 MN of US 50. US 50 MP WP 61.794 to 68.432; US 93 MP WP 53.639 to 54.273			\$15,600,000			Moved from 2019 Adv. with Hydraulic Project
Not Scheduled		I 80 fm. the beg. of the PCCP, 1.779 ME of the trailing edge of I-876 to 1.064 MW of the HU/LA Co. Line. (Eastbound Only) MP HU 54.860 to 60.320			\$7,600,000			
Not Scheduled		US 395 fm. functional class break at I 80 to McCarran Blvd. Intch. MP WA 25.731 to 27.064			\$3,900,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 28, Incline Village, fm. 0.242 MN of E. Lakeshore Blvd. to the NV/CA Stateline. MP WA 5.217 to 10.990			\$3,100,000			
Not Scheduled		I 80/I 580/US 395 Various Ramps in Reno/Sparks UL			\$5,000,000			Tentative. Not included in 3R Program List.
4-03443	73937	SR 596, Jones Blvd., fm. S. of US 95 to Smoke Ranch Rd. MP CL 43.007 to 45.038				\$5,200,000		Moved from 2017 Cost changed from \$3,400,000 SBC Processing for Roadbed Mod. Complete Street? Scope includes ADA Project (73937)
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd., fm. I 580 to SR 647, 4th St. MP WA 0.000 to 6.272				\$10,700,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 612, Nellis Blvd., fm. Tropicana Ave. to SR 604, Las Vegas Blvd. MP CL 37.880 to 47.307				\$15,000,000		
1-07118	73665	I 80 fm. 0.597 ME of the Grays Creek grade sep., the beg. of PCCP, to 0.048 MW of the Willow Creek grade sep. MP EL 62.09 to EL 68.978				\$17,500,000		
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				\$12,000,000		Moved from 2018 Pursuing Complete Street. (3R Program Approval 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				\$17,400,000		Moved from 2020
Not Scheduled		US 50 fm. 1.00 ME of Alpine Rd. to the CH/LA Co. Line. MP CH 85.961 to 106.845				\$14,300,000		Moved from 2018
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		
Not Scheduled		US 50A/95A fm. SUL of Fernley at Royal Oaks Dr. to the jct. with SR 427, Main St. MP LY 11.915 to 14.119				\$5,000,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 160, Pahrump Valley Rd., fm. 1.030 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to the CL/NY Co. Line. (Eastbound Only) MP CL 21.723 to 43.293				\$21,500,000		Moved from 2017
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				\$7,400,000		Moved from 2018 Cost changed from \$14,400,000



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

Not Scheduled		US 395 fm. McCarran Blvd. to Panter Valley Intch. MP WA 27.064 to 30.188						\$19,800,000	
Not Scheduled		SR 564, Lake Mead Dr., fm. the jct. of US 95 ramps to 0.035 MW of Boulder Hwy. MP CL 0.000 to 1.733						\$2,800,000	
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	Moved from 2019
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						\$13,000,000	Moved from 2018 Cost changed from \$3,000,000 Scope includes ADA Project (60750)
Not Scheduled		SR 573, Craig Rd., fm. 0.506 ME of Losee to Las Vegas Blvd. MP CL 2.766 to 5.755						\$4,200,000	
Not Scheduled		SR 573, Craig Rd., fm. 0.008 MW of N. Rainbow Blvd. to Decatur Blvd. MP CL 0.316 to 2.260						\$2,800,000	
Not Scheduled		US 93 fm. 0.030 MN of US 93A to 0.096 MS of the LAWPRR Xing. MP WP 112.944 to EL 11.800						\$15,100,000	
Not Scheduled		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	
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	
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	Moved from 2018
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 to the HU/LA Co. Line. (Westbound Only) MP HU 54.860 to 60.320						\$14,600,000	
SubTotal:			\$89,610,963	\$105,150,000	\$79,800,000	\$130,400,000	\$128,800,000		

BRIDGE/STRUCTURES PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program	\$3,000,000					Annual Program
		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				Moved from 2016 Cost changed from \$1,200,000
1-27068	60767	I 80 at Fairview Ditch, Replace B-1392E		\$500,000				
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				
3-07091	74025	SR 226 at Jack Creek, Replace B-639 (off-system bridge)		\$500,000				
Not Scheduled		I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit I-717E/W, I-740E/W, H-844E/W, I-700E/W		\$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				CMAR
Not Scheduled		FR 09 Lockwood Dr. at UPRR, Washoe Co. - Rehab/Repair G-751 on-system bridge.			\$540,000			
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Eastern Avenue, Replace I-1440			\$8,000,000			
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program			\$3,000,000			Annual Program
Not Scheduled		US 50 at Carson River W. of Fallon - Address Scour B-1557			\$600,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 605, Paradise Rd., at Tropicana Wash - Rehab B-1344			\$1,500,000			
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Boulder Highway and Sahara - Rehab/Retrofit I-1449, H-1446			\$800,000			
Not Scheduled		SR 206, Genoa Ln., at Carson River - Address Scour B-1239			\$300,000			
6-13010	73701	Eden Valley Rd. at Humboldt River - Replace off-system Structure B-1658			\$5,747,000			R/W Acquisition needed
3-31139	73750	SR 447 at Washoe Co. near Nixon B-1351 MP 15.49			\$1,350,000			Moved from 2017
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Flamingo Intch. - MSE Wall Rehab			\$3,000,000			
6-01023	60769	Maine St., Fallon, at L Line Canal - Replace off-system B-242				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 396, Cornell Ave. N. of Lovelock, Pershing Co. - Replace B-28 on-system bridge.				\$2,600,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 278, N. of Eureka, Eureka Co. - Replace B-478 on-system bridge (dbl rcb).				\$200,000		
Not Scheduled		Six Mile Canyon Rd., Storey Co. - Replace B-2476 off system bridge				\$600,000		
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program				\$3,000,000		Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Shady Ave. over Gold Canyon Cr., Dayton, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1711 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled		Gold Canyon Cr. S. of Silver City, Lyon Co. - Replace B-375 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		Dressler Ln., Douglas Co. - Replace B-1600 off-system bridge				\$600,000		
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		
6-27026	73753	FR PE 01, G-29 Structure Replacement				\$3,200,000		Cost changed from \$3,000,000
Not Scheduled		SR 589, Sahara Ave., at UPRR - Rehab/Retrofit G-1064				\$1,400,000		
Not Scheduled		SR 88 in Douglas Co. - Rehab/Retrofit B-553, B-575, B-580, B-576, and B-627				\$4,000,000		
Not Scheduled		I 515 at UPRR and Main Street, Replace G-947					\$80,000,000	
		Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program					\$3,000,000	Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Garson Road at I 80, Replace I-770 (off-system bridge)					\$4,000,000	
3-03178		SR 163 at Colorado River in Laughlin - Widen and Rehab Structure B-1847					\$6,000,000	Moved from 2019
Not Scheduled		I 15 at Muddy River - Rehab/Retrofit B-781 N/S					\$2,000,000	
SubTotal:			\$3,000,000	\$18,900,000	\$24,837,000	\$21,500,000	\$95,000,000	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
6-03203	60683	Summerlin Parkway, Las Vegas, fm. Buffalo Dr. to CC215 - Cable Barrier Rail (Off System)	\$1,250,000					LPA - City of Las Vegas
2-09045	60671	US 6 fm. the jct. w/ US 95 to 1.974 MW of Millers Roadside Park. MP ES 18.815 to 43.892 - Slope Flattening, Passing Lanes and Drainage	\$5,189,796					Cost changed from \$6,080,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 3/9/16; Contract Number 3628. Advance Construction. Adv. with 3R Project (73648)
3-23067	73841	SR 372 at Pahrump Valley Roundabout	\$1,894,275					Cost changed from \$3,200,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 6/15/16; Contract Number 3645.
3-23066	73837	SR 372 at Blagg Roundabout	\$1,887,393					Cost changed from \$2,900,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 6/15/16; Contract Number 3645.
8-03128	60717	Multiple Intersections in Dist. 1 (Las Vegas) Pkg. 3 - Signal System Modifications	\$482,393					Cost changed from \$490,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 1/6/16; Contract Number 3622. Design by City and Traffic Operations
3-31143	60640	SR 431 Truck Escape Ramp	\$5,496,517					Completed with an Adv. Date 1/27/16; Contract Number 3623. Advance Construction. \$583,570 State Funds.
6-00017	60697	Te-Moak & Duckwater Tribal Lands - Pedestrian & Road Safety Improvements	\$724,000					Cost changed from \$950,000
2-05121	73862	US 395 at Airport Rd., Johnson Ln., and Stephanie Way		\$1,300,000				
2-15023	60539	US 50, fm. CH/LA Co. to .052 ME of SR 305. LA 0.00 to LA 23.30 - Shoulder Widening and Slope Flattening		\$5,000,000				SBC Processing Added to 3R Project (60539)
Not Scheduled		SR 667, Safety Improvements along Kietzke Ln. (SMP)		\$3,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60681	SR 573, Craig Rd. fm. Decatur Blvd. to 5th St. (SMP)		\$3,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
6-31218	UNASSIGNED	Multiple Intersections in Dist. II (Sparks) - Signal System Modification.		\$2,250,000				Design by Traffic Operations
Not Scheduled		RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements on Curves		\$3,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements		\$522,500				
8-00266	60679	Second St. fm. Keystone Ave. to I-580. Arlington Ave. fm. Court St. to 6th St. (SMP)			\$3,000,000			Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00266	60680	Eastern Ave. and Civic Center, fm. US 95 to Cope Ave. (SMP)			\$3,000,000			
Not Scheduled		RSA - Systemic Safety Improvements			\$3,000,000			
Not Scheduled		Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements			\$522,500			
Not Scheduled		US 93, fm. MP CL 64 to CL 86 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening			\$3,000,000			
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				\$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	
SubTotal:			\$16,924,374	\$18,072,500	\$12,522,500	\$12,522,500	\$11,522,500	

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
8-00223	60668	SR 147, Ped. and ADA Improvements (Road Diet & Roadbed Mod.) on Lake Mead fm. Civic Center to Pecos (SED)	\$6,800,000					Traffic Safety Design Consultants
8-00223	60667	SR 159, Ped. and ADA Improvements on Charleston Blvd. and Boulder Hwy. at Sun Valley Dr. (SED)	\$2,000,000					Completed with an Adv. Date 8/3/16; Contract Number 3650. Traffic Safety Design Consultants
4-03444	73936	SR 160 Blue Diamond Rd. at El Capitan and Ft. Apache Rd.	\$2,889,726					Completed with an Adv. Date 1/6/16; Contract Number 3620.
4-31243	73939	SR 430, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements on N. Virginia St. at Moraine Way. and Talus Way.	\$833,684					Cost changed from \$684,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 4/13/16; Contract Number 3637. Adv. With Ped. Safety Project (60727)
4-31242	60727	SR 667, Ped. and ADA Improvements on Kietzke Ln. at Grove St., Apple St., Taylor St. and Roberts St. (SMP) Pkg. 1	\$675,027					Cost changed from \$590,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 4/13/16; Contract Number 3637. Adv. With Ped. Safety Project (73939)
8-00223	60678	SR 443, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements on Sun Valley Blvd.	\$1,346,173					Cost changed from \$1,200,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 5/25/16; Contract Number 3643.
4-31245	73979	SR 430, Permanent Traffic Signal, Lighting and Ped. Facilities on N. Virginia St., N. of Lovitt Ln. to Hoge Rd.		\$1,300,000				
4-31242	60728	SR 667, Lighting Improvements at Taylor St. and Roberts St. (SMP) Pkg. 2		\$200,000				
4-03446	73980	SR 582, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements at Various Locations along Boulder Hwy.		\$3,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
2-00012	73988	US 50, Ped., Lighting and ADA Improvements at Pike St. (MP LY 3.16), Silver State St. (MP CC 13.16), Lakeshore Blvd. (MP DO 3.16).		\$1,000,000				Traffic Safety Design Consultants
SubTotal:			\$14,544,610	\$5,500,000				



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
2-31132	60749	US 395 fm. I 80 to NV/CA State Line, Reno - Install ITS devices, TM Pkg. 4	\$10,500,000					Limits increased to state line Cost increase per Director's Request
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks	\$365,040					Annual Program
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas	\$2,617,056					Annual Program
1-03369	60657	I 15 fm. Speedway Blvd. to Apex - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H1	\$2,303,056					Completed with an Adv. Date 10/21/15; Contract Number 3618.
2-00010	73951	US 50 fm. CC to Ely. MP CC 12.547 to MP WP 72.246. - Install Hot Spots and access existing FO	\$8,000,000					Deliver as two Contracts. Dist. 2 (60755) & 3 (60758)
2-03276	60689	US 95 fm. Bypass to Laughlin - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K1		\$5,000,000				
1-31221	UNASSIGNED	Install Electronic Check Station Signage, I 80 at Wadsworth/Mustang.		\$350,000				Ready in 2016
1-03384	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. Apex to Logandale - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H2		\$5,500,000				
Not Scheduled		Install State Pakrs Signing - Various Locations Statewide		\$1,000,000				
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
1-31220	73946	I 580, Washoe Co., Neil Rd. to Moana. MP WA 20.00 TO WA 22.00, RENO PKG 1 - Install ITS infrastructure.			\$2,000,000			Moved from 2017
2-03276	60690	US 95 fm. Bypass to Laughlin - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. K2			\$3,000,000			
1-03369	60713	I 15 fm. Logandale to AZ Stateline - Install ITS infrastructure, FAST Pkg. H3			\$5,500,000			
8-00251	60693	District 3 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A			\$2,000,000			Moved from 2019
1-03325	73823	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Las Vegas			\$2,617,056			Annual Program
1-31205	73828	Freeway Sevice Patrol/Incident Response Vehicle - Reno/Sparks			\$365,040			Annual Program
Not Scheduled		Replace High Mast HPS Lighting w/ LED Lighting				\$1,500,000		Moved from 2018
1-31219	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Mt. Rose to Neil Rd. - Install ITS infrastructure - TM Pkg. 2A				\$3,000,000		Moved from 2018
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.
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
8-00250	Pkg. A	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. A					\$1,000,000	Moved from 2019 Tentative
8-00250	Pkg. B	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. B					\$1,000,000	Tentative
8-00250	Pkg. C	District 2 - Install Rural ITS Smart Zones, Pkg. C					\$1,000,000	Tentative
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 80 to US 395 Pkg. 4 - 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
SubTotal:			\$23,785,152	\$15,132,096	\$15,482,096	\$15,282,096	\$55,482,096	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

HYDRAULICS/TAHOE PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program	\$500,000					Agreement
1-11018	60723	I 80 at Structures G-884 and G-885. MP EU 4.21 and 4.38 - Scour Mitigation and Erosion Control On/Under Structures and within UPRR/I 80 ROW	\$486,900					Cost changed from \$375,000 Completed with an Adv. Date 4/6/16; Contract Number 3635.
2-05115	73653	US 50 Slope Stability, Water Quality, and Erosion Control Imp. - US 50 fm. Cave Rock to SR-28 Spooner jct.	\$3,702,067					Completed with an Adv. Date 2/10/16; Contract Number 3627. Adv. with Cave Rock Tunnel Extension Project (73948)
Not Scheduled		US 50, Tahoe, Slope Stability, Water Quality and Erosion Control near Logan Shoals Dr. MP DO 7.00 to 9.00		\$2,500,000				Project added as high priority per Geotech & D2
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop (Tahoe)		\$525,000				Consolidated to one year
2-05126	73995	US 395, at Martin Slough. MP DO 23.82		\$1,500,000				Agreement
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program		\$500,000				Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop		\$300,000				Agreement
Not Scheduled		Master Plan Water Quality & Erosion Control Improvements - SR 28 fm. 0.13 ME of the CC/WA line to Sand Harbor (FLAP)		\$4,500,000				
Not Scheduled		Zephyr Cove Cooperative Projects (Tahoe)			\$350,000			
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program			\$500,000			Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop			\$600,000			Agreement
Not Scheduled		SR 431 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP WA 0.00 to 8.00			\$3,600,000			
2-05120	60765	US 50 Spooner Summit to Carson City. MP DO 13.00-14.58 and CC 0.00-7.60			\$4,000,000			
3-05059		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			
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program				\$500,000		Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop				\$600,000		Agreement
Not Scheduled		SR 207 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 3.15				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled		US 50 in Ely, MP WP 66.34 to 68.43 and US 93, MP WP 53.10 to 54.27. Storm drain system improvements along US 50/US 6 including rehabilitation or enlargement of existing trunk system.				\$6,000,000		Adv. with 3R Project (73650)
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		
Not Scheduled		US 50 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 13.07					\$1,000,000	
Not Scheduled		SR 28 - Treatment at Outfalls directly connected to Lake Tahoe. MP WA 0.00 to MP WA 10.99, MP CC 0.00 to MP CC 3.95, and MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 1.23					\$4,000,000	
SubTotal:			\$4,688,967	\$9,825,000	\$14,050,000	\$12,100,000	\$5,000,000	

STORMWATER PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
9-07035	60656	MY 927, N. Fork Maint. Yard. SR 225 MP EL 77.87 - Drainage Improvements and Repave Yard	\$968,254					Completed with an Adv. Date 3/30/16; Contract Number 3631.
9-07034	60655	MY 931, Ruby Valley Maint. Yard. SR 229 MP EL 35.45 - Drainage Improvements and Repave Yard		\$1,000,000				Moved from 2016 District Contract
9-33004	73973	My 919, Ely Maint. Yard. US 93 MP WP 54.28 - Drainage and Wash Pad Improvements, Repave Yard		\$2,000,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
9-29001	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.		\$1,000,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
9-03037	74006	MY 921, Las Vegas Maint. Station. SR 578 MP CL 0.503		\$2,500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 975, Goldfield Maint. Yard. US 95 MP ES 19.401			\$500,000			District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 983, Lovelock Maint. Yard. 6th St. MP PE 0.311			\$2,000,000			Moved from 2017 District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 920, Tonopah Maint. Yard. US 6 MP NY 1.787			\$500,000			Moved from 2017 District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 976, Mina Maint. Yard. US 95 MP MI 15.358			\$500,000			Moved from 2017 District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 971, Battle Mountain Maint. Yard. Galena St. MP LA 0.100			\$500,000			Moved from 2017 District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled		MY 927, Searchlight Maint. Station. SR 164 MP CL 18.483			\$500,000			Moved from 2017 District Contract-Cost TBD
SubTotal:			\$968,254	\$7,500,000	\$4,500,000			



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
1-31233	73943	I 580 at Plumb Lane, SB On-Ramp and Flyover. MP WA 23.62		\$920,000				Moved from 2016
2-05123	73926	US 50 at Stateline S. Lake Tahoe - State Entrance Gateway. MP DO 0.05		\$248,750				
4-31244	73942	Veterans Pkwy. - Roundabout Aesthetic Improvements. MP WA 6.06		\$747,500				Moved from 2016
1-31228	60665	I 580 at Damonte Ranch Intch. MP WA 16.98		\$2,000,000				Moved from 2016
2-03281	73925	US 93 at Hoover Dam - State Entrance Gateway. MP CL 0.027		\$248,750				
2-07064	73924	US 93 at Jackpot - State Entrance Gateway. MP EL 141.76		\$248,750				
2-31133	73927	US 395 at Bordertown and SR 28 at Crystal Bay- State Entrance Gateways. US 395 MP WA 42.09 and SR 28 MP WA 10.98		\$470,833				
2-05125	73959	US 395 at Topaz Lake - State Entrance Gateway. MP WA 0.005		\$248,750				
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Russell Rd. Intch. MP CL 9.631			\$2,000,000			Moved from 2017 Will Require Permanent Erosion Control.
1-31228	LAND2	I 580 at S. Meadows Pkwy. Intch. MP WA 18.33			\$1,250,000			Moved from 2017
Not Scheduled		I 80 at US 95 and at SR 289 Intchs.- Community Gateway to Winnemucca/Recreational to Black Rock Desert				\$2,000,000		Moved from 2018
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Boulder Hwy. Intch. MP CL 14.414				\$1,250,000		Moved from 2018
1-31228	LAND1	I 580 at S. Virginia, Patriot Blvd. Intch. MP WA 19.29				\$1,250,000		Moved from 2018
1-31228	LAND3	I 580 at Neil Rd. Intch. MP WA 20.71					\$750,000	Moved from 2019
Not Scheduled		I 80 at SR 305 Intch. - Battle Mtn. Community Gateway and Paint E. & W. Intchs.					\$2,000,000	Moved from 2019
Not Scheduled		I 515 at Charleston Blvd. MP CL 16.005					\$1,000,000	Moved from 2019 Included with 4-03442 - Additional Funding over the Required 3% L&A Budget.
SubTotal:				\$5,133,333	\$3,250,000	\$4,500,000	\$3,750,000	



NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #7
August 4, 2016 PDC Mtg.

ADA PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
Not Scheduled		SR 372, Pahrump, fm. Blagg St. to SR 160 and SR 160 fm. E. Acoma Ave. to Lockspur Ave.		\$195,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Searchlight, MP CL 19.97 to 20.53		\$250,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Mina, fm. 6th St. to Eleventh St.		\$330,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 95, Fallon, fm. 500ft N. of Sheckler Rd. to Keddie St.		\$190,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50A/US 95A, Fernley, fm. Mull Ln. to Farm District Rd.		\$155,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. at Prater Way		\$150,000				
Not Scheduled		SR 659, McCarran Blvd. (East), Reno, fm. US 395 North to S. Virginia St.		\$320,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 595, S. Rainbow Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. W. Tropicana Ave. to Westcliff Dr.		\$500,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 322, Pioche, Main St. fm. Railroad Ave. to Cedar St.		\$160,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		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
1-00028	73982	I 80 Intch. ramps in Winnemucca, Battle Mtn., Elko, Wells, and West Wendover		\$520,000				Moved from 2016
1-31235	73984	I 80 & I 580/US 395, Reno, fm. Verdi to Vista Blvd. and fm. S. Virginia St. to Stead Blvd.		\$470,000				Moved from 2016
1-03387	73983	I 515, Las Vegas, fm. Wagonwheel Dr. to Casino Center Blvd.; I 15, Las Vegas/Mesquite, fm. Primm Blvd. to Sandhill Blvd.; US 95, Las Vegas, fm. S. Martin L. King Blvd. to Paiute Way.		\$745,000				Moved from 2016
Not Scheduled		I 215/SR 564, Henderson, fm. Stephanie St. to Lake Las Vegas Pkwy.		\$250,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		FREL17/FREL18, Elko, at I 80 ramps and Idaho St. Intch. and FREL18 at Delaware Ave., El Dorado Dr., and Idaho St. Ints.		\$40,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15, Mesquite, at W. Mesquite Intch. and Pioneer/Sandhill Intch. and SR 170 at Mesquite Blvd.		\$20,000				Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave., fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd.		\$1,700,000				Scope within 3R Project (73549)
Not Scheduled		US 50, Ely, fm. W. 1st St. to 0.25 MS of the jct. with US 6			\$450,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave., fm. Dean Martin Dr. to Eastern Ave. (3R); Eastern Ave. to Boulder Hwy. (ADA) MP CL 0.01 to 7.30. Phase 2			\$5,100,000			Scope within 3R Project (73879)
Not Scheduled		SR 589, E. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, fm. S. Las Vegas Blvd. to S. Nellis Blvd.			\$1,150,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
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		US 93, Ely, fm. US 50 to E. 15th St.			\$730,000			Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 396/SR 398/SR 854/SR 397, Lovelock, SR 396 fm. S. Broadway Ints. to N. Broadway Ints., SR 398 fm. I 80 Intch. to 17th St., SR 854 fm. Jamestown Ave. to SR 398, SR 397 fm. 4th St. to 11th St.				\$555,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 93A, W. Wendover, fm. I80 to MP 53.2				\$70,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50, Eureka, fm. 0.054 MN of Parker St. to 0.040 MN of Richmond St.				\$115,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 50, Austin, fm. Stokes Castle Rd. to 3rd St.				\$165,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
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		Scope within 3R Project (73937)
Not Scheduled		SR 589, W. Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, fm. S. Rainbow Blvd. to Las Vegas Blvd.				\$515,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 574, Cheyenne Ave., Las Vegas, fm. N. Martin L. King Blvd. to N. Nellis Blvd.				\$950,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 305, Battle Mtn., fm. Broyles Rd. to SR 304 and SR 304 fm. Eastgate Dr. to Forrest Ave.				\$285,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 223, Wells, fm. I 80 Intch. to 600 ft. E. of US 93				\$265,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		I 15, Primm, Intch. ramps and S. Las Vegas Blvd. at E. Primm Blvd.				\$30,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		All Five Winnemucca Locations				\$535,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 582, Fremont St., Las Vegas, fm. S. 8th St. to E. Charleston Blvd.				\$645,000		Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
2-01089	60750	US 50, Fallon, fm. Allen Rd. to Sherman St.					\$785,000	Moved from 2018 Scope within 3R Project (60750) Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 612, N. Nellis Blvd, Las Vegas, fm. E. Russell Rd. to E. Charleston Blvd.					\$970,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		US 93, Wells, fm. 500 ft. S. of I 80 to SR 223					\$265,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 445, Pyramid Way, Sparks, fm. Nugget Ave. to Sparks Blvd.					\$380,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd., Las Vegas, fm. Lamb Blvd. to the EUL.					\$2,170,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
Not Scheduled		SR 578, Washington Ave., Las Vegas, fm. I 15 to Las Vegas Blvd.					\$165,000	Tentative - ROW/Utility impacts TBD
SubTotal:				\$6,075,000	\$9,600,000	\$4,380,000	\$4,735,000	



MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
3-23070	60737	SR 160, Nye Co., Roadside Safety at Johnnie Curve Site (Shoulder Widening, High Friction Surface, Flashing Chevron Signs) MP NY 26.200 to 27.351; SR 160 and US 95 Intersection Modifications (US 95 Deceleration Lanes) MP NY 13.81 to 14.23	\$2,404,000					Added to 3R Project (73921)
3-17097	73901	SR 317 Rainbow Canyon, Lincoln Co., fm. 1 MN of Elgin to the jct of US 93. MP LN 41.77 to LN 52.37	\$2,700,000					Completed with an Adv. Date 4/13/16; Contract Number 3639.
2-05124	73948	US 50 at Cave Rock. MP DO 7.11 - Extend Westbound Tunnel	\$3,337,723					Completed with an Adv. Date 2/10/16; Contract Number 3627. Going with US 50 Slope Stability, Water Quality Project (73653)
3-05058	73966	SR 756, Centerville, fm. Waterloo Ln. to US 395 (Bikelanes)		\$600,000				TAP Funding (2nd Project)
3-19053	73861	SR 828 Farm District Rd. fm. Crimson Rd. to Jasmine Ln. in Fernley. MP LY 0.90 to LY 2.75		\$530,315				TAP funding (City of Fernley); \$173,485 City of Fernley; \$650,000 Safe Routes
3-05057	73867	SR 756 Centerville Ln. at Structure B-287. MP DO 3.68		\$600,000				TAP funding (Douglas County)
4-03417	73725	SR 612, Nellis Blvd. and SR 589, Sahara Ave. Reconstruct Intersection.		\$1,200,000				State Funded Construction due to Road Relinquishment.
Not Scheduled		SR 445 at Calle de la Plata (NB Deceleration Lane)		\$1,600,000				
Not Scheduled		SR 163, Laughlin, Roundabout				\$2,500,000		
SubTotal:			\$8,441,723	\$4,530,315		\$2,500,000		

DISTRICT BETTERMENT PROJECTS

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
		District Betterments	\$33,958,825					Cost changed from \$22,623,698
		District Betterments		\$33,170,033				
SubTotal:			\$33,958,825	\$33,170,033				

BIKE & PED PROJECT

PCEMS No.	PIN/EA No.	PROJECT NAME	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	NOTES
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2016	\$2,214,600					
Not Scheduled		US 50 - Warning Signage in all mountainous areas regarding bicycles may be in travel lane	\$100,000					
Not Scheduled		US 50, Stateline Ave. to Elks Point Rd. - Bicycle Lanes	\$10,000					
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2017		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2018			\$1,000,000			
Not Scheduled		US 50 / US 95 - Bicycle Improvements			\$1,000,000			
Not Scheduled		Off System - 2019				\$2,000,000		
SubTotal:			\$2,324,600	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000		

Grand Total	Grand Total	\$317,433,996	\$507,488,277	\$426,351,596	\$442,384,596	\$662,489,596
--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Qualifiers/Disclaimers

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

The list of projects shows those projects which NDOT has identified as being funded or potentially funded with money controlled by NDOT, such as STP Statewide, NHPP, Safety, state funds , etc. The list does not show projects which are solely locally funded or funded with federal funding controlled by the MPOs, such as CMAQ or STP Local funds. The list does not show Local Public Agency (LPA) projects which do not have NDOT controlled funds included in the project or an agreement to have NDOT controlled funds in them.

The dollar amounts may not be the total project cost but rather the amount of NDOT controlled funds in the project. It does not include any funding from federal earmarks or local/Developer funds. The dollar amounts show the federal fiscal year in which it is anticipated the funds may be obligated. It does not represent the year that the funds will be expended. The dollar amounts shown are for the construction phase only and does not reflect design or right of way costs.

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

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

CHANGES FROM THE 5-5-16 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 10, 2016																							
CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	CP	LE of CM	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CONT MOD STATUS	
3532	1	916	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP- RUGULEISKI TRISH	RE-OPEN F STREET UNDER I 15 INTERSTATE TO TRAFFIC	\$13,600,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	S	S	N	A				10/1/15	10/1/15		Y	Gave back to crew for corrections on 12/17/15. Crew targeting end July for re-submit.	pending		
3546	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING - CONNER TRISH	I-15 MILL, 3" PBS, 3/4" OPEN-GRADE, 2 MI TRUCK CLIMBING LN NORTH BOUND	\$35,650,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	A	6/10/15				1/19/16	1/19/16		N	Crew preparing to request pickup.		
3554	1	926	LAS VEGAS PAVING - SULAHRIA TRISH	US 95 FROM ANN ROAD TO DURANGO DRIVE	\$35,700,000.01	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N	9/18/15	10/22/15	9/13/16	Partial Relief 11/24/2015				N	Crew is preparing for pickup. Partial relief granted, full is pending Plant Est. (exp 9/13/16).		
3576 FM	1	906	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 147 FM 2ME OF EUL OF NLV CL 9.67 TO APPX BOUNDARY LAKE MEAD NRA	\$5,948,497.07	\$50,000.00	N	A	S	S	N	A	1/7/16				2/17/16	2/17/16		Y	8/4/16 HQ finished initial review. Giving back to crew for corrections 8/8/16. RE verifying submittal of EEO.	1 - Trish	
3577 FM	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP- CONNER TRISH	US 95 FROM 1.2 MILES NORTH OF FRCL 34 TO 0.9 MILES NORTH OF THE TRAILING EDGE OF I-1075 3" COLD MILL & FILL w/ OG	\$23,642,334.99	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	A	11/17/15				1/19/16	1/20/16		N	Rec'd Dist. Accept 1/19/16 & Dir Accept 1/19/16. Crew hasn't requested pickup to date.		
3597	1	903	GRANITE CONST. CO. - CONNERS 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								N	Construction on-going		
3602 FM	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP- CHRISTIANSEN TRISH	SR 160 EMERGENCY MEDIAN CROSSEOVERS / PLACEMENT OF CABLE BARRIER RAILS	\$794,000.00	\$42,197.00	N	A	S	S	N	S	1/6/16				2/17/16	2/17/16		Y	HQ working on pick up. RE verifying submittal of EEO.	2 - Trish	
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	N	N	N	N	N	N	6/30/16				6/30/16	7/11/16		N	Crew working to request pickup.		
3292	2	910	FISHER INDUSTRIES - DURSKI ROB-MATT	FROM 395 S. OF BOWERS MANSION CUTOFF NORTH TO MOUNT ROSE HWY.	\$393,393,393.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A	11/19/12		2/28/15		3/2/15	3/9/15	4/5/16	Y	Qty's sent to contractor on 7/14/2016 poss. According to RE they will be signed off this week. Payoff 8/14/2016. Crew still has testing books at office.	Done	
3561	2	911	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - DEENA	2 3/4" MILL 2" PLANTMIX SURFACE WITH 3/4" OPEN GRADE	\$6,354,354.01	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	A	11/7/14		N/A		9/21/15	9/28/15		N	Crew preparing to request pickup.		
3564 CMAR	2	911	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - ANGEL MATT	SR 207 KINGSBURY GRADE FROM THE JUNCTION WITH US 50 TO 3.866 MILES E. OF US 50	\$14,877,619.23	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	A	10/15/14		10/1/15		11/3/15	11/3/15		N	AB completed will collect at time of pickup. Crew preparing to request pickup. Pending completion of 3561.		
3574	2	905	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - LOMPA MATT	CRACK SEALING, SPALL REPAIR AND DIAMOND GRINDING	\$12,114,205.11	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Construction ongoing - in clean up phase.		
3582 FM	2	911	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. ANGEL MATT	US 50 IN DAYTON, 0.13 MI WEST OF PINE CONE RD TO 0.17 MI EAST OF RETAIL RD. - REVISE STRIPING, CONST RAISED MEDIAN ISLANDS AND DECEL LANES @ VARIOUS LOCATIONS	\$328,357.56	\$10,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A	5/22/15				6/12/15	6/24/15		Y	Crew requested pickup on 8/3/2016. Initial job pickup complete sent back to crew for corrections.	1-Matt	
3586 FM	2	911	MKD CONSTRUCTION ANGEL MATT	US 5- CARSON CITY LOWER AND CENTRAL CREEK WATERSHED STORM DRAIN PROJECT FM CREEK INTERCHANGE TO JUNCTION OF US 395	\$1,323,150.00	\$50,000.00	A?	A	N	A	N	A	11/6/15		11/6/16		3/29/16	3/29/16		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final. Plant Establishment. EEO Clearance?		CM# 11 routing
3587 FM	2	911	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. ANGEL DEENA	US 50 FROM BOYER LN TO PINTO LN CONSTRUCT FENCE WITH CATTLE GUARDS @ VARIOUS LOCATIONS	\$689,007.00	\$37,854.11	A?	A	N	A	A	A	10/23/15		10/23/16		1/29/16	1/29/16		N	Crew working to prepare for pickup and semi-final. Plant Establishment. EEO Clearance?		
3591 FM	2	910	Q & D CONST. - DURSKI DEENA	I-580 @ S. VIRGINIA (SUMMIT MALL); CONSTRUCT LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS	\$1,915,906.50	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N	3/31/16		3/31/19					N	Completion pending plant establishment (3/2019). Crew working to closeout. Check with Design in Jan 2017 to reduce Plant Establishment (per Sharon).		

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 10, 2016

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	CP	LE of CM	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CONT MOD STATUS
3592 FM	2	911	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. ANGEL MATT	SR 823, LOWER COLONY AND ARTESIA ROADS, FROM SR 208 TO UP/PER COLONY ROAD 2" PBS OVERLAY	\$1,609,665.96	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	A		9/17/15			11/3/15	11/3/15		Y	Crew requested pickup on 8/6/2016. 90% complete, Crew working on items that still need to be reviewed. Crew working on As-Builts.	2-Matt	
3593 FM	2	904	A & K EARTHMOVERS-BOGE DEENA	SR 722 2" PLANTMIX OVERLAY	\$2,792,971.35	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		10/28/15			2/24/16	4/12/16	7/29/16	Y	Crew req. pickup; sched for pickup on 7-29-16. Picked up cont.-no issues. Will send qlys out Mon. 8/1/16.	1-Deena	
3595 FM	2	907	GRANITE CONST. CO. - HURLBUT DEENA	SEISMIC RETROFIT, SCOUR COUNTERMEASURES & REHAB OF STRS. I-1263 NB/SB (CRADLEBAUGH SLOUGH) & B-1262 NB/SB (CARSON RIVER)	\$1,699,881.25	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N		5/13/16	7/18/16		Partial 5/25/16			N	NDEP requires 70% plant cover to be achieved before NOT is issued. Working in Waterway permit will not be closed until river flows recede, & final cleanup can be performed.		
3600 FM	2	907	Q & D Construction. - HURLBUT Matt	MY 922 CARSON CITY MAINTENANCE YARD	\$2,893,934.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N		6/10/16	6/15/16					N	Relief Maint. District acceptance 8/4/16.		
3601 FM	2	904	Q & D CONST. - BOGE DEENA	NORDYKE RD. EAST OF WALKER RIVER LYON COUNTY, REPLACE BRIDGE B-1610	\$792,700.00	\$41,685.00	N	A	N	N	N	A		3/3/16						N	Crew working with Contract Compliance for EEO. District Acceptance pending NDEP release (Rick confirming). AB ready.		
3608 FM	2	904	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC - BOGE MATT	SR 115 HARRIGAN ROAD AT LINE CANAL	\$668,904.69	\$33,445.23	N	A	N	N	N	N		???						N	District Acceptance pending NDEP release (Rick verifying). Performing District Acceptance soon. Pending closeout of 3601		
3611 FM	2	905	Q & D CONSTRUCTION INC- LOMPA DEENA	DIST II MTNC YARD (RENO) DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	\$760,006.15	\$38,000.31	N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Construction ongoing. CCD work in progress.		
3612 FM	2	905	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - LOMPA MATT	FR WA 06 SPARKS NUGGET AVENUE PYRAMID TO MCCARREN STREET	\$839,623.86	\$41,981.19	N	A	N	N	N	A		5/3/16			5/17/16	5/22/16		Y	Crew requested pickup on 8/1/2016. Job scheduled for pickup on 8/11/2016. 0% complete. Working on EEO Clearance.	3-Matt	
3626 FM	2	910	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL- DURSKI MATT	SR447 WASHOE COUNTY GERLACH ROAD MP WA 48.93 TO MP WA 74.65	\$938,382.98	\$46,919.15	N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Construction on-going		
3525	3	912	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS - DECARLO DEENA	DOWEL BAR RETROFIT, PROFILE GRIND, SAW & SEAL, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB OF STRUCTURE ON I-80	\$14,222,222.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	A	A	A	A	Y	3/11/15	4/12/15		5/18/15	8/14/15	2/24/15	Y	Outstanding Wage Complaint, resolution pending hearing at Supreme Court.	Done	
3550	3	918	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC PIERCE MATT	2" MILL, 2" PBS WITH OPEN-GRADE AND 3 3/4" MILL, 1" STRESS RELIEF COURSE, 2" PBS WITH OPEN GRADE.	\$19,656,656.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N		5/11/16	6/10/16	9/7/16	Partial 3/3/2016			N	Crew working on closeout, but final payment is pending plant establishment.		
3551	3	908	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS, LLC SENRUD DEENA	ADD 6' SHOULDERS, PASSING LANES, FLATTEN SLOPES, & EXTEND DRAINAGE FACILITIES. PACKAGE 2	\$8,363,636.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	N		10/9/15	10/14/15		12/10/15	1/5/16		N	Crew working towards request for pickup. Crew requested CM19I 6-27-16.		
3557	3	912	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - DECARLO DEENA	REPLACE SUBSTANDARD OFF-SYSTEM STRS G-324 & B-395 ON FR EU NEAR DUNPHY @ THE HUMBOLDT RIVER	\$7,835,211.70	\$50,000.00	S	A	N	S	N	S		9/11/15		11/17/16	Partial Relief (Str. G-324) 11-2-15		11/17/15	Y	CCO work on repairs have been made to the Str. Crew making final payment. NDEP reviewing request for NOT on 5/13/16. Have not rec'd. full DA/ROM.	Done, pending repair	Pending
3563	3	301 ELY	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. CO. HESTERLEE DEENA	US50-5, US93, SR140, SR278, SR292, SR294, and SR305; CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	\$4,824,007.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	A	N	N	A		7/29/15			9/30/15	9/30/15	7/19/16	Y	Rec'd contract in HQ 7/12/16, audit completed 7/19/16, & spoke w/ Randy re: Final P/R letter, ATSS & CPPRs. Qlys sent to contractor. Possible payoff 8/25/16.	Done	
3603	3	920	SIERRA NEVADA CONST. - SCHWARTZ DEENA	SR 140 DENIO RD/ADEL/RD/OREGON RD; PATCH, CHIP SEAL	\$2,344,007.00		N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Construction on-going		

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

Contract	Description	Contractor	Resident Engineer	NDOT/Consultant Manager	Project	Original Bid	CCO Amount	% CCO	Qty Adjustments (Tot Pd - (Bid+CCO))	% Adjustments	Total Paid	Total Amount Over/Under Bid Amount	% of Bid Amount	Agreement Estimate (budget)	Total Amount Over/Under Budgeted Amount	% of Budget
3594	ELKO MAINT YARD IMPROVEMENTS	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION LLC.	TRENT AVERETT	PHILIP KANESBERG		\$ 499,999.00	\$51,418.25	10.3%	(\$1,613.21)	-0.3%	\$ 549,804.04	\$49,805.04	110%	\$ 621,019.00	(\$71,214.96)	89%
3560	SR 318, ENHANCED MILEPOST & RMBLE STRIP	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	GLENN PETRENKO	JOHN BRADSHAW		\$ 426,000.00	\$0.00	0.0%	(\$29,295.78)	-6.9%	\$ 396,704.22	(\$29,295.78)	93%	\$ 495,820.00	(\$99,115.78)	80%
3584	US95, BEATTY, 1/2 INCH CHIP SEAL	VSS INTERNATIONAL DBA	STEVE BAER (MARTIN STRGANAC)	PHILIP KANESBERG		\$ 1,542,000.00	(\$490.60)	0.0%	(\$23,350.63)	-1.5%	\$ 1,518,158.77	(\$23,841.23)	98%	\$ 1,710,710.00	(\$192,551.23)	89%
3524	I 80, RUBBLIZE, PBS AND OG	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	DAVE SCHWARTZ	JOHN BRADSHAW		\$ 32,106,106.01	\$432,908.00	1.3%	\$966,861.88	3.0%	\$ 33,505,875.89	\$1,399,769.88	104%	\$ 34,221,117.00	(\$715,241.11)	98%
3566	DIST I, MULTIPLE INT, SIGNAL MOD	NEVCAL INVESTORS INC	MARTIN STRGANAC	JIM CERAGIOLI		\$ 590,432.20	\$74,050.00	12.5%	\$24,119.65	4.1%	\$ 688,601.85	\$98,169.65	117%	\$ 659,953.00	\$28,648.85	104%
3516	US 395, CC FRWY (2B-2)	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	STEPHEN LANI	NICHOLAS JOHNSON		\$ 9,545,454.00	\$501,184.62	5.3%	\$412,416.26	4.3%	\$ 10,459,054.88	\$913,600.88	110%	\$ 9,958,381.00	\$500,673.88	105%
3589	SR158 DEER CREEK RD, COLD MILL & PLANTMIX	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	STEVE CONNER	JOHN BRADSHAW		\$ 2,118,000.00	\$13,002.58	0.6%	\$107,126.75	5.1%	\$ 2,238,129.33	\$120,129.33	106%	\$ 2,337,256.46	(\$99,127.13)	96%
3588	5 SCHOOLS WASHOE, OFF-SYST, PED ITEMS	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	BRAD DURSKI	ROBERT BRATZLER		\$ 491,691.60	\$0.00	0.0%	\$129,394.80	26.3%	\$ 621,086.40	\$129,394.80	126%	\$ 610,937.25	\$10,149.15	102%
3558	SR 431, COLDMILL AND PBS WITH OG	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	SHANE COCKING	KEVIN MAXWELL		\$ 10,293,293.00	\$1,670,127.77	16.2%	\$708,896.09	6.9%	\$ 12,672,316.86	\$2,379,023.86	123%	\$ 11,035,511.00	\$1,636,805.86	115%
Totals						\$57,612,975.81	\$2,742,200.62	4.8%	\$2,294,555.81	4.0%	\$62,649,732.24	\$5,036,756.43	109%	\$61,650,704.71	\$999,027.53	102%
													Number of Projects Over/ Under Agr. Estimate (Budget)	Projects Equal to or Under Budget	5	
														Projects Over Budget	4	

Contract No. 3516**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60537**FHWA Project No(s):** NH-395-1(024)**County:** CARSON CITY**Location:** US 395, CARSON CITY FREEWAY, FROM SOUTH CARSON STREET (SR 529) TO FAIRVIEW DRIVE PACKAGE 2B-2**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT SNYDER AVENUE WITH BRIDGE OVER US 395, RETAINING WALLS, DRAINAGE AND DETENTION BASINS.**Advertised Date:** OCTOBER 11, 2012**Bid Opening:** NOVEMBER 15, 2012**Contract Awarded:** JANUARY 15, 2013**Notice to Proceed:** FEBRUARY 18, 2013**Work Completed:** JULY 11, 2014**Work Accepted:** MAY 18, 2015**Final Payment:** JUNE 17, 2016**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**Resident Engineer:** STEPHEN LANI**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$11,503,969.74
Bid Price:	\$9,545,454.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$10,046,638.62
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$9,958,381.00
Final Contract Amount	\$10,459,054.88
Percent of Budget:	105%
Total Change Orders:	\$501,184.62
Percent Change Orders:	5.3%
Original Working Days:	250
Updated Working Days:	303
Charged Working Days:	291
Liquidated Damages:	\$12,750.33

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$1,325,376.60	11.25%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$10,459,054.88	88.75%
Total Project Cost:	\$11,784,431.48	

Contract No. 3524**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73694, 73695, 60543**FHWA Project No(s):** BR-080-3(061), SPI-080-3(033), IM-080-3(062)**County:** HUMBOLDT**Location:** I-80 FROM BEGINNING OF PCCP, 0.112 MILES EAST OF PERSHING/HUMBOLDT COUNTY LINE TO 0.345 MILES EAST OF THE EDGE OF H-1256 AT THE WEST STRIP GRADE SEPARATION AND ON I-80, HUMBOLDT COUNTY, VARIOUS LOCATIONS**Work Description:** RUBBLIZING, PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE WITH OPEN-GRADE AND SEISMIC RETROFIT AND REHABILITATION OF G-863, I-862, H-865 EAST/WEST, I-1255, H-1256 EAST/WEST, I-868, H-869 EAST/WEST, I-871 EAST/WEST AND G-872 EAST/WEST/RAMP**Advertised Date:** SEPTEMBER 12, 2012**Bid Opening:** NOVEMBER 1, 2012**Contract Awarded:** DECEMBER 10, 2012**Notice to Proceed:** MARCH 1, 2013**Work Completed:** AUGUST 6, 2015**Work Accepted:** OCTOBER 1, 2015**Final Payment:** JUNE 3, 2016**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**Resident Engineer:** DAVID SCHWARTZ**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$34,493,342.11
Bid Price:	\$32,106,106.01
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$32,539,014.01
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$34,221,117.00
Final Contract Amount	\$33,505,875.89
Percent of Budget:	98%
Total Change Orders:	\$432,908.00
Percent Change Orders:	1.3%
Original Working Days:	250
Updated Working Days:	300
Charged Working Days:	300
Liquidated Damages:	\$32,092.53

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	\$ 1,545,514.88	4.24%
Right of Way:	\$ 6,226.68	0.02%
Construction Engineering:	\$ 1,375,687.00	3.78%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$33,505,875.89	91.96%
Total Project Cost:	\$36,433,304.45	

Contract No. 3558**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60552**FHWA Project No(s):** STP-0431(007)**County:** WASHOE**Location:** SR 431 MT ROSE HWY FROM 0.11 MILES EAST OF THE MT ROSE SUMMIT TO US 395.**Work Description:** 2 1/2" COLD MILL, 2 1/2" PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE WITH 1" OPEN-GRADED WEARING COURSE**Advertised Date:** MARCH 12, 2014**Bid Opening:** APRIL 10, 2014**Contract Awarded:** MAY 12, 2014**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 2, 2014**Work Completed:** JULY 1, 2015**Work Accepted:** SEPTEMBER 10, 2015**Final Payment:** JULY 21, 2016**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**Resident Engineer:** SHANE COCKING**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$12,720,911.34
Bid Price:	\$10,293,293.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$11,963,420.77
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$11,035,511.00
Final Contract Amount	\$12,672,316.86
Percent of Budget:	115%
Total Change Orders:	\$1,670,127.77
Percent Change Orders:	16.2%
Original Working Days:	180
Updated Working Days:	180
Charged Working Days:	117
Liquidated Damages:	\$14,866.64

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$ 890,526.77	6.57%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$12,672,316.86	93.43%
Total Project Cost:	\$13,562,843.63	

Contract No. 3560**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73807**FHWA Project No(s):** SI-0318(014)**County:** LINCOLN, NYE, WHITE PINE**Location:** SR 318 FROM THE JUNCTION OF US 93 TO THE JUNCTION OF US 6.**Work Description:** INSTALL ENHANCED MILEPOST MARKERS AND MINIMAL CENTERLINE/SHOULDER RUMBLE STRIPS WHERE CURRENTLY NOT INSTALLED.**Advertised Date:** MARCH 5, 2014**Bid Opening:** APRIL 3, 2014**Contract Awarded:** MAY 6, 2014**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 9, 2014**Work Completed:** JULY 25, 2014**Work Accepted:** DECEMBER 14, 2014**Final Payment:** MAY 23, 2016**Contractor:** MKD CONSTRUCTION, INC.**Resident Engineer:** GLENN PETRENKO**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$408,791.67
Bid Price:	\$426,000.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$426,000.00
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$495,820.00
Final Contract Amount	\$396,704.22
Percent of Budget:	80%
Total Change Orders:	N/A
Percent Change Orders:	N/A
Original Working Days:	40
Updated Working Days:	40
Charged Working Days:	33
Liquidated Damages:	\$2,000.00

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	\$ 66,035.01	13.37%
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$ 31,030.52	6.28%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$396,704.22	80.34%
Total Project Cost:	\$493,769.75	

Contract No. 3566**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60624**FHWA Project No(s):** SI-0032(134)**County:** CLARK**Location:** MULTIPLE INTERSECTIONS IN DISTRICT 1 (CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS). PACKAGE 2, SIGNAL SYSTEM, IN CLARK COUNTY**Work Description:** SIGNAL SYSTEM MODIFICATION IN CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS. SYSTEMIC REPLACEMENT OF 5 SECTION PROTECTIVE/PERMISSIVE HEADS TO 4 SECTION PROTECTIVE/PERMISSIVE HEADS (UTILIZING FLASHING YELLOW ARROW)**Advertised Date:** JULY 16, 2014**Bid Opening:** AUGUST 14, 2014**Contract Awarded:** SEPTEMBER 26, 2014**Notice to Proceed:** OCTOBER 27, 2014**Work Completed:** SEPTEMBER 14, 2015**Work Accepted:** APRIL 25, 2016**Final Payment:** JUNE 15, 2016**Contractor:** FAST-TRAC ELECTRIC (NEV-CAL INVESTORS, INC.)**Resident Engineer:** MARTIN STRGANAC**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$848,063.82
Bid Price:	\$590,432.20
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$664,482.20
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$659,953.00
Final Contract Amount	\$688,601.85
Percent of Budget:	104%
Total Change Orders:	\$74,050.00
Percent Change Orders:	12.5%
Original Working Days:	40
Updated Working Days:	40
Charged Working Days:	28
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$ 90,955.00	11.67%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$688,601.85	88.33%
Total Project Cost:	\$779,556.85	

Contract No. 3584
NDOT Project I.D. No(s): 60663
FHWA Project No(s): SPF-095-2(054)
County: NYE
Location: US 95 AMARGOSA VALLEY TO BEATTY
Work Description: 1/2 INCH CHIP SEAL
Advertised Date: FEBRUARY 18, 2015
Bid Opening: MARCH 19, 2015
Contract Awarded: APRIL 8, 2015
Notice to Proceed: MAY 11, 2015
Work Completed: JUNE 26, 2015
Work Accepted: AUGUST 25, 2015
Final Payment: JUNE 3, 20

Contractor: VSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Resident Engineer: STEVEN BAER

Project Performance:

Engineers Estimate:	\$1,409,032.98
Bid Price:	\$1,542,000.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$1,518,158.77
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$1,710,710.00
Final Contract Amount	\$1,518,158.77
Percent of Budget:	89%
Total Change Orders:	-\$23,841.23
Percent Change Orders:	-1.5%
Original Working Days:	40
Updated Working Days:	40
Charged Working Days:	26
Liquidated Damages:	\$490.60

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$ 86,434.17	5.39%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$1,518,158.77	94.61%
Total Project Cost:	\$1,604,592.94	

Contract No. 3588**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60684**FHWA Project No(s):** MS-0031(111)**County:** WASHOE**Location:** FOR 5 SCHOOLS IN WASHOE COUNTY – OFF SYSTEM: 1)VIRGINIA PALMER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, KLONDIKE & E. 9TH; 2) LEMMON VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PATRICIAN DRIVE, LEMMON TO LEMMON VALLEY PARK; 3) ELIZABETH LENZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, HOMELAND AND EDMANDS; 4) NANCY GOMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, LIMKIN ST; 5) BROWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, WESTERN SKIES DRIVE.**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT SIDEWALK, NEW GATE WITH STEPS AND INSTALL PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL.**Advertised Date:** APRIL 1, 2015**Bid Opening:** APRIL 30, 2015**Contract Awarded:** MAY 14, 2015**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 15, 2015**Work Completed:** AUGUST 7, 2015**Work Accepted:** SEPTEMBER 3, 2015**Final Payment:** JULY 15, 2016**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY**Resident Engineer:** BRAD DURSKI**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$424,819.19
Bid Price:	\$491,691.60
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$621,086.40
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$610,937.25
Final Contract Amount	\$621,086.40
Percent of Budget:	102%
Total Change Orders:	\$129,394.80
Percent Change Orders:	26.3%
Original Working Days:	N/A (Completion Date)
Updated Working Days:	N/A (Completion Date)
Charged Working Days:	N/A (Completion Date)
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$ 88,198.16	12.43%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$621,086.40	87.57%
Total Project Cost:	\$709,284.56	

Contract No. 3589**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60635**FHWA Project No(s):** SPSR-158(1)**County:** CLARK**Location:** SR 158 DEER CREEK ROAD**Work Description:** COLDMILLING AND PLACING PLANTMIX BITUMINOUS SURFACE**Advertised Date:** MARCH 25, 2015**Bid Opening:** APRIL 16, 2015**Contract Awarded:** MAY 4, 2015**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 8, 2015**Work Completed:** AUGUST 5, 2015**Work Accepted:** SEPTEMBER 3, 2015**Final Payment:** JULY 1, 201**Contractor:** LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION**Resident Engineer:** STEVE CONNER**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$2,095,006.01
Bid Price:	\$2,118,000.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$2,238,129.33
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$2,337,256.46
Final Contract Amount	\$2,238,129.33
Percent of Budget:	96%
Total Change Orders:	\$120,129.33
Percent Change Orders:	5.7%
Original Working Days:	40
Updated Working Days:	40
Charged Working Days:	40
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$66,520.65	2.89%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$2,238,129.33	97.11%
Total Project Cost:	\$2,304,649.98	

Contract No. 3594**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60654**FHWA Project No(s):** SP-MS-2325(2)**County:** ELKO**Location:** MY 925, INDEPENDENCE VALLEY MAINTENANCE YARD AT SR 226**Work Description:** DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, REPAVE MAINTENANCE YARD**Advertised Date:** MAY 6, 2015**Bid Opening:** JUNE 4, 2015**Contract Awarded:** JULY 1, 2015**Notice to Proceed:** AUGUST 3, 2015**Work Completed:** DECEMBER 16, 2015**Work Accepted:** FEBRUARY 17, 2016**Final Payment:** MAY 20, 2016**Contractor:** REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LLC**Resident Engineer:** TRENT AVERETT**Project Performance:**

Engineers Estimate:	\$437,741.40
Bid Price:	\$499,999.00
Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:	\$549,804.04
Agreement Estimate (Budget):	\$621,019.00
Final Contract Amount	\$549,804.04
Percent of Budget:	89%
Total Change Orders:	\$49,805.04
Percent Change Orders:	10.0%
Original Working Days:	40
Updated Working Days:	50
Charged Working Days:	50
Liquidated Damages:	N/A

Project Cost Breakdown:

Preliminary Engineering:	N/A	N/A
Right of Way:	N/A	N/A
Construction Engineering:	\$100,794.20	15.49%
Construction Final Contract Amount:	\$549,804.04	84.51%
Total Project Cost:	\$650,598.24	

Open Contract Status 07/31/2016

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	¹ ADJUSTED BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	² % Budget	³ % Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	RESIDENT ENGINEER	COMMENTS
3292	I-580 FREEWAY EXTENSION	\$ 405,824,356.00	\$ 393,393,393.00	\$ 435,012,932.81	\$ 447,477,665.41	110%	100%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	AMIR SOLTANI/CH2M HILL	BRAD DURSKI	Change Site Conditions and 8% Changes, \$4.2M REA for concrete paving, temporary arch remaining in place and testing submitted 5/2014 - Denied by Dept 3/2015
3525	I 80, NEAR DUNPHY, MULT STRUCTURES	\$ 15,187,265.00	\$ 14,222,222.00	\$ 14,617,874.43	\$ 16,189,664.50	107%	100%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JOHN BRADSHAW	MIKE SIMMONS	Utility Delay (Fiber Optic) and Bridge Deck Repair Quantity Increase
3532	I 15, REOPEN F STREET	\$ 14,201,021.00	\$ 13,600,000.00	\$ 13,805,279.49	\$ 13,648,191.73	96%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JENICA KELLER	TIM RUGULEISKI	
3541	US 50, MULTI USE TRAIL, CMAR	\$ 1,424,013.00	\$ 1,424,013.00	\$ 1,413,532.00	\$ 1,346,562.00	95%		Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	Pedro Rodriguez	JOHN ANGEL	
3546	I 15, DRY LK. MILL, PBS & TRCK CLIMBING LN	\$ 37,235,208.00	\$ 35,650,000.00	\$ 37,121,987.11	\$ 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	\$ 20,014,635.12	\$ 19,668,625.02	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	\$ 8,363,363.00	\$ 8,758,310.17	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	\$ 36,748,651.98	\$ 36,001,908.77	97%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JENICA KELLER	ABID SULAHRIA	
3557	DUNPHY AT UPRR, OFF-SYST STRCT	\$ 8,383,676.00	\$ 7,835,211.70	\$ 8,151,753.95	\$ 8,102,700.63	97%	100%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	JOHN BRADSHAW	MIKE SIMMONS	
3559	I 80, GOLCONDA, MILL, PBS WITH OG	\$ 10,849,672.00	\$ 10,069,069.00	\$ 10,069,069.00	\$ 10,105,444.74	93%	100%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	DAVE SCHWARTZ	
3561	US 50, DEER RUN, MILL & PBS WITH OG	\$ 6,684,652.00	\$ 6,354,354.01	\$ 6,375,654.22	\$ 6,613,920.35	99%	92%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	STEVE BIRD	JOHN ANGEL	
3563	US50,US93,SR140,SR278,SR292,SR294,SR309	\$ 5,349,866.00	\$ 4,824,007.00	\$ 4,824,007.00	\$ 4,952,289.58	93%	91%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	CHRISTOPHER PETERSEN	RANDY HESTERLEE	
3564	SR 207, KINGSBURY GRADE, CMAR	\$ 14,877,619.00	\$ 14,877,619.23	\$ 14,877,619.23	\$ 13,401,255.33	90%	63%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	Pedro Rodriguez	JOHN ANGEL	
3574	I-580,MOANA TO TRUCKEE RIVER	\$ 12,936,849.00	\$ 12,114,205.11	\$ 12,383,377.59	\$ 11,098,495.00	86%	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	\$ 6,011,968.77	\$ 5,742,049.59	97%	100%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	LORI CAMPBELL	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3577	US95, N. OF FRCL34 TO TRAILING EDGE I1079	\$ 23,642,334.99	\$ 22,120,000.00	\$ 24,805,884.16	\$ 22,479,160.40	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	\$ 3,392,007.14	\$ 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	\$ 103,172,941.69	\$ 46,099,918.55	50%	37%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	RYAN WHEELER	TIMOTHY RUGULEISKI	ROW, Utility, Earthwork and Resequencing Contract Modifications
3582	US50, RAISED MEDIAN & DECEL LANES	\$ 328,357.56	\$ 266,007.00	\$ 372,086.42	\$ 372,086.42	113%	71%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	STEVE BIRD	JOHN ANGEL	Change Order \$70K - Island Modifications for Fortune Drive future Signal System
3583	US 95, NW PHASE 3A	\$ 46,140,382.00	\$ 39,200,000.00	\$ 40,290,123.38	\$ 24,178,364.07	52%	36%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JENICA KELLER	ABID SULAHRIA	
3585	US395, CARSON CITY FREEWAY	\$ 44,149,197.28	\$ 42,242,242.00	\$ 43,275,589.23	\$ 21,937,721.12	50%	61%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	JEFF LERUD	ASHLEY HURLBUT	
3586	US50 & CLEAR CR, STORM DRAINS AND INLET	\$ 1,323,150.00	\$ 1,160,000.00	\$ 1,519,354.91	\$ 1,585,089.98	120%	102%	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	VICTOR PETERS	JOHN ANGEL	Change Orders \$215K - Drainage Modifications and Corrections
3587	US50, VARIOUS LOCS, FENCE W/CATTLE GUARD	\$ 757,082.28	\$ 689,007.00	\$ 691,415.72	\$ 691,415.72	91%	84%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	STEVE BIRD	JOHN ANGEL	
3590	US95, PASSING LANES & SLOPE FLATTENING	\$ 9,995,996.00	\$ 9,323,000.00	\$ 9,840,876.65	\$ 7,652,370.15	77%	71%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	LORI CAMPBELL	LARRY BOGE	
3591	I580 AT SO. VIRGINIA, LANDSCP & AESTHETIC	\$ 2,110,249.03	\$ 1,915,906.50	\$ 1,981,065.57	\$ 1,790,296.03	85%	55%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	PAUL SHOCK	BRAD DURSKI	
3592	SR823, COLONY RDS, BITUMINOUS OVERLAY	\$ 1,609,665.96	\$ 1,449,007.00	\$ 1,643,292.47	\$ 1,643,292.48	102%	97%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	PHILIP KANEGBERG	JOHN ANGEL	Change Orders \$195K - Plantmix Quantity Increases
3593	SR722, 2" PLANTMIX OVERLAY	\$ 2,792,971.35	\$ 2,542,000.00	\$ 2,687,465.19	\$ 2,687,465.19	96%	92%	A&K EARTHMOVERS INC	PHILIP KANEGBERG	LARRY BOGE	
3595	US 395, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB STRUCS	\$ 1,814,935.00	\$ 1,625,625.00	\$ 1,940,036.65	\$ 1,910,602.50	105%	85%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	ASHLEY HURLBUT	Extensive Structure Repair Work
3596	US 93, WILDLIFE SAFTEY CROSSING	\$ 2,394,139.00	\$ 2,177,777.00	\$ 2,517,154.78	\$ 1,879,763.91	79%	95%	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION LLC.	BILLY EZELL	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3597	I15, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB STRUCS	\$ 2,259,404.00	\$ 2,050,050.00	\$ 2,286,051.76	\$ 2,139,077.69	95%	96%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	STEVE CONNER	
3598	I580, RDWY REHAB WIDEN & SEISMIC RETRO	\$ 15,910,059.62	\$ 14,823,785.92	\$ 15,478,995.56	\$ 11,531,081.63	72%	5%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KEVIN MAXWELL	BRAD DURSKI	
3600	CARSON CITY MAINT YARD IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 3,097,704.00	\$ 2,906,000.00	\$ 3,315,487.40	\$ 3,266,304.71	105%	89%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	PHILLIP KANEGBERG	ASHLEY HURLBUT	Design and Drainage Modifications Will Increase Costs
3601	NORDYKE RD, REPLACE BRIDGE B-1610	\$ 889,259.00	\$ 792,700.00	\$ 833,700.00	\$ 785,927.82	88%	73%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	VICTOR PETERS	LARRY BOGE	
3602	SR160, INSTALL CROSS OVERS & CABLE RAIL	\$ 899,660.00	\$ 794,000.00	\$ 856,821.94	\$ 817,952.47	91%	84%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JOHN BRADSHAW	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3603	SR140, PATCH SEAL & CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,587,577.56	\$ 2,344,007.00	\$ 2,419,947.07	\$ 1,535,574.63	59%	55%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	JOHN BRADSHAW	DAVE SCHWARTZ	
3604	I80, COLD MILL,RUBBLIZING,DENSE & OPEN C	\$ 12,163,746.00	\$ 11,696,696.00	\$ 11,968,059.69	\$ 6,630,103.28	55%	46%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	VICTOR PETERS	DAVID SCHWARTZ	
3605	SR596, COLD MILL, PLANTMIX & ISLAND IMP	\$ 8,228,878.00	\$ 7,669,990.00	\$ 7,846,683.10	\$ 5,429,332.30	66%	63%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	DEVIN CARTWRIGHT	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3606	I80, LOCKWOOD INTERCHANGE RAMPS	\$ 921,701.00	\$ 816,816.00	\$ 861,209.92	\$ 656,193.94	71%	95%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	PHILIPKANEGBERG	SAM LOMPA	
3607	US95, SHOULDER WORK & PLANTMIX SURFA	\$ 15,161,921.00	\$ 14,141,141.00	\$ 14,432,071.82	\$ 10,536,723.28	69%	57%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	VICTOR PETERS	SAMI YOUSUF	
3608	SR115, REPLACE STRUCTURE B-100	\$ 706,525.00	\$ 622,000.00	\$ 668,904.69	\$ 637,259.77	90%	101%	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	KEVIN MAXWELL	LARRY BOGE	
3609	I80, COLD MILL AND OVRLY W/LEVELING CO	\$ 17,559,989.00	\$ 16,394,527.13	\$ 16,851,241.46	\$ 7,912,204.57	45%	44%	WW CLYDE & CO	KEVIN MAXWELL	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3610	I15, REPLACE HIGH MAST LOWERING SYS	\$ 1,342,987.00	\$ 1,247,920.00	\$ 1,305,399.20	\$ 1,069,265.00	80%	60%	LLO INC DBA	ERIC MACGILL	SAMIH ALHWAYEK	
3611	RENO MAINT YARD IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 810,407.00	\$ 715,006.15	\$ 825,588.15	\$ 761,434.93	94%	80%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	PHILIP KANEGBERG	SAM LOMPA	Change Order \$320K - Pump Station Required
3612	FRWA06, EX RDWY PLACE AGG & PLANTMIX	\$ 895,049.00	\$ 786,786.00	\$ 801,251.39	\$ 766,021.37	86%	58%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	PHILLIP KANEGBERG	SAM LOMPA	
3613	SR160, WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 17,636,208.00	\$ 16,458,854.00	\$ 16,857,848.06	\$ 4,651,831.74	26%	32%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	LUIS GARAY	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3614	I80, CONCRETE SUBSTRUC REPAIR	\$ 2,559,554.00	\$ 2,554,554.00	\$ 2,559,554.00	\$ 1,956,122.16	76%	17%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	JENICA KELLER	BRAD DURSKI	
3615	I80, SAFETY OVER XINGS & FENCING	\$ 15,501,359.00	\$ 14,076,436.07	\$ 14,371,964.39	\$ 3,455,477.53	22%	30%	WADSWORTH BROTHERS CONSTRUCT	JOHN BRADSHAW	BERHANE TESFAGABR	
3616	GOLDFIELD VISITOR CENTER FACILITY	\$ 814,708.00	\$ 712,369.19	\$ 764,492.88	\$ 243,695.52	30%	57%	TRADE WEST CONSTRUCTION INC.	KEVIN MAXWELL	SAMI YOUSUF	
3617	I15, REHAB AND REPAVE TRUCK INSPEC STA	\$ 1,022,699.00	\$ 904,953.00	\$ 959,002.53	\$ 868,634.33	85%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	PHILIP KANEGBERG	STEVE CONNER	
3618	I15, INSTALL ITS INFRASTRUCTURE	\$ 2,002,657.00	\$ 1,812,321.10	\$ 1,955,814.31	\$ 1,017,484.69	51%	60%	NEV-CAL INVESTORS INC.	RODNEY SCHILLING	STEVE CONNER	
3620	SR160, INSTALL SIGNAL SYS & PED FACILITIES	\$ 2,512,805.00	\$ 2,373,106.00	\$ 2,441,462.06	\$ 765,335.09	30%	53%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	STEVE BIRD	MARTIN STRGANAC	
3621	US93, COLD MILL & PLACE DENSE & OPEN GH	\$ 3,967,089.00	\$ 3,612,781.22	\$ 3,782,199.53	\$ 2,769,041.98	70%	47%	WW CLYDE & CO	STEVE BIRD	DEAN DECARLO	
3622	LV VAR LOCS, SIGNAL SYS MODS YELLOW AR	\$ 459,422.00	\$ 390,983.00	\$ 431,982.99	\$ 123,675.01	27%	45%	LLO INC DBA	JONATHAN ALLEN	MARTIN STRGANIC	
3623	SR431, CONSTRUCT TRUCK ESCAPE RAMP	\$ 5,002,630.00	\$ 4,669,566.69	\$ 4,768,851.83	\$ 1,373,930.29	27%	43%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KENT STEELE	JOHN ANGEL	
3626	SR447, CHIP SEAL WITH FOG SEAL	\$ 1,000,647.00	\$ 888,498.00	\$ 938,382.98	\$ 751,975.98	75%	40%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	PHILLIP KANEGBERG	BRAD DURSKI	
3627	US 50, CAVE ROCK WATER QUALITY IMPR	\$ 6,399,809.00	\$ 5,687,013.00	\$ 6,176,799.65	\$ 1,988,910.99	31%	29%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	DEVIN CARTWRIGHT	JOHN ANGEL	
3628	US6, COLDMILL STRESS RELIEF W/OPEN GRA	\$ 18,243,510.00	\$ 21,800,000.00	\$ 22,522,573.70	\$ -	0%	0%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	JOHN BRADSHAW	SAMI YOUSUF	
3629	I15, MILL & OVRLY, PCCP WIDENING, SEISMIC	\$ 35,284,201.00	\$ 33,800,000.00	\$ 34,270,262.33	\$ -	0%	0%	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	\$ 3,576,440.42	\$ 17,820.00	0%	9%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	JOHN BRADSHAW	DON CHRISTIANSEN	
3631	N FORK MAINT YARD, DRAINAGE IMPROVS	\$ 904,911.00	\$ 799,999.00	\$ 848,840.59	\$ 102,636.40	11%	15%	REMINGTON CONSTRUCTION LLC.	GREGORY MINDRUM	TRENT AVERETT	
3632	I580, BRIDGE DECK & APPRO SLAB REHABS	\$ 1,632,145.00	\$ 1,485,485.00	\$ 1,527,984.99	\$ -	0%	0%	THE TRUESDELL CORPORATION	ROBERT BRATZLER	BRAD DURSKI	
3633	SR318, CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,115,404.00	\$ 1,788,149.81	\$ 1,847,031.30	\$ -	0%	0%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	ROBERT BRATZLER	DEAN DECARLO	
3634	US93, CLOVER VALLEY CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,475,398.00	\$ 2,254,007.00	\$ 2,317,547.07	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	PHILIP KANEGBERG	REGINA MARLETTE' PIERCE	
3635	I80, STRUC INSTALL SCOUR MIT & EROSION C	\$ 423,391.00	\$ 354,000.54	\$ 398,540.55	\$ -	0%	0%	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	JOHN BRADSHAW	JOHN BRONDER	
3636	FRPE01, OVERLAY & REPAIR COLUMNS	\$ 3,383,194.00	\$ 2,775,775.00	\$ 2,951,677.37	\$ -	0%	0%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	ROBERT BRATZLER	LARRY BOGE	

Open Contract Status 07/31/2016

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	¹ ADJUSTED BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	² % Budget	³ % Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	RESIDENT ENGINEER	COMMENTS
3637	SR667, PED LIGHTING AND ADA IMPROVS	\$ 724,943.00	\$ 1,094,007.00	\$ 1,142,551.13	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	VICTOR PETERS	LARRY BOGE	
3640	SR529, MICRO SURFACE, PATCH & PED IMPR	\$ 1,388,805.00	\$ 1,244,007.00	\$ 1,301,374.07	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	STEVE BIRD	BRAD DURSKI	
3643	SR443, PED, LIGHTING AND ADA IMPR	\$ 1,240,647.00	\$ 1,110,000.00	\$ 1,162,806.50	\$ -	0%	0%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	LORI CAMPBELL	BRAD DURSKI	
3644	SR293, CHIP SEAL AND SEAL COAT	\$ 677,198.00	\$ 589,007.00	\$ 635,897.07	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION CO.	GREGORY MINDRUM	DAVID SCHWARTZ	
		\$ 1,048,758,533.19	\$ 996,060,282.38	\$ 1,076,084,217.47	\$ 853,496,813.41						

¹ Adjusted Bid Contract Amount for EDOC contracts may include liquidated damages (Contracts 3576 and up)

² % BUDGET = Total Paid to Date / Agreement Estimate

³ % TIME = Charged Working Days to Date / Updated Working Days