



Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors - Construction Working Group  
Notice of Public Meeting  
1263 South Stewart Street  
Third Floor Conference Room  
Carson City, Nevada  
June 8, 2015 – Upon Transportation Board  
Adjournment

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment (Discussion Only) - No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes unless the Committee elects to extend the comments for purposes of further discussion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
3. Comments from Working Group (Discussion Only)
4. Approval of March 9, 2015 Nevada Department of Transportation Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting minutes (Discussion/For Possible Action)
5. Discussion on the process of using Alternate Design/Alternate Bid in NDOT construction and design build contracts (Discussion Only). *This item will go over NDOT's process for allowing a contractor to select and bid the roadway structural section they would like to place in their bid (asphalt or concrete).*
6. Discussion regarding the Bid Review Analysis Team (BRAT)(Discussion Only). *This item will explain the purpose and process of the BRAT.*
7. Old Business (Discussion Only)
  - A. Update on eDocumentation (Verbal)
  - B. CWG Task List
  - C. Requested Reports and Documents
8. Briefing on Status of Projects in Development (Discussion only)
  - A. Projects Under Development (5-year Project Plan)
9. Briefing on Status of Projects under Construction (Discussion only)
  - A. Project Closeout Status
  - B. Summary of Projects Closed
  - C. Projects Closed, Detail Sheets
  - D. Status of Active Projects
  - E. Partnering Update (Verbal)
    - a) DRT Training
    - b) Steering Committee
10. Public Comment (Discussion Only) - No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes unless the Committee elects to extend the comments for purposes of further discussion. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
11. Closed session to receive information from counsel regarding potential or existing litigation (Discussion Only)
12. Adjournment (Possible Action)

**Notes:**

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

This agenda is posted at [www.nevadadot.com](http://www.nevadadot.com) and at the following locations:

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

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

Nevada Dept. of Transportation  
310 Galletti Way  
Sparks, Nevada

Nevada Dept. of Transportation  
1951 Idaho Street  
Elko, Nevada

Governor's Office  
Capitol Building  
Carson City, Nevada

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Chairman Len Savage	Tracy Larkin	Dave Olson
Controller Ron Knecht	Bill Hoffman	Mary Martini (Las Vegas)
Kevin Lee	Sean Sever	Mario Gomez (Las Vegas)
Reid Kaiser	Jeff Freeman	Frank Martin (Las Vegas)
John Terry	Lisa Schettler	Darin Tedford
Dennis Gallagher	Megan Sizelove	Thor Dyson
Sharon Foerschler	Jenni Eyerly	Pierre Gezelin

---

Savage: Okay. So let's go ahead and get started this afternoon with the Construction Working Group Meeting of March 9<sup>th</sup>. It's a little after 1:30. We have everybody here today. So in Las Vegas I see Member Martin and we have the Controller, Mr. Ron Knecht. We thank you for the work (inaudible).

Knecht: Likewise.

Savage: I'd like to call everything to order, and by that we have public comment as our second Agenda item. Is there anybody here in Carson City that would like to speak on the public's behalf? And Las Vegas?

Martin: None here, sir.

Savage: Okay. We'll move on to Agenda Item Number 3. Any comments from the Working Group for discussion only at this time from anybody on the Board or anybody that's staff or within the Department?

Kaiser: I'm Number 9D, Contractor Prequalification. Jenni's involved in interviews today and she might have a break at 2:00, so when she shows up we might try and fit her in, because she wants to give a little discussion on contractor prequalification.

Savage: That sounds good.

Kaiser: Okay. Reid Kaiser, by the way, for the record.

Savage: Thank you, Reid.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Savage: Any other comments or concerns that would like to be tabled at this time?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Dyson: For the record, Thor Dyson, District Engineer. I thought maybe we could go around just the room for introductions for Board members, if that's all right.
- Savage: It sounds like a great idea.
- Dyson: So I'm Thor Dyson, district engineer for District 2, which is the Reno/Sparks area, basically the northwestern portion of Nevada.
- Knecht: Thank you for taking care of 242--or 1?
- Dyson: 342.
- Knecht: 342.
- Dyson: That's all right.
- Larkin: Tracy Larkin. I'm the Deputy Director, and I'm located in Southern Nevada.
- Terry: John Terry. I'm the Assistant Director for Engineering.
- Tedford: Darin Tedford, Chief Materials Engineer.
- Hoffman: Bill Hoffman, Deputy Director.
- Lee: Kevin Lee, District Engineer for District 3, basically Northeast and Central Nevada.
- Sever: Sean Sever, Communications Director. I'm also the Legislative Liaison.
- Gallagher: Dennis Gallagher, the AG's Office.
- Sizelove: Megan Sizelove. I work in the Construction Division.
- Schettler: Lisa Schettler. I'm in Construction Division, the Partnering Program.
- Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler. I'm the Assistant Construction Engineer over Districts 2 and 3.
- Freeman: Jeff Freeman. I'm the other Assistant Construction Engineer over District 1, which is the Las Vegas up through the Tonopah area.
- Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, Assistant Director of Operations.
- Knecht: Ron Knecht, Controller.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Savage: And Len Savage
- Knecht: Happy to be here with you.
- Savage: Thank you, Mr. Controller. And Len Savage.
- Unidentified Male: Oh, (inaudible) south?
- Savage: Yes. Let's talk to Southern Nevada. Member Martin?
- Martin: I've got two members with me today, Mary and Rudy, so I'll let them introduce themselves to Ron.
- Martini: Mary Martini, District Engineer for District 1, which is Southern Nevada, and this is Mario.
- Gomez: Mario Gomez, Assistant District Engineer, District 1, Las Vegas.
- Martin: And I'm Frank Martin, the guy that'll always getting names wrong.
- Savage: Well, thank you, everyone and, again, I want to reiterate what I said at the earlier Board meeting. It's a real pleasure to chair the Construction Working Group and Member Martin and the new Controller, we look forward to welcoming you. And it's a real pleasure to have the engagement and the passion that we have with the NDOT administration, NDOT staff. It's a real pleasure. We kind of roll up our sleeves at this level a little bit to ensure that we have an open dialogue, roundtable discussion for the betterment for the State of Nevada. So I just wanted to say a few words. Anybody else? Then we'll get right into business. Has everybody had a chance to review Agenda Item Number 4, the November 10, 2014 Construction Working Group Meeting Minutes? And I realize the Controller was not at the meeting so he will not be able to voice his approval on this subject matter. Member Martin?
- Martin: I wasn't at the meeting either, Chairman Savage. So it looks like you've got a majority of one right now.
- Savage: Looks like they're correct, so I'll move to approve.
- Knecht: Yes, I read them. They look good to me.
- Savage: (Inaudible). Okay to approve those?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Gallagher: It actually should take a majority of the members of the Board. However, I mean, given the fact a majority of the Board were not present, I think you can make representation to those other Board members that this is a fair and accurate minutes of the last meeting, and under those circumstances, I would advise the other Board members that they are free to vote.

Savage: Okay.

Martin: I'll second Chairman Savage's motion.

Knecht: And I'll vote yes.

Savage: So we approve the minutes. All in favor say aye.

Group: Aye.

Savage: Thank you. And moving to Agenda Item Number 5, the update on the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise known as DBE Program. Ms. Tracy Larkin.

Larkin: Basically, just to kind of let you know where we're at. Two things I wanted to say upfront is we have 10 positions, 7 of those are vacant. So we are working under a little bit of (inaudible). So we're focusing on the backlog of certificates. We're focusing on the backlog of closeouts, and then working on setting a good, firm foundation for the DBEs we move ahead.

Now, for outreach efforts, as we announced earlier, we have a new Civil Rights Officer, Sonnie Braih, bring him in. He comes with -- he used to run the DBE Program in the State of Minnesota when he went back to school, became a lawyer, put out a shingle, and decided that it's actually easier working a state worker than, I guess, being a lawyer. So he has been phenomenal in there. He really knows the program. He knows the national players.

And so we've been working on the outreach methods efforts. We have joined with RTC with their outreach efforts, particularly in Southern Nevada. We're doing joint events. Also, we are partnering with the AGC to provide training there so they're -- also the Contractors Board also provided funding in there so, basically, the three of us have gotten together, provided funding. We're sharing our training officers and what

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

that does for the DBE Program is it's a reduced rate to the DBE or free for the DBE component, and we're keeping track of that.

Also, a lot of outreach efforts to all the other chambers; they call them Community Connectors, so the Asian Chamber, the Latin Chamber, the Urban Chamber, and what outreach is there. They also have a couple Workforce Connections in Southern Nevada. Basically meeting with them and looking how we can promote and develop our DBE team farther.

The biggest issue we're finding in our area of transportation is while we have about 488 DBEs, which is actually a fairly shallow pool, there's only about 24, maybe 30, that actually operate within our industry. And that's proving to be a huge challenge, particularly in Northern Nevada. I mean literally, in the Reno area we have about seven and that actually basically overlaps into the Elko area, where we have about four, and we're talking a couple of the same agencies. So it's a very small pool that we're working on developing.

On the Unified Certification Program there are six certifying people that participate on the UCP Board. Three of them...

Knecht: A question on that...

Larkin: Sorry.

Knecht: ...if I may. When the DBEs operate as subcontractors, do they have to be identified beforehand by the contractor in the bid?

Larkin: Yes.

Knecht: And can a given firm be a DBE for two different contractors that are bidding?

Larkin: Yes and yes.

Knecht: Yes and yes. Okay. So at least we don't further diminish our numbers by forcing them to compete head-to-head on a mutually exclusive basis.

Larkin: That doesn't mean they will work with all of them. And maybe...

Knecht: Fair enough.

Larkin: ...that's not a fair statement to make. But one of the issues that we do have to watch, and particularly as we now are actually picking up in

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

construction -- and more in Southern Nevada where they have a lot of the fuel revenue indexing they've got there -- is that the more work that there is out there, while we're taxing some of them, we have to watch that pool as to where they're actually working. We have run into some trouble, some issues with some agencies where they're just stretched too thin.

Knecht: Stretched thin.

Larkin: So on the UCP Board there are three certifying agencies within the state and that means NDOT and the two airports, Reno-Tahoe and McCarran. There are six persons on the Board itself that actually do the approval. So, basically, NDOT and the airport do all the background; we do the processing. We then go to the Board and present it to the six people; that is RTC in the north, RTC in the south, the two airports, CAMPO, and NDOT. So it goes before that Board and then upon approval, basically gets certified and goes forward. Do you have a question?

Savage: Yeah, I did. How long has this program been in existence? It's a federal program, I take it?

Larkin: Oh, the DBE programs...

Savage: No, not the DBE, the Unified Certification Program.

Larkin: You know, I can't answer that. I've been dealing with it for about two years. I certainly know it's been in effect considerably longer. I really don't know.

Savage: And who represents NDOT on that Board?

Larkin: Right now it's Sonnie Braih.

Savage: Sonnie Braih.

Larkin: Usually there's a couple representatives. There's only one vote, but they'll usually have a couple representatives of each agency so that in the absence of one, someone else can show up.

Savage: And Tracy, first of all, I want to thank you for spearheading the DBE for the Department, because I know that's a huge undertaking. I know it's been discussed at the T Board level quite often. And one of the questions I have from the feds direction, do they dictate this Unified Certification Program?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Larkin: It is part of the federal program. Each state is made up a little differently, and from my understanding, is NDOT's is a little bit different than from some of the other states, where basically it goes in and you have a full Board. But, like I said, that's the way we've been operating since I got in. I haven't seen any reason to particularly change that at this time, but...

Savage: Okay. So you think we're still heading down that path without any additional issues?

Larkin: Basically, it goes before the Board so that if -- basically, to try to eliminate any bias that might come through...

Savage: Mm-hmm.

Larkin: ...on any particular agency. So that you get another pair of eyes that will actually -- each time at the monthly meeting, and it does meet monthly, they present the file and they'll basically say it meets the qualifications. It meets the amount of personal net income. It meets the ownership criteria, and the other criteria that goes before. So if anyone has any question -- and usually that gets in the areas of do they actually operate the business? Do they actually make the business decisions? And sometimes that could be debatable, depending on your perspective.

Savage: And how often do you have to recertify?

Larkin: They have to do an annual account, basically saying nothing has changed (inaudible).

Savage: So every DBE contractor comes in front of the Board at least once a year?

Larkin: They usually don't come in front of the Board; they have to submit, basically, a piece of paper or something that basically we still meet the criteria. Hopefully, the intent is that they graduate from the program. They develop enough that they basically see the income level and they graduate from the program.

Savage: Mm-hmm.

Larkin: We recently had one that was decertified in the state of Arizona and it was because they had graduated from the program. The issue there was that they were certified in our state by reciprocity.

Savage: Okay.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Larkin: So that then becomes just decertified here.

Savage: That's all I have on that UCP.

Larkin: We are working and it has actually been going very well. In the last five months we're are working on create a single website for the Nevada DBE, so that all of us will be looking at connecting basically. So if you want a DBE question to go to one site that has one master list, and then it could also have -- for instance, in Southern Nevada they do like an emerging small business program that could have that list, but make sure that it's clear that if you're using federal money it has to be the certified list from NDOT; it cannot be any other list in order for it to count. And also with some links to the different programs of that. So a lot of DBEs are basically airport concessions. That's a good portion of them, so you can get in there and look at it. So all the people you see, all those ones at the airport, usually are in on those programs.

Then going down to contracted services, basically, like I told before, that we are really working on the backlog of DBE certifications. We hired a group -- this is actually a question from one of the Boards, the ACC group. They know the Nevada DBE pool. They are actually under contract with both RTCs and both airports. So we did a sole source on it, but they came in because they know the process on there, so we are rapidly catching up on the backlog and then processing new ones.

Then moving on from that, again, there are also the new applications we're taking in. Sonnie and the ACC group have been working phenomenally on that. We put some clerical work associated with them that they can do like certification (inaudible) and the smaller housekeeping items with it.

Supportive services contract. We have one that's just about ready to go out, and that is actually going to be interviewing every DBE we have and what we're looking at is to truly get a base of what we have. Because I keep giving round numbers, but a lot of what we'll have is you have the (inaudible) codes and we're looking at further dividing that with work codes. So that if you're a contractor and you say that I do concrete, do you do residential work, do you do commercial work? Basically, so we can fine-tune what we have and identify the gaps and help develop, so we can grow the pool that can service our industry. And that money -- and actually, that is provided by federal funds. That is supportive services that

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

we are allotted from the federal government, and for this one it's about to the tune of \$132,000.

The process for tracking attainment of DBE participation. We're doing a number of things there, but right now how we track is through certified payroll. So, basically, as you had mentioned before, they identify the DBE at the time of bid, how they're going to obtain it, and then by following the certified payrolls to that company or also by invoices to a certified supplier. And these things come at different rates. Like if you're a supplier it counts at 60 percent of the income. Unless you're the manufacturer supplier, in which case it's 100 percent, and we could go on this for a long time.

But we have done a fair amount of outreach to industry and I want to say upfront is that most of the people in here know that when I came into this program, which I've probably been involved for about a year; it was officially put under me last July, I've had a lot to learn. And I want to thank the Construction Division. I want to thank Member Martin and his son, the AGC's Office. I've been asking questions left and right. The district engineers, the REs, the contractors. I mean, a lot of them get, "Can you explain to this me? What does this mean to you? If I do this what does that mean? If we change this process what does it mean?" Sharon has been phenomenal in writing things up and helping me formulate things and get it out there, and good at reminding me when I don't pay attention.

So we've had three workshops with industry, with the construction industry, and we just had a meeting with AGC last week and it was requested and we'll set another one out. We have written a DBE implementation plan. It is out for initial review right now, and then it will go out to the industry, and I'll be happy to send you a copy. Basically, it defines the responsibilities of contract compliance of the RE construction, basically it identifies the roles of each area.

We brought back on two people who used to work in construction, they've been retired a couple of years, and they are working on a -- I want to make sure I say it right -- basically it's not a construction model, but it's basically a process manual that has about nine different chapters and it's on the subcontractor agreement, request to utilize service providers, apprentices, trucking, determine if it's on prevailing wages, and all that. Of that, about

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

four chapters are done. Five are in final revision, and that should be going out to review fairly soon.

So we're basically trying to get -- and I know I keep saying basically -- right now we're trying to get a firm foundation. We're trying to get the processes outlined and make sure that everyone actually is on the same page and knows what they need to do. And that is we have an RE meeting that actually starts tomorrow. It goes tomorrow afternoon through - which we'll be there and Wednesday. This is a big topic of discussion in the field and we're trying to get these questions answered before the construction gets into full swing.

Part of the process is we want to ask from contractors upfront, basically, if there's a resource type of low bid diagram. We're not exactly sure how to do it. We've been messing with some different forms, trying to see what works. And basically I also need to send that out to the contractors to see how it looks from their end. And what it is, is if you're using DBEs, where they're expected to be used within the contract, so that along with tracking the certified tables. So if you get it 50 percent done at the contract, or you should be 30 percent done with your DBE, 20 percent. It really depends on what items are being used. You may have the full force of it at the end of a contract. You may have it at the beginning of a contract. So we want to kind of get an idea of kind of a spot check. Are we on track on there? And the thing that we have been saying, really, at every single agency meeting, meeting with industry, and we do have them both in the north and south and we have them quarterly in the north and south, plus Lisa puts together partnering meetings, one thing that we're really stressing is documentation. Documentation. Documentation that it's (inaudible) any time you get a blip, document it. Because at the end of it, when we're having to deal -- at the end of the contract if there's nonattainment, that has repercussions with the Federal Government withholding funds, and we want to make sure that we document why we couldn't achieve it. If there's good documentation -- and sometimes there are reasons, there are valid reasons, and sometimes the reason's are a little questionable. So we just say that we're really kind of putting the onus on REs to basically keep very -- apparently I can't get basically out of my vocabulary now. The real estate on top of it and anytime there is anything, just document saying are there other alternatives, are there other opportunities?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

And then on the last part going down here is the construction crew training is starting, but we're by no means where we need to be on it yet. And on a commercially usable function there is actually a form and we need to do that with every single DBE that's out on the job to make sure -- and it's a responsibility of the construction crew or whoever is assigned to it, but basically determine is the DBE that's out on the site actually doing a commercially usable function. Are they really doing something that's useful or is it kind of a pass-through? And that is pretty well it. Any questions?

Savage: I have a couple. First of all, thank you, Tracy. And thank you, Sharon, your staff and the entire Department, because I know it's quite an undertaking and I'm glad the Department is being proactive about everything at this stage, because I know we had some internal issues at one time and now we're moving on. So one of the questions I have is from the fed standpoint, do they use a pass or fail per project? Or how does that work as far as--

Larkin: A goal is set per project.

Savage: Right.

Larkin: And that's really one of the reasons when we say pass/fail (inaudible). So if our overall state goal is 5.59 percent, so at the end of the year what we're looking at is did we, with all of our projects, put 5.59 percent or more towards the project? Each project is individual. Some projects do not support a DBE goal at all.

Savage: Correct. Right.

Larkin: Others can maybe go a little higher, others lower. So if we set a project goal at 5 percent, that's the goal for the project, that's what the feds use. Now, if a contractor comes back in and just say they're going to 10 percent, they now become contractually liable for the 10 percent. It becomes the new goal for that project. So at the end of it they're looking to say did they obtain that 10 percent? Now, if it's moving along and they don't, then basically they have to explain why they did not achieve it. We had one where a DBE actually went out of business during the middle of a contract; one where there was something at the end. But if there's other opportunities or they know about changes, they need to make a good faith

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

effort during the contract to see if they can replace it. If they don't make it at the end, that is where the feds are coming in and looking at (inaudible).

Savage: So the feds are at the table the entire time with the Department...

Larkin: Oh, believe me, they're on fast dial.

Savage: Okay. During the construction project.

Larkin: I would say we keep them more informed (inaudible) if we hear anything coming up, we've got a bit of a heads-up.

Savage: And my last question, Tracy, is what kind of grade do we give ourselves at the end of the job to confirm that X contractor had fulfilled his percentage of DBE commitment?

Larkin: That's part of the close-out process, is actually going back in to determine did we have enough of the (inaudible) supplier or do we have a certified payroll. That's how we check it and then we clear it that way. Now, if they don't, that's where it becomes an issue, because basically at that time, it's too late. But that's why we pay attention and we're really stressing to pay attention as you go along. We have withheld funds. So we've retain funds and right now we're starting off with retaining 10 percent of the non-attained portions. We withhold that from a payment. And basically that's to kind of get the attention of -- if it gets fixed, then we let it go. If it's not, we still hold it. There's still some discussion as to whether we're going to withhold more if there's no action taken, but that's where we start, and we just implemented that in the past couple of months.

Savage: And it'll be interesting to see how that moves forward because there has to be consequences and if the contractors don't abide by their percentage stipulated at bid time, then what enforcement do we have as a department to ensure that we obtain these federal reimbursements?

Larkin: And one other thing that has been expressed a great many times is that -- and this is expressed internally and externally -- is that as we set the goals there's very little incentive, really particularly in some of these areas, for the contractor to exceed the goal that we state. Because if they go really high and then something fails, DBE doesn't perform, it doesn't go forward, well, then they have to replace it. Or if they sub out -- the DBE is supposed to do \$100,000 worth of work. They sub out \$20,000 to a non-DBE firm, that \$20,000 doesn't count. That means then you have to get

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

another DBE to replace it to take that other \$20,000. So now they're paying out another \$20,000. You can see where this goes. But if you don't leave enough of a cushion -- and then that's another thing. When you actually look at how you determine a DBE goal, you're looking at the availability of people to do the work, you're looking at the geographical location of the work. You're looking at the amount of work that's out there and then you're also looking at basically -- well, all those things factor together. But you need to leave a little cushion in there, because if you use every item in there that could potentially be subbed out, I think you're putting the contractor in a no-win situation. Because if anything fails, it's going to be hard to make it. And it's a lot of paperwork when they don't, so from my perspective (inaudible).

Kaiser: I have a quick question for you. Again, this is Reid Kaiser. You had mentioned earlier that we're really limited on DBE subs here in Northern Nevada and it seems like me everybody uses the trucking or their DBE sub and if a DBE sub like that goes and promises three contracts that he can be their DBE and he has, say, 15 trucks and he's using all of his trucks over here in this other job, what does contractor two and three do if contractor one has them all? And then contractor two and three--

Larkin: You're getting the crux of a really big problem that we're having and then it's two things. Trucking is used -- actually, it seems primarily in the rural areas, and I've been asking the contractors about that. It seems like more the rural areas that that's what they use or if you have some where you use it, just you're doing a lot of things, you're delivering oil or something like that.

We really need to take that into consideration when we set the goal, because if not, and again, we have asked at different times. Like when there were three or four jobs in Kevin's area in District 3, if you're getting three or four jobs in a very rural area the chances continually grow smaller on there. So I do know, in some cases, we've had contractors who had a little bit more leeway in some of their scheduling where they weighed it, they adjusted it, and that. But that was one where it was very well documented and we allowed a good faith effort on that to go through. And even the feds, while not happy, understood what it was. But I think it becomes really crucial on us to be prudent, and I don't mean hold back, but we need to be fair in how we set the goals. Because we're also getting complaints from non-DBE trucking agencies that if it's a federal job,

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

federal projects, they're not even being asked. Don't even bother to submit a bid. Because that's where they're trying to gain all their--

Kaiser:

Wow.

Knecht:

One more question on the withholding. You said 10 percent of what now?

Larkin:

I said the nonattainment. So if a project, let's say, it had \$1 million worth of DBE, they already attained \$500,000 of it. So with \$500,000 left our first withholding would be \$50,000. So we don't want to penalize them for what they have attained.

Knecht:

Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Savage:

Thank you, Mr. Controller. Anything from Las Vegas, Member Martin?

Martin:

No. I've met with Tracy and talked with Tracy a couple times on this thing. She's got it pretty well in hand. I operate in this world all the time and she's been doing a really good job. The method that, Len, for the certification of what the contractor claims is kind of arduous for staff because they literally go back and talk to each one of the minority subs just to confirm what they're doing. And when we get back into a really, really busy time I can see that getting really arduous for Tracy and her staff to have to confirm the participation of every -- rather than taking the prime contractor's word for it, they go back and actually get copies from the minority subcontractors, get a copy of their bids just to make sure that they had bid. And so it gets pretty arduous.

Larkin:

And, actually, Member Martin has really made a good point on it, is one of the reasons why we have been meeting a lot with industry and more, again, meeting with the REs is because we recognize this is a big impact, at times, on the staff. And so there's that point of what we really need to do to make regulations and how we actually think we're making them.

Knecht:

One more question, if I may. Do we have any kind of information technology system that would let us automate that verification process and reduce the, as Mr. Martin says, arduous load on staff?

Larkin:

Some of the points, and it depends on where you're talking about. If you're talking about the verification at pre-bid, it goes in.

Knecht:

Yeah.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Larkin: And much as it pains me to say, there are times when we have calls from the DBE where they said the contractor didn't give a bid and the DBE will say we were never contacted, which is one of the reasons why that practice is still perpetuated.
- Knecht: But in the actual execution of the contractor, do you actually verify, "Did you submit this bill and did you get paid," and that stuff?
- Larkin: The payroll certification is actually -- we have what's called LCP Tracker. And that tracks the payments. So ultimately it should be, and as we get some training on that, the RE or the designee on the crew should be able to pretty well follow that and kind of get a percentage of where they're at on the project. So that's kind of doing that with a spot check. So, yes, we're trying to implement as much as we can.
- Knecht: Thank you.
- Savage: Thank you, Tracy. Any other comments or questions? Let's move on to Agenda Item Number 6.
- Kaiser: Okay. Reid Kaiser for the record. I'll cover Item Number 6 and back to Item Number 5. We do, at the Department, also internally want to thank Tracy for all the hard work because it was very difficult some the goals we were getting in that section, and we appreciate all the efforts she's done in making it a realistic program for the Department. So we appreciate it.
- Savage: Excuse me, Reid. I just saw Jenni walk in.
- Larkin: Oh, Jenni's here.
- Kaiser: Oh. Okay.
- Eyerly: I snuck in.
- Savage: You snuck in.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Savage: (Inaudible), Jenni. So if you'd like to come up here, Jenny. We're moving down quickly to Agenda Item Number 9D; is that correct?
- Kaiser: It's 11E.
- Savage: I'm sorry; 11E. It was 11E. I'm sorry.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Kaiser: No, it is 9D. It's 9D. 9D.

Savage: We're just letting you--

Eyerly: What do you need?

Kaiser: Contractor prequalification. We want to just get a quick update on where we're at, what our program is. And I wanted to update the CWG just so they're aware of what a contractor needs to do to get prequalified to bid in that work.

Eyerly: Okay. So the way it works right now, the prequalification is based on four different components. So the first one is the financial condition, and that looks at their assets and liabilities. Basically, we get a financial statement from them and look at their current assets minus current liabilities plus any letters of credit. So we're basically looking at their liquidity and that forms the basis for the prequalification dollar amount. So what happens is we look at their liquid assets and then we apply a multiplication factor, and that factor has three different components. And those are: their company experience, their volume of business, and their past performance rating. So depending on how they score in each of those three different areas, they get a multiplication factor up to 10. Anything over \$25 million is considered unlimited, so we don't keep track of anything specific over \$25 million. But those are the factors that determine their bidding capacity.

So if we wanted to look at one or the other of those areas and see how it impacted or changed the point system or look at what's not working about the current system and how we want to change it, I'll tell you right now the quickest and easiest way is to look at the things that we have already and tweak one or the other of those. If we're trying to wipe the slate clean and start over again we're going to have a really hard time, because of lots of regulations and rules and open competition and Federal Government wanting to look at open and fair bidding. Same thing with the State. So I guess it really depends on what you're trying to achieve. And then we look at what we have now and see how we can (inaudible) what you -- where you're headed.

Savage: I don't know if it's a valid achievement, just about gathering knowledge as to how it's been to review if the process is viable in 2015. When did it originate? Do we need to look at this and try to make it better? I'm not

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

sure. I think this is a discussion only at this time to see how we can get the wheel going a little bit.

Kaiser: Yes. Now, the NRS, does it require that we just have to have a program? Or does it say that we have to have to use the point system and so forth?

Eyerly: It doesn't get this specific.

Kaiser: Okay.

Eyerly: This was developed through a transportation policy that was revised in August of 2012, but the foundation of this has been around for a lot longer than that. I think we looked at it in 2005 and it was--

Kaiser: Yeah, a long time.

Eyerly: --still viable back then. So the regulation isn't this prescriptive, but it does say that you have to be prequalified based on a program that's established and that's published, and known fair and followed, so...

Savage: Has it ever been challenged, Jenni?

Eyerly: I have been here almost four years and not that I'm aware of. It hasn't been challenged.

Savage: And do we disqualify contractors that don't prequalify?

Eyerly: Yes. There's been a couple of occasions, actually, especially when the economy went bad, that there were some contractors that really didn't have any current liquidity. So if you don't have current liquid assets it doesn't matter what your multiplying factor is, you're not going to have a bidding capacity. So there were some people who didn't have enough liquid assets to actually qualify to bid on a project. And then there were some cases that we looked at very closely because of the past performance ratings and how that was affecting their bidding capacity. And those get escalated up to the Director's Office level and they make the decision about using their discretion to disqualify someone or not.

Savage: So does the Department have monetary levels for contractors who are only able to bond X amount, like \$5 million and under or \$1 million and under, \$10 million and above. Do we have different categories for different contractors?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Eyerly: No. So when it comes to bonding, here's where it gets kind of interesting. It's almost a whole separate discussion which can make it confusing because we don't look at how much they can bond for, we look at their financial strength based on their financial statements. So there's actually a few different pieces that need to come together in order for them to actually get a contract with us. So there's the Contractor's License limit through the Contractors Board and this NDOT bidding capacity and then the actual bond that they produce when they get a contract with us.

Savage: Member Martin, did you get a copy of this NDOT Contractor Prequalification's Checklist?

Martin: No.

Eyerly: Would you like one?

Martin: Please. A couple of things that I found interesting. She said what's on the financial statements of the company and their liquidity, I get that part and that's good. Len, you and I both know that in our world a lot of times what's counted by the bonding companies, which is really where the buck stops, is how much personal assets the indemnitor has as well. And so what I hear her saying is that NDOT doesn't take that into consideration in their evaluation of the contractor. Every entity, every State entity, the Department of Public Works, Clark County, City of Las Vegas, Clark County School District, City of Henderson, they all have their own little prequalification tweaks and, Reid, what you said, the State of Nevada Regulations does not lay out any particular formula. Everybody seems to design their own, and it sounds like NDOT has designed one. I have never, ever seen it and so what she's saying makes sense. The only thing is, is that many times a lot of entrepreneurs don't carry all their wealth in their company; they carry it in their hip pocket or they carry it in other assets. And so the indemnification comes from a different point for the company or the assets for the company's actual ability to perform comes from different areas. I don't know if that's any help.

I think the way NDOT's doing it right now is a reasonable way to do it because it does make them look at the company and it makes each entrepreneur, or each owner, want to keep their assets, or should want to keep their assets, within the company. I've not ever heard when somebody said has one been disqualified, I immediately said to myself no. I didn't know that actually people had been disqualified.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Eyerly: Yes. We did run into that situation. It's rare but it does happen.
- Martin: What about when somebody answers or wants to bid on a job and they've got a bid limit established by you all for \$5 million and a job comes in at \$7.5 million? Do you disqualify them when they go ahead and bit on it?
- Eyerly: They typically don't bid on it. They usually know ahead of time that they don't meet the criteria.
- Martin: What about DBEs, do they go through the same kind of criteria?
- Eyerly: Yes, they do. However, DBEs are more commonly subcontractors.
- Martin: Right.
- Eyerly: To the prime.
- Martin: So you don't watch the DBE; you leave that up to the prime to watch?
- Eyerly: Correct.
- Martin: Okay. That's the way it is in my industry as well, so I understand that part.
- Eyerly: And one thing I did just want to clarify. When you were talking about the assets of certain corporations and the way that they structured their financial assets, the letter of credit can be a tool to help that situation. So if they don't carry a lot of liquid assets in the business, if they get a letter of credit from their financial institution, their base financial dollar amount for that multiplying factor.
- Martin: Yes. Where I was coming from, I have seen subcontractors -- because we prequalify our subcontractors, within my company too, and I've seen subcontractors that carry an asset value within their company, liquidity within their company, that said they couldn't do a \$5 million job. On the other hand, they bring to me a letter from the bonding company, not from the agent, that's says they're bondable up to \$30 million. And so when the rubber meets the road in that way we usually elect -- whatever the financial statement says, we elect, in some instances, to hire them; we just bond them. Because someplace out there, when you've got that letter from the bonding company that they can just submit a \$25 million bond, someplace out there, there are assets that the bonding company's got a hold of that will allow them to issue that kind of a statement. Does that make sense to you?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Eyerly: Yes.
- Savage: Thank you, Member Martin.
- Martin: So maybe--yes, that's all I've got. Thanks.
- Savage: Thank you, Member Martin. Another question I see here is on the past performance rating. So if the contractor gets an F on the job are they still allowed to bid the next job? I mean, where do we go and what type of mechanism do we have in place for holding the people accountable in maintaining that standard of excellence that we expect per plans of specifications, contract schedule, budget, all those checklist items? Do we have enough points in this little sheet, if they do get an F, to not allow them to have the opportunity to bid the next job? I know this is the elephant in the room here.
- Eyerly: So I think there's a timing factor that I think we need to first talk about because it may not necessarily be there very last job. Because of the lag in the way that projects work, they could easily be bidding a job well ahead of its start date. So their bidding capacity is determined at the time of bid opening. So they may be six months out from even starting the job, but we're getting them on board early. So it's not an instant process when the evaluation comes in to where it -- let me rephrase that. It's possible that we don't have the evaluation of their current project yet and they may be bidding another one.
- Kaiser: Let me jump in real quick. Again, this is Reid Kaiser. This was an issue for us years ago, Kevin will remember, up in District 3. We had a contractor up there who hadn't done any work on a project and that was what we wanted to do. So you can submit a past performance rating any time during the contract. If they haven't done any work, but they're out of working days and then they just fail to show up, you can do a past performance rating and give them a bad number. The problem is that they can just go out and if they have enough financial support behind the company, it really won't make any effect on their bidding. They could still remain unlimited.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. To further expand on that, the past performance ratings, you know, from the RE level and people out in the field, we don't think it has enough teeth or it doesn't really have any impact. So, like Reid Kaiser said they're still able to bid jobs.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Savage: Well, that's not good in my mind to the taxpayers.
- Kaiser: Now, let me say one more thing. Now, one thing that we have looked at in the past, there is language in our contract docs that the Director can use to say that a contractor doesn't have -- I don't know the correct language -- doesn't have the capacity to bid work and not award a contract to a certain contractor if they have a bunch of failures in their background. We have never done that. A previous Director, a couple of Directors ago, did write the letters but they never did go out. That contractor just agreed never to bid the work anymore. So we do have that option.
- Savage: Okay. This is just an education, Jenny, at this point. Maybe the Department needs to have an internal steering committee to review the prequalification process just see if it still is effective here in 2015. On the private side, like Member Martin was saying, every prequalification that we fill out, one of the question is, "Any current litigation?" Maybe the feds don't allow that. I don't know. But it's realistic and the performance is huge, litigation is big, financial is big. So maybe this is an ongoing discussion that we have at the CWG in six months or...
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Savage: ...a few months down the road just to ensure that you feel, as the Department, you're doing everything you can with input from ourselves at the CWG Board.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Regarding past performance, I think we call them CCPRs or CPPRs. Is that what we call them? Contractor Past Performance Ratings. If they're not going to mean very much from the RE level and the field level when we're filling these out, then we don't want to do them. But they are required right now for a contract closeout. It's a piece of paper, we fill it out, submit it. The Construction Office comes in and the project's closed out because of one of many reasons, because that past performance rating is complete. But I can tell you that it could use some revamping. I do know that on, and correct me if I'm wrong, on design-build projects or CMAR projects, projects that have alternative delivery methods, that some of the questions there for prequalifying and getting involved with the CMAR process, or design-build process, is does this contractor have any previous claims? Does your team have LDs? Have you been assessed LDs? And those seem to have some impact for not only the contractor and the design team, but also to the RFP people,

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

the people that are reviewing the proposals, as to whether this team is selected over another team or their proposal should be even submitted over another proposal. So I would like to see things looked at, particularly on the past performance ratings done by people out in the field, because that's who I work with a lot. And if it has meaning we'll be happy to do it. If it doesn't, then we'd just as soon eliminate one form and another piece of paperwork.

Kaiser: Well, let me go ahead and -- otherwise, we're going to beat the Transportation Board meeting time.

Savage: Well, that's our goal.

Knecht: Just one little quick question.

Kaiser: Sure.

Knecht: Somebody comes in with an F. Whatever number you give that, looking at the past performance rating on the formula here, they've been around a long time and have done enough volume of business they can get up to seven points, but you can wipe out seven points with an average between zero and forty-nine right there. And now they've got a bidding capacity calculation of zero and even at six minus six minus five, you're getting down to a pretty low bidding capacity ratio, so unless they've been around a long time and done a lot, and suddenly screw up, it seems to me that a big screw up on the last contract, once that gets into the system, is going to take care of it.

Eyerly: It could. It depends -- yes, it depends on the score and, like you said, unless they've been around a long time and been doing well and then done poorly once. If it's a pattern over time we do have a mechanism to where they can basically eliminate their whole prequalification all on their own. And I'm sorry; I didn't state for this record is this Jenni Eyerly, Admin Services. That was long overdue. You're correct; it can. I think we, as a Department, have a ways to go, and I think I heard Thor volunteer to be part of the internal committee to discuss this issue, to figure out how to really implement this. I think there's concern from -- well, I don't know if I want to open this can of worms, but right now it's confidential. We don't share it with the contractor. So if we're going to really take a look at this, I think that should be part of the conversation, if so, how we share it with the contractor, what the process is to really set that and make it so that the

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

RE understands what the implication is of the bidding capacity. Because if they're out in the field thinking that it's not going to make a difference whether they turn this piece of paper in or not, I think that's worth taking a look at.

Savage: So I think that sounds good. So maybe in two or three CWG meetings down the road here we'll revisit this subject. Keep it on the task list and maybe have an internal steering committee meeting review things. Because work is picking up and my concern is whether or not the contractors are going to spread themselves too thin, not be able to man it, and perform the work. So I appreciate it, Reid. Thank you, Jenny, very much.

Eyerly: You're welcome.

Savage: Thank you both.

Eyerly: I need Frank's email address. Do you have it?

Kaiser: I got it.

Eyerly: Okay.

Savage: Let's move on to Agenda Item Number 6.

Kaiser: Okay. I'll go ahead and cover this one. Reid Kaiser. If you guys want to open up to Item Number 6 and maybe also Item Number 11A, we'll just briefly go over our project closeout sheet. I thought this was important for the Construction Working Group since we've been working with contract closeouts with the last two or three years and they've been such a big issue, that you guys actually understand what a resident engineer will go through to close out a project.

Something the Department does before a contractor goes to work, we actually send a letter to the contractor letting them know what certifications will be required for the project. So it essentially gives them a way to track what certs he needs to submit to the construction crew. And, again, if there's materials added or something's changed it's assumed the contractor knows he needs to also submit those certs.

So the first column I'll start out with is the EEO. And that's your Equal Employment Opportunity Civil Rights column, and that also includes the

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

DBE. So the resident engineer, once a project is done, should get, I believe it's a memo, from Contract Compliance Group letting them know whether that item is complete or not. So really it's just the RE is responsible for making sure all the certified payrolls are submitted.

Okay. The lab clearance in Materials Division. What the Materials Division does is they send a memo through all the different labs in the Materials Division, and they'll sign each individual lab. And correct me if I'm wrong, Darin, but they send a memo to all the labs and they'll sign whether all of the tests are complete for that project, for the materials that were submitted and how many failures there were, how many were passing and so forth. And once we get all those, and once we get all of our certifications, then we will send that documentation to the Construction Division.

As-builts. Each resident engineer is responsible to submit a set of as-builts, I believe, to the Districts, to the Construction Office, and what those have in them is a copy of all of the change orders, anything that's changed on a project. Do we put LOAs in the as-builts? The LOAs, which are letter of authorizations, they don't go in the as-builts, so it's just change orders and any changes that were made to the contract. And if I'm missing anything...

Sizelove: You're doing great.

Kaiser: Okay. Jump in and tell me.

Savage: I have a question on the as-builts.

Kaiser: Shoot. Ask away. You bet.

Savage: So are the as-builts done by the contractor?

Kaiser: No, they're done by NDOT.

Savage: By NDOT. And it's all counted by -- is it --

Tedford: Not yet.

Kaiser: Those are hard copies.

Savage: So it's a redline copy from the RE?

Kaiser: Yes. Yes.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Dyson: At this point in time, yes.
- Savage: At this point in time. Okay.
- Kaiser: Yes.
- Savage: So the outside consultant on a design-build bid is not involved with as-builts?
- Dyson: No.
- Kaiser: Not typically.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Member Savage, are you talking about a consultant administration? A consultant that's performing NDOT construction administration of that project?
- Savage: Yes.
- Dyson: Because if they're the acting RE--
- Savage: Consultant design.
- Dyson: Oh, okay.
- Kaiser: No, they're not.
- Savage: They're not? Okay, they're not.
- Unidentified Female: (Inaudible) construction manager would be.
- Dyson: Would be.
- Kaiser: Usually a resident engineer will get four sets of the plans, sit them in the corner and call those his as-builts and either they will, as a project progresses, they'll add change orders to them or they'll wait till the end of the job and then sit down and cut and paste and put all the change orders inside the set of plans.
- Savage: Because a lot of times, and you probably know this on the vertical side, is that if the contractor doesn't keep up the as-builts, the monthly progressive payments can be withheld if those as-builts are not kept up, and that's not the case here on the horizontal whatsoever.
- Kaiser: No.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Savage: Okay.
- Kaiser: Yeah. And another thing that can be really difficult when it comes to as-builts is the electrical items, because the electrical items typically change, unfortunately, quite a bit in our plans, and so they're constantly being upgraded. And electrical are really important because that's what the Districts use if they want to go put in a sign somewhere in the shoulder, you know, they've got to go dig a hole. What's usually in the hole? The utilities. So that's why it's really important that all your electrical items be correctly documented in your as-builts, because those as-builts are used by the Districts, they're used by the Permits Group people--
- Dyson: Design.
- Kaiser: Yeah, they're used by everybody.
- Savage: So every DOT across the United States does their own as-builts? The contractors...
- Kaiser: I couldn't tell you. We do.
- Martini: No, that's not true.
- Unidentified Male: I doubt that.
- Martini: Get his attention. I can answer some of those questions.
- Martin: Chairman Savage?
- Savage: Yes? Go ahead.
- Martin: Yes. Mary is sitting here and she says no, that's not true. She's been in other DOTs.
- Martini: Well, two things. Reid is correct around the use of the as-builts and from a District perspective when we're doing permits and even when we're going back in to past jobs in order to design new jobs, we find a lot of inaccurate information, because in many cases the changes were not recorded on the as-builts, and Nevada does assign that work to the RE. In some cases, the as-builts -- actually, if there's a consultant designer it's assumed that the designer has signed off on the engineering sufficiency of the change orders, but the as-builts themselves do not go back to the

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

engineer of record to certify that it was built as designed. And in my previous life, other people besides the DOT were assigned the responsibility of doing the as-builts. That was a work in progress, at that time, where it was being transferred to either the design consultant or in some cases the contractor, but the contractor never had primary responsibility for it.

Savage: Thank you, Mary. Anybody else?

Martin: As you know in our world, Len, we're responsible. And you said exactly that the payment stops if the as-builts are not kept up to date. And I can't say that's happened to me, but I have witnessed it and I find a lot of our procedures to be really legacy type of procedures, for lack of a better word.

Savage: So I guess that bears the question, is the Department satisfied right now with the way the as-builts are done?

Kaiser: That would be a good question for the Districts, because they're the ones who are actually using the as-builts the most or even the Design Section. The REs, they work with the District, but sometimes the District uses those as-builts afterwards. So, I mean, Thor, Kevin?

Dyson: Yeah. Thor Dyson, District Engineer for District 2. For us the as-builts work. It is an additional load to the RE, the RE and the office staff, particularly if they have multiple jobs going on and they're quite busy. As-builts on a complicated, long multi-year job can be problematic. A good RE and staff will do just like what a contractor does. They don't have financial incentive like the contractor does to keep up the as-builts, but they know that they the end-of-the-job-centive because it will be painful if they don't stay up on their as-builts. I've had tremendous success and my Permits Office is the keeper of the as-builts. The REs submit one of those four copies to my permit staff in the District 2 Office and any time I've got a question, I need to look at a job, I go pull the as-builts. I'll even make copies of the as-built plans for specific contracts that the permittee or consultant or whomever wants to take a look at that section or roadway for a particular item, they have the as-builts to look at. So it works for us, but I certainly would entertain changing. Just because we've done it this way all along forever and ever doesn't mean that we can't look at something on having the RE not do as-builts and having

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

someone else do them like the contractors in the vertical world. I don't know. What do you say, Kevin?

Lee: Kevin Lee, District Engineer for Elko. I would agree on the basis, whether it's a pipe and stuff like that, but when it comes to electrical and some of the more complex systems, because the Carlin Tunnels was one of the worst. Staff does not understand electrical, so when they're trying to do an as-built, does it come out to what is actually out there when it comes to some of these complex, say, electrical items? It tends to be around the electrical world is where we're deficient. Whether it's a signal system or heavy electrical items, that's where we're probably deficient. Now, the location of them is fine, but what's in the conduit or what's in the cabinet or what's in the board, that's a different issue.

Savage: And that's a whole nother discussion for a whole nother people because every city, county uses a different type of controller in their cabinet or wants a different type of conductor. So it's a constant hassle for us, as Kevin's saying, when it comes to the electrical items.

Lee: The basics of it seems to be fine; it's some of those complex systems, that's where I see we're deficient.

Savage: Thank you, Kevin.

Martini: Could I ask if I could chime in one more time? Here's the cost of not having accurate as-builts. When we're doing permits, obviously, the electrical is one area where we can get into a lot of trouble. We automatically do a "call before you dig." There's a normal distrust of the as-builts. But even on the regular roadways items, bridge items, etc., we are spending time and money in order to go out and do what is in place, in situ, right now. Now, things change. You can't completely depend on as-builts, but there's a lot of time and money that gets spent when a project is in the beginning phases of design or if it's missed during construction in order to change things, because we don't have a good record of what we have out there and what was built. And if you've got good REs and they've got the time to put it together, then we've got some projects that are great. We have projects that are not great and you never know the difference.

Savage: Thank you, Mary, and well said. And for the record I know Member Martin had to leave, so he's no longer at this meeting. But great

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

comments, I think, from everyone here at NDOT, and I think it goes to say that I think the as-built process has to be reviewed. And it doesn't have to be reviewed right now, but we'll review it internally and try to have some more clarity and accountability from all stakeholders within a project.

Dyson: Member Savage, Thor Dyson, District Engineer. We do have the REs meeting in the next couple of days, so maybe we can bring that up as a quick sidebar item, just to get a pulse of what the REs think of it, along with, later, some other divisions.

Savage: Good idea. Good idea. And sorry to interrupt you, Reid, but go ahead and proceed.

Kaiser: Oh, that's okay. The next column is a contractor's past performance rating. That's what we just talked about regarding the previous item with Jenni. Okay. The LE is a letter of explanations. What that item is, is for certain items that -- what does it say here? I haven't written one in so long. It must explain cost overruns and underruns, 10 percent and \$25,000. So if they underrun or overrun one of those items they have to write a letter of explanation explaining why it did that.

The next column, the ATSS, the Acceptance Test Summary Sheet. Actually, they have a new form for that, right?

Sizelove: It's a combination of the (inaudible) estimates.

Kaiser: Why don't you go ahead and explain that? I don't think I've seen the new form yet.

Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler, for the record. So the ATSS is generated at the beginning of a project and it comes from the Materials Division and lets the resident engineer know what tests are going to need to be performed and at what frequency. And it's based on quantities, so we have our testing frequencies that come from our construction manual. So as the project progresses, the resident engineer will fill out and make sure that we're getting our tests, as well as the Construction Division's Quality Assurance section will make sure that we're doing our independent assurance on those quantities as well. So it's a summary at the end of the project of what's required at the beginning, what the actual quantities were, and that we performed our independent assurance testing at the end of the project.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Savage: Thank you, Sharon.
- Kaiser: Okay. And the next column is the WC. That's if there's any wage complaints from the employees on the project. Is that Contract Compliance, the next column?
- Sizelove: Construction Completion Date.
- Kaiser: Construction -- oh, okay. Completion Date.
- Sizelove: Those are just kind of our own tracking mechanisms for the next column that is actually a key date, within the closeout is the District Acceptance.
- Kaiser: Okay. Yeah, District Acceptance. We require the District to accept each project, and what that entails is the resident engineer will typically go out on a project with the district engineer or the assistant district engineer and they'll make sure that the contract is built according to the standards it should be. Because essentially after that time once the District accepts it, at that time it goes over to being maintained by NDOT staff, NDOT maintenance staff.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Basically, just like Mr. Kaiser said, when that meeting happens, then my office will send out a letter saying we're golden, good to go, and the contractor's pretty much gone.
- Kaiser: He's off the hook.
- Dyson: They're gone.
- Kaiser: Now, a contractor can request, during a project on long projects or big projects, to be granted relief of maintenance for certain items. Like, say, if you have a three-year paving project and they've installed a bunch of guardrail the first year, they want to ask for relief of maintenance of that guardrail, they can ask for it and we can grant it. And what would happen after that is if any of that guardrail ever gets damaged, then we'd have to pay for it. So there is that opportunity for them.
- Savage: And this brings up the warranty discussion we've had in the past; and the thing about the warranty to me is we're doing this escalator project down in Las Vegas. I mean, there needs to be a warranty on that CMAR project, I would think, different than what we have in our department.
- Terry: Oh, yeah.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Savage: Okay.
- Terry: Yeah, you can get them on those types of things. John Terry, for the record. On those types of projects but on our typical horizontal highway construction there really aren't warranty items other than certain electrical items.
- Savage: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Once we give the contractor relief maintenance, like Mr. Kaiser said, particularly if it's a problematic area and we know it's going to be hit a lot, contractors have performed the work, it's acceptable, we give them a relief of maintenance. Then we do one of two things: if it gets hit, and it seems like everything gets hit in our business, but either NDOT District crews will go and maintain and repair that particular item that the contractor completed, and that we have him relief of maintenance on, or depending on what the item is, sometimes we will ask the contractor, they're right there, we'll ask them to do a change order and get that item repaired for us. And that has happened, on a limited basis, but we'll use that as an option. Get them back out and redo it.
- Savage: Right. Thank you, Thor.
- Kaiser: Okay. After the District Acceptance, then a memo that is sent to the contractor telling them we accept the DC to a construction office. That will trigger for them to send a document to the Director's Office. We'll accept it, the Director's Office will. And then the next column is Pickup Completed and that's when the Construction Administration group goes out and picks it up. And that's a rough run through of what the closeout document is. Do you guys have any questions? Hopefully, this was helpful.
- Savage: Very helpful, Reid, and I thank you and staff for putting it together. And I know it's beneficial for the Controller and myself, and Member Martin. It's mundane to you folks, I understand that, because it's an everyday issue, but all we're trying to do is light a signal and get somebody thinking from a different perspective and maybe try and do something different one day.
- Kaiser: Yeah.
- Savage: And that helps, so I thank you.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Kaiser: Maybe those as-builts, maybe we can make those electronic and make it easier to do the as-builts someday. We'll have to wait and see. I want to thank Megan, Cecilia, and Alma for all the hard work and spearheading this. And as I mentioned in the Board Meeting today, we have done a tremendous job the last few years closing out projects. We're a lot farther ahead of the ball now than we were three or four years ago.

Savage: Absolutely.

Kaiser: Now we've got contractors complaining if their projects aren't closed out in two or three months, so that's good.

Savage: That's good news. Thank you again, Mr. Kaiser. We'll move on to Agenda Item Number 7, NDOT's Outreach Efforts to Promote the Department through the Public Information Office.

Sever: Sean Sever, Communications Director here at NDOT. I have eight slides ready for you to talk about some of the things we're working currently in my Division and then some things that we're looking at for the future. And as you probably know, we've been in the news quite a bit lately in Northern Nevada with District pedestrian safety issues, but as P.T. Barnum said, "No publicity is bad publicity." So we have had some good things come out of that.

I have 12 employees that work for me in the north and the south and they're excellent staff, which allows me to keep an eye on things that are going on at the legislature. These are some of the things we do: press releases. We put out 15 to 20 per month and with those we really try to be proactive because we've found drivers and people in the public react a lot better when they hear about things first instead of driving into something. So really trying to be proactive there.

Media inquiries. The pedestrian safety issues we've been having. In those kinds of cases, we don't write the stories for the reporters or the headlines. We just want to make sure that the reporters are accurate in what they're reporting, so make sure they have the facts down.

Social media. We have 11,000 followers on Twitter, 1,500 on Facebook. And we use social media primarily as a customer service function. We always try to leave the last response and respond to people quickly. And then on YouTube we do about 5 to 10 videos per month. Sholeh over

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

there taking the photos. We stole her from Channel 8 in Reno and she does an excellent job. Our website is a popular place. We get about 4,000 visits per day. The day before the I-15 flooding event happened in Las Vegas we got about 2,200 hits, but the day after that jumped to almost 63,000 hits.

Public events. We get out in the public a lot, open houses, and school outreach. We found a niche in Las Vegas in drivers ed classes presenting our Zero Fatalities program to the students. And then our public hearings. Maxine handles our public hearings. She does really well. But we're looking to reach out to (inaudible) looking at new methods to reach out to them because a lot of people that show up to our public meetings are retired people concerned with this.

The next slide is on customer service. We're one of the last state agencies that answers the phone with a person and we get 400 to 500 calls per week. You can see 89 percent of those people got the information they needed when they called. So you wouldn't believe some of the calls that we get. People call to find out when their library books are due.

Knecht: I'll swap stories with you on that.

Sever: Right.

Knecht: Because I've been known to answer my own phone and you wouldn't believe.

Sever: Right. Ron and I used to work together at the PUC and I handled phone calls there too, so talk about some interesting calls. So the next slide is our project specific outreach. The reason why you don't see a lot of agreements come before the Board from my Division is because a lot of public outreach is included, especially if it's a larger project. But we do have about \$70,000 in on-call funds if (inaudible). I've been really trying to press that every budget needs some sort of outreach, no matter how small it is.

Next slide is Zero Fatalities. I'm sure most of you have seen our TV ads, billboards. In fact, 98 percent of Nevadans are familiar with this campaign, which is a really good reach, and 65 percent have been influenced to be more traffic safe. And so part of the discussion on ped safety is a lot of the different agencies came forward and are partnering

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

with us on this campaign, which includes the Southern Nevada RTC, the Northern RTC, and also the City of Reno.

So I've been at NDOT for three years and I've been trying to do a communications plan that would tie the work performance standards for my employees to NDOT's overall goals. And I just have never had a chance to do it. Every time I start working on it, I get sidetracked. So Meg, who works for me, was at a social media class at UNR and the professor there offered the students up to do the communications plan for the agency and I thought that was a really good idea. Like I said before, my staff does an excellent job, but I thought that would be a good opportunity to get new ideas from younger people.

So with students you never really know what you're going to get, but Bill and I showed up for their presentation. So it's a journalism class at UNR. They worked on our campaign all last semester and presented to us in December, Bill and I, and they did a really good job. So instead of going out and hiring an ad agency to do this for us, these UNR students did this for us for free. And it was half the class working on our project. And their other clients were Pizza Hut and the Reno Philharmonic and half the class was working on our project. So the instructor, too, he also owned an ad agency, so he has private sector experience. But they came up with a tagline for us which I think is really good: Safe and Connected. Keeping you safe and connected. And I would like to share this with the Board sometime. I think it's really important, with everything that's going on publicity-wise with NDOT, that we get our name out there.

So the next slide up, some future options. My staff and I are going to dive into this communications plan that the students gave us. We're going to decide what to do and what not to do. We're going to look at using the Safe and Connected tagline.

And then the third thing is our Zero Fatalities ads are done. When those ads finish you don't see NDOT at the end of those ads or the Office of Traffic Safety and that was done on purpose, because we didn't want to have to sell somebody safety, but I think we're missing out on that part. We're not getting credit for that campaign and we spent \$800,000 a year on those ads, so...

And the fourth thing is creating a road conditions app. That's what the public is looking for. We've been talking about it for a long time, but we

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

want to make sure when we launch it there's not a lot of bugs in it, that it's 100 percent ready to go. But that's really something we need to push forward with.

And then the last one is just realigning some of my staff job duties. Through attrition as people leave, I would really like to have a social media person, just one person that focuses on social media and responds to people immediately, and they would have other duties as well. But maybe one of those pie plans is maybe some of the UNR students, getting them indoctrinated in my department. And, as a matter of fact, we have an intern position this summer. I'm looking for some input. So that's my presentation.

Savage: Well, thank you very much, Sean. I think you bring out some outstanding points as far as the Department needing more outreach. I mean we saw it on the Kingsbury project and the Moana project, very, very successful. And you play more offense than defense and I'm glad to see the Department moving in that direction, and I think it does need to be on almost every project. I think the administration can review it and whether or not it's a bid line item, I don't know, but it's reality. And the social media thing, I mean, I'm behind on that one, but I know my boys are ahead of it and that's the way that things are going. So it's almost like partnering. We talk about the CWG as partnering all the time, Lisa, and we're really going to try to stress partnering. And I think we really need to stress the outreach that we have to the public on what we're doing with our projects. Mr. Dyson.

Dyson: Yes, Member Savage. I'd like to ask on that data that you put up, Sean, the 400 to 500 calls. Because you were saying that Nevada was one of the last that takes the phone call, that's your staff?

Sever: Mm-hmm.

Dyson: So I'd like to offer up that District 2, and I'm quite sure that Districts 1 and 3 are the same, we take a lot of phone calls also at our District offices. We probably -- I can get -- or maybe we have something -- we need to start track -- well, actually, I can get that tracked for you, the number of phone calls we take on a daily and weekly basis of the public asking questions. So they have multiple resources. They call Sean and his staff; they're also calling my staff in my building as well. So I venture to say that 400 to 500 calls, is that per week?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Sever: Per day, I believe.

Dyson: Per day?

Sever: Oh, per week.

Dyson: Per week.

Sever: Yeah, per week.

Dyson: So I would venture to say it's quite a bit higher than that.

Savage: Yes. It's so great to hear that we're still talking to a live person because nobody likes to get an automated teller or not an automated teller, an automated receptionist. And I really commend the Department, because normally when somebody calls NDOT it could be a frantic call or a time of need, whatever it could be. So let's not get away from people serving people. I think that's very important.

Dyson: Again, Thor Dyson, District Engineer. The last thing I want to say on this is that I think Sean and his staff do an outstanding job, Meg, and Julie. I don't see her here -- there she is. And then Sholeh, did I say that right? They do a great job and have really moved in a really positive manner. I can tell you that other states -- I was fortunate as a district engineer, along with Kevin and Mary, Mr. Hoffman took us up to the State of Washington and I was amazed at the staff that they have from a marketing and a PIO type standpoint. They have literally, if I remember, at the time, and correct me if I'm wrong, Kevin or Bill, Mary, they had like 120 PIOs in the State of Washington. And that included public information people or types that are working on major projects as well. And I know Sean said that was incorporated into the project, but these are DOT employees for the State of Washington. Of course, they have 7,000 people in the DOT. We have 1,800, I think. And at that time we only had three or four, whereas the State of Washington had 120. So you do the ratio, you do the math, and these guys are worked overly hard, so to speak.

Savage: Thanks. I agree, Thor. And, again, Sean, what intrigued me was you went to UNR. And I think you might take it to the T Board level, because I know there's been some concern about the whole research dollar, and if you can get something for free at the University of Nevada, Reno or UNLV, you might take it to the next level and really -- you get a great Safe and Connected. It's a great term. Now, does the next journalism

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

class work on another project like that? Do we take a couple semesters? Do we have a graphic that goes along with that Safe and Connected? I mean that's great stuff, really good stuff. So think about taking it to the T Board one day for maybe a little goodness.

Knecht: Their meetings aren't very long.

Martini: Mr. Chairman?

Savage: Yes, Mary.

Martini: This is Mary Martini, District Engineer for District 1. Since we're on the subject of both outreach and construction, one of the programs that we are trying to launch here in Las Vegas is kind of a network coordination for the outreach. And what we're facing, of course, as the good news is between the fuel revenue indexing and NDOT funds we're going to be doing a lot of projects. The not so good news is that every major thoroughfare in the Valley will probably be affected in some way, so there needs to be an overall coordination.

So the outreach aspect of that is to try to give people a weekly update of what's going on and in the past, and even right now, when we've got lane closures, etc., we're putting out individual media releases, but we're trying to get switched over to and normalized for the media to expect is that once a week we are saying what's happening throughout the network. Here's all of the lane closures on 95, all of the lane closures on 15, 215, etc. And one of the examples I use is that Flamingo and Tropicana are parallel routes and yet we've got projects on both of them, the RTC on one of them and NDOT on the other. So we really need to be able to coordinate those lane closures. So one of the nice things about this is that if we are good about putting out the data, companies like Google will actually data mine the information and be able to provide it to their subscribers, so that commuters and just the general population has a bigger picture look at all of the projects and how all of the projects are working together.

Savage: Thank you, Mary. Any other comments regarding outreach? Sean, thank you very much for this presentation. We'll go to Agenda Item Number 8, Discussion of the Roles of NDOT Divisions during the Design-Build and CMAR Projects. The roles of project management, as well as construction.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Terry: I guess I'll start. And since Sean had a PowerPoint, I figure (inaudible). John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering and I'll introduce the Design-Build and CMAR Project, I'm going to give you an overview and kind of lead in after that.

Of course, we've now been doing design-build for, I don't know, six, seven years, CMAR for a little bit less than that. So we've done, what, five design-build jobs and four CMARs, I think, so we're starting to get a little more familiar with it. The process for design-build, as well as CMAR, are laid out in our Pioneer Program Guidelines. This is the update of August 2013. It's been updated over time. It kind of goes through the rules that we use for procuring and using alternative delivery. It also talks about the P3 process and some of the, frankly, the diagrams from in here are the ones we've brought before the Board when we say we are here in the process or whatever. So those two processes are documented in there of how we do it.

If you go to the next one; unfortunately, the ability to do design-build and what I feel is a relatively simple and easy to read NRS under 408, which most everything we do is under 408, but unfortunately we do CMAR under 338 in a rather, in my opinion, poorly written NRS that is a little more difficult to interpret. It seems always to be changing and, in fact, CMAR for everybody runs out in 2017 if it isn't revised and added to in the 2017 legislature. So on design-build, of course, we do only best value design-build procurement. So it's a qualification-based selection by NRS. It has to be at least 30 percent price. We've almost always found more than that. We have, as you've seen, going through NEON and we have a shorter list of quals process followed by an RFP process. Then we can procure a CMAR through a one-step procurement process where they're selected during the design phase, assist us with the design, and then we have the G&P and award of the contract.

The next slide is on design-build. Of course, the owner is up there. The design-builder and all of his designers and everybody is sub to the design-builder and they all answer to NDOT.

And if you go to the next one is the CMAR process where we hire a CMTC. We hire the designer. They work both up through us, then we negotiate the G&P with the CMAR contractors versus design-bid-build.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Go to the next one. And I will point out we're still basically a design-bid-build outfit. The vast majority of our contracts are design-bid-build, not the vast majority of the contract value of our contracts. The biggest contracts tend to go design-build and a certain number of contracts go CMAR, and we do have a selection process that we go through to pick projects that are going to be alternative delivery.

But this slide kind of gets to, I think, some of the contract administration issues that we get doing design-build and CMAR and that is when we do design-bid-build, essentially, once the project is awarded, the Construction Division essentially takes over and design answers questions as need be, whether it be consultant design or our internal design, and review shop drawings and answer questions. But when we talk about CMAR and design-build, we assign a project manager to those projects and the project manager stays involved through the entire duration of the project, both the procurement phase and into construction.

So the roles, as you get into construction, are different than they are in our design-bid-build projects. And I think that while those lines have been laid in the Pioneer Program Guidelines I think they've also evolved a little bit over time as we've been through design-build projects, both now in the south as well as now in the north. And so we see a few different roles. And I think that lays out really the upfront explanation of the issue, but I think probably an open discussion of kind of those roles is really the issue of this item.

Kaiser: I have one comment here. Reid Kaiser, for the record. Some of the differences we see on the operations side is on an active construction contract, the RE, they take for an example, change orders. They'll sign the change orders. Those change orders will then go to District, who will sign them. Then they'll go to Construction Office. They'll get routed from the Construction Office to the different divisions within NDOT for review, and then they'll go to the Director's Office for signature. Under a design-build or a CMAR, they go up through the ranks on the engineering side of the house. So there is some differences in operations in regards to change orders and I think also on how claims and those kind of issues are handled.

Dyson: Thor Dyson. They still do as-builts. There's no change.

Kaiser: The contractor does the as-builts.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Terry: Oh, no, the contractor does the as-builts on design-builds.
- Dyson: The contractor does the as-builts.
- Kaiser: Yeah.
- Terry: And, in fact, we forced us to do electronic as-builts, because they have a designer and they do the as-builts. I'm not sure on CMARs. CMAR, do we still do them ourselves?
- Dyson: I don't know.
- Terry: Kevin, what do you guys do up there?
- Lee: I'd have to say I think so.
- Terry: Okay. And, of course, the big issue for construction crews on design-builds, they don't have to keep track of quantity. There are no quantities we pay. The payment system for a design-build is earned valued based contractor cost loaded schedule percent complete on a lump sum versus our normal pay items. So for that reason the construction crew doesn't have to keep track of quantities. They only have to keep track of quantities in the bigger picture in order to make sure the testing frequencies meet. They have to know how many tons of asphalt to replace so that they know how many tests to take, but that's not a pay item. So even all our new electronic documentation has no application in design-build.
- Kaiser: So is our closeout process the exact same? You still got to go through all those different columns?
- Terry: Pretty close.
- Savage: On a design-build?
- Terry: Yeah, but there's not quantities. We don't have any quantity--
- Kaiser: Other than quantities.
- Terry: --ratification, but I'd say almost every other process is the same. And design-builds are extremely difficult to close out.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Savage: On design-builds, on the payment schedule of values that you referred to, Mr. Terry, have there been any issues in the past on agreement on schedule of values or progress payments?

Terry: Somebody else jump in on some of the projects up north. The ones down south that I've been aware of, of course, okay, we make him submit with his proposal a rough cost-loaded schedule. Then, I think it's 60 or 90 days into the job, he has to submit his final cost-loaded earned-value schedule.

Savage: Okay.

Terry: And I know on design-build south we allow them, and it's listed in the contract, if he ever wants to make a modification to that he has to submit and get that done. And, of course, when he submits that one with his proposal he can't all of a sudden in 90 days have one that's completely different than that. We get the criteria and it can't be too different than that. I'm not aware of big issues with that.

Savage: Okay.

Terry: The biggest issue I've been aware of -- well, you're a contractor, you probably understand this. At first we have at the lowest level of the work breakdown structure it's either done or it isn't done and we changed that to the lowest level of the work breakdown structure to pay on percentage. And then everything rolls up above that. We also, in the early design-builds, had what I called earned value light which was sort of a shortened value. What'd we call them? Pay centers. Price centers that we had which is sort of like earned value light. We've kind of gone away from that and have more of a full-fledged earned value system that's submitted by the contractor. But I haven't heard of issues. To me the biggest issue we have with design-builds, which tend to be our bigger projects, is we can only withhold \$50,000. In other words, we can only withhold 10 percent or \$50,000.

Kaiser: Don't bring that up.

Savage: No, thanks for bringing that up, Mr. Terry.

Terry: When you're working on \$250 million job and you've got \$50,000 in retention, it seems like that's a pay issue to me.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Savage: Yeah. And I don't know how long I'll be at the Department, but I'll tell you, the 10 percent is something I'm going to keep mentioning. So I thank you for bringing it up. We need a tool at a Department.
- Terry: But other than that, jump in on District 2, I don't think the pay system in design-build has been an issue.
- Savage: Okay.
- Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. It has not been an issue.
- Savage: Well, I thank you for your presentation, Mr. Terry. And are there any other questions or comments within this room or down in Las Vegas regarding these too? Well displayed here on Amir's part and your part, Mr. Terry, as to the definitions. And any comments or questions or concerns from anybody.
- Martini: Just a question. The presentations that were given today, the cameras were on the presenters and we didn't see the PowerPoint's. So if they were available online we'd very much appreciate it.
- Savage: Okay. Claudia said she would get them to you, Mary.
- Martini: All right. Thank you. And I'm Mary Martini, District Engineer.
- Savage: Okay. And one last comment I have. So upon doing this process and writing this up, did anything come to mind from Amir's point or your point, John, or Reid's, as far as we do it the same way we've done it in the construction. We do it different on project management. Is there anything we can do to streamline it to make them both consistent or is two different animals? And I know the delivery method is different. I get that. I'm talking about the actual process. And maybe you guys can think about it, and talk about it. Don't need to know it right now because it's an internal -- I'm just trying to push the buttons and get the thoughts rolling because there's different ways to skin the cat. The process can be the same. Whatever's more consistent is going to make it easier.
- Dyson: So, Member Savage, that would mean that Mr. Terry would have to speak to Mr. Kaiser. They'd have to communicate.
- Savage: And Amir.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Dyson: I think you bring up a good point that we could help Mary the two a little bit better because design-build, like Mr. Terry said, is new. It's relatively new. We've been doing design-bid-build for a long time. That's what a lot of us are very, very familiar with. Now, District 1 has the lead on design-build and I think District 3 and 2 have done some CMARs now, so we're moving along in that direction. District 2 is going to have a second design-build project, USA Parkway.

Savage: Right. And I want to be very clear. This Department does an excellent job in CMAR delivery, design-build, hard bid, plan of spec. We do a great job. Everyone works their tails off and everybody's working together, but I think we can just be a little more streamlined and look at it from the outside in. So that's enough on that one. Let's move on to Agenda Item Number 9.

Kaiser: Okay. 9A. Megan.

Sizelove: Yes. I'll keep it brief because I'm sure everybody's watching their time. But as most of you know, Electronic Documentation, that's the software that the Department chose to purchase to assist us with contract administration during the construction phase. Just a reminder, every contract 3576 and above will be administered through electronic doc. It will be an eDoc contract, so we will utilize that software.

A quick update is we are about 60 percent complete with the training. I would say all of District 1 has been trained and they have one project that's actually in the process, and this has been moving well along the process, so that's good. We are just about finished with District 2 training and then next month we will tackle District 3. So we're trying to structure our implementation rollout as the contracts come out throughout the state.

Like I mentioned, District 1 has a contract 3577 and then District 2, I believe, has 3578. Those are the two contracts that are currently in the software, running along smoothly. They've gone through a couple of different payment processes successfully, so that's good. The contractors are getting paid. We're excited about that. So we're, at this point in time, in terms of District 1, just continuously working with the crew, making sure that all their questions are answered, that they don't feel like they've just been given the software and the initial training and thrown out to the wolves. Well, we're working with them pretty hands-on. And then as we

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

continue to roll out the contracts, we'll be touching base with all the crews to make sure they're comfortable as well, but so far things are going great.

Savage: Good. That's great news.

Sizelove: Yes. It is.

Savage: And good feedback from the industry.

Sizelove: In terms of the construction or construction crews within...

Savage: Yeah, within the Department.

Sizelove: Within the Department? So far, yeah. Certainly it's finally to a stage, I would say, that the REs are starting to wrap their head around the software...

Savage: Excellent.

Sizelove: ...and come up with some really great questions and helping us tackle more of the complex issues, which is nice for us to get their involvement. And from a contractor perspective, we've been mentioning it at the AGC meetings and getting them -- just making sure that this isn't a new -- a surprise to them.

Savage: That's good. Well, thank you, Megan. Item Number B: CWG Task List.

Kaiser: That's just a group of items that I put in there that I pulled out of the notes from the previous meeting. I think we covered Contractor Prequalification. Construction Agreements. We had agreed that we would hear about that in June, giving you an update on where we are in our construction agreements. Tracy covered the NDOT DBE Process. And report on CMAR projects. Are you guys still wanting an update on change orders from the CMAR projects? That was an item from, I believe, the previous CWG.

Dyson: Thor Dyson, District Engineer. Wasn't that referring to the CMAR job on Kingsbury?

Kaiser: Well, there was Kingsbury. See, I wasn't quite clear on it. Do you guys want it from all the CMARs or was it just Kingsbury or was it also including...

Savage: I think it's the CMAR projects.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Kaiser: Yeah. Okay.
- Savage: As a Department, we write them up as a GMP. And we just need to reassure the Board that these CMAR projects are negotiated. We need to be accountable for that number.
- Kaiser: Okay. Okay.
- Savage: So I think we need to, maybe on a semiannual basis Reid.
- Kaiser: Okay. Okay.
- Savage: And then you were going to add partnering to this task list.
- Kaiser: Sure.
- Savage: As well as prequalification.
- Kaiser: Now, prequal, I'll leave up there is number one and we'll cover that in September.
- Savage: Okay.
- Kaiser: Partnering. Okay. You want to hear on partnering? It's a later item but if you want to hear about it now we can. It's 11E.
- Savage: Okay. Let's hear about it.
- Schettler: Okay. This is Lisa Schettler, Construction Department Program Manager. So we've mentioned before that we were working on a project to research and gather nationwide best practices and compile those on the FHWA's website. FHWA gave us some money specifically for this project. We are going to have a conference here in Nevada, the nationwide conference. So the RFP went out and the deadline has passed and now we have a March 17<sup>th</sup> deadline for the selection committee to finish scoring the proposal that we got. So we hopefully will have an agreement in April, I think at the latest, as long as the proposal -- I guess there were two proposals, but only one made it through the -- had all of the -- what you need in an RFP. So it didn't quite make it through the agreement. So this was processed.
- Knecht: You didn't reach out to the universities, did you?
- Schettler: It was advertised in all kinds of forums, so...

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Knecht: Well, they do research, I'm told.

Schettler: Yes. So, anyway, we're moving forward with that. Hopefully, we'll get started with that in April. The steering committee, we met with Reid recently as the not-so-new Assistant Director of Operations to go over our mission statement for the steering committee and we're just waiting for one final review. We've added internal partnering as part of the mission statement, so once we have final approval on that we're going to move forward. We're trying to form the committee and have our first meeting.

Savage: So who's on the committee, Lisa?

Schettler: Well, I don't have names. We have positions that we came up with. So it's the NDOT Director, Deputy Director, some of our Division Chiefs, the District, all three Districts, Project Management, and then we wanted the agency in the north, the agency Nevada here in the north and Las Vegas agency involved in it. And then I would just be the facilitator, we want to look at construction partnering, internal partnering, (inaudible) resolution process, and we've made the efforts for those (inaudible) processes. So hopefully we'll be looking at a meeting for that. And then the DRBF agreement, DRBF is the Dispute Resolution Board Foundation. They're a nonprofit international organization that we identified as a sole source meaning other states (inaudible) they're international. They're used all over the place. We wanted them to come in and do our training for our dispute resolution team members and also for NDOT and contractors and other agencies and other stakeholders, so that we would have a pool of Dispute Resolution Team members that are trained specifically for Nevada to utilize on our projects. We're going to require dispute resolution teams on projects over \$10 million and 120 working days. So where we're at with the agreement is we've got the proposal. We've negotiated the proposal. There are just a couple of requirements that NDOT has with insurance. We're trying to work through those issues because it's a nonprofit organization.

Savage: Okay.

Schettler: It's a little tough for them. So we have identified or we have funding on projects already for dispute resolution teams and specifically one of them is Boulder City Bypass. So since we don't have this training done yet we're looking at nearby states who have done the training. They have lists

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

and we're looking into ways we can select some good dispute resolution team members for these projects prior to this training.

Savage: Good.

Schettler: The other thing I'm just going to add is we've had three projects were applications for our Partnering Awards in 2014 and we're going to have that up at the next Board meeting in April. We're going to issue the awards.

Savage: How many people submitted on that, out of curiosity?

Schettler: There were three projects and we -- just as a little background, we sent reminders out to the resident engineers. We also have just, I think, a couple times the agencies in the north and the south; the three projects are all up north. There's Carlin Tunnels, the Kingsbury Grade, and Mt. Rose. So I think maybe we need to figure out why we're not getting projects from the south to apply, because there are definitely projects in the south too. So that's something that we want to look at in the future.

Savage: Okay.

Schettler: So that's (inaudible) what we've got. And on a side note, we did get one of our projects, Carlin Tunnels, on the cover of International Partnering Institute Magazine. They did not do an article, but they did put a picture on the cover. So I was going to give these to Kevin. But we are a member of the International Partnering Institute so anybody in the Department, anyone outside the Department, I encourage you to look at their site. They have a lot of good information. One of the things they just had in their most recent magazine, that in the years 2013 and 2014 they found that for every dollar invested in partnering there was a savings of \$96 on projects on average.

Savage: Thank you, Lisa.

Schettler: You're welcome.

Savage: Any comments or questions? I appreciate the effort. It's a goal here at CWG to mitigate the attorney's fees that we pay and hopefully this is a tool that will see some results for us. So I appreciate everyone's time and effort and engagement, because it's very important. Moving on to Agenda Item Number 10.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

Kaiser: Okay. Item 10, that is the Five-Year Plan. John, that got away from us there, didn't it?

Terry: I don't know. Maybe a little bit for the Controller Knecht. In fact, I don't know if you've been exposed to NDOT. At the Board meeting today we talked about the STIP and that's the long-range plan and the formal plan. The five-year plan is a little bit different than that, in that it's essentially what we're getting ready to put out. It's intentionally over-committed beyond the amount of dollars we probably have in that year, but we want to make sure we have enough projects ready to go or in case something goes wrong with one project, we get more money, something else. Bid prices come in lower than expected, which has been happening lately.

And it is also, I'll give a heads-up, one of the main things that the Director was talking about using this program to help us prioritize better between the categories. Currently we say we're going to do this much value in capacity projects, this much value in our 3R projects, this much in safety projects, etc. We don't really compete them against each other, and we're hoping to look at a better way to maybe make them compete against each other, but also to show that the projects we're doing are really meeting the performance measures, that we are negotiating with FHWA, as well as with the State, and so we want to make that connection between those performance measures and the projects we're doing.

Like safety, we're saying use Zero Fatalities, we're doing projects we think were improving safety, then that improves that performance measure. The performance measure for capacity is we don't want break down levels of service on our interstate freeways; is this project going to improve those levels of service on that freeway, while probably at the same time improving safety on that freeway, then that meets those two performance measures for that.

So we're not there yet on making those two connect. That's part of what we're doing. But the rest of the five-year plan is out there of projects we're working on, but I will say it's still a little bit light in the years, especially '19 and '20, and we have some work to do on capacity projects to fill those out there. But pretty much anything that's shown this year and next year will go out up to the point where perhaps we're overcommitted and we have to hold on to a project until the next year. With that, if I can answer any questions I'd be glad to. It used to be a two-page list, but I noticed it's

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

gotten to five now, but I tried to keep it as a shortened list but that never seems to work.

Kasier: Yeah. Well, part of the thing, I think they even have on here water quality projects, ADA projects. There's an admin or funding or a division that has projects, I believe they're going on here now.

Terry: Which has added to the over commitment issue.

Kaiser: Yeah.

Knecht: Thank you, John. That's helpful.

Freeman: This is Jeff Freeman. I'd just like to expand on something John had mentioned about finding extra money. The Department has traditionally been very good at the end of the federal fiscal year going after other DOTs unspent money. I think we got, what, \$10, \$11, last year?

Terry: I think \$11.

Freeman: \$11 million last year. So this over commitment in the Five-Year Plan is also a plan to be ready when October, when the federal fiscal year cycles through, to try to grab those extra dollars out there. So the Department has been very proactive on that and has gotten quite a bit of money in the past.

Terry: Well, and not that we see it coming but when the stimulus program came years ago and they wanted everything shovel-ready, well, they're not shovel-ready if you haven't finished the design. We don't have very much on the shelf anymore, so we need to get a few extra jobs on the shelf ready to go. But the problem is you don't want to have too many on the shelf because, frankly, they don't age very well. In other words, you've got to put a lot of effort into them if they sit on the shelf for a while. So it's a little bit of a game. You've got to design more than you can afford to put out but not by too much.

Savage: Thank you, John. Thank you, Jeff. I don't have any questions. Appreciate the presentation. Let's move on to Agenda Item Number 11.

Kaiser: Okay, 11A. That's our Project Closeout Document. You guys got any questions on our status? Any projects?

Savage: I have a question on 3292. Let's see, it's page...

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Knecht: It's in the middle of page two.
- Savage: Yes. Any update or status on job closeout? It says we're waiting for potentially Change Order 6491. Who's working on 69? Anything else besides what I see here or that's what we've got for now?
- Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler. There's a couple of outstanding issues on that contract and I don't know if we want to have that in public or behind closed doors session?
- Savage: Okay. Very good.
- Knecht: There's obviously something suspicious about that because the bid price was \$393,393,390. How did they get to that?
- Kaiser: Reid Kaiser, just for the record. What contractors will do is they'll come up with a bid dollar amount maybe an hour or two before and they'll write it in like that, but that won't be what their actual price is because they may still be waiting on prices from subs. So what they'll do is since they have that dollar amount then they can just go back and write in their dollar amount for subs.
- Knecht: Okay.
- Kaiser: And work it about that way. And then, I don't know if they modify their mode or whatever at the end so that same number comes out.
- Savage: Because as a contractor, we're very superstitious. I don't have any other questions.
- Kaiser: Okay.
- Savage: Let's move on to Item 11E.
- Kaiser: Now, one thing you'll notice, there's only one job. And the reason for that is our construction administration group has been working feverishly on getting electronic documentation out to the crews. So that's where they've been spending all their time. So now that that is out we are going to start getting the contract closeout again. So hopefully next quarter you should see a few more than just one.
- Savage: Good.
- Kaiser: Is that a fair statement?

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Sizelove: Absolutely it is. Megan Sizelove. I'd like to add to that as well. We want to just start our time period of reporting over again at the beginning of the year, so we're in March, so theoretically it should've covered a three-month span. However, based on when we run the numbers, we run everything at the end of the month. So, therefore, this really only captured January. February was not captured, based on the time of the submittal for all the information for today's meeting. So it just...
- Savage: It was a timing issue?
- Sizelove: Correct, yes. In the June meeting we'll be able to report on February, March, April, May.
- Savage: Good.
- Sizelove: We'll see an increase in that number.
- Savage: Double digits.
- Sizelove: We can only hope.
- Savage: Thank you, Megan. Thank you, Reid. Let's go to Agenda Item Number 11C. That's the breakdown of the closeout.
- Kaiser: That's our one project we closed out.
- Savage: Yeah.
- Sizelove: That's good.
- Savage: All right. And 11D, Status of Active Projects.
- Kaiser: Okay. Reid Kaiser. Controller, red means that we're over on budget and time, okay, on that project. And a yellow means that we're potentially going to turn to red here pretty quick.
- Knecht: You remember.
- Kaiser: Yes, I do remember. We're approaching budget and time, so that's what those colors mean.
- Knecht: Thank you.
- Foerschler: Sharon Foerschler. I'm sorry, it's or. The red can be or, it's not both. It can be budget or time.

Minutes of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Board of Directors Construction Working Group Meeting  
March 9, 2015

- Kaiser: Oh, okay. Okay.
- Foerschler: And the same with the yellow.
- Kaiser: Okay. Perfect. Thank you, Sharon.
- Foerschler: You're welcome.
- Savage: And the only question I had, and I think, John, you answered it earlier, is I see Amir's name at the top and these are all design-build projects for closeout; is that correct or not?
- Terry: You're looking at this list, right?
- Terry: No. That may just mean that Project Management led the design, not necessarily that it's design-build. Like 3292 isn't design-build. Some of them are.
- Dyson: So incidentally -- Thor Dyson, District Engineer -- 3292, the District acceptance and a complete District relief of maintenance letter was sent out last week.
- Savage: Okay. Thank you, Thor. I don't have any questions. Mr. Controller.
- Knecht: No. Reid answered mine.
- Savage: Okay. So with that being said, that'll close Agenda Item Number 11. We already did 11B. We'll go to Agenda Item Number 12. Any public comment here in Carson City? Any public comment down in Las Vegas?
- Martini: None here.
- Savage: We'll go to Agenda Item Number 13. I'll take a motion to close the session at this time...
- Knecht: So moved.
- Savage: ...for the information regarding the legal counsel. There was a motion made by the Controller. I'll second the motion. Session closed at this time.



## MEMORANDUM

May 29, 2015

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

**FROM:** Rudy Malfabon, Director

**SUBJECT:** June 8, 2015 Construction Working Group Meeting

**Item # 5:** Update on the use of the Life Cycle Equivalency Factor for Boulder City Bypass, Phase 1

---

### **Summary:**

This item is an update to the February meeting agenda item regarding the use of the Life Cycle Equivalency Factor on the Boulder City Bypass, Phase 1 project in Las Vegas. The Board approved award of this contract to Fisher Sand and Gravel. The estimated savings realized by using the Life Cycle Equivalency Factor are approximately \$3.6 million in net present values, but many times that in actual future costs.

### **Background:**

A Life Cycle Equivalency Factor is used to analyze the future maintenance costs for a specific project. The frequency of future maintenance activities has been anticipated based on typical deterioration rates. These rates and the scope of the maintenance work have been established for both asphalt and concrete pavement.

Using the length and width of Phase 1 of the Boulder City Bypass, the quantities of material for future maintenance work can be estimated. The scope of future work on the asphalt pavement includes removing part of the existing surface by cold milling and replacing it with new asphalt pavement. This is anticipated to happen three times in the 35 year analysis period. The scope of work on the concrete pavement includes grinding the surface to restore a smooth ride, repairing minor spalling, replacing slabs and sealing the concrete joints. This is anticipated to happen once or twice during the 35 year analysis period, depending on the item of work.

The cost of each maintenance operation and the year it is expected to be completed is incorporated into the Life Cycle Equivalency Factor calculation. The software program used is supplied by the Federal Highway Administration. Also included is the Real Discount Rate, which is supplied by the Office of Management and Budget of the White House, Circular A-94, Appendix C. This is the percentage suggested for analysis of cost effectiveness.

### **Analysis:**

When a dollar amount is developed for the Life Cycle Equivalency Factor, that number indicates which pavement surface will be more expensive to maintain in the future. That number is

applied to the bids for asphalt pavement, in this case, and the bid for both asphalt and concrete are reviewed. The lowest overall bid is proposed for approval of award.

**List of Attachments:**

None.

**Recommendation for Board Action:**

Informational item only.

**Prepared by:**

Darin Tedford, Chief Materials Engineer



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

## MEMORANDUM

May 29, 2015

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

**FROM:** Rudy Malfabon, P.E., Director

**SUBJECT:** June 8, 2015 Construction Working Group Meeting

**Item #6:** Explanation of the columns on the Construction Contract Closeout Status Document

---

### **Summary:**

The Department has assembled an interdisciplinary team, the Bid Review and Analysis Team (BRAT), to develop procedures and guidelines to evaluate bid proposals for unbalanced bids or irregularities. Unbalanced bids have the potential to create administrative and enforcement issues in the field, which could result in additional cost to the state or an inferior product in the field. Considering the results of the evaluation, the BRAT makes a recommendation to the Department Director on whether or not to award the contract in the best interest of the State. The BRAT performs bid reviews on all our standard contracts advertised for construction (some contracts less than \$250,000 do not go through this review).

Attached is the Bid Review and Analysis Procedure memo that provides a summary of the bid review process.

### **Background:**

Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 635.114 requires that State Transportation Departments examine unit bid prices submitted to determine reasonable conformance to the engineer's estimated prices and to thoroughly evaluate bids with extreme variations from the engineer's estimate or where obvious unbalancing of unit prices have occurred. Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 408.343 gives the Department legal authority to reject bids if they are unbalanced, incomplete or contain irregularities. Section 102.07 of NDOT's Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction also describes situations where unbalanced or irregular bids may be rejected by the Department.

### **Analysis:**

The BRAT goes through a thorough review of accepted bid proposals, as described in

the attached BRAT Procedures memorandum.

**List of Attachments:**

1. BRAT Procedures
2. Sample BRAT Summary Memo
3. Sample BRAT Sensitivity Analysis

**Recommendation:**

Informational item only.

**Prepared by:**

Paul Frost, Chief Roadway Design Engineer, BRAT Co-Chair



STATE OF NEVADA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CONSTRUCTION/DESIGN DIVISIONS

MEMORANDUM

June 20, 2012

TO: Christi Thompson, Chief, Administrative Services

FROM: Paul Frost, P.E., Chief Roadway Design Engineer  
Jeff Shapiro, P.E., Chief Construction Engineer

SUBJECT: Bid Review and Analysis Procedures

**Background:**

Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 635.114 requires that State Transportation Departments examine unit bid prices submitted to determine reasonable conformance to the engineer's estimated prices and to thoroughly evaluate bids with extreme variations from the engineer's estimate or where obvious unbalancing of unit prices have occurred. Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 408.343 gives the Department legal authority to reject bids if they are unbalanced, incomplete or contain irregularities. The purpose of this Memorandum is to formalize the Bid Review and Analysis procedures to comply with 23 CFR § 635.114 and to assist the Department with the award process under NRS 408.343 and Subsection 102.07 of the Standard Specifications.

**Definitions:**

**Mathematically Unbalanced Bid:** A bid is mathematically unbalanced if the bid contains lump sum or unit bid items that do not reflect reasonable actual costs plus a reasonable proportionate share of the bidder's anticipated profit, overhead costs and other indirect costs.

**Materially Unbalanced Bids:** A bid is materially unbalanced if there is a reasonable doubt that award to the bidder submitting a mathematically unbalanced bid will result in the lowest ultimate cost to the Department.

**Significant Item of Work:** An individual item of work that exceeds \$50,000.00 in value of either the Engineer's estimate or the apparent low bid.

**Significantly Unbalanced Bid Price:** Where the apparent low bidder's unit price differs

from the engineer's estimate, expressed as a percent of the estimate, by more than 150% or less than 75%.

**Bid Review and Analysis Team (BRAT):** The BRAT will be comprised of following:

- Primary BRAT Members
  - Chief Road Design Engineer (Chair)
  - Chief Construction Engineer (Co-Chair)
  - Specifications Engineer
  - Roadway Design Principal Engineer
  - Constructability Section Manager
  - FHWA Operations Team Representative (on Full Oversight Federal Aid Projects only)
- As-Needed BRAT Members
  - Contract Services Section Manager
  - Attorney General's Office Representative
  - Contract Compliance Section Manager
  - Technical Division Representative
    - Project Manager / Coordinator
    - Lead Designer
    - Price Checker
    - Resident Engineer

### **Bid Review and Analysis Procedures**

1. After bid opening Administrative Services will provide to the BRAT members a complete bid tab comparing all bidders as well as a price sensitivity report. The report will contain all significant items of work and identify those with significantly unbalanced bid prices. The price sensitivity report will identify the amount a quantity of work must vary to change the order of the two low bidders. These reports will typically be provided within a few working days after bid opening. Administrative Services will also notify the BRAT as soon as possible, of any defects or challenges that would or may render any of the bids "nonresponsive" or otherwise affect the award of the contract.
2. The BRAT members will perform an analysis of the items on the bid tab and price sensitivity report. The analysis will include items that could have considerable quantity variability, items that raise concerns of risk of material unbalancing, or

any other item that has high potential for changing the order of the bidders if the bid quantity is incorrect.

3. The BRAT will typically meet on a weekly basis to review and discuss the analysis of all bids. The meeting, either in person or by teleconference, will be comprised of a minimum of 3 Primary BRAT Members with at least one member each from the Design Division and the Construction Division. As-Needed BRAT Members may also be invited to participate to address specific project needs or issues.
4. An unbalanced bid analysis will be performed if:
  - a. The BRAT becomes aware of an error in a quantity of an item in the bid proposal.
  - b. An individual item of work is found to be significant to the contract and significantly unbalanced.
5. An unbalanced bid analysis shall consist of the following steps:
  - a. The unit prices in the engineer's estimate for all items identified as being significantly unbalanced will be reviewed for correctness. Corrections will be made as needed and the low bidder's unit prices will be reevaluated against the corrected engineer's estimate to determine if the item remains significantly unbalanced.
  - b. Quantities for all items found to be significant to the contract will be checked and verified. Quantities will be determined based upon the bidding documents and the construction methodologies depicted in the plans. These quantities will be used only for the purpose of performing the unbalanced bid analysis.
  - c. Quantities with known errors will be corrected, and the gross sum for the contract for each bidder will be recalculated.
  - d. A comparison of the calculated gross sum totals will be made. If the calculated gross sum for the apparent low bid is found to be higher than the calculated gross sum of another bidder, the low contract bid proposal

shall be determined to be materially unbalanced. If the calculated gross sum of the apparent low bid is found to be less than the calculated gross sum of all other bidders, that bid shall be determined to be not materially unbalanced.

- e. Repeat item 5.d. as necessary using the next low contract bid proposal until a contract bid is found to be not materially unbalanced.
6. The BRAT will meet to discuss the results of the unbalanced bid analysis.
    - a. If the apparent low bid is found to be not materially unbalanced (mathematically unbalanced), the contract will be considered for award at the bid amount in accordance with the Standard Specifications. The contract will be based upon the bid amount and the quantities shown in the bidding documents.
    - b. If the apparent low bid is found to be materially unbalanced, it will be considered irregular as reasonable doubt exists that the bid does not represent the lowest cost to the Department.
  7. The BRAT will document all meetings and discussions of each bid analysis. The bid analysis for each project will culminate with written recommendation, subject to the Standard Specifications as modified by the Special Provisions, of one of the following actions to the Chief, Administrative Services, and subsequent submittal to the Director's Office for action:
    - a. Award the contract to the low bidder.
    - b. Reject the low bid and award the contract to the next responsive low bid that is not materially unbalanced.<sup>1</sup>
    - c. Reject all bids and re-advertise.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> – Recommendation for rejection requires written explanation and justification. May also require FHWA approval.

Bid Review and Analysis Procedures

June 20, 2012

Page 5 of 5

8. If the awarded project has mathematically unbalanced items of concern, the BRAT will identify those items and notify the Resident Engineer identifying the unbalanced items.

Please contact the Chief Roadway Design Engineer at (775) 888-7490 or the Chief Construction Engineer at (775) 888-7460 if you have any questions.

cc: Division Administrator, FHWA  
Assistant Director – Operations  
Assistant Director - Engineering  
Assistant Construction Engineers  
File



1263 South Stewart Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89712  
Phone: (775) 888-7070  
Fax: (775) 888-7101

**MEMORANDUM**

**Administrative Services**

April 16, 2015

**To: Jenni Eyerly, Chief - Administrative Services**  
**From: Bid Review and Analysis Team**  
**Subject: BRAT Summary Report for Contract #3585**

The Bid Review and Analysis Team met on April 14, 2015 to discuss the Bids for Contract 3585, Carson City Freeway. The following were in attendance:

- Paul Frost, Chief Roadway Design Engineer
- Sharon Foerschler, Chief Construction Engineer
- Casey Connor, Assistant Chief Roadway Design Engineer
- Shawn Howerton, Principal Roadway Design Engineer
- Stephen Lani, Resident Engineer
- Ashley Hurlbut, Engineer, Crew 907
- Jeff Stoffer, Associate Engineer, Crew 907
- Steve Bird, Senior Designer
- Jeff Cobb, Constructability
- Teresa Schlaffer, BPA III, Administrative Services
- Paula Aiazzi, BPA I, Administrative Services
- Andrew Soderberg, FHWA
- Dale Wegner, FHWA

Although several bid prices from the apparent low were mathematically unbalanced, the overall bid proposal amount was evaluated and determined to be acceptable. The Price Sensitivity report, with comment, is attached.

The apparent low bidder, Road and Highway Builders, LLC, submitted a bid which is 100.31% of the Engineer's Estimate. The BRAT recommends award of this contract, pending receipt of additional information regarding pollution and dust control elements of the contract from the contractor.

Submitted:

DocuSigned by:  
*Paul Frost*  
016884043CAB47F

Paul Frost, BRAT Co-Chair

DocuSigned by:  
*Sharon Foerschler*  
87AAC09AACB7477

Sharon Foerschler, BRAT Co-Chair

cc: attendees  
Pierre Gezelin, Legal  
Design Admin

**Price Sensitivity**  
April 2, 2015

Contract No.: 3585  
 Project No(s): NHP-395-1(027)  
 Project ID/EA No.: 60604  
 County: Carson City  
 Range: R37 \$41,000,000.01 to \$49,000,000  
 Working Days: 350

RE: Stephen Lani  
 Designer: Fred Shakal

Engineer's Estimate	Road and Highway Builders	Fisher Sand & Gravel Co.	Diff. Between Low & 2nd	Diff Between EE & Low	Low Bid % of EE
\$42,112,241.52	\$42,242,242.00	\$42,625,000.00	\$382,758.00	\$130,000.48	100.31%

Item No.	Quantity	Description	Unit	Engineer's Est. Unit Price	Low Bid Unit Price	2nd Low Bid Unit Price	Qty Chg Req'd to Chg Bid Order	% Change In Qty Req'd	Low % of EE	Significantly Unbalanced	Quantity Check Comments
2010100	1.00	CLEARING AND GRUBBING	LS	\$90,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$100,000.00	N/A	N/A	166.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2020935	1,333.00	REMOVAL OF COMPOSITE SURFACE	CUYD	\$50.00	\$60.00	\$15.00	8,505.73	638.09%	120.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2020990	38,682.00	REMOVAL OF BITUMINOUS SURFACE (COLD MILLING)	SQYD	\$3.50	\$4.00	\$2.00	191,379.00	494.75%	114.29%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2021287	189,931.00	GRINDING FOR PAVEMENT MARKINGS	LINFT	\$1.75	\$0.10	\$0.50	-956,895.00	-503.81%	5.71%	Yes	EE price high, limited bid history at this quantity. Quantity verified.
2021288	8,990.00	GRINDING FOR PAVEMENT MARKINGS	SQFT	\$10.00	\$1.00	\$6.50	-69,592.36	-774.11%	10.00%	Yes	EE price high, limited bid history. Quantity verified.
2030140	1,016,750.00	ROADWAY EXCAVATION	CUYD	\$5.25	\$8.00	\$6.00	191,379.00	18.82%	152.38%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2030160	17,004.00	DRAINAGE EXCAVATION	CUYD	\$10.00	\$12.00	\$7.00	76,551.60	450.20%	120.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2060110	53,326.00	STRUCTURE EXCAVATION	CUYD	\$10.00	\$6.00	\$15.00	-42,528.67	-79.75%	60.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2070110	24,327.00	GRANULAR BACKFILL	CUYD	\$10.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	N/A	N/A	250.00%	Yes	EE price low, limited bid history at this quantity. Quantity verified.
2110110	36,610.00	TOP SOIL (SALVAGE)	CUYD	\$7.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	N/A	N/A	42.86%	Yes	EE price high, limited bid history at this quantity. Quantity verified.
2110260	88.00	HYDRO-SEEDING	ACRE	\$2,500.00	\$2,000.00	\$3,500.00	-255.17	-289.97%	80.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2110520	41,770.00	SEDIMENT LOG	LINFT	\$1.50	\$1.00	\$2.90	-201,451.58	-482.29%	66.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120040	38,750.00	AESTHETIC PATTERNING	SQYD	\$30.00	\$8.00	\$28.00	-19,137.90	-49.39%	26.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120050	2,400.00	DETAIL PAINTING	SQFT	\$15.00	\$25.00	\$12.00	29,442.92	1226.79%	166.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120830	150.00	DECORATIVE BOULDER (TYPE B)	EACH	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$250.00	1,531.03	1020.69%	100.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120840	129.00	DECORATIVE BOULDER (TYPE C)	EACH	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$300.00	546.80	423.87%	100.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120870	300.00	DECORATIVE ROCK (TYPE A)	TON	\$60.00	\$200.00	\$125.00	5,103.44	1701.15%	333.33%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120880	940.00	DECORATIVE ROCK (TYPE B)	TON	\$50.00	\$200.00	\$100.00	3,827.58	407.19%	400.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120940	240.00	IMAGE PANEL	SQYD	\$1,500.00	\$1,400.00	\$900.00	765.52	318.97%	93.33%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2120942	1.00	DECORATIVE FIGURE (TYPE A)	EACH	\$120,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$11,000.00	13.20	1319.86%	33.33%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2121943	47.00	DECORATIVE FIGURE (TYPE B)	EACH	\$4,100.00	\$8,000.00	\$2,000.00	63.79	135.73%	195.12%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
2130200	32.00	FLUSH VALVE ASSEMBLY	EACH	\$1,800.00	\$200.00	\$100.00	3,827.58	11961.19%	11.11%	Yes	EE price high, limited bid history. Quantity verified.
3020140	143,721.00	TYPE 1 CLASS B AGGREGATE BASE	CUYD	\$15.00	\$27.00	\$21.00	63,793.00	44.39%	180.00%	Yes	EE ok, limited history with this unit of measure. Quantity verified.
3050140	30,400.00	PROCESSING FOR ROADBED MODIFICATION	SQYD	\$1.50	\$4.00	\$3.00	382,758.00	1259.07%	266.67%	Yes	EE ok, limited bid history. Quantity verified.
3050190	30,838.00	PULVERIZE EXISTING SURFACE	SQYD	\$1.00	\$4.00	\$2.00	191,379.00	620.59%	400.00%	Yes	EE ok, limited bid history. Quantity verified.
4020190	85,680.00	PLANTMIX SURFACING (TYPE 2C)(WET)	TON	\$80.00	\$55.00	\$75.00	-19,137.90	-22.34%	68.75%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
4020200	488.00	PLANTMIX SURFACING (TYPE 3)(WET)	TON	\$100.00	\$130.00	\$115.00	25,517.20	5228.93%	130.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
4030110	10,665.00	PLANTMIX OPEN-GRADED SURFACING (3/8-INCH)(WET)	TON	\$110.00	\$120.00	\$115.00	76,551.60	717.78%	109.09%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
4060100	255.00	CUTBACK ASPHALT, TYPE MC-70NV	TON	\$650.00	\$69.00	\$700.00	-606.59	-237.88%	10.62%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
4090210	9,918.00	PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT (9-INCHES)	SQYD	\$65.00	\$45.00	\$55.00	-38,275.80	-385.92%	69.23%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5020170	21,613.00	CONCRETE BARRIER RAIL (TYPE FA)	LINFT	\$45.00	\$30.00	\$45.00	-25,517.20	-118.06%	66.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5020200	10,162.00	CONCRETE BARRIER RAIL (TYPE FB)	LINFT	\$50.00	\$70.00	\$35.00	10,935.94	107.62%	140.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5020740	551.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE (MAJOR)	CUYD	\$500.00	\$600.00	\$600.00	N/A	N/A	120.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5020750	177.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE (MINOR)	CUYD	\$1,200.00	\$1,800.00	\$1,950.00	-2,551.72	-1441.65%	150.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5020770	470.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE (ISLAND PAVING)(SPECIAL)	CUYD	\$400.00	\$500.00	\$900.00	-956.90	-203.59%	125.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.

**Price Sensitivity**  
April 2, 2015

Item No.	Quantity	Description	Unit	Engineer's Est. Unit Price	Low Bid Unit Price	2nd Low Bid Unit Price	Qty Chg Req'd to Chg Bid Order	% Change in Qty Req'd	Low % of EE	Significantly Unbalanced	Quantity Check Comments
5020950	3,423.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE, MODIFIED (MAJOR)	CUYD	\$500.00	\$300.00	\$275.00	15,310.32	447.28%	60.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5021010	4,850.00	CLASS EA CONCRETE, MODIFIED (MAJOR)	CUYD	\$800.00	\$400.00	\$700.00	-1,275.86	-26.31%	50.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5021590	3,390.00	FINE SURFACE FINISH	SQYD	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	N/A	N/A	100.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
5050100	948,189.00	REINFORCING STEEL	POUND	\$0.86	\$1.00	\$1.00	N/A	N/A	116.28%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6000100	448.00	TRENCH DRAIN	LINFT	\$250.00	\$100.00	\$300.00	-1,913.79	-427.19%	40.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030140	5,667.00	15-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$30.00	\$90.00	\$25.00	5,888.58	103.91%	300.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030170	2,819.00	18-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$50.00	\$100.00	\$25.00	5,103.44	181.04%	200.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030230	1,481.00	24-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$80.00	\$110.00	\$35.00	5,103.44	344.59%	137.50%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030290	1,447.00	30-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$90.00	\$120.00	\$55.00	5,888.58	406.95%	133.33%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030350	2,158.00	36-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$90.00	\$150.00	\$75.00	5,103.44	236.49%	166.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030410	5,090.00	42-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$100.00	\$160.00	\$100.00	6,379.30	125.33%	160.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6030440	871.00	48-INCH REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE, CLASS III	LINFT	\$110.33	\$180.00	\$130.00	7,655.16	878.89%	163.15%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6091030	20,400.00	CASTINGS	POUND	\$2.50	\$3.00	\$2.50	765,516.00	3752.53%	120.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6091040	29,511.00	STRUCTURAL STEEL GRATES	POUND	\$2.50	\$3.00	\$3.50	-765,516.00	-2594.00%	120.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6091280	15.00	60-INCH PRECAST REINFORCED CONCRETE MANHOLE, TYPE 2 (MODIFIED)	EACH	\$4,500.00	\$7,000.00	\$5,000.00	191.38	1275.86%	155.56%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6091310	14.00	72-INCH PRECAST REINFORCED CONCRETE MANHOLE, TYPE 2	EACH	\$6,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00	N/A	N/A	116.67%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6100170	956.00	RIPRAP (CLASS 150)	CUYD	\$100.00	\$190.00	\$55.00	2,835.24	296.57%	190.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6100340	12,750.00	SELECTED ROCK SLOPE	CUYD	\$60.00	\$20.00	\$45.00	-15,310.32	-120.08%	33.33%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6100460	647.00	RIPRAP BEDDING,(CLASS 150)	CUYD	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$55.00	8,505.73	1314.64%	100.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6120100	340.00	GRAFFITI RESISTANT COATING	SQYD	\$20.00	\$300.00	\$25.00	1,391.85	409.37%	1500.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6130390	9,823.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE GLUE DOWN CURB (TYPE B)	LINFT	\$8.00	\$15.00	\$8.00	54,679.71	556.65%	187.50%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6130890	11,529.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (TYPE 8)	LINFT	\$15.00	\$10.00	\$18.00	-47,844.75	-414.99%	66.67%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6131140	2,045.00	CLASS AA CONCRETE SIDEWALK (4-INCH)	SQYD	\$40.00	\$50.00	\$55.00	-76,551.60	-3743.35%	125.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6161200	10,728.00	72-INCH CHAIN-LINK FENCE	LINFT	\$15.00	\$30.00	\$12.00	21,264.33	198.21%	200.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6180230	11,562.00	CABLE BARRIER	LINFT	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$16.00	-382,758.00	-3310.48%	100.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6230236	54.00	NO. 7 PULL BOX, MODIFIED	EACH	\$1,250.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,250.00	-1,531.03	-2835.24%	80.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6230570	15.00	STEEL POLE, TYPE 7	EACH	\$3,500.00	\$7,000.00	\$3,000.00	95.69	637.93%	200.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6230575	8.00	STEEL POLE, TYPE 7 WITH SAFETY BASE	EACH	\$4,500.00	\$8,000.00	\$3,800.00	91.13	1139.16%	177.78%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6230650	4.00	STEEL POLE, TYPE 35A (MODIFIED)	EACH	\$15,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$27,500.00	-19.63	-490.72%	53.33%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6231780	111,982.00	1-INCH CONDUIT	LINFT	\$1.10	\$4.00	\$2.50	255,172.00	227.87%	363.64%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6231820	48,972.00	3-INCH CONDUIT	LINFT	\$16.50	\$8.00	\$6.00	191,379.00	390.79%	48.48%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6231940	17,356.00	NO. 3/0 CONDUCTOR	LINFT	\$5.50	\$1.00	\$3.50	-153,103.20	-882.13%	18.18%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6231975	30,344.00	NO. 6 CONDUCTOR	LINFT	\$1.75	\$1.00	\$1.00	N/A	N/A	57.14%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6232530	35.00	SIGNAL HEAD 1W3C, MAST ARM	EACH	\$900.00	\$2,000.00	\$800.00	318.97	911.33%	222.22%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6232885	1.00	DYNAMIC MESSAGE SIGN (TYPE 1)	EACH	\$85,000.00	\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00	N/A	N/A	94.12%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6250490	1.00	RENT TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES	LS	\$250,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$400,000.00	N/A	N/A	240.00%	Yes	EE ok.
6270110	1.00	PERMANENT OVERHEAD SIGN SUPPORT STRUCTURES	LS	\$1,035,000.00	\$531,756.45	\$1,100,000.00	N/A	N/A	51.38%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6270150	5,403.47	PERMANENT SIGN PANELS (OVERHEAD)	SQFT	\$30.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	N/A	N/A	83.33%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6270190	1,913.76	PERMANENT SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED) (METAL SUPPORTS)	SQFT	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$60.00	38,275.80	2000.03%	100.00%	No	EE ok. Quantity verified.

**Price Sensitivity**  
April 2, 2015

Item No.	Quantity	Description	Unit	Engineer's Est. Unit Price	Low Bid Unit Price	2nd Low Bid Unit Price	Qty Chg Req'd to Chg Bid Order	% Change in Qty Req'd	Low % of EE	Significantly Unbalanced	Quantity Check Comments
6280120	1.00	MOBILIZATION	LS	\$2,379,891.19	\$2,000,000.00	\$1,688,888.44	N/A	N/A	84.04%	No	EE ok.
6290100	350.00	TIME RELATED OVERHEAD	DAY	\$4,500.00	\$8,000.00	\$7,500.00	765.52	218.72%	177.78%	Yes	EE ok.
6320930	53,926.00	EPOXY PAVEMENT STRIPING (8-INCH SOLID WHITE)	LINFT	\$1.00	\$0.50	\$0.50	N/A	N/A	50.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
6321020	44,472.00	EPOXY PAVEMENT STRIPING (8-INCH SOLID YELLOW)	LINFT	\$2.50	\$0.50	\$0.55	-7,655,160.00	-17213.44%	20.00%	Yes	EE ok. Limited bid history. Quantity verified.
6370110	1.00	TEMPORARY POLLUTION CONTROL	LS	\$100,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$400,000.00	N/A	N/A	10.00%	Yes	EE ok.
6370190	1.00	DUST CONTROL	LS	\$59,497.27	\$5,000.00	\$500,000.00	N/A	N/A	8.40%	Yes	EE ok.
6410150	8.00	IMPACT ATTENUATOR (70 MPH)	EACH	\$25,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$25,000.00	-38.28	-478.45%	60.00%	Yes	EE ok. Quantity verified.
Additional Comments:											

☐  
☐  
☐

**State of Nevada Department of Transportation  
Executed Agreements and Amendments  
January 1, 2013 to May 7, 2015**

Agreement No	Amend No	Contractor	Purpose	Fed	Original Agreement Amount	Amendment Amount	Payable Amount	Receivable Amount	Start Date	End Date	Amend Date	Project Manager	Division	Notes
11410	01	TROXLER ELECTRONICS LABS INC	RADIATION EXPOSURE MONITORING	N	8,568.00	8,568.00	17,136.00	-	6/25/2010	9/30/2014	04/09/13	MIKE WEST	CONSTRUCTION	AMD 1 04-09-13: INCREASE AUTHORITY \$8,568.00 FROM \$8,568.00 TO \$17,136.00 TO CORRECT A MATHEMATICAL ERROR IN THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT THAT CALCULATED THE TOTAL COST FOR ONLY TWO (2) YEARS RATHER THAN THE FULL FOUR (4) YEARS OF THE AGREEMENT. 06-25-10: RADIATION EXPOSURE MONITORING SERVICES, STATEWIDE. NV B/L#: NV20101478370
19013	00	BLACK EAGLE CONSULTING, INC.	EXPERT WITNESS	N	75,000.00	-	75,000.00	-	7/17/2013	12/31/2014	-	MEGAN SIZELOVE	CONSTRUCTION	07-17-13: CLAIM SUPPORT AND EXPERT WITNESS SERVICES REGARDING DRILLED SHAFT FOUNDATIONS ON CONTRACT 3389. WASHOE COUNTY. NV B/L#: 19971293847-S
26713	00	BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING, LLC	BIOLOGICAL OVERSIGHT	N	1,000,000.00	-	1,000,000.00	-	11/13/2013	12/31/2015	-	MEGAN SIZELOVE	CONSTRUCTION	11-13-13: BIOLOGICAL OVERSIGHT AND THREATENED/ENDANGERED SPECIES COMPLIANCE OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS IN CLARK, NYE, AND LINCOLN COUNTIES. NV B/L#: NV20081558348 NOTE: THIS PROCUREMENT WAS AWARDED AS A 50/50 SPLIT AMONG THE TOP 2 SERVICE PROVIDERS
49813	00	HDR ENGINEERING, INC.	BIOLOGICAL OVERSIGHT	N	1,000,000.00	-	1,000,000.00	-	11/13/2013	12/31/2015	-	MEGAN SIZELOVE	CONSTRUCTION	11-13-13: BIOLOGICAL OVERSIGHT AND THREATENED/ENDANGERED SPECIES COMPLIANCE OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS IN CLARK, NYE, AND LINCOLN COUNTIES. NV B/L#: NV19851010291 NOTE: THIS PROCUREMENT WAS AWARDED AS A 50/50 SPLIT AMONG THE TOP 2 SERVICE PROVIDERS
05314	00	LANDAUER INC	RADIATION EXPOSURE MONITORING	N	22,084.80	-	22,084.80	-	5/1/2014	7/15/2018	-	MIKE WEST	CONSTRUCTION	05-01-14: PROVIDE RADIATION EXPOSURE MONITORING DETECTION SERVICES, STATEWIDE. NV B/L#: NV20141203138- Q
13214	00	ATKINS	P6 PROFESSIONAL TRAINING	N	209,020.00	-	209,020.00	-	12/18/2014	12/31/2017	-	MARK CAFFARATTI	CONSTRUCTION	12-18-14: PROVIDE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR PRIMAVERA P6 PROFESSIONAL SOFTWARE, AND ASSISTANCE IN UPDATING CURRENT STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION AS IT RELATES TO CURRENT INDUSTRY STANDARDS FOR PROJECT SCHEDULING, STATEWIDE. NV B/L#: NV19981347315-R

**Kaiser, Reid G**

---

**Subject:** Item 04: Change orders CMAR Projects  
**Start Date:** Monday, March 02, 2015  
**Due Date:** Monday, June 08, 2015

**Status:** In Progress  
**Percent Complete:** 25%

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

**Owner:** Kaiser, Reid G

June 8, 2015:

Below is a list of all the active CMAR contracts. It appears that only one of them has had a CCO in the past 6 months. CCO #4 for 3540 is a no cost change; spec change only and was initiated this morning.

CMAR contracts

3518

3537

3540 – CO # 4, Specifications change from Working Day contract to a Completion date contract.

3541

3564

<input type="checkbox"/> SUBJECT	DUE DATE	% COMPL...	STATUS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 01: Contractor Prequalification (September and March)	Mon 9/14/2015	25%	In Progress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 02: Construction Agreements (June and December)	Mon 6/8/2015	25%	In Progress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 03: NDOT DBE Process	Mon 6/8/2015	25%	In Progress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 04: Change orders CMAR Projects	Mon 6/8/2015	25%	In Progress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 05: As-Builts	Mon 6/8/2015	75%	In Progress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 06: NDOT Partnering Program	Mon 6/8/2015	75%	In Progress
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Item 07: Unbalanced Bidding	Mon 9/14/2015	10%	In Progress

**NDOT/Industry Liaison Meeting  
12:00-1:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 3, 2015  
AGC Office – 5400 Mill Street, Reno**

**AGENDA**

1. Introductions
2. Review of minutes from the December 9, 2014 meeting
3. Partnering Update
  - a. Status of Dispute Resolution Teams
4. Materials Working Group Update
  - a. Percent within Limits (PWL)
  - b. Grindings
5. Future Projects
  - a. Federal Funding
  - b. State Funding
6. 2015 Legislative Session Update
  - a. Prevailing Wage
  - b. SB149 – GST Revenue
7. EPA/Stormwater Update
8. Contract Compliance/DBE Task Force Update
  - a. Good Faith Effort – Other DOT's
  - b. Owner/Operator Certified Payroll
  - c. Trucker Subcontract Agreements
9. NDOT Construction Reports
  - a. CWG General Report
  - b. Project Closeout
10. Southern Nevada NDOT Industry Meeting Update
11. Staff Update
12. Confirm Meeting Dates
  - a. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 9, 2015 – AGC Office
  - b. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 8, 2015 – AGC Office
  - c. 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, December 8, 2015 – AGC Office
13. Open Discussion
14. Adjourn

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

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

Lance Semenko  
John Terry  
Tracy Larkin-Thomason  
Bill Wellman

**NDOT/Industry Liaison Meeting  
10:00 a.m. Tuesday, December 9, 2014  
AGC Offices, 5400 Mill Street, Reno**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. Meeting was called to order at 10:03 a.m., by Co-Chairs Kyle Larkin and John Terry. Those present introduced themselves, which included, Rudy Malfabon, Bill Hoffman, Bill Wellman, Kyle Larkin, Rich Buenting, Thor Dyson, Scott Hiatt, Craig Holt, Kevin Lee, Reid Kaiser, Craig Madole and John Madole.
2. The minutes from the last meeting dated Wednesday, September 9, 2014 were reviewed and approved as presented.
3. Mr. Malfabon gave an update on current NDOT funding and Highway Fund Balances. Currently, \$83 million is available for construction. NDOT is maintaining a reserve of \$95 million to cover a 45 day operating period should FHWA not receive necessary funding from Congress. The total fund balance is \$272 million, which includes \$94 million for Project NEON right of way procurement and the \$95 million reserve. Mr. Malfabon stated that he does not anticipate NDOT needing to assist in filling general fund shortfalls in the upcoming biennium.
  - a. The construction outlook for NDOT was discussed to have four major projects in the upcoming 12-18 months. These projects include Project Neon, I-11 Phase 1, USA Parkway and the Carson Freeway. It is anticipated that the preservation projects will remain at the same level for the upcoming biennium. Due to the immediate need of the USA Parkway completion, the I-80 overlay has been postponed. NDOT is hopeful that federal funding can allow for the completion of the Blue Diamond interchange.
  - b. Federally, there appears to be a lack of an appetite to increase the gas tax for a sustainable level of funding for the Highway Trust Fund. Mr. Malfabon is expecting that Congress will maintain current funding levels through general fund transfers.
  - c. It was discussed that the Michigan DOT Director recently created videos addressing perceived waste on DOT projects and the need for state funding. Mr. Malfabon stated that NDOT is working with RTC's to identify needs and funding requirements throughout Nevada. It was also discussed that efforts are underway to have a single question on the 2016 ballot for Clark County gas tax indexing.
4. Mr. Malfabon provided an update on the election results. NDOT has been actively meeting with incoming freshmen legislators. Most of the discussions have been very specific and

legislators have been looking for great detail. NDOT is of the opinion that a thoughtful approach to proposing future projects will be needed to garner support to protect existing resources. NDOT has also been receiving questions on bid protests and what is required to on NDOT projects.

5. Bill Hoffman reviewed the 2011 Environmental Protection Agency audit of NDOT. This audit has led to a new BMP manual being created. The Nevada Department of Environmental Protection is delegating EPA Authority in Nevada. NDOT is looking to strengthen language on liquidated damages for construction near rivers and navigable waters. A Stormwater Manager certification program is being created with the Las Vegas AGC. The program, once created, will be brought to the Nevada Chapter AGC. NDOT is required to have enforcement actions for Stormwater BMP compliance. The AZDOT program is currently being redeveloped for NDOT. NDOT is going to research to determine if the required CALTRANS training may be reciprocated for Nevada contractors that have received the training. All future Stormwater requirements will be pull sheet additions to the Silver Book.
6. Tracy Larkin-Thomason and Kyle Larkin agreed to include the District Engineers in all future meetings. It was agreed that including the District Engineers in high level discussions will allow them to be more involved in partnering and ensure a more consistent approach between the districts. NDOT is going to be placing a larger emphasis on partnering in the near future. All projects above \$10 million will have a partnering requirement. NDOT is looking to address inconsistencies in working in the different districts and feel that this is an important first step.
7. Ms. Larkin-Thomason reported that NDOT had held three workshops on non-attainment of DBE goals. New procedures for contractors will be coming out for review in December. There will be a 30 day review process for these procedures. Documentation will be required for non-attainment of goals and what the contractor's efforts were to address the shortfall. NDOT is creating a definition of good faith effort. A study will be forthcoming to determine the availability of DBE subcontractors that can perform a commercially useful function.
8. Ms. Larkin-Thomason reviewed the findings from the FHWA single audit. One of the focuses was weekly certified payroll. It is believed that in May a vetted procedure to train Resident Engineers to how to monitor compliance will be completed. A compliance letter will start coming from the Resident Engineers at District Offices. All tracking will be performed using LCP Tracker. Potential discrepancies between Davis-Bacon and the NRS is still being addressed.

9. Chairs for 2015 were reaffirmed. Rich Buenting of Road and Highway Builders will be the Co-Chair for industry and Reid Kaiser will be the Co-Chair for NDOT.

10. Meeting dates for 2015 were agreed upon. Meetings will be held on:

- a. Tuesday, March 3, 2015.
- b. Tuesday, June 2, 2015.
- c. Tuesday, September 1, 2015.
- d. Tuesday, December 1, 2015.
- e. All meetings tentatively set at 10 a.m. and will be hosted at the Nevada AGC office.

11. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

John Terry, Co-Chair  
Rudy Malfabon  
Kyle Larkin, Co-Chair  
Jeanette Belz  
Rich Buenting  
Scott Hiatt

Bill Hoffman  
Marc Markwell  
John Madole  
Lance Semenko  
Tracy Larkin-Thomason  
Bill Wellman

Also Present:  
Thor Dyson  
Craig Holt  
Reid Kaiser  
Kevin Lee  
Craig Madole  
Lisa Schettler

DRAFT

**EXECUTIVE AGENCY  
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: February 20, 2015

Agency Submitting: Department of Motor Vehicles, Management Services and Programs Division

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2014-15	Fiscal Year 2015-16	Fiscal Year 2016-17	Effect on Future Biennia
Current Allocation to General Fund (Revenue)				
Proposed Allocation to General Fund (Revenue)		\$31,270,797	\$31,339,593	\$62,679,186
Proposed Loss to Highway Fund (Revenue)		(\$31,270,797)	(\$31,339,593)	(\$62,679,186)
Contract Programming (Expense)	\$83,200			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$83,200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Explanation

(Use Additional Sheets of Attachments, if required)

BDR 43-669 requires the State Treasurer to establish a program to provide grants to local governments for public works projects. Section 7 of the BDR requires the BGST revenue from the depreciation schedule change (SB429, 2009 Session) be diverted to the General Fund and be split equally between the General Fund and the Highway Fund with a portion of the revenue diverted to the General Fund to support bonds issued for public works. This BDR would be effective upon passage and approval for Sections 1 through 5, 8, 9 and 10; Sections 6 and 7 on July 1, 2015. Due to the Department's existing programming priorities and mandates, funding for a computer systems Master Service Agreement programmer is included in this fiscal note to make changes to GL Extract Programs, Semi-Monthly and Monthly Reports. The estimated contract programming hours are 832 at \$100 per hour. The proposed implementation date of 07/01/2015 cannot be met as a result of the estimated programming hours needed to complete the requirements.

Basis for Calculations Using the Following Assumptions:

The State General Fund Allocation as reported in the DMV's Taxes & Fees History & Projections, published: December 2014 was used as the basis for determining the projections and showing the reallocation to the State General Fund grants program and the fiscal impact to the Highway Fund's anticipated revenue. The Governor's Recommended Budget includes removal of the 6/30/15 sunset and the allocation of the full amount of the BGST to the General Fund. However, statute currently requires this revenue to go to the Highway Fund beginning FY16.

Name Amy McKinney

Title Chief of Administration

**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENTS**

The agency's response appears reasonable.

Date Friday, February 20, 2015

Name Julia Teska

Title Director

BDR /Bill/ Amendment #: **43-669/SB149** Agency Name: **Department of Motor Vehicles**  
 Division Name: **Management Services & Programs** Date: **2/17/15**

Description	FY 14/15 (Based on FY14 Actuals)	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	Future Biennia (FY18 + FY19)
Current Allocation to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proposed Allocation to General Fund	\$ -	\$ 31,270,797.00	\$ 31,339,593.00	\$ 62,679,186.00
Proposed Loss to Highway Fund	\$ -	\$ (31,270,797.00)	\$ (31,339,593.00)	\$ (62,679,186.00)
<b>Sub-totals</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>

Cost to Program the CARRS Application

Title	Hourly Wage	Programming Hours	Programming Cost FY15
Contract Programmer Cost	\$100.00	832	\$83,200
Project Manager Cost	\$132.50	0	\$0



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8A  
May 7, 2015 PDC Mtg.

## MAJOR/CAPACITY PROJECTS

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
1-03332	UNASSIGNED	I 15 at Hardy Way in Mesquite. CL 118.00	\$0					\$15M Other funding
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC	\$30,000,000					
4-03389	60633	SR 160 Phase 1 - Blue Diamond Road, fm. SR 159 Red Rock Canyon Road to beginning of Mountain Area. MP CL 10.89 to MP CL 16.63.	\$25,000,000					
7-03007	73824	SR 593, Tropicana Ave. at SR 604 Las Vegas Blvd. (Replace Escalators)	\$0					\$20M LVCVA Funding - CMAR
2-25051	60604	US 395, Carson City Freeway, fm. S. Carson St. (SR 529) to Fairview Dr. Pkg. 2B-3. MP CC 0.05 to CC 3.15	\$47,650,000					At grade intersection alternative
6-03143	60638	US 95 NW Phase 3A; CC 215 fm. US 95 to Tenaya Way MP CL 0.88 - N/E & W/S Ramps and S/B collector Rd.	\$35,200,000					Funds in PSAMS \$25.3M CC Regional Flood Control Dist., \$6.4M RTC, \$25.6 NDOT
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	NEON Construction Bond Re-payment		\$2,100,000				
3-23068	60682	SR 160, fm. Rainbow Ave. to Calvada Blvd. MP NY 7.00 to 8.50.		\$4,200,000				Adv with 3R (3-23070)
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC		\$30,000,000				
3-19052	60660	SR 439, USA Parkway, fm. US 50 in Lyon Co. to I 80 in Washoe Co. - New Road.		\$70,000,000				
1-03352	CONST2A	I 15 N. - Part 2 Pkg. A,C,D		\$40,200,000				Pkg A, C, D combined into one contract
2-03250	CONSTPKG2B	US 95 fm. Durango Dr. to Kyle Canyon Rd. - Pkg 2B. MP CL 89.92 to 92.37.		\$36,353,000				Backup Project
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 at SR 593 Tropicana - Operational Improvements			\$40,000,000			Scope and budget TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 515 - Operational Improvements			\$40,000,000			Scope and Budget TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	NEON Construction Bond Re-payment			\$8,600,000			
4-03389	160PH2	SR 160 Phase 2 - Blue Diamond Rd. fm. 1.24 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to beginning of Mountain Area. MP CL 22.00 to 17.5			\$45,000,000			Backup Project
1-03367	73687	I 15 Starr Ave, Las Vegas, at MP CL 29.375			\$0			Cost changed from \$70,000,000 \$52M Construction in FRI funding and Earmark;\$29M ROW
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC			\$30,000,000			
6-03143	CONST953B	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3B at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Hualapai to Tenaya Way. MP 88 and CC 215 MP 37.00 to 39.00 (Relocate Gas Line)			\$17,100,000			
2-19073	UNASSIGNED	US 50, Lyon Co, fm. Roy's Rd. to the to the jct. w/ US 95A. - widen & intersection upgrades. MP LY 19.90 to WA 29.44			\$36,000,000			Cost changed from \$26,000,000 Backup Project
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 580 Operational Improvements				\$40,000,000		Scope and Budget TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	NEON Construction Bond Re-payment				\$16,600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 159, Charleston Blvd. fm. Lamb Blvd. to Honolulu St. - DDI at I-515				\$3,000,000		CMAQ Funds Scope and Budget TBD
1-03365	73652	NEON - R/W AC				\$30,000,000		
6-03145	73536	I 15, Las Vegas, at the CC 215 Northern Beltway Intch. - new System to System Intch.				\$40,000,000		Phase, Scope and Budget TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 N. - Phase 3 (Speedway Blvd. to Apex Intch.)					\$82,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	NEON Construction Bond Re-payment					\$24,800,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 HOV Improvements					\$40,000,000	Scope and budget TBD
6-03143	CONST953C	US 95 NW Corridor Phase 3C at MP 88 and CC 215 fm. Hualapai to Tenaya Way. MP 88 and CC 215 MP 37.00 to 39.00					\$83,900,000	
SubTotal:			\$137,850,000	\$182,853,000	\$216,700,000	\$129,600,000	\$230,700,000	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8A  
May 7, 2015 PDC Mtg.

## ROADWAY (3R) PROJECTS

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
1-07120	73667	I 80 fm. 0.048 MW of the Willow Creek grade separation to 0.816 ME of the E. Wells Intch. MP EL 68.978 to EL 74.855	\$17,400,000					Cost changed from \$12,200,000
4-03428	73781	SR 604, Las Vegas Blvd, fm. E. Carey Ave. to 0.240 MN of Craig Rd. MP CL 33.064 to CL 37.713	\$12,000,000					Does not include \$4M for Road Transfer to NLV (Tonopah Ave. to Carey Ave.)
2-09044	73784	US 95 fm. 0.796 MS of Dry Wash B-1478, to the ES/NY Co. Line. MP ES 32.880 to 44.194	\$8,000,000					Adv with Safety 60632
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 \$9 M in 2015 & \$9 M in 2016 to the RTC
2-31131	60616	I 580 fm. S/B Off Ramp at the N. Carson St. Intch. to 0.86 MS of the Bowers Intch. MP CC 8.49 to WA 5.99 (I-1261, I-812N/S)	\$17,500,000					
1-13055	60573	I 80 fm. 1.065 MW of HU/LA Co. Line to HU/LA Co. Line; I 80 fm. HU/LA Line to SR 304, 0.93 ME of E. Battle Mtn. Intch. MP HU 60.31 to HU 61.38; MP LA 0.0 to LA 9.05	\$19,700,000					SR 304(73635) State Funded
4-03429	73779	SR 593 Tropicana Ave. fm. Eastern Ave. to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 3.53 to 7.30. Phase 1 MP CL 24.830 to 32.176. Phase 1. (AC Pavement Only)	\$12,000,000					Broken into two projects with scope change
4-03430	73780	SR 592, Flamingo Rd, fm. Paradise to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 26.505 to 31.378 (Agreement w/ RTC)		\$9,000,000				Agmt. To pay \$9M in 2015 & \$9M in 2016 to the RTC
4-25057	73923	SR 529, Carson St, fm. the jct. w/ US 50 to Fairview Dr. MP CC 0.560 to 2.548		\$4,400,000				Relinquishment
2-33089	73912	US 93, N. of McGill, fm. 3.610 MS of Success Summit Rd. to 5.390 MN of Success Summit Rd. MP WP 66.995 to 75.995		\$6,100,000				
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave, fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd. MP WA 2.700 to 5.357		\$12,800,000				Possible Relinquishment
3-23070	73921	SR 160 fm. 0.465 MN of Basin Rd. to 12.556 MN of Bella Vista Dr. at the 2010 NUL of Pahrump. MP NY 11.193 to 26.363		\$21,900,000				Advertise with 3-23068 widening project
2-15023	60539	US 50 fm. CH/LA Co. line to 0.508 MW of the W Boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest. MP LA 0.000 to LA 25.408		\$14,500,000				Advertise with Safety (2-15024)
2-23066	73928	US 6 fm. 0.736 ME of the ES/NY Co. line to US 95. US 95 fm. the ES/NY Co. line to US 6 in Tonopah. MP US 6 NY 0.736 to 1.801; MP US 95 NY 107.220 to 109.509		\$5,100,000				
2-09041	73648	US 6 fm. 0.187 ME of the Jct. of US 6/US 95 to 1.974 MW of Millers Roadside Park. MP ES 19.055 to 43.939		\$16,500,000				Moved from 2015 Adv with Safety Project (60671)
2-33085	73636	US 6 fm. the Jct. w/ SR 318 to 0.956 ME of US 50 Jct. MP WP 13.919 to 40.146			\$16,000,000			
2-19081	73639	US 95A(sharedroad US 50A), Lyon Co, fm. The jct. w/ US 50/US 95A in Silver Springs to SR 427. MP LY 0.000 to 14.119 (includes truck lane and passing lane)			\$10,900,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	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			
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 0.646 MN of US 50. US 50 MP WP 61.794 to 68.432; US 93 MP WP 53.450 to 54.096			\$15,600,000			
4-03443	73937	SR 596, Jones Blvd, fm. 1.000 MN of W. Charleston Blvd. to Smoke Ranch Rd. MP CL 43.007 to 45.038			\$3,400,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 160, Pahrump Valley Rd, fm. 1.030 MN of Mountain Springs Summit to the CL/NY Co. Line. MP CL 21.723 to 43.293			\$21,500,000			
4-03439	73902	SR 159, Red Rock Rd, fm. 1.989 MW of Durango Rd to an NHS break at Rainbow Blvd. MP CL 17.030 to 21.064			\$4,600,000			
2-03275	73644	US 93 fm. FRCL08 on the S. side Garnet Intch. To 15.887 MN of FRCL07 at Garnet Intch. MP CL 52.010 to 67.981			\$24,400,000			Moved from 2018 Advertise with Safety Project (60688)
4-03429	73879	SR 593, Tropicana Ave, fm. Dean Martin to Boulder Hwy. MP CL 24.830 to 32.176. Phase 2 (Concrete Bus Ln. and ADA)				\$24,000,000		CMAR RW is not included in the estimate.
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 80/I 580/US 395 Various Ramps in Reno/Sparks UL				\$5,000,000		Tentative
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 beginning of the PCCP. MP EL 1.097 to 7.512				\$5,600,000		Tentative
1-19015	73914	I 80 fm. 0.419 ME of the E. Fernley Grade Sep. to the LY/CH Co Line. MP LY 5.844 to 15.912				\$13,600,000		Tentative
1-31231	73920	I 80 fm. the CA/NV Stateline to 0.023 MW of Keystone Intch. Includes frontage Rd. FRWA03 at Garson Rd Intch. MP WA 0.00 to 12.445				\$13,400,000		FR Cost with State Funds
1-25004	73931	US 395, Carson City, US 50/Williams St. to 0.661 MS of the CC/WA Co Line. MP CC 5.254 to 8.950				\$4,900,000		Tentative
1-13058	73789	I 80 fm. 0.345 ME of the trailing edge of H-1256 at the W. Strip Grade Sep. to 0.549 ME of the E. Winnemucca Intch. MP HU 12.023 to 17.354				\$8,400,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 fm. 1.00 ME of Alpine Rd. to the CH/LA Co. Line. MP CH 85.961 to 106.845				\$14,300,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 28, Incline Village, fm. 0.242 MN of E Lakeshore Blvd. to the NV/CA Stateline. MP WA 5.217 to 10.990				\$3,100,000		Tentative
2-01089	73932	US 50 fm. 0.008 ME of Allen Rd. to the EUL of Fallon at Rio Vista. MP CH 19.351 to 21.708				\$2,600,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 80 fm. 1.108 ME of Moor Intch. to 3.263 MW of Pequop Intch. MP EL 83.332 to 94.800				\$17,400,000		Tentative
1-27067	73666	I 80 fm. 1.776 ME of Humboldt Intch. to 0.516 MW of Dun Glenn Intch. MP PE 51.38 to PE 62.49				\$14,300,000		Tentative
1-07124	73787	I 80 fm. the trailing edge of the H-902 to 0.93 MW of Osino Intch. MP EL 26.58 to 32.00				\$14,400,000		Tentative
2-03280	73919	US 95 fm. The CA/NV Stateline to 7.790 MN of Loran Station Rd. MP CL 0.00 to 17.423				\$8,800,000		Tentative
3-07090	73911	SR 227, Lamoille Rd, fm. 0.013 MS of Spring Creek Rd. to 2.273 MN of Spring Creek Rd. MP EL 11.549 to 13.835				\$4,700,000		Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. 0.302 MN of the Moana Intch. to the Mill St. Intch. MP WA 22.563 to 23.740 SB					\$13,100,000	Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. 0.302 MN of the Moana Intch. to the Mill St. Intch. MP WA 22.563 to 23.499 NB					\$11,000,000	Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. trailing edge of the viaduct to the Glendale Intch. MP WA 23.759 to 25.003					\$8,000,000	Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 580 fm. Glendale Ave. to the Truckee River. MP WA 25.003 to 25.276					\$4,300,000	Tentative
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 80 fm. the crossover, a maintenance break to the beginning of the PCCP, 1.779 ME of the trailing edge of I-876. MP HU 42.426 to 54.860					\$22,800,000	Tentative
1-07121	73668	I 80 fm. 0.816 ME of the E. Wells intch. To 1.040 ME of the Moor intch. MP EL 74.855 to EL 83.264					\$15,800,000	Tentative
1-07118	73665	I 80 fm. 0.597 ME of the Grays Creek grade sep, the beginning of PCCP, to 0.048 MW of the Willow Creek grade sep. MP EL 62.09 to EL 68.978					\$17,500,000	Tentative
SubTotal:			\$95,600,000	\$90,300,000	\$106,900,000	\$154,500,000	\$92,500,000	



**BRIDGE/STRUCTURES PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
2-31131	60616	I 580 Washoe Valley - Rehab/Retrofit I-1261, I-812 N/S	\$1,000,000					Adv with 3R 60616
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program	\$2,000,000					Annual Program
3-01040	73798	SR 115, Harrigan Rd, at L Line Canal - Replace Structure B-100	\$1,050,000					Cost changed from \$1,000,000
6-19012	73762	Bridge B-1610 Nordyke Rd. over the E. Fork of the Walker River in LY Co.	\$1,100,000					
1-03374	73796	I 15 in N. Las Vegas. MP CL 44.13 TO CL 48.43 - Rehab/Retrofit H-948, G-949, G-953, I-956	\$2,000,000					Cost changed from \$1,500,000
2-05119	73801	US 395, DO Co. - Rehab/Retrofit B-1262N/S, B-1263N/S	\$1,500,000					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Bridge Inventory /Inspection Program		\$2,000,000				Annual Program
1-03375	73797	I 515 at LV Downtown Viaduct - Rehab/Retrofit G-947, I-947R, I-947M		\$27,000,000				Cost changed from \$26,000,000
3-05056	73800	SR 757, Muller Ln. at Carson River - Replace Structure B-474		\$1,200,000				
6-27026	73753	FR PE 01, G-29 Structure Removal		\$1,400,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 605, Paradise Rd, at Tropicana Wash - Replace B-1344		\$1,500,000				
6-13010	73701	Eden Valley Rd. at Humboldt River - Replace off-system Structure B-1658		\$5,747,000				R/W acquisition needed
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 515 at Flamingo Intch - MSE Wall Rehab		\$2,500,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program			\$2,000,000			Annual Program
3-03178	73803	SR 163 at Colorado River in Laughlin - widen and Rehab Structure B-1847			\$6,000,000			Cost changed from \$10,000,000
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit I-717E/W, I-740E/W, H-844E/W, I-700E/W			\$4,000,000			Moved from 2018 Cost changed from \$6,000,000
3-31139	73750	SR 447 at Washoe Co. Near Nixon B-1351 MP 15.49			\$1,100,000			
1-31227	73799	I 80 at Truckee River and UPRR near Verdi - Address Scour B-764 E/W and G-772 E/W. Construct Scour Countermeasures.			\$5,500,000			CMAR GMP by Dec 2016
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Dressler Ln, Douglas Co. - Replace B-1600 off-system bridge				\$600,000		Moved from 2017
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	FR 409 Lockwood Dr. at UPRR, Washoe Co. - Rehab/repair G-751 on-system bridge.				\$540,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Gold Canyon Cr. S. of Silver City, Lyon Co. - Replace B-375 off-system bridge.				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Bridge Inventory/Inspection Program				\$2,000,000		Annual Program
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Tedford Bridge at Truckee-Carson Canal - Replace off-system B-1707				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 80 at Fernley/ Wadsworth - Rehab/Retrofit and address scour B-716E/W				\$2,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 at Carson River W. of Fallon - Address Scour B-1557				\$600,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 515 at Boulder Highway and Sahara - Rehab/Retrofit I-1449, H-1446				\$800,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 206, Genoa Ln, at Carson River - Address Scour B-1239				\$300,000		Moved from 2017
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 at Muddy River - Rehab/Retrofit B-781 N/S				\$2,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 589, Sahara Ave, at UPRR - Rehab/Retrofit G-1064				\$1,400,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 396, Cornell Ave. N. of Lovelock, Pershing Co. - Replace B-28 on-system bridge.					\$2,600,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 278, N. of Eureka, Eureka Co. - Replace B-478 on-system bridge (dbl rcb).					\$200,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Shady Ave. over Gold Canyon Cr, Dayton, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1711 off-system bridge.					\$600,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	East Walker Rd, SE of Yerington, Lyon Co. - Replace B-1348 off-system bridge.					\$600,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Six Mile Canyon Rd, Storey Co. - Replace B-2476 off system bridge					\$600,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 88 in Douglas Co. - Rehab/Retrofit B-553, B-575, B-580, B-576, and B-627					\$4,000,000	Moved from 2018
SubTotal:			\$8,650,000	\$41,347,000	\$18,600,000	\$11,440,000	\$8,600,000	



# NDOT 5 YEAR PLAN

Working Copy - Subject to Funding and Approval

Item #8A  
May 7, 2015 PDC Mtg.

## SAFETY PROJECTS

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
1-07117	73606	I 80 @ Pequop Summit Animal Crossing	\$2,000,000					\$2M Safety and \$9M Misc
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Safety Services/Programs/Railroad	\$6,657,000					Cost changed from \$6,450,000 Annual Program
4-03440	73915	SR 160 MP CL 22.00 to 43.28 - Cable Barrier Rail	\$800,000					Moved from 2016
2-09043	60632	US 95 MP ES 0.00 to ES 44.13 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening	\$7,562,000					Cost changed from \$3,781,000 Advertise with 3R 73784
2-01085	73616	US 95 fm. 0.16 MS of the jct w/ SR 726 to 0.822 MS of the Trailing Edge of B-680. MP CH 28.00 to CH 57.00 - Passing lane and Slope Flattening	\$9,500,000					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Safety Services/Programs/Railroad		\$6,356,000				Cost changed from \$6,491,000 Annual Program
2-15023	60539	US 50 LA 0.00 to LA 25.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening - Phase 1		\$1,000,000				Cost changed from \$10,350,000
2-05121	73862	US 395 at Airport Rd, Johnson Ln. and Stephanie Ln.		\$1,300,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Te-Moak Safety Improvements		\$950,000				Cost changed from \$400,000
6-03203	60683	Summerlin Pkwy, Las Vegas, fm. Buffalo to CC 215 - Cable Barrier Rail (OFF SYSTEM)		\$1,250,000				
3-31143	60640	SR 431 Truck Escape Ramp		\$3,895,000				Cost changed from \$4,000,000 \$205,000 State Funds.
3-23066	73837	SR 372 at Blagg Roundabout		\$1,815,000				Cost changed from \$1,825,000 \$95,500 State Funds. Advertise with 3R 73841.
2-09045	60671	US 6, Esmeralda Co, from the jct. w/ 95E to 8 ME of Millers Rest Park. MP ES 18.86 to ES 38.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening		\$6,080,000				Moved from 2015 Cost changed from \$6,400,000 \$320,000 State Funds. Advertise with 3R 73648.
8-03137	UNASSIGNED	Multiple Intersections in Dist. 1 (Las Vegas) Pkg. 3 - Signal System Modifications		\$800,000				Design by City and Traffic Operations
3-23067	73841	SR 372 at Pahrump Valley Roundabout		\$2,317,302				Cost changed from \$2,225,000 \$121,963 State Funds. Advertise with 3R 73837.
8-00266	60681	SR 573, Craig Rd. fm. Decatur Blvd. to 5th St. (SMP)			\$3,000,000			Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Schedule	UNASSIGNED	Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements			\$522,500			
2-03275	60688	US 93 CL 48.63 to CL 64.52 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening			\$5,177,500			Cost changed from \$5,450,000 \$272,500 State Funds. Advertise with 3R 73644
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 667, Kietzke Ln, fm. Galletti Way to 200' N. of Mill St.			\$3,563,000			Moved from 2018 Cost changed from \$3,000,000
8-00266	60679	Second St. fm. Keystone Ave. to I-580. Arlington Ave. fm. Court St. to 6th St. (SMP)			\$3,000,000			Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Safety Services/Programs/Railroad			\$1,000,000			Cost changed from \$6,000,000 Annual Program
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	RSA safety improvements Statewide (SEDS)			\$2,000,000			Cost changed from \$3,000,000 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Eastern Ave. and Civic Center, fm. US 95 to Cope Ave. (SMP)			\$3,000,000			
6-31217	UNASSIGNED	Multiple Intersections in Dist. II (Sparks) - Signal System Modification. Phase 1			\$2,250,000			Moved from 2016 Design by Traffic Operations
6-31218	UNASSIGNED	Multiple Intersections in Dist. II (Sparks) - Signal System Modification. Phase 2				\$1,000,000		Moved from 2017
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	RSA safety improvements Statewide (SEDS)				\$2,000,000		Cost changed from \$3,000,000 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Safety Services/Programs/Railroad				\$6,000,000		Annual Program
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Southern Nevada (SMP). Lamb Blvd.				\$3,000,000		Cost changed from \$6,000,000
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Southern Nevada (SMP). Tropicana Ave.				\$3,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 430 ADA Improvements and Road Diet on N. Virginia St. Phase 2				\$3,000,000		Cost changed from \$300,000
Not Schedule	UNASSIGNED	Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements				\$522,500		
2-15024	UNASSIGNED	US 50 LA 0.00 to LA 25.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening - Phase 2				\$2,500,000		
2-23064	60685	US 95 MP NY 30.34 to NY 59.74 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening				\$4,275,000		Moved from 2016 Cost changed from \$4,000,000 \$225,000 State Funds.
2-23065	60686	US 95 MP NY 60.00 to NY 80.00 - Shoulder widening				\$4,275,000		Cost changed from \$4,500,000 \$225,000 State Funds.
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	RSA safety improvements Statewide (SEDS)					\$2,000,000	Cost changed from \$3,000,000 Traffic Safety Design Consultants
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Safety Services/Programs					\$6,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Southern Nevada (SMP)					\$3,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Southern Nevada (SMP).					\$3,000,000	Cost changed from \$6,000,000
Not Schedule	UNASSIGNED	Tribal Low Cost Safety Improvements					\$522,500	
2-15024	UNASSIGNED	US 50 LA 0.00 to LA 25.00 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening - Phase 3					\$4,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Northern Nevada (SMP)					\$3,000,000	
4-03416	UNASSIGNED	SR 147, Lake Mead Blvd, Pkg. 2 CL 7.56 - 9.67					\$2,200,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 93 MP CL 64.52 to 86.58 - Shoulder widening and slope flattening					\$2,500,000	Cost changed from \$10,350,000
SubTotal:			\$26,519,000	\$25,763,302	\$23,513,000	\$29,572,500	\$26,222,500	



PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROJECTS

Table with 8 columns: PCEMS NO, PIN/EA NO, PROJ NAME, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, NOTES. Contains 8 project rows and a SubTotal row.

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS PROJECTS

Table with 8 columns: PCEMS NO, PIN/EA NO, PROJ NAME, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, NOTES. Contains 48 project rows and a SubTotal row.



**HYDRAULICS/TAHOE PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
		Incline Green St. Projects Coop	\$80,000					Agreement
		SR 88 Cottonwood Slough	\$350,000					Agreement
		Zephyr Cove Coop	\$250,000					Agreement
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program	\$500,000					Agreement
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop	\$250,000					Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop	\$300,000					Agreement
3-25005	73414	Master Plan Water Quality & Erosion Control Improvements - SR 28 fm. 0.13 ME of the CC/WA line to Sand Harbor	\$1,000,000					\$2M split into 2 years TTD Agreement State Funds
2-05120	60628	US 50 Clear Creek Watershed Storm Drain Project	\$1,300,000					
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop		\$600,000				Agreement
		US 395 Martin Slough		\$250,000				Agreement
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program		\$500,000				Agreement
		Burke-Rabe Meadow Coop		\$300,000				Agreement
3-25005	73414	Master Plan Water Quality & Erosion Control Improvements - SR 28 fm. 0.13 ME of the CC/WA line to Sand Harbor		\$1,000,000				\$2M split into 2 years TTD Agreement State Funds
2-05115	73653	US 50 Slope Stability, Water Quality, and Erosion Control Imp. - US 50 fm. Cave Rock to SR-28 Spooner Jct		\$5,000,000				
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program			\$500,000			Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop			\$600,000			Agreement
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Master Plan Water Quality & Erosion Control Improvements - SR 28 fm. 0.13 M of the CC/WA line to Sand Harbor			\$1,000,000			
2-05120	73859	US 50 Spooner Summit to Carson City MP DO 13.00-14.58 and CC 0.00-7.60			\$4,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 431 – Treatment at Outfalls Directly Connected to Lake Tahoe MP WA 0.00 to MP WA 8.00				\$3,600,000		
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop				\$600,000		Agreement
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program				\$500,000		Agreement
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 207 Kingsbury Grade fm. MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 11.08; 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				\$6,000,000		
		Clear Creek Erosion Control Program					\$500,000	Agreement
		Lake Tahoe Stormwater Project Coop					\$600,000	Agreement
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 – Treatment at Outfalls Directly Connected to Lake Tahoe MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 13.07					\$1,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 in Ely, MP W66.34 to MP 68.43 and US 93m. MP WP 53.10 to MP WA 54.27. Storm drain system improvements along US 50/US6 including rehabilitation or enlargement of existing trunk system.					\$4,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 207 – Treatment at Outfalls Directly Connected to Lake Tahoe MP DO 0.00 to MP DO 3.15					\$1,000,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	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	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$4,030,000</b>	<b>\$7,650,000</b>	<b>\$6,100,000</b>	<b>\$10,700,000</b>	<b>\$11,100,000</b>	

**STORMWATER PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
9-25061	73940	MY 922, Carson City Mntc. Yard. FRCC05 MP CC 0.127 (Stantec Washpad design)	\$500,000					District Contract-Cost TBD
9-07035	60655	SR 229, Ruby Valley Mntc. Yard	\$500,000					District Contract
9-07033	60654	SR 226, Independence Valley Mntc. Yard	\$500,000					District Contract
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Reno - Sparks (Stantec Washpad design)	\$500,000					District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Fairview Mntc. Yard	\$500,000					District Contract-Cost TBD
9-07034	60656	SR 225, N. Fork Mntc. Yard	\$500,000					District Contract
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Wells Mntc. Yard		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Ely Mntc. Yard		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Las Vegas Mntc. Station		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Lovelock Mntc. Yard		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Virginia City Mntc. Yard		\$500,000				District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Searchlight Mntc. Station			\$500,000			District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Tonopah Mntc. Yard			\$500,000			District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Battle Mountain Mntc. Yard			\$500,000			District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Mina Mntc. Yard			\$500,000			District Contract-Cost TBD
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Goldfield Mntc. Yard				\$500,000		District Contract-Cost TBD
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$3,000,000</b>	<b>\$2,500,000</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>		



**LANDSCAPE & AESTHETICS PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 395 S. Topaz Lake - US Route State Gateway	\$248,750					Cost changed from \$150,000
4-31244	73942	Veterans Pkwy. Roundabout aesthetic improvements	\$600,000					
1-31228	73812	I 580 at S. Virginia, MP WA 15.91; at Damonte Ranch Pkwy, MP WA 16.98; at the S. Meadows intch, MP WA 18.33; at the S. Virginia St./Patriot Blvd, MP WA 19.30; and at Neil Rd, MP WA 20.72	\$2,307,000					
2-07064	73924	US 93 Jackpot - US Route State Gateway	\$248,750					Cost changed from \$175,000
2-31133	73927	US 395 N. Bordertown - US Route State Gateway	\$470,833					Cost changed from \$175,000
2-03281	73925	US 93 Hoover Dam - US Route State Gateway	\$248,750					Cost changed from \$175,000
2-05123	73926	US 50 Stateline S. Lake Tahoe - State Route Gateway	\$248,750					Cost changed from \$175,000
1-31233	73943	I 580, Reno, at Plumb Lane, SB on-ramps and flyover, MP 23.62		\$1,250,000				Cost changed from \$1,000,000
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 515 and Russell Rd.		\$2,000,000				Moved from 2019
1-31228	60665	US 395 Damonte Ranch Intch.		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Hidden Gems Highway - Info kiosks/pull-outs (4 locations)		\$160,000				
1-03382	73929	I 15 Spring Mountain			\$5,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 80 Winnemucca Structures				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 395 S. Meadows Intch.				\$1,250,000		
1-31228	LAND3	US 395 Neil Rd. Intch.				\$750,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 Flamingo Intch.				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 15 Lake Mead Blvd.				\$1,500,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Community Gateway to Winnemucca/Recreational to Black Rock Desert				\$50,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Boulder Hwy./ I 515					\$2,500,000	
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Charleston Rd. and I-515					\$2,000,000	Moved from 2016
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	I 580 Spaghetti Bowl to Moana W. Side					\$2,500,000	
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$4,372,833</b>	<b>\$5,410,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$6,550,000</b>	<b>\$7,000,000</b>	

**ADA PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
3-13048	73904	SR 794, E. Winnemucca Blvd, fm. Haskell St. to Great Basin Ave. at Maslona Dr.	\$35,000					Cost changed from \$241,000 State funds and TAP funding
2-05122	UNASSIGNED	US 395 Gardnerville fm. Mill St. to Kings Ln. MP DO 20.85 to 21.57	\$32,000					Cost changed from \$268,000 State funds and TAP funding
		SR 653 E. Plumb Ln. ADA Improvements fm. Kietzke Ln. to Harvard Way	\$50,000					3 Quote
4-31231	73549	SR 648, Glendale Ave, fm. Kietzke Ln. to McCarran Blvd.		\$1,700,000				
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$117,000</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>				

**MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
6-31202	60684	5 Schools in Washoe County SRTS	\$650,000					
1-07117	73606	I 80 at the Pequops. MP EL 91 ES and MP EL 97.45 ES Summit Animal Crossing	\$9,000,000					\$2M Safety and \$9M Misc
2-19084	73903	US 50 fm. Boyer Ln. to Pinto Ln. and fm. Onyx St. to the Jct. of US 95 in Silver Springs. MP LY 19.17 to LY 20.19 and LY 26.25 to LY 29.24 - Fence w/ Cattle Guards at various locations. MP LY 19.16 to 20.26 and LY 26.30 to LY 29.27	\$1,100,000					
2-19083	73890	US 50, Dayton, fm. 0.13 MW of Pine Cone Rd. to 0.17 ME of Retail Rd. MP LY 7.23 to 7.74	\$333,000					
8-09001	73624	US 95 in Goldfield fm. Columbia St. to 2nd St. ES 19.29 to ES 19.35	\$931,000					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 160, Nye County, from 0.517 mi N. Horseshutem Spring Rd. to Johnnie Mine Rd. and SR 160 at US 95 intersection. MP NY 26.531 to 27.266 and MP NY 37.238. Johnnie Curve		\$3,000,000				Moved from 2017 May go with a 3R (3-23070), waiting approval.
3-17097	73901	SR 317 Rainbow Canyon, Lincoln Co, fm. 1 MN of Elgin to the jct of US 93. MP LN 41.77 to LN 52.37		\$2,000,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	SR 163, Laughlin, Roundabout			\$2,500,000			
3-05057	73867	SR 756 Centerville Lane at Structure B-287. MP DO 3.68			\$600,000			TAP funding (Douglas County)
3-05058	UNASSIGNED	SR 756, Centerville, fm. Waterloo Ln. to US 395 (Bikelanes)			\$600,000			TAP Funding (2nd Project)
3-19053	73861	SR 828 Farm District Road fm. Crimson Rd. to Jasmine Lane 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
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$12,014,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$4,230,315</b>			

**DISTRICT BETTERMENT PROJECTS**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	District Betterments	\$24,879,358					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	District Betterments		\$23,873,698				
<b>SubTotal:</b>			<b>\$24,879,358</b>	<b>\$23,873,698</b>				



**BIKE & PED PROJECT**

PCEMS NO	PIN/EA NO	PROJ NAME	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	NOTES
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Bicycle Lanes - SR 756 - SR 88 to US 395	\$1,000,000					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Off System - 2015	\$1,712,500					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Pedestrian Sidewalk - US 50 - Lake Parkway to SR 207 and Elks Point Road (S. Side)	\$1,300,000					
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Off System - 2016		\$2,214,600				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 - Warning Signage in all mountainous areas regarding bicycles may be in travel lane		\$100,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50, Stateline Ave. to Elks Point Rd. - Bicycle Lanes		\$10,000				
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Off System - 2017			\$2,000,000			
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Off System - 2018				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	US 50 / US 95 - Bicycle Improvements				\$1,000,000		
Not Scheduled	UNASSIGNED	Off System - 2019					\$2,000,000	
SubTotal:			\$4,012,500	\$2,324,600	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$331,286,691</b>	<b>\$414,228,600</b>	<b>\$401,175,315</b>	<b>\$359,844,500</b>	<b>\$394,504,500</b>

**Qualifiers/Disclaimers**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CHANGES FROM THE 1-27-15 VERSION OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN ARE SHOWN IN BOLD AND BLUE**

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

Department of Transportation  
Construction Contract Closeout Status  
May 13, 2015

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	CP	LE	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CHANGE ORDER STATUS
3409	1	926	CAPRIATI CONSTRUCTION - SULAHRIA CECILIA DEENA -	US 95 FROM RAINBOW/SUMMERLIN INTERCHG. TO RANCHO/ANN RD. & DURANGO DR. (PKG. 1)	\$68,761,909.90	\$50,000.00	N	A	A	A	N	A	Y	12/1/12	2/15/13	12/16/13	3/7/14	3/12/14		Y	HQ working on closeout.	1 - Deena - Cecilia	
3529	1	903	TRANSCORE ITS LLC - CONNER DEENA	SIGNAL SYSTEM MODIFICATION IN COTY OF LAS VEGAS, SYSTEMIC REPLACEMENT OF 5 SECTIONS P/P HEADS	\$1,753,671.20	\$0.00	N	A	N	N	N	A		10/3/13			12/9/14	1/5/15		Y	Pickup requested by Crew 5/4/2015.	2 - Deena	
3530	1	902	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP - YOUSUF MATT	CONSTRUCT NEW INTERCHANGE I-15 AT CACTUS AVENUE	\$38,900,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	N	N	N		8/29/14		3/31/14			5/4/15	Y	HQ completed contract pickup 5/4/2015. Sent items back to crew for corrections. Cont needs District acceptance.	Done pending crew corrections	
3532	1	916	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP-RUGULEISKI MATT	RE-OPEN F STREET UNDER I 15 INTERSTATE TO TRAFFIC	\$13,600,000.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N		10/24/15						N	Crew preparing to request pickup.		
3534	1 (D3)	922	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION-CHRISTIANSEN MATT	CONSTRUCT SHOULDERS AND PASSING LANES	\$9,886,886.00	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	A	N	N		10/17/14	10/24/14		12/30/14	2/11/15		N	Crew working on preparing for pickup request. Working on final stages of cleanup and SWPPP clearances.		
3546	1	903	LAS VEGAS PAVING - CONNER MATT	I-15 MILL, 3" PBS, 3/4" OPEN-GRADE, 2 MI TRUCK CLIMBING LN NORTH BOUND	\$35,650,000.00	\$50,000.00	S	N	N	N	N	N					Partial Relief 5/8/15			N	Construction ongoing.		
3548	1	901	SNC - ALHWAYEK MATT	CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	\$1,174,007.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	N	A		7/18/14			7/31/14	8/26/14		Y	HQ working with crew on finaling closeout.	Done pending crew corrections	
3552	1	915	NEVCAL INVESTERS - STRGANAC MATT	SIGNAL SUSTEM MODIFICATION IN THE CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	\$441,763.58	\$22,136.05	N	A	N	N	N	S	N	1/15/15						N	Contract in clean up status		
3556	1	901	ROAD & HIGHWAY - ALHWAYEK MATT	REALIGN US 93 FOR APPROXIMATELY 5000 FT USING GEO-FOAM TO AVOID UNSUITABLE S SOILS	\$3,595,595.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	N	N	N		12/3/15						N	Crew preparing to request pickup.		
3560	1	906	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC - CHRISTIANSEN / FREE DEENA	INSTALL ENHANCED MILEPOST MARKERS & MINIMAL CENTERLINE/SHOULDER RUMBLE STRIPS	\$426,000.00	\$21,300.00	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	7/25/14	7/25/14		11/24/14	12/14/14	3/11/15	Y	Potential <b>Wage Claim issue</b> , contract compliance is working with Contractor. Closeout process 100% complete. <b>Final Pmt is pending resolution.(EDOC PILOT)</b>		
3562	1(D3)	922	GRANITE CONST CO - CHRISTIANSEN MATT	2" COLD MIX ON EXISTING ROADWAY	\$2,886,886.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	A		9/5/14	10/5/14		12/10/14	12/17/14		N	Crew preparing to request pickup.		
3566	1	915	NEVCAL INVESTORS INC - STRGANAC - MATT	SIGNAL SYSTEM MODIFICATION CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	\$590,432.20	\$30,379.11	N	A	N	N	N	N								N	Construction ongoing.		
3567	1	915	ACME ELECTRIC - STRGANAC - DEENA	MULTIPLE INTERSECTIONS IN DIST 1 - SIGNAL MODIFICATION IN LAS VEGAS	\$605,969.00	\$30,298.45	S	N	N	N	N	N								N	Contract temp <b>SUSPENDED</b> due on-going City work. 1 WD remaining on contract.		
3572	1	906	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORP- CHRISTIANSEN MATT	SR 574 CHEYENNE AVE, SR 593 TROPICANA AVE AT I 15, CL 37.38 AND SR 592 FLAMINGO RD AT I 15	\$1,390,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	N	N	A	A	S		10/24/14			12/12/14	1/5/15		N	Contract in clean up status		
3573	1	915	FAST-TRAC ELECTRIC (NEV-CAL INVESTORS, INC) STRGANAC DEENA	INSTALL SIGNAL SYSTEM ON SR 160 AT CIMARRON ROAD; CONSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES AT BUFFALO AND DURANGO DR.	\$1,426,603.74	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	A		8/22/14			11/24/14	12/1/14		Y	Pickup requested by Crew on 3/18/15.	5 - Deena	

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

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

WC=Wage Complaint  
CA=Contractors Acceptance  
\*= Internal

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

Department of Transportation  
Construction Contract Closeout Status  
May 13, 2015

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	CP	LE	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CHANGE ORDER STATUS
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	N	A	A	A	A	S		11/19/12		2/28/15	3/2/15	3/9/15		Y	HQ working with Crew on closeout. Plant establishment complete 2/28/15.		Crew working on 69
3389 ARRA	2	913	MEADOW VALLEY CONST - LIGHTFOOT DEENA	I-580 AT MEADOWOOD MALL EXCHANGE	\$21,860,638.63	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N		7/10/13		11/1/13	8/12/14	9/26/14		N	Claim pending		3,25
3433	2	911	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - DEENA ANGEL	US 50, FROM CAVE ROCK TO SR 28	\$3,661,661.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A	Y	12/12/12		11/1/14	10/23/14	11/17/14	3/24/15	Y	Final Qtys send to contractor 4-20-15. Possible payoff 5-20-15.		
3501	2	911	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - DEENA ANGEL	ON SR 431, MT. ROSE HWY, FROM THE JUNCTION WITH SR 28 TO INCLINE LAKE RD.	\$5,318,188.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	A	A		11/8/13		10/17/13	6/5/14	6/23/14		N	Crew working on preparing for closeout request. Contract Compliance working with contractor and FHWA to resolve payroll issues. AB pending HQ pickup/closeout.		
3505	2	907	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - LANI DEENA	US 50, LYON COUNTY, CHAVES ROAD TO ROY'S ROAD	\$21,212,121.00	\$50,000.00	S	N	A	N	N	S		10/3/13		10/3/14				N	Pickup request pending completion of CCOs.		2,3,4 are routing through divisions 12/2. Prior paid 6 and 8, working on 7.
3509	2	904	A & K EARTHMOVERS - DEENA BOGE	COLD-IN-PLACE RECYCLE W/ DOUBLE CHIP SEAL ON SR 116 AND SR 860	\$2,094,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		8/1/14			12/5/14	12/11/14	4/28/15	Y	HQ completed pickup. Final Qtys sent to contractor 4/28/15 via Docusign. Possible payoff 5/28/15.		
3516	2	907	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - MATT LANI	US 395 CARSON CITY FREEWAY FROM CARSON ST. TO FAIRVIEW	\$9,545,454.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	A	N	N	N		7/11/14						N	Finalizing misc cleanup items. Scheduling Dist Accept pending execution of CCO's		need 10
3541	2	911	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - DEENA ANGEL	CONSTRUCT PHASE 1 C MULTI USE TRAIL OF STATELINE TO STATELINE BIKEWAY PROJECT	\$1,424,013.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	S	A	A		10/15/13		12/2015	Partial Accept (excl Plant Est.) 11-21-13			N	Per Project Management, TTD in agreement with NDOT to do Weed Monitoring activities until 12/2015. Can not close out until completion of agreement with TTD.		
3543	2	905	GRANITE CONST. CO DEENA LOMPA	REMOVE BITUMINOUS SURFACE & PBS AND OPEN-GRADE WEARING COURSE	\$1,524,247.76	\$50,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	N		10/23/14			1/30/15	2/13/15		Y	Pickup requested by Crew on 3/5/2015	4- Deena	
3545	2	910	R OAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS- DURSKI DEENA	REMOVE BRIDGE DECK AND REPLACE WITH POLYMER CONCRETE ON STRUCTURES I-100, I1087 & I1005 E/W	\$792,459.75	\$39,622.99	N	A	A	N	N	N								N	Working on final repairs pending weather (May). Crew preparing for pickup request		
3547	2	904	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION BOGE DEENA	CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	\$558,007.00	\$50,000.00	N	A	A	A	A	A		7/15/14			12/5/14	12/11/14	3/16/15	Y	Final Qtys sent to contractor 4/20/15. Pending EEO, crew working with Cont. Comp. Possible payoff 5/20/15		
3555	2	910	DIVERSIFIED STRIPING SYSTEMS - DURSKI DEENA	INSTALL INTERSECTION SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS INCL SOLAR FLASHING STOP BEACONS	\$479,629.79	\$23,981.49	A	A	A	A	A	A		8/1/14			12/15/14	12/23/14	3/25/15	Y	Final qtys sent to contractor 4/20/15. Possible payoff around 5/20/15		
3558	2	913	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - LIGHTFOOT MATT	SR 431 MT ROSE HWY FROM 0.11 MILES EAST OF THE MT ROSE SUMMIT TO US 395	\$1,459,145.70	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N					Partial Relief 11/24/2014			N	Construction ongoing. Misc item pending weather		Need CCO 1,3,5,6 priors paid. Not using 4
3561	2	911	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - DEENA ANGEL	2 3/4" MILL 2" PLANTMIX SURFACE WITH 3/4" OPEN GRADE	\$6,354,354.01	\$50,000.00	S	N	N	S	N	N								N	Construction ongoing, working on final cleanup.		need Co 2,3,4,5 paid on priors

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

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

WC=Wage Complaint  
CA=Contractors Acceptance  
\*= Internal

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

Department of Transportation  
Construction Contract Closeout Status  
May 13, 2015

CONT NO	DIST	CREW #	CONTRACTOR - RESIDENT ENGINEER	DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT BID PRICE	RETENT HELD	EEO	LAB	AB	CP	LE	ATSS	WC	CONST. COMPL.	CLEANUP FINALIZED	PLANT ESTAB. (end date)	DISTRICT ACCEPT	DIRECTOR ACCEPT	PICK UP COMPL.	R P U	COMMENTS	PRIORITIES (based on Const Comp Date)	CHANGE ORDER STATUS
3564	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 CMAR	\$14,877,619.23	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	S	A	A								N	Crew preparing to request pickup.		
3569	2	905	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION-LOMPA DEENA	SR 445 PYRAMID HWY MP WA 11.00-43.98;SR 447 GERLACH MP WA 35.00-49.00	\$2,404,007.00	\$10,000.00	A	A	N	A	N	N		10/9/14			1/30/15	2/13/15		Y	Pickup requested by Crew on 3/5/2015	6 - Deena	
3570	2	910	A & K EARTHMOVERS - DURSKI MATT	2" OVERLAY TYPE 2 PBS -SR 208 TOPAZ/YERINGTON RD; SR 447 GERLACH RD	\$4,784,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	S		10/1/14			12/15/14	12/17/14		Y	Pickup scheduled for 5/22/2015 at crews office.	1- Matt	
3571	2	907	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION LANI DEENA	CONSTRUCT A CENTER TURN LANE & RT TURN LANE INTO THE TRIBAL COMMERCIAL CENTER	\$795,007.00	\$39,750.35	S	A	A	N	N	N		10/2/14		N/A				N	Crew working towards scheduling Dist Accept and preparing to request pickup.		2 has more back up coming 1 is routing
3575	2	910	A & K EARTHMOVERS - DURSKI DEENA - MATT	MY 935 WELLINGTON MAINTENANCE YARD	\$316,000.00	\$15,800.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		11/24/14		N/A	12/15/14	12/23/14		Y	Pickup scheduled for 5/22/2015 at crews office, 0% complete	2- Matt	
3435	3	908	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS (AGG. INDUSTRIES) - MOURITSEN (ACTING RE) MATT	I-80 FROM 0.26 MILES EAST OF THE HALLECK/RUBY VALLEY INTERCHANGE TO 0.60 MI EAST OF THE GREY'S CREEK GRADE SEPARATION	\$33,699,999.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	A	A	A		11/21/12	8/22/13	N	8/28/13	9/30/13	10/1/14	Y	Contractor disputed qtys 4/14/2015. Chief Const. Eng responded to contractor on 4/29/2015 with deadline of 5/22/2015 to repond		
3451	3	Asst. District Eng (Hesterlee)	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS (AGG. INDUSTRIES) - HESTERLEE DEENA	US 50 FROM 3.38 MI. OF HICKSON SUMMIT TO THE LANDER / EUREKA COUNTY LINE .	\$10,799,999.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	A	A	A	A		1/24/12		1/25/14	6/3/14	6/26/14	11/5/12	Y	Final Payment Memo & Final Payment with revised qtys sent for review by RE & Dist Eng. before payoff as soon as Docusigned qtys are returned to Const HQ.		
3461	3	918	FISHER INDUSTRIES - KELLY DEENA	I-80 EAST OF OASIS INTERCHANGE TO WEST PF PILOT PEAK INTERCHANGE	\$30,999,999.00	\$50,000.00	A	N	N	S	A	N		11/15/13		11/1/14	12/17/14	1/11/15		Y	Pickup requested by Crew onn 4-9-15.	3 - Deena	
3524	3	920	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - SCHWARTZ MATT	RUBBLIZING, PBS WITH OG SEIMIC RETROFIT AND REHABILITATION	\$32,106,106.01	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N								N	Construction ongoing (until summer 2015)		
3525	3	912	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS - SIMMONS DEENA	DOWEL BAR RETROFIT, PROFILE GRIND, SAW & SEAL, SEISMIC RETROFIT & REHAB OF STRUCTURE ON I-80	\$14,222,222.00	\$50,000.00	N	N	N	N	N	N					Partial Relief 12/05/14			N	Construction ongoing		Need co2&2R prior approved and paid on
3533	3	912/910	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - SIMMONS DEENA	PBS OVERLAY WITH OPEN GRADE, PAVED CROSSOVER, CHAIN UP AREAS, AND WORK @ BEOAWAWA INTERCHANGE	\$14,283,000.00	\$50,000.00	A	A	A	S	S	S		7/14/14			3/17/15	4/7/15		Y	Pickup requested by Crew on 4-9-15	6 - Deena	
3537 (CMAR)	3	908	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - SENRUD DEENA	COLDMILLING AND PLACING PLANTMIX SURFACE, PAVING CROSSOVER SAND PURCHASING LIGHTING FIXTURES	\$2,818,944.00	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	S	N	A		10/10/14						N	Waiting for final clean up to request Dist Acceptance. Closeout with Cont 3540.		
3539	3	920	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION - SCHWARTZ DEENA	SLOPE FLATTENING & CONSTRUCT PASSING LANES	\$7,616,616.00	\$50,000.00	S	A	N	N	N	S		9/18/14			Partial Relief 4/6/15			N	Contract in cleanup period, working with District on acceptance. Crew working with Contractor to resolve issues.		
3540 (CMAR)	3	908	Q & D CONSTRUCTION - SENRUD MATT	REPAIR TUNNEL, RENOVATE DRAINAGE & IMPROVE LIGHTING, PERFORM WORK ON STRUCTURES B-106, B-1112, B-1113 REPAIR PCCP WITH NEW SURFACE	\$28,340,000.13	\$50,000.00	N	A	N	S	A	N		3/13/15						N	District Acceptance pendng cleanup issues. Crew working on items for closeout/request pickup.		

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

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

WC=Wage Complaint  
CA=Contractors Acceptance  
\*= Internal

**NDOT Construction Contracts Closed Out  
(February - April) 2015**

Item #9B

Contract	Description	Contractor	Resident Engineer	NDOT/Consultant	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
3401	ADD NORTHBOUND AUXILIARY LANES AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	Crew 913 - Cocking	Jeffrey Lerud	\$ 31,495,495.00	\$ 2,199,444.39	7.0%	\$ 2,616,275.20	8.3%	\$ 36,311,214.59	\$ 4,815,719.59	115%	\$ 35,127,922.00	\$ 1,183,292.59	103%
3421	CONSTRUCT HOV-ONLY ROADWAY AND BRIDGE CONNECTING SUMMERLIN PRKWAY AND US 95	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	Crew 916 - Ruguleiski	John Terry	\$ 26,080,589.00	\$ 83,078.91	0.3%	\$ 902,955.74	3.5%	\$ 27,066,623.65	\$ 986,034.65	104%	\$ 27,325,505.00	\$ (258,881.35)	99%
3440	WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT AND EROSION CONTROL	Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Crew 911 - Angel	Matthew Nussbaumer	\$ 5,613,054.00	\$ 243,859.86	4.3%	\$ (80,914.66)	-1.4%	\$ 5,775,999.20	\$ 162,945.20	103%	\$ 5,989,778.00	\$ (213,778.80)	96%
3454	CRUMB RUBBER OVERLAY	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO.	Crew 916 - Ruguleiski	Luis Garay	\$ 5,995,000.00	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,006,534.03	16.8%	\$ 7,001,534.03	\$ 1,006,534.03	117%	\$ 7,422,149.00	\$ (420,614.97)	94%
3456	RECONSTRUCT EXISTING REST AREA (IMPROVING ACCESS, PAVING EXISTING SURFACE, NEW BATHROOM FACILITIES, LIGHTING AND SIGNING).	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS	Crew 918 - Yates	Steve Bird	\$ 1,832,222.00	\$ (0.40)	0.0%	\$ (33,169.56)	-1.8%	\$ 1,799,052.04	\$ (33,169.96)	98%	\$ 2,015,478.00	\$ (216,425.96)	89%
3466	COLDMILLING WITH PBS AND OPENGRADE	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR	Crew 906 - Christiansen	Christopher Petersen	\$ 18,006,000.00	\$ (516,804.28)	-2.9%	\$ 358,914.01	2.0%	\$ 17,848,109.73	\$ (157,890.27)	99%	\$ 19,343,626.00	\$ (1,495,516.27)	92%
3468	CONSTRUCT TWO RAMPS TO COMPLETE DIAMOND INTERCHANGE AT WEST CARLIN INTERCHANGE; WIDEN STRUCTURE AT CENTRAL CARLIN INTERCHANGE AND CONSTRUCT ACCELERATION LANE ON NORTHBOUND SR766	Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Crew 912 - Simmons	Victor Peters	\$ 7,263,806.50	\$ 321,108.84	4.4%	\$ (151,437.94)	-2.1%	\$ 7,433,477.40	\$ 169,670.90	102%	\$ 7,791,069.00	\$ (357,591.60)	95%
3471	CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT	Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC	Crew 911 - Angel	Casey Connor	\$ 2,414,236.00	\$ 410,674.37	17.0%	\$ (64,571.24)	-2.7%	\$ 2,760,339.13	\$ 346,103.13	114%	\$ 2,647,363.00	\$ 112,976.13	104%
3510	MICROSURFACING OF EXISTING ROADWAY	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Crew 907 - Lani	Anita Bush	\$ 1,772,007.00	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 22,159.51	1.3%	\$ 1,794,166.51	\$ 22,159.51	101%	\$ 1,896,048.00	\$ (101,881.49)	95%
3526	CONSTRUCT ITS ELEMENTS (CRAIG ROAD TO SPEEDWAY)	TRANSCORE ITS LLC	Crew 915 - Strganac	Luis Garay	\$ 4,850,856.00	\$ (119,837.00)	-2.5%	\$ 3,972.26	0.1%	\$ 4,734,991.26	\$ (115,864.74)	98%	\$ 6,764,790.00	\$ (2,029,798.74)	70%
3535	CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC.	Crew 906 - Christiansen	Anita Bush	\$ 3,966,996.00	\$ (156,487.90)	-3.9%	\$ 293,445.56	7.4%	\$ 4,103,953.66	\$ 136,957.66	103%	\$ 4,484,856.00	\$ (380,902.34)	92%
3536	CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Crew 904 - Boge	Anita Bush	\$ 369,007.00	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 29,090.66	7.9%	\$ 398,097.66	\$ 29,090.66	108%	\$ 394,837.00	\$ 3,260.66	101%
3565	CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC	Crew 915 - Strganac	Philip Kanegsberg	\$ 4,114,893.06	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 111,274.09	2.7%	\$ 4,226,167.15	\$ 111,274.09	103%	\$ 4,616,843.00	\$ (390,675.85)	92%
3568	UPGRADE SIGNAL SYSTEMS AT THE I 80 INTERCHANGES OF 4TH STREET, ROCK BLVD, AND PYRAMID WAY	TITAN ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING, INC.	Crew 905 - Lompa	Jeffrey Lerud	\$ 214,246.00	\$ -	0.0%	\$ (2,970.55)	-1.4%	\$ 211,275.45	\$ (2,970.55)	99%	\$ 260,673.00	\$ (49,397.55)	81%
			Totals		\$ 113,988,407.56	\$ 2,465,036.79	2.2%	\$ 5,011,557.11	4.4%	\$ 121,465,001.46	\$ 7,476,593.90	107%	\$ 126,080,937.00	\$ (4,615,935.54)	96%
			Number of Projects Over/ Under Agr. Estimate (Budget)								Projects Over Budget	3	Projects Equal to or Under Budget	11	

**Construction Terms:**

**Contract Change Order:** Written modification to the contract covering changes in the plans or specifications, establishes basis for payment & time adjustments.

**Quantity Adjustments:** The difference between the price of the estimated quantities at bid time and the cost of the actual quantities placed.

**Agreement Estimate (Budgeted):** Actual unit bid item prices and estimated quantities and generally includes other estimated ancillary costs such as contingencies, asphalt or fuel escalation .

**Notice To Proceed:** A written notice to the Contractor to proceed with the contract work.

**Construction Complete:** All construction activity completed including final punch list items.

**Project Closed Out:** All certifications, clearances, as-built plans, and reports processed, final pay quantities audited and agreed to, and retention released.

**Contract No.:** 3401  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73393 and 60343  
**FHWA Project No(s):** DE-580-1(028) and SPI-580-1(018)  
**County:** WASHOE  
**Location:** ON I-580 FROM MOANA LANE TO I-80  
**Work Description:** ADD NORTHBOUND AUXILIARY LANES AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS  
**Advertised Date:** NOVEMBER 19, 2009  
**Bid Opened:** DECEMBER 23, 2009  
**Contract Awarded:** JANUARY 19, 2010  
**Notice to Proceed:** FEBRUARY 22, 2010  
**Work Completed:** SEPTEMBER 10, 2013  
**Work Accepted:** APRIL 22, 2013  
**Final Payment:** FEBRUARY 18, 2015

**Contractor:** GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY  
**Resident Engineer:** SHANE COCKING

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$45,539,013.18
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$31,495,495.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$33,694,939.39
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$35,127,922.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$36,311,214.59
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	103%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$2,199,444.39
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	7.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	510
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	510
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	478
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$21,505.70

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 89,859.09 (0.25%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$36,311,214.59(99.75%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$36,401,073.68

**Contract No.:** 3421  
**NDOT I.D. No.:** 73363  
**FHWA Project No.:** STP-095-2(050)  
**County:** CLARK  
**Location:** US 95 AT SUMMERLIN PRKWY  
**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT HOV-ONLY ROADWAY AND BRIDGE  
 CONNECTING SUMMERLIN PRKWY AND US 95  
**Advertised Date:** SEPTEMBER 16, 2010  
**Bid Opened:** OCTOBER 21, 2010  
**Contract Awarded:** NOVEMBER 18, 2010  
**Notice to Proceed:** DECEMBER 20, 2010  
**Work Completed:** AUGUST 10, 2012  
**Work Accepted:** JUNE 6, 2014  
**Final Payment:** APRIL 27, 2014

**Contractor:** LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION  
**Resident Engineer:** TIM RUGULEISKI

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$31,588,892.50
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$26,080,589.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$26,163,667.91
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$27,325,505.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$27,066,623.65
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	99%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$83,078.91
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.3%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	325
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	325
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	325
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$3,054,734.37(9.57%)
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 1,798,583.18(5.63%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$27,066,623.65(84.80%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$31,919,941.20

**Contract No.:** 3440  
**NDOT I.D. No.:** 73413  
**FHWA Project No.:** MS-0028(005)  
**County:** WASHOE  
**Location:** ON SR 28 FROM THE JUNCTION WITH SR 431 TO THE CALIFORNIA/NEVADA STATE LINE  
**Work Description:** WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT AND EROSION CONTROL  
**Advertised Date:** DECEMBER 15, 2010  
**Bid Opened:** JANUARY 27, 2011  
**Contract Awarded:** FEBRUARY 23, 2011  
**Notice to Proceed:** MAY 2, 2011  
**Work Completed:** DECEMBER 28, 2012  
**Work Accepted:** JUNE 4, 2015  
**Final Payment:** APRIL 2, 2015

**Contractor:** Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC.  
**Resident Engineer:** JOHN ANGEL

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$5,348,679.90
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$5,613,054.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$5,856,913.86
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$5,989,778.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$5,775,999.20
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	96%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$243,859.86
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	4.3%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	220
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	162
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	162
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$751,113.74(8.79%)
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$1,560,327.20(18.25%)
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 461,840.42(5.40%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$5,775,999.20(67.56%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$8,549,280.56

**Contract No.:** 3454  
**NDOT I.D. No:** 73669  
**FHWA Project No:** SI-015-01(149)  
**County:** CLARK  
**Location:** ON I-15 FROM TROPICANA AVENUE TO US 95  
**Work Description:** CRUMB RUBBER OVERLAY  
**Advertised Date:** MAY 2, 2011  
**Bid Opened:** JUNE 2, 2011  
**Contract Awarded:** JULY 14, 2011  
**Notice to Proceed:** SEPTEMBER 11, 2011  
**Work Completed:** OCTOBER 20, 2011  
**Work Accepted:** APRIL 20, 2012  
**Final Payment:** MARCH 17, 2015

**Contractor:** FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO.  
**Resident Engineer:** TIM RUGULEISKI

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$5,613,277.40
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$5,995,000.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$5,995,000.00
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$7,422,149.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$7,001,534.03
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	94%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$0.00
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$31,231.62 (0.43%)
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 169,237.73 (2.35%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$7,001,534.03(97.22%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$7,202,003.38

**Contract No.:** 3456  
**NDOT Project I.D. No:** 73628  
**FHWA Project No:** STP-093-4(017)  
**County:** WHITE PINE  
**Location:** ON US 93 SHELLBOURNE REST AREA  
**Work Description:** RECONSTRUCT EXISTING REST AREA (IMPROVING ACCESS, PAVING EXISTING SURFACE, NEW BATHROOM FACILITIES, LIGHTING AND SIGNING).  
**Advertised Date:** JUNE 1, 2011  
**Bid Opened:** JUNE 30, 2011  
**Contract Awarded:** JULY 29, 2011  
**Notice to Proceed:** APRIL 2, 2012  
**Work Completed:** SEPTEMBER 10, 2012  
**Work Accepted:** JULY 29, 2013  
**Final Payment:** MARCH 25, 2015

**Contractor:** ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS  
**Resident Engineer:** MIKE YATES

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$1,495,601.75
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$1,832,222.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$1,832,221.60
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$2,015,478.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$1,799,052.04
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	89%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	-\$0.40
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	50
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	50
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	55
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$58,754.68(2.89%)
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$1,163.04(0.06%)
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 172,474.29(8.49%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$1,799,052.04(88.56%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$2,031,444.05

**Contract No.:** 3466  
**NDOT Project I.D. No:** 73551  
**FHWA Project I.D. No:** SPF-095-6(020)  
**County:** CLARK  
**Location:** ON I 15 FROM SPEEDWAY/HOLLYWOOD INTERCHANGE TO 0.103 MILES  
 NORTH OF DRY LAKES REST AREA  
**Work Description:** COLDMILLING WITH PBS AND OPENGRADE  
**Advertised Date:** August 25, 2011  
**Bid Opened:** September 15, 2011  
**Contract Awarded:** November 17, 2011  
**Notice to Proceed:** December 19, 2011  
**Work Completed:** JANUARY 16, 2013  
**Work Accepted:** JANUARY 24, 2013  
**Final Payment:** MARCH 16, 2015

**Contractor:** AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR  
**Resident Engineer:** DON CHRISTIANSEN

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$17,436,992.25
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$18,006,000.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$17,489,195.72
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$19,343,626.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$17,848,109.73
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	92%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	-\$516,804.28
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	-2.9%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	130
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	130
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	140
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$89,602.23

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$283,259.71(1.48%)
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$10,180.53(0.05%)
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 1,015,996.45(5.30%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$17,848,109.73(93.16%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$19,157,546.42

**Contract No.:** 3468**NDOT I.D. No.:** 60519**FHWA Project No.:** STP-080-4(091)**County:** ELKO**Location:** ON I-80 AT THE WEST CARLIN INTERCHANGE AND ON SR 766 AT THE CENTRAL CARLIN INTERCHANGE**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT TWO RAMPS TO COMPLETE DIAMOND INTERCHANGE AT WEST CARLIN INTERCHANGE; WIDEN STRUCTURE AT CENTRAL CARLIN INTERCHANGE AND CONSTRUCT ACCELERATION LANE ON NORTHBOUND SR766**Advertised Date:** AUGUST 4, 2011**Bid Opened:** AUGUST 25, 2011**Contract Awarded:** SEPTEMBER 22, 2011**Notice to Proceed:** OCTOBER 24, 2011**Work Completed:** JULY 17, 2013**Work Accepted:** AUGUST 1, 2013**Final Payment:** FEBRUARY 2, 2015**Contractor:** Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC.**Resident Engineer:** MIKE SIMMONS**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$6,938,375.70
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$7,263,806.50
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$7,584,915.34
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$7,791,069.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$7,433,477.40
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	95%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$321,108.84
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	4.4%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	200
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	200
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	185
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$5,200.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$1,437,461.38(16.20%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$7,433,477.40(83.80%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$8,870,938.78

**Contract No.:** 3471  
**NDOT Project I.D. No.:** 60492  
**FHWA Project No.:** SI-0028(007)  
**County:** WASHOE  
**Location:** SR 28 AT THE INTERSECTION OF MOUNT ROSE HIGHWAY (SR431)  
**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT  
**Advertised Date:** OCTOBER 27, 2011  
**Bid Opened:** DECEMBER 1, 2011  
**Contract Awarded:** JANUARY 9, 2012  
**Notice to Proceed:** MAY 1, 2012  
**Work Completed:** OCTOBER 15, 2012  
**Work Accepted:** JUNE 5, 2014  
**Final Payment:** March 25, 2015

**Contractor:** Q & D CONSTRUCTION, INC  
**Resident Engineer:** JOHN ANGEL

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$1,965,086.50
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$2,414,236.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$2,824,910.37
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$2,647,363.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$2,760,339.13
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	104%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$410,674.37
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	17.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 196,479.60 (6.64%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$2,760,339.13(93.36%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$2,956,818.73

**Contract No.** 3510  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s).**: 60558  
**FHWA Project No(s).**: SP-000M(185)  
**County:** CARSON CITY, CHURCHILL, LYON & WASHOE  
**Location:** ON MULTIPLE ROUTES  
**Work Description:** MICROSURFACING OF EXISTING ROADWAY  
**Advertised Date:** MAY 9, 2012  
**Bid Opening:** MAY 30, 2012 2:00 PM  
**Contract Awarded:** JUNE 21, 2012  
**Notice to Proceed:** JULY 23, 2012  
**Work Completed:** AUGUST 16, 2013  
**Work Accepted:** MAY 15, 2014  
**Final Payment:** MARCH 16, 2015

**Contractor:** SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION, INC.  
**Resident Engineer:** STEPHEN LANI

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$2,676,748.24
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$1,772,007.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$1,772,007.00
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$1,896,048.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$1,794,166.51
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	95%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$0.00
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	115
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	115
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	105
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 140,050.59 (7.24%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$1,794,166.51(92.76%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1,934,217.10

**Contract No.** 3526

**NDOT Project I.D. No.:** 60562

**FHWA Project No.:** CM-015-1(152)

**County:** CLARK

**Location:** I-15 NORTH, PART 2 PACKAGE B, LAS VEGAS FROM CRAIG ROAD TO SPEEDWAY

**Work Description:** CONSTRUCT ITS ELEMENTS (CRAIG ROAD TO SPEEDWAY)

**Advertised Date:** SEPTEMBER 19, 2012

**Bid Opening:** OCTOBER 18, 2012 2:30 PM

**Contract Awarded:** NOVEMBER 14, 2012

**Notice to Proceed:** JANUARY 7, 2013

**Work Completed:** OCTOBER 24, 2013

**Work Accepted:** APRIL 10, 2014

**Final Payment:** MARCH 16, 2015

**Contractor:** TRANSCORE ITS LLC

**Resident Engineer:** MARTIN STRGANAC

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$6,381,891.70
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$4,850,856.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$4,731,019.00
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$6,764,790.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$4,734,991.26
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	70%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	-\$119,837.00
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	-2.5%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	200
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	200
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	189
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 497,720.25(9.51%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$4,734,991.26(90.49%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$5,232,711.51

**Contract No.** 3535-READV  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60582  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SP-000M(191)  
**County:** NYE  
**Location:** US 6, SR 361, SR 375, and SR 160  
**Work Description:** CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY  
**Advertised Date:** May 30, 2013  
**Bid Opening:** June 20, 2013 1:30 PM  
**Contract Awarded:** July 9, 2013  
**Notice to Proceed:** August 12, 2013  
**Work Completed:** JULY 1, 2014  
**Work Accepted:** AUGUST 8, 2014  
**Final Payment:** APRIL 22, 2015

**Contractor:** INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC.  
**Resident Engineer:** DON CHRISTIANSEN

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$3,406,016.15
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$3,966,996.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$3,810,508.10
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$4,484,856.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$4,103,953.66
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	92%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	-\$156,487.90
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	-3.9%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	65
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	65
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	57
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 157,264.05(3.69%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$4,103,953.66(96.31%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$4,261,217.71

**Contract No.** 3536  
**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 60583  
**FHWA Project No(s):** SP-000M (192)  
**County:** PERSHING  
**Location:** SR 854 MP PE 0.00 TO 3.59; SR 396 MP PE 1.42 TO 7.70  
**Work Description:** CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY  
**Advertised Date:** FEBRUARY 20, 2013  
**Bid Opening:** MARCH 21, 2013 2:00 PM  
**Contract Awarded:** APRIL 19, 2013  
**Notice to Proceed:** MAY 20, 2013  
**Work Completed:** AUGUST 15, 2013  
**Work Accepted:** AUGUST 12, 2014  
**Final Payment:** MARCH 25, 2015

**Contractor:** SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION, INC.  
**Resident Engineer:** LARRY BOGE

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$479,766.03
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$369,007.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$369,007.00
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$394,837.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$398,097.66
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	101%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$0.00
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 36,325.33(8.36%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$398,097.66(91.64%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$434,422.99

**Contract No.** 3565

**NDOT Project I.D. No(s).**: 60598

**FHWA Project No(s).**: SP-000M(201)

**County:** LINCOLN, NYE

**Location:** US 95 MP NY 72.00-103.63; SR 318 MP LN 0.00-30.00; SR 321 MP LN 0.00-5.12; SR 376 MP NY 54.00-81.75; AR NY44 MP NY 0.00-19.58

**Work Description:** CHIP SEAL OF EXISTING ROADWAY

**Advertised Date:** FEBRUARY 19, 2014

**Bid Opening:** MARCH 13, 2014 2:00 PM

**Contract Awarded:** APRIL 29, 2014

**Notice to Proceed:** JUNE 2, 2014

**Work Completed:** AUGUST 29, 2014

**Work Accepted:** NOVEMBER 24, 2014

**Final Payment:** APRIL 22, 2015

**Contractor:** INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL, INC.

**Resident Engineer:** MARTIN STRGANAC

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$3,366,715.33
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$4,114,893.06
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$4,114,893.06
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$4,616,843.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$4,226,167.15
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	92%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$0.00
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	80
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	80
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	53
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$625.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	n/a
<b>Right of Way:</b>	n/a
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 136,554.86(3.13%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$4,226,167.15(96.87%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$4,362,722.01

**Contract No.** 3568

**NDOT Project I.D. No(s):** 73825

**FHWA Project No(s):** SPI-080-1(073)

**Location:** I 80 AT 4TH, ROCK, AND PYRAMID INTERCHANGES, SPARKS

**Work Description:** UPGRADE SIGNAL SYSTEMS AT THE I 80 INTERCHANGES OF 4TH STREET, ROCK BLVD, AND PYRAMID WAY

**Advertised Date:** MARCH 12, 2014

**Bid Opening:** APRIL 3, 2014 2:00 PM

**Contract Awarded:** APRIL 25, 2014

**Notice to Proceed:** MAY 27, 2014

**Work Completed:** AUGUST 29, 2014

**Work Accepted:** NOVEMBER 5, 2014

**Final Payment:** APRIL 27, 2015

**Contractor:** TITAN ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING, INC.

**Resident Engineer:** SAMUEL LOMPA

**Project Performance:**

<b>Engineers Estimate:</b>	\$250,663.67
<b>Bid Price:</b>	\$214,246.00
<b>Adjusted Bid Contract Amount:</b>	\$214,246.00
<b>Agreement Estimate (Budget):</b>	\$260,673.00
<b>Final Contract Amount</b>	\$211,275.45
<b>Percent of Budget:</b>	81%
<b>Total Change Orders:</b>	\$0.00
<b>Percent Change Orders:</b>	0.0%
<b>Original Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Updated Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Charged Working Days:</b>	0
<b>Liquidated Damages:</b>	\$0.00

**Project Cost Breakdown:**

<b>Preliminary Engineering:</b>	\$ 25,552.91(10.05%)
<b>Right of Way:</b>	\$ 1,258.12(0.49%)
<b>Construction Engineering:</b>	\$ 16,180.06(6.36%)
<b>Construction Final Contract Amount:</b>	<u>\$211,275.45(83.09%)</u>
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$254,266.54

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	<sup>1</sup> AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	ADJUSTED BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	<sup>2</sup> % Budget	<sup>3</sup> % Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	COMMENTS
3292	I-580 FREEWAY EXTENSION	\$ 405,824,356.00	\$ 393,393,393.00	\$ 430,451,409.31	\$ 447,058,437.41	110%	104%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	SOLTANI, AMIR/CH2M HILL	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
3389	I-580 MEADOWOOD MALL	\$ 22,845,305.00	\$ 21,827,613.92	\$ 22,386,083.85	\$ 22,461,021.39	98%	134%	MEADOW VALLEY CONTRACTORS INC	SOLTANI, AMIR/CH2M HILL	\$14M REA for Plan Errors & Omissions
3409	US 95 WIDENING PCKG 1	\$ 71,947,575.00	\$ 68,761,909.90	\$ 73,462,591.60	\$ 73,605,048.75	102%	100%	CAPRIATI CONSTRUCTION CORP INC	SOLTANI, AMIR	Drilled Shaft Delay
3433	US 50, CAVE ROCK TO SPOONER	\$ 4,113,346.00	\$ 3,661,661.00	\$ 6,156,657.90	\$ 6,452,083.76	157%	92%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO DBA	NUSSBAUMER, M./WOOD R.	Change Site Conditions
3435	I-80 WEST OF OSINO, ELKO	\$ 35,482,218.00	\$ 33,699,999.00	\$ 34,024,631.66	\$ 35,968,072.97	101%	100%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	BIRD, STEVE,	Plantmix Quantity Increases
3451	US 50, CIR LA/EU COUNTY	\$ 11,562,099.00	\$ 10,799,999.00	\$ 10,738,346.93	\$ 10,876,788.68	94%	100%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	PETERS, VICTOR,	
3461	I-80, E.OASIS TO PILOT PK, CIR	\$ 32,539,538.00	\$ 31,000,000.00	\$ 32,430,559.58	\$ 33,086,327.83	102%	100%	FISHER SAND & GRAVEL CO	BRADSHAW, JOHN,	Earthwork, Base and Bridge Deck Repair Quantity Increases
3501	SR 431, WATER QLTY & EROSION C.	\$ 5,703,141.00	\$ 5,318,188.00	\$ 5,578,763.44	\$ 5,169,684.60	91%	100%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	NUSSBAUMER, M./WOOD R.	
3505	US 50, WIDEN & DRAINAGE IMP.	\$ 22,256,347.00	\$ 21,212,121.00	\$ 21,201,767.48	\$ 23,652,851.52	106%	100%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO DBA	BIRD, STEVE,	Plantmix Quantity Increases
3509	SR 116 & SR 860, CIR & CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,331,480.00	\$ 2,094,000.00	\$ 2,101,784.50	\$ 2,085,214.57	89%	76%	A&K EARTH MOVERS INC	BUSH, ANITA	
3516	US 395, CC FRWY (2B-2)	\$ 9,958,381.00	\$ 9,545,454.00	\$ 10,007,788.28	\$ 10,218,302.36	103%	96%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	SOLTANI, AMIR/ LOUIS BERGER	Utility Delay (NV Energy). \$284K
3524	I 80, RUBBLIZE, PBS AND OG	\$ 34,221,117.00	\$ 32,106,106.01	\$ 32,539,014.01	\$ 32,125,438.34	94%	88%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	BRADSHAW, JOHN,	
3525	I 80, NEAR DUNPHY, MULT STRUCTURES	\$ 15,187,265.00	\$ 14,222,222.00	\$ 14,663,763.12	\$ 16,108,063.25	106%	100%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	BRADSHAW, JOHN,	Utility Delay (Fiber Optic) and Bridge Deck Repair Quantity Increase
3529	MULT. INTER. SIGNAL SYTEM MOD	\$ 2,074,259.00	\$ 1,753,671.20	\$ 1,709,017.52	\$ 1,386,202.87	67%	100%	TRANSCORE ITS LLC DBA	BRADSHAW, JOHN,	
3530	I 15, CACTUS INTERCHANGE	\$ 40,534,954.00	\$ 38,900,000.00	\$ 39,242,182.00	\$ 38,991,483.25	96%	87%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	MIRANDA EDUARDO/ LOUIS BERGER G.	
3532	I 15, REOPEN F STREET	\$ 14,201,021.00	\$ 13,600,000.00	\$ 13,735,741.37	\$ 13,584,403.61	96%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	FINNERTY, JENICA	
3533	I 80, W. EMIGRANT PASS, OVERLAY	\$ 15,357,027.00	\$ 14,283,000.01	\$ 14,479,438.32	\$ 14,881,579.64	97%	91%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	MAXWELL, KEVIN,	
3534	US 93, NJCT AT CURRIE, PASSING LANES	\$ 10,592,452.00	\$ 9,886,886.00	\$ 10,082,453.89	\$ 10,181,005.94	96%	100%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3537	I 80, CARLIN TUNNELS PCKG 1, CMAR	\$ 2,847,133.00	\$ 2,818,944.00	\$ 2,818,944.00	\$ 2,815,168.00	99%	80%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KELLER, DALE	
3539	US 95, N. WINN., SLOPE FLATTENING	\$ 8,157,766.00	\$ 7,616,616.00	\$ 7,619,771.95	\$ 7,707,110.59	94%	99%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	BIRD, STEVE,	
3540	I 80, CARLIN TUNNELS PCKG 2, CMAR	\$ 28,339,999.00	\$ 28,340,000.13	\$ 28,340,000.13	\$ 27,852,497.54	98%	112%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	KELLER, DALE	
3541	US 50, MULTI USE TRAIL, CMAR	\$ 1,424,013.00	\$ 1,424,013.00	\$ 1,413,532.00	\$ 1,340,586.60	94%	0%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	RODRIGUEZ, PEDRO	
3543	I580 RAMPS, COLDMILL, PBS & OG	\$ 1,659,849.00	\$ 1,496,496.00	\$ 1,524,247.76	\$ 1,565,118.82	94%	100%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	BUSH, ANITA	
3545	I 80, REM. BRDG DECK & OVERLAY	\$ 879,631.00	\$ 792,459.75	\$ 792,459.75	\$ 752,849.08	86%	68%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	FROMM, DOUGLAS	
3546	I 15, DRY LK. MILL, PBS & TRCK CLIMBING LN	\$ 37,235,208.00	\$ 35,650,000.00	\$ 37,095,902.11	\$ 35,836,560.59	96%	92%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	PETERS, VICTOR,	1.4M in Change Orders - Tortoise Fence and Traffic Control
3547	US 95, CHIP SEAL	\$ 607,648.00	\$ 558,007.00	\$ 577,965.00	\$ 582,598.68	96%	78%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	BUSH, ANITA	
3548	SR 319, CHIP SEAL	\$ 1,277,928.00	\$ 1,174,007.00	\$ 1,174,007.00	\$ 1,188,869.09	93%	68%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	BUSH, ANITA	
3550	SR 227, IDAHO ST, COLDMILL & PBS	\$ 20,616,055.00	\$ 19,656,656.00	\$ 19,682,702.74	\$ 13,148,001.19	64%	63%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	BIRD, STEVE,	
3551	US93, CURRIE TO JCT 232, FLATTEN SLOPES	\$ 8,956,862.00	\$ 8,363,363.00	\$ 8,363,363.00	\$ 2,452,371.58	27%	36%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3552	DIST I, SIG. SYSTEM MODIFICATIONS	\$ 508,269.00	\$ 441,763.58	\$ 442,720.93	\$ 436,368.51	86%	98%	NEVCAL INVESTORS INC	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3554	US 95, ANN RD TO DURANGO PCK 2A	\$ 37,306,043.00	\$ 35,700,000.01	\$ 37,275,196.49	\$ 17,930,700.75	48%	68%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	SOLTANI, AMIR	1.6M in Change Orders - Realign Ramp for Phase 3
3555	DIST II, INT. SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	\$ 534,018.00	\$ 479,629.79	\$ 511,129.09	\$ 509,557.64	95%	89%	DIVERSIFIED STRIPING SYSTEMS	PETERSEN, CHRISTOPHER,	
3556	US 93, REALIGN USING GEOFOAM	\$ 3,881,087.00	\$ 3,595,595.00	\$ 3,595,595.00	\$ 3,604,164.54	93%	100%	ROAD & HIGHWAY BUILDERS LLC	PETERSEN, CHRISTOPHER,	
3557	DUNPHY AT UPRR, OFF-SYST STRCT	\$ 8,383,676.00	\$ 7,835,211.70	\$ 7,835,211.70	\$ 5,664,363.20	68%	61%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	BRADSHAW, JOHN,	
3558	SR 431,COLDMILL AND PBS WITH OG	\$ 11,035,511.00	\$ 10,293,293.00	\$ 10,719,165.20	\$ 11,745,101.70	106%	63%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	MAXWELL, KEVIN,	Drainage changes/Plantmix and Drainage Quantity Increases
3559	I 80, GOLCONDA, MILL, PBS WITH OG	\$ 10,849,672.00	\$ 10,069,069.00	\$ 10,069,069.00	\$ 6,139,221.20	57%	73%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	BRADSHAW, JOHN,	
3560	SR 318, ENHANCED MILEPOST & RMBLE STRIP	\$ 495,820.00	\$ 426,000.00	\$ 426,000.00	\$ 396,704.22	80%	83%	MKD CONSTRUCTION INC	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3561	US 50, DEER RUN, MILL & PBS WITH OG	\$ 6,684,652.00	\$ 6,354,354.01	\$ 6,354,354.01	\$ 6,606,773.99	99%	92%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	BIRD, STEVE,	
3562	SR229, COLDMIX ON EXISTING RDWAY	\$ 3,157,837.00	\$ 2,886,886.00	\$ 2,794,663.50	\$ 2,695,219.59	85%	100%	GRANITE CONSTRUCTION CO	KANEGBERG, PHILIP	
3563	US50,US93,SR140,SR278,SR292,SR294,SR305	\$ 5,349,866.00	\$ 4,824,007.00	\$ 4,824,007.00	\$ 2,288,324.98	43%	50%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	KANEGBERG, PHILIP	
3564	SR 207, KINGSBURY GRADE, CMAR	\$ 14,877,619.00	\$ 14,877,619.23	\$ 14,877,619.23	\$ 13,244,980.78	89%	63%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	RODRIGUEZ, PEDRO	
3566	DIST I, MULTIPLE INT, SIGNAL MOD	\$ 659,953.00	\$ 590,432.20	\$ 607,582.20	\$ 432,223.48	65%	13%	NEVCAL INVESTORS INC	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3567	DIST I, SIG. SYSTEM MODIFICATIONS, PCK 2	\$ 676,268.00	\$ 605,969.00	\$ 605,969.00	\$ 578,406.77	86%	98%	LLO INC DBA	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3569	SR 445 & SR 447, DBL CHIP SEAL	\$ 2,636,328.00	\$ 2,404,007.00	\$ 2,459,491.68	\$ 2,567,569.19	97%	100%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	KANEGBERG, PHILIP	
3570	SR 208/SR 447, 2" PBS OVERLAY	\$ 5,227,258.00	\$ 4,784,000.00	\$ 4,784,000.00	\$ 4,990,874.47	95%	100%	A&K EARTH MOVERS INC	KANEGBERG, PHILIP	
3571	US 395, GARDNERVILLE INDIAN COLONY	\$ 898,608.00	\$ 795,007.00	\$ 795,007.00	\$ 785,949.88	87%	100%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	CERAGIOLI, JIM,	
3572	SR 574, SR 593, SR 592 RAMPS	\$ 1,544,246.00	\$ 1,390,000.00	\$ 1,390,000.00	\$ 1,387,423.01	90%	100%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	FILBERT, RICHARD	
3573	SR 160, CIMARRON SIG SYS & PED FACILITIES	\$ 1,513,732.00	\$ 1,390,312.98	\$ 1,426,603.74	\$ 1,235,851.22	82%	0%	NEVCAL INVESTORS INC	BIRD, STEVE,	
3574	I-580,MOANA TO TRUCKEE RIVER	\$ 12,936,849.00	\$ 12,114,205.11	\$ 12,114,205.11	\$ 1,161,949.55	9%	22%	Q&D CONSTRUCTION INC	PETERS, VICTOR,	
3575	MY 935 WELLINGTON MAINTENANCE YARD	\$ 370,016.00	\$ 316,000.00	\$ 316,000.00	\$ 333,594.86	90%	58%	A&K EARTH MOVERS INC	BUSH, ANITA,	
3576	SR 147, TO APPROX L. MEAD NRA	\$ 5,948,497.07	\$ 5,553,726.00	\$ 5,948,497.07	\$ 819,702.14	14%	48%	AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES SWR INC	CAMPBELL, LORI	
3577	US95, N. OF FRCL34 TO TRAILING EDGE I1075	\$ 23,642,334.99	\$ 22,120,000.00	\$ 23,642,334.99	\$ 1,185,602.20	5%	27%	LAS VEGAS PAVING CORPORATION	MAXWELL, KEVIN,	
3578	I-580, WIND WARNING SYSTEM	\$ 3,319,768.45	\$ 3,123,589.00	\$ 3,353,301.45	\$ 936,193.21	28%	20%	PAR ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS	SCHILLING, RODNEY	
3581	US93, MICROSURFACE EXISTING RDWY	\$ 1,701,621.04	\$ 1,538,538.00	\$ 1,701,621.04	\$ 605,186.93	36%	35%	INTERMOUNTAIN SLURRY SEAL INC	KANEGBERG, PHILIP	
3582	US50, RAISED MEDIAN & DECEL LANES	\$ 328,357.56	\$ 266,007.00	\$ 328,357.56	\$ -	0%	0%	SIERRA NEVADA CONSTRUCTION INC	BIRD, STEVE,	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 1,033,201,880.11</b>	<b>\$ 988,732,007.53</b>	<b>\$ 1,008,618,480</b>	<b>\$ 981,415,750.51</b>					

<sup>1</sup> AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET) for EDOC contracts includes contingencies (Contracts 3576 and up)

<sup>2</sup> % BUDGET = Total Paid to Date /Agreement Estimate

<sup>3</sup> % TIME = Charged Working Days to Date / Updated Working Days

CONTRACT	DESCRIPTION	<sup>1</sup> AGREEMENT ESTIMATE (BUDGET)	BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	ADJUSTED BID CONTRACT AMOUNT	TOTAL PAID TO DATE	<sup>2</sup> % Budget	<sup>3</sup> % Time	CONTRACTOR	PROJECT MANAGER NDOT/CONSULTANT	COMMENTS
----------	-------------	--	---------------------	------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	------------	------------------------------------	----------

