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Sandoval: Good morning. Good morning. I'll call the Department of Transportation Board of Directors Meeting to order. Before we begin with the Directors Report, obviously, we've had a tragedy on the scale that no one in our state or nationally or internationally has ever known. And, you know, I know that NDOT played a big role in helping out with what was going on down there. I mean, there's not a person that hasn't been affected by this. I know that we all have our thoughts and prayers with the victims who lost their lives, their families, their friends, their neighbors, those that were there and survived. This is a trauma that, you know, I personally don't know how they're going to handle that.

I know that we're going to do everything we can to provide the resources out there for people for whatever they need, but as I said, this isn't about me, but some of the things I saw are things that I will never forget, that I will never get over. You know, it's just really difficult, and we see the worst in people and we see the best in people, and it's just remarkable the stories that are starting to come out of people helping total strangers that are next to them and risking their lives to help other people and the stories of the first responders. I had an opportunity to visit one of the ambulance companies and them telling me what they came into and just being around the men and women of metro and the heroic acts that they did.

And to me, to get to this, I don't even want to call him a person. I don't know what he is, but to be there in 11 minutes and the amount of lives that they saved because of their professionalism and their training. You know, it was interesting to me, because I met with a family whose daughter had been shot, and she was 18 years old, but he said to me—he said, "You know, Las Vegas is always called Sin City, but you guys should rename it. It should be Heart City." And he said the
outpouring of support and assistance that he and his family have gotten and how people, you know, have dropped everything to do whatever it took, lines around the block to give blood, eight-hour wait. People waited eight hours to give blood, sending food, sending money. I think they’ve raised over $10 million already for the victims and the survivors and their families. The candlelight vigil that occurred in Las Vegas, I had an opportunity to attend a vigil up at UNR last week, you know, and as I said, being around 18 to 23-year-olds and I was with my daughter and seeing them struggle and trying to understand and hearing time after time, "Dad, I’m never going to feel safe at an event." You know, "I'm afraid"—"I'm afraid to be home alone." These are the things that have the ripple effects that, as I said, you see and observe and think about these things.

As I said, we're going to respond to this. You know, the healing—that's what these candlelight vigils and talking about these things are all about, is to start the healing process and to always remember these victims. I mean, they came from everywhere, and they're going to go home and have to deal with these things. I can't tell you how many Governors have called me and offered support and resources, whatever we need. So, it really is—as I said, it's a hard thing—an impossible thing, not a hard thing, an impossible thing to comprehend and to understand, and we probably never will. But again, to see the people open up their hearts and their wallets and giving their own blood to do whatever it took to help people out, but for all of you that are here today, I know that we've all thought about this and prayed on it and provided whatever type of support that we can. You know, it's still way too early in the process to start trying to diagnose what happened, and I think it is still all about the victims and families and making sure that they have the resources that they need.

But I know that NDOT stepped up and helped with the road controls, and I'm sure there were a lot of other ways that I'm not aware of that you all helped. And I said the amount of compassion just makes me proud to be Governor of this state the way that the state agencies have responded, the way the people of this state have responded, the way that everybody that has gotten involved. But as I said, this is more of a stream of consciousness than anything else, and I think it's important that we not try to lock this away and ignore it, that we do talk about it, that we do take it head-on, that we do figure out what needs to happen as we move forward. You know, we can never guarantee that something like this can't happen again, but we can learn from it, and we can build on it, and as I said,
aligned with—try to make it as best as it possibly can be for the people that were directly affected by it. So, that's all I have to say.

If there's anyone else on the Board who would like to throw in their two words, obviously, this is a good time to do it, but really appreciate your time and patience with me. Anybody else before we go on with the Directors Report?

Martin: Governor?

Sandoval: Yes?

Martin: I agree with what you said. The outpouring in Las Vegas has been outstanding, and as somebody that's been in Las Vegas for a very, very long time, what I've seen here, we're a community that everybody is from someplace else, and what I've seen over the course of the last week is that this event made us a community again rather than being from someplace else. We're all now from Las Vegas, because we've—this thing has galvanized the people of Las Vegas like nothing I've ever witnessed in the—I've been here since 1961. I've not witnessed anything that was a more galvanizing event than this tragedy, and it truly did, as you said, brought out the best in everyone. Thank you.

Sandoval: Thank you, Frank. Rudy?

Malfabon: Thank you for your leadership during that time, words of comfort acknowledging the efforts of our first responders, and we do appreciate the NDOT workers that had to go out there and close those roads, work the dispatch at the Traffic Operations Center. We really have—our hearts are with Las Vegas and all of us as Nevadans and as Americans were affected by this.

Our federal partners are off today since it's Columbus Day, but just to give you a quick update, what we were hearing is likely to be pushed off to 2018 for the Infrastructure Bill. They're moving on to tax reform as an issue to address, and then some of that offshore profits that global companies have that could be brought back to America to reinvest in infrastructure is probably one of the—the core of Trump's plan. There is a continuing resolution for the federal fiscal year '18 budget extension through December 8th. Hopefully, they'll address the rest of the federal fiscal year at that time, give us the rest of—assurance of what we're going to receive for transportation funding from the feds. President Trump made some comments about public-private partnerships, which were a bit surprising to a lot of the folks as we attended our AASHTO conference in Phoenix recently. A
lot of the senior staff from USDOT were present, and it seemed like they were a bit surprised. They definitely know that public-private partnerships still have a place as a tool in the toolbox for funding projects, but the theme is still about leveraging federal, not to have federal as the major source of funding. And one thing that was mentioned was that if you count up all the state and local funding that goes to transportation, a lot of communities are helping themselves by raising that revenue and putting it to use in infrastructure and transportation. So, we wanted to make the point that there’s—the federal money that comes is only a small part when you consider all the funding that is raised by local and states.

The Senate passed their—Senate Committee passed their version of the self-driving cars regulations. The House had done the same, so they have to reconcile their differences, but the big issue, as I mentioned before for the National Governors Association, AASHTO, Association of the State DMVs, AAMBA is about preemption, which has to do with the role of the State versus the role of the federal government in this issue and recognizing that the states have more authority over licensing of drivers, licensing of vehicles, registration. The federal government typically handles the requirements for the manufacturers of these vehicles. So, more to come on that issue as they negotiate the role of federal versus state on self-driving cars. The Senate version doesn't address commercial vehicles, trucks, but we know that those are being piloted as well with platooning of commercial vehicles, and eventually, this issue of trucks and freight movement will be impacted by this type of technology.

Secretary Chao addressed us as a group of state DOTs during the AASHTO meeting in Phoenix recently. She said some statements that really made us feel good about the role and the attitude of the federal agencies and transportation, that their success, USDOT's success, is based on the State's success. They are trying to address some of these things, regulations. Fiscal constraint is one of those that can hamper us when we're trying to work on projects, and as a policy, it makes sense to have the fiscal constraint issue. That's where a state has to identify the money that is going to fund a transportation project before it's into the plan. That way, the feds can review the environmental documents. They're not reviewing documents for projects that aren't real or not going to be funded. So, it makes sense from a policy perspective, but we asked them to relax some of these requirements, because you can't have these projects ready to go without starting the planning and environmental process. And typically, they want to see those projects and the plan on larger projects such as a Project Neon. You have to
identify where that money is coming from, and it could be—we found a solution with bonding on Project Neon, but some states tackle that issue of large projects in a phased approach. That could be problematic to identify all the funding in the out years of a transportation plan. So, they are working with us on this issue, and I think it's a give and take on both sides. We're not going to inundate our federal partners with projects that are not going to be funded, and they'll look at the NEPA documents for the projects when we get them into the plan, but they'll be working with us on identification of funding. A lot of other comments made about the efforts from USDOT, but the focus is really on streamlining, eliminating bureaucracy, having all the DOT modal administrations working together and using best practices.

Tracy Larkin-Thomason was able to visit our delegation with the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce and the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. They talked about I-11, briefed the I-11 Caucus of Congressional Representatives, and Arizona DOT was also there to give a briefing on what's happening in Arizona. And then right after that, the group, with RTC and Tracy Larkin-Thomason, visited Atlanta to look at the stadium there and see how it affects transportation and how quickly that stadium was built, what were the impacts to various modes of transportation serving that venue, the new Atlanta NFL stadium. So, good lessons learned there to bring back home to Las Vegas as that stadium is being developed. In the—we have a long-range plan that we've called the One Nevada Plan, and our folks have been making the rounds throughout the state to get input. We're identifying transportation corridors throughout the state for further development and including the I-11 Corridor. So, it addresses a lot of what Congressman Amodei had talked about, maybe perhaps considering a tiered approach, the NEPA process, high level first and then a more definite environmental document later. We feel that because we're doing this approach with the transportation corridors and the One Nevada Plan, that will serve the purposes of advancing I-11 as well as other projects that were needed in our state in the long-term. But we have our sights set on completing Phase 1, that's to the interchange with US 95, the road to Searchlight, by the end of this year. RTC, their contractor, Las Vegas Pavement, is working on Phase 2. It should open the middle of next year. So, more to come on the exact dates of that, but they are really having good success with the construction phase of Phase 2, and we're just wrapping up Phase 1.
We had two public meetings recently in September for the Spaghetti Bowl. A lot of the detail I've asked the staff to provide to you next month, really good information on some of the alternatives that are being developed. One of the things that we did with these meetings as we live streamed them on Facebook, we had over 2,000 views of the video of the public meeting and had a lot of questions from property owners mainly about property acquisition, process, when do we start that. Well, we're in the planning phase and environmental phase. We haven't identified all the properties that we're going to need. So, you have a general sense if you have property right by the Spaghetti Bowl, that you may be impacted, but there is definitely a certain process to use so that we are very aware of a timeline for acquisition and establishing the value of the property that we're going to need to build a project. Right now, we're just looking at alternatives, getting public input, and we'll try to shoot for the mid-2018, a draft, environmental impact statement that will be reviewed. But we went over the project goals, safety, improving traffic operations, and that interchange, unveiled some of the concepts, especially the—the one that I like a lot was around the Nugget, which is constrained by some of the buildings next to I-80, but to kind of elevate one side of the freeway so that you can overhang and get the number of lanes you need in there. We have to build this to handle 2040 traffic projections. So, it's going to be a good project. It's going to address the needs in that area.

Glendale Avenue is wrapping up. Weather permitting, we might finish that final layer of pavement called open-graded. It's about an inch-thick layer of pavement, gives you a good friction surface. And the contractor has to have warm temperatures to place that final lift, because it's so thin. Hopefully, they'll have good weather the next few weeks to wrap it up. If not, then we'll have to finish it up next spring with that final lift. We also—I have a safety project that was recently awarded, about a $2 million project at US 395, Airport Road, Johnson Lane, and Stephanie Way. At Airport Road, we're modifying the approach to get better visibility from the side street and installing a traffic signal. At Johnson Lane, we're putting in an acceleration lane northbound. On Stephanie, we're extending the existing acceleration lane northbound, so a driver will have more room to merge over. So, we're really proud of these safety projects that we're implementing all across this state. An Emergency Contract was awarded to Q&D Construction for aligning pipes. We noticed after we, earlier this year, had a pipe collapse due to deterioration on State Route 207, Kingsbury Grade, we investigated with cameras the rest of the pipes in that area and saw some
deterioration, not to the extent that we had to dig everything out and replace it, but we couldn't line those pipes and make them safe from deterioration and collapse.

In Southern Nevada, we received the bids on the US 95 widening. That's a six-mile widening project to widen US 95 to six lanes up to the road to Mt. Charleston, Kyle Canyon Road. It's going to have a new HOV ramp at Elkhorn Road, which is just a bridge over US 95 right now, and a lot of regional flood control improvements that are funded by Clark County. This one is a partnership with the City of Las Vegas, Clark County, the RTC. It's really the way that we do business down there in Las Vegas to get everything done at the same time and make those investments and plan for future traffic needs.

You'll—that—pardon me—back to that project, you'll receive the recommendation to award next month. These photos give you a good sense of the aesthetic improvements at the pedestrian bridges. The Clark County agreement to transfer these from NDOT to Clark County at Tropicana and Las Vegas Boulevard has been drafted and reviewed. Our Assistant Director for Engineering, John Terry, has been meeting with Clark County Public Works Director along with our District Engineer, Mary Martini, to finalize that agreement, and we anticipate that it's going to be done just as we're finishing up the project. The final bridge will be done before New Year's Eve. So, that's a big weekend in Las Vegas, and we'll have it all wrapped up, and you can see just the dramatic improvement from the chain link fence to the glass. It's really a nice-looking pedestrian bridge.

Governor, you had asked about the lack of the Welcome to Nevada signs at certain crossings at state line. There are some monuments that are being—to be installed at that—we haven't contracted that out yet, but it's coming. So, those are the locations where you'll see a nice-looking monument to welcome folks to Nevada, and the other sign issue that you had brought up was to put larger state park signs, and so we're revamping all those state park signs, putting a nice logo for the State Parks Department on those signs, but that contract was awarded. And we're going to take the approach that we did with the Welcome to Nevada, have separate contracts in each district. So, we're on our way. We're replacing those state park signs as well. I know that that's one of the things that you've really promoted, is to visit each state park in Nevada and get a passport stamped. So, we're very proud to put larger signs out there to let people know in those rural parts of the state especially that there's some really neat venues to go out and visit and see the sights.
We have the sign produced and ready to set up out there for the November 2nd event to honor our BLM firefighters that tragically lost their lives on a traffic crash there on that highway, State Route 140. Thank you, Governor, for making the time to schedule that and it definitely will be a good event with the family members and the BLM firefighters.

We have a—in your packet, you see the settlement approved by the Board of Examiners for Ferris Investments related to Project Neon, and we have two other settlements before the Board of Examiners tomorrow, Ranch Properties and Reich. These properties, we negotiated settlements with the land owners' attorneys. We feel that they're in the best interest of the State, and they're subject to Board of Examiners' approval tomorrow. So, we'll be presenting that, Dennis Gallagher and myself. And we also received a very favorable ruling from Nevada State Supreme Court on Nassiri Case. What this case involved was Mr. Nassiri purchased some surplus property from NDOT right by where we realigned the Blue Diamond Road near I-15 Interchange. Subsequent to that Blue Diamond Interchange Project, we built a design-build project called I-15 South, and it included a flyover bridge from Blue Diamond headed eastbound to go northbound on I-15. Mr. Nassiri said that it affected the views of his property. He wanted us to pay him the amount of money either—at first, he approached us to buy the property back. We said no, we didn't need it. Then he had this case asking for a lot of money and that he would retain the property as well. It didn't make any sense for us that we—I'm going to allow Dennis to kind of answer any questions about that, but we definitely were pleased with the Supreme Court Ruling. They're related to some substantial issues that could affect us in the future, and it puts us on a good footing to fight those types of cases.

And I'm going to close with a nice video commemorating our centennial. We've been producing these videos, getting some folks to reminisce about what they recall from their younger days as residents of Nevada and how we've come a long way.

[video plays]

Malfabon: And Governor, Board Members, that concludes the Directors Report. I'm willing to have any questions, and Dennis, too.

Sandoval: Thank you, Rudy. Board Members, any questions for the Director? Hearing none. Well done. Thank you. All right, we'll move to Agenda Item No. 2, which
is Public Comment. I'd ask any of the speakers who do provide public comment to limit their remarks to three minutes. I have two individuals signed here on the sheet in front of me for Carson City. The first is Paul Corrado.

Corrado: Governor, Members of the Board, my name is Paul Corrado. I'm 4100 Meadow Wood Road, Carson City, Nevada. I'm here today to talk to you. You have handouts. Couple of things. First of all, the extension to the USA Parkway required the Board and the transportation community to make sure that it was funded well, and so they took money out of allotted projects around the state. I want to make sure that since that project was started, the Record of Decision was 1986, that we put that money back into, if not that flyover, maybe something that is more pressing in that intersection, which is going from I-580 South to Carson City. You have some information on that here.

Secondly, the interchange at Highway 50 and 580 is going to exhibit—or it's going to be pressured a lot more than it is now because of the USA Parkway. And so, I want to make sure that all of the issues associated with that are taken care of both in the planning as well as the implementation phase. I'd like to start at the back of the information that I gave to you in the handout, and the first one is—the last page talks about storage areas which are enclosed by 100% screening. This is to obscure what amounts to an issue associated with land use. Now, you say, well, what does this have to do with transportation, and we'll get to that in a minute, but the bottom line is that we have an industrial use, not even a commercial, but industrial use here in Carson City surrounded by—and it's a state use, and it's surrounded by four residential properties, and one of those properties is a state—is on the National Historic Register.

If you look at the second page, you can see this is a cut sheet from curbs and gutters with the section two clouded. That's going to be important in a minute, and the third is the Record of Decision, which was May 21st, 1986, which talked about that flyover which was taken out of the budget for the obviously necessary USA Parkway, and nobody disputes that. We just want to make sure we aren't forgotten and that we understand that it's been 30-some years when this was approved, and we still don't have it, and it was taken out of the budget, and so don't forget us.

The other thing is if you notice here is the use, and you can see the pipes and the equipment, all of that is in that 2.99 acres associated with the historic site. It's the Marlette Lake property, and we just want it screened, and we want—and we have
some ideas about how that should be done based upon two landscape architects who are in the neighborhood and who provided input. Those landscape architects have had over 50 years experience. If you look at the next picture, you'll see a man standing at the edge of a roadway together with what amounts to a rod, and that is actually the property line associated with the private residence.

If you get the next picture, it's him standing there, and it also shows the intersection. Where that rod is, is actually private property, and it's been paved over by the project that was 100% wonderful for the people in this area, because as you see, that safety ramp, you extended that lane, and that lane was truncated prior to this time. And so, we now, I don't think, are going to have near as many deaths associated with that because of the improvements that you did, and it's awesome. But also, like, if you look at that, you will see that there is room for a channelization, because right now, there is a double yellow line, and people are going 65 to 75 miles an hour, treating it as an expressway ramp, and you'll also note the stop bar on that picture. So, people coming from the subdivision having to turn left have to deal with that, and so we need to channelize that. We need to put that curb up along that area, and we need to negotiate with that homeowner to make sure—and he's open to negotiations, and by the way, these surveys were done by NDOT, thank you, to establish these facts.

Now, I think my three minutes is up, and you're always kind to me, Governor, but I think I better sit down. Thank you.

Sandoval: Thank you, Mr. Corrado. Mr. Lake?

Lake: Good morning, Governor, Board Members. For the record, my name is Ray Lake. I'm the Chairman of the North Valley Citizens Advisory Board in Washoe County. I'm kind of sad this morning as I come down here, because we were expecting to have an NDOT presentation at our Board Meeting this evening, and our County Commission enforced through our newly appointed Third Assistant County Manager has removed that from the agenda along with every other public presentation that we normally have, and we've been limited to just zoning changes and modifications of projects. So, I just wanted to let the folks at NDOT know that we won't be having a presentation tonight because you're not on the agenda, and so we can't engage with you, and I apologize for that. The Board Members were eager to hear the presentation. The citizens were eager to hear the presentation, but the County seems to believe otherwise, so thank you.
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Sandoval: Thank you very much. Is there any other public comment from Carson City? I hear and see none. Is there any public comment from Las Vegas?

Martin: None here, sir.

Sandoval: Thank you. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 3, Approval of September 11, 2017 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. Have the Members had an opportunity to review Minutes and are there any changes? If there are none, the Chair will accept a motion for approval.

Savage: Move to approve.

Sandoval: Member Savage has moved for approval. Is there a second?

Knecht: Second.

Sandoval: Second by the Controller. Any questions or comments on the motion? Hear none. All those in favor say aye. [ayes around] That motion passes unanimously. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 4, Approval of Contracts over $5,000,000. Good morning.

Nellis: Good morning, Governor, Members of the Board. For the record, Robert Nellis, Assistant Director for Administration. There are two contracts under Agenda Item No. 4 that can be found on Page 3 of 24 for the Board's consideration. The first project is located on US 93 from 2.74 miles north of Interstate 15 to nearly 15 miles south of State Route 168 in Clark County for roadway rehabilitation, shoulder widening, slope flattening, and northbound widening for a truck climbing lane. There were three bids, and the Director recommends award to Las Vegas Paving Corporation in the amount of $8,885,000.

The second project is located on Interstate 15, Starr Avenue in Las Vegas to construct a new interchange. There were five bids, and the Director recommends award to Las Vegas Paving Corporation in the amount of $33,700,000, and that concludes this Agenda Item. Does the Board have any questions regarding these two contracts?

Sandoval: Thank you, Mr. Nellis. Questions or comments from Board Members? We always like it when they come in below the engineer's estimate. Mr. Controller?

Knecht: Thank you, Governor, and thank you, Mr. Nellis. Looking at these two items, Page 3 of 24, I'm struck by the fact that all the bids, except the two from the
winner, Las Vegas Paving Corporation, were above the engineer's estimate and somewhat substantially so in some cases. And Las Vegas Paving Corporation's two bids were substantially below. I guess I too am hesitant to look a gift horse in the mouth, but let's do. My question is I had understood that construction was ramping back up in Nevada. We're nowhere close to where we were, but that is because it has been ramping back up, some of the supply sided is a little bit constrained in terms of resources and that people are paying substantial—or significant premia to get people to do work at this time. I guess the first question would be is that a correct understanding, and secondly, if it is correct, how is it that one company manages to swim against the tide here? Can you give us some help understanding what's going on with these two bids?

Terry: John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. I'll take a shot. I will comment on not only these two bids, but the bid the Director had up in his Directors Report, which we're finding a very similar situation. And I will say if not for Las Vegas Paving bidding on these three jobs, we would have been a bit overbudget, and we would have had a bit of an issue of not having the money to put out some more broad projects next year. And we're in a good position because their bids were a little bit under the engineer's estimate in all cases. So, I guess from my perspective we're still getting three and four bids on these big jobs in Las Vegas, which is good. But yes, if not for their bids, we would have been a little bit over our budget for some of our biggest projects this year.

Knecht: So, while the construction industry is still ramping back up, it really hasn't gotten to a constrained position where you're starting to pay, in all cases, premia. There are still some people out there who have resources that they can bring at a reasonable level, and that's the good news, I guess.

Terry: Again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. Again, we continue to analyze the bids as they come in and look at the prices. If you look at the particulars of some of these, you're seeing, again, other than Las Vegas Paving, on some of these, asphalt and concrete and some of our bigger items are coming in a bit above historical projections. So, maybe you are starting to see some of that. I think when you see in the later Agenda Item of the smaller contracts that have been awarded, you'll find the same thing. Some of our prices are starting to go up.

Malfabon: And Governor, Board Members, if I may add, one of the things that we see with Las Vegas Paving is they do a lot of work for other entities besides NDOT, but in
a lot of those cases, those projects are finishing. They got work on the Clark County Beltway. They did the airport connector project. The I-11 project is in its final phases. So, they also had the US 95 widening project, the Centennial Bowl for NDOT, and they've completed those projects. So, I believe that they have a lot of capacity and can get those efficiencies. They're probably taking less profit than some of their competitors on these as proprietary, but that's just my assumption, is that they can sharpen their pencil and give us a great price. And as Assistant Director John Terry said, we can use this savings to add in some projects that are going to be ready to go next year and put that money to work.

Knecht: Well, I guess with that, I've done what probing I think is reasonable, looking the gift horse in the mouth, and I'll say, hey, great. Let's go.

Sandoval: Any other questions or comments with regard to Agenda Item No. 4? Mr. Nellis, any further presentation?

Nellis: No, sir, that concludes this Agenda Item here.

Sandoval: Thank you. If there are no questions or comments, the Chair will accept a motion to approve the two contracts presented in Agenda Item No. 4.

Martin: Move for approval.

Knecht: Second

Sandoval: Member Martin has moved for approval. The Controller has seconded the motion. Any questions or comments on the motion? I hear none. All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Those opposed, say no. Okay, that motion passes unanimously. We'll move on to Agenda Item No. 5, which is Approval of Agreements over $300,000. Mr. Nellis?

Nellis: Thank you, Governor. There are three agreements under Agenda Item No. 5 on Page 3 of 139 for the Board's consideration. Line Item No. 1 consists of designing new ramps, flyovers, and street connections to complete the system-to-system interchange configuration at the northern I-15, 215 Las Vegas Beltway Interchange. Line Item No. 2 is for environmental and preliminary engineering services for the I-15 Tropicana Interchange, Harmon high-occupancy vehicle ramps, Hacienda HOV ramps, and future design services. And lastly, Item No. 3 is for augmentation of Crew 926 for US 95 Phase 2B and 3C, and this is to ensure construction of the projects that are accomplished in conformance with the plan.
specifications and all their contract documents. And Governor, that concludes this Agenda Item. Does the Board have any questions for us regarding these agreements?

Sandoval: Thank you, Mr. Nellis. I have one with regard to contract number two. Will those services complement the construction of the stadium?

Terry: John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. We had a feasibility study which was done previous to the stadium issue. Yes, we will look at the traffic modeling. For the most part, we will design these facilities for, you know, normal peak hour traffic moving into 2040, but we will take into account, as we can, how those improvements would work with the stadium.

Sandoval: I don't know if it's premature or not to be moving forward, because the bonds haven't been let for the stadium. The parking issue is still up in the air, and I just want to make sure, and, you know, I have confidence that all that is going to happen, but I don't want to see us going in a—you know, in one direction and then have something happen. So, what is the timing with regard to this contract?

Terry: Again, we will—with approval of the Board, we will start on what we call the NEPA process. So, we will get into the full environmental, which is going to take us a couple years. We do not anticipate a full environmental impact statement. We're hoping it will be environmental assessment, which is a shorter timeframe. After that, we will have some right-of-way acquisition that will be part of this project. So, moving as fast as we can, we wouldn't have anything out to construction for four or five years, so we need to get going. There's also the possibility we combine these two elements for the NEPA process, but there's no guarantee we will construct them as one project. It's possible we could construct the HOV ramps, which I feel would probably serve the stadium, earlier than the interchange if we choose to do so, but we've got to get through the NEPA process in order to do that. So, I don't know if I answered your question. We don't have an exact timeline. I believe we have tentatively scheduled for the construction, like, in 2021 or 2022.

Sandoval: No, and it sounds to me—I think what you're saying is this is work that has to be done regardless of whether the stadium is going to be built or not. I, obviously, just don't want us to do work that either needs to be undone or done depending on what the outcome is there.
Terry: This project, we were always going to do. The normal traffic in Las Vegas requires this. The Tropicana Bridge over I-15 is kind of the constraint on I-15, and that will become more noticeable once Neon is completed, and that's more open up the traffic. This will become the bottleneck. It's something we were always going to do, and the stadium came along and perhaps made us accelerate it a little, but that's all. It needs to be done.

Sandoval: Well, I'm glad for your spontaneous response, because that's what we've been saying all along, is this work was going to be done regardless of whether that stadium is going to be built, but if it is built, we're going to be making the improvements to complement that change.

Terry: Yes.

Sandoval: Yeah, all right. Any other questions from Board Members with regard to Agenda Item No. 5?

Martin: Yeah, I have one, sir.

Sandoval: Yeah, Frank, please proceed.

Martin: On Agreement 10917 on Page—let's see, it's Page 11 of 139 pages. Item No. 1 is travel costs. It's a result—the page I'm looking at is a result of a negotiation for what appears to be a $471,000 budget turned into $1,737,000 contract, kind of get that. Probably work scopes change, and so on, but the travel cost, we had budgeted $18,000 an hour at $58,000. Can somebody help me understand? CA Group is a Las Vegas firm. This is for the Garnet Interchange, which is Las Vegas, basically. How do we get to $58,000 worth of travel costs?

Terry: Again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. I'll try to take a shot at that, and this actually is for the same one that we were talking about with the Governor that is the—or no, I'm sorry, we're talking about the interchange at I-15 and 215. So, we pay travel cost if we require the consultants, say, to bring staff from Las Vegas to a meeting in Carson City. We pay travel costs for, say—they have Geotech people that have to go down to Las Vegas and do drilling. We don't pay travel costs for them to bring people at their convenience to work in another office, but those costs can add up when we require people from north and south to travel to one or the other in completion of the job. I'd have to look at a little bit into details of why that came out to be $57,000, but those are the types of travel costs that we do reimburse on this type of contract.
Martin: It just seemed like it was a strange number for me to—that's a lot for a local firm, and the interchange is five miles away from downtown Las Vegas. I didn't quite understand $58,000. My number is $58,000, John, not $57,000, just a little—I round up. You round down.

Terry: Okay. [laughter]

Martin: But I just thought that the $58,000 was a pretty strong number.

Terry: And again, it's an estimate, and we pay actuals. So, we will track the actuals that are spent on travel as a part of that job.

Sandoval: Anything further, Frank?

Martin: No, sir.

Sandoval: Okay, thank you. Member Savage.

Savage: Thank you, Governor. Mr. Nellis, Mr. Terry, on Line Item No. 2, couple questions. In the notes—this is on the CA Group Tropicana Interchange reconstruction. In the notes and the dates in the backup in the correspondence, it says it's a four-year term, but on this front cover sheet, it says it's a two-year term. But it's very evident, I believe, that the funding and the term is a four-year term. I just want to confirm it's '21 instead of 2019.

Terry: Again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. I believe that the first is we want the work to get done in two years, and they've signed that this will—certain tasks will be done within the two years, but we set up the contract with more years in it than that so that we don't have to amend for a time extension unless it's necessary and to allow us to move into a further phase of the project without a time extension. So, I believe two years is they're making contractual—and I think there were some actual contractual concepts, certain activities done within 18 months and some within two years. But we set the term of the agreement on this type of NEPA project much longer than we actually have the milestones within the contract, because things happen, and we don't want to extend. And if we put a tighter timeframe in the actual language of the contract, then we're required to extend, and we'd rather not do that. So, they still have to hold to completing the activities that are said within the scope within the time period, but we set up the contract with a much longer period than that.
Savage: So, because on Page 77 of 139 and Page 79 of 139, they both indicate the 2018 through 2021, and I just want to confirm that this contract goes through 2021, not through 2019. As the budget reflects on the funding notes on 77 of 139 as well as page 79 as well for the expenditures falling around $7.5 million.

Terry: Hang on just a—yeah, that funding—is Dwayne down in Las Vegas? I am a little bit unsure as to why we've got money shown as far out as 2021 under the current scope—or Jeff I guess it is.

Lerud: Jeff Lerud, NDOT Project Management. So, what you're looking at right there is the original 2A when we got our budget approval, and so that was the best assumption at the time, and I don't know why that in particular is in the Board Packet, but that was the original 2A that I got approved through to get the funding going. Does that make sense?

Terry: So, maybe—just to add to that—John Terry, again, Assistant Director for Engineering. We set up our budget. That was the assumption that was made. They put that in here. We're going to have to pull up some of that funding and meet what's written in the contract. So, yeah, the payments to this contractor have got—to this designer have got to happen faster than is shown in that funding notes line in there. We have to get the work done to the full $7 million much sooner than that. So, I misspoke when saying you were basing it upon four years was what the term we put in the contract. You're basing on this funding assumptions note, and we're going to have to move that up. We get the budget approved in advance, and we negotiate the contract. We're going to now have to adjust these budget numbers to pull the money up based upon what we negotiated.

Savage: So, the 2019 is correct is what you're indicating.

Terry: From when they have to have this phase of the project. Is that correct, Jeff?

Lerud: Yes.

Savage: Okay, thanks for that clarification, and then Mr. Terry and Mr. Lerud, on the notes to the right, again, on Line Item 2, on Page 3 of 139, in the fourth line, it says, "This work may include finalizing the plan, specifications, and estimates." Should it be "will" or would it be "may"?

Terry: Again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering. This is very common for how we do these types of agreements. At our option, we can give them any or all
part of final design or administration of, you know, design-build or CMAR should it happen. It's at our option. We put that in there intentionally. This scope and this budget is for the current phase. It's at our option to give them those final phases.

Savage: So, this does not include the final phase, this amount.

Terry: That's correct.

Savage: Okay. And then secondly, on the next line, it says "innovative delivery procurement and administration," comma, "and innovative delivery construction," because I know we have three types of construction deliveries, plans and specs, design-build, and CMAR. Is there a new one?

Terry: No, we're just trying to cover our bases here and saying at our option, when we decide, when NEPA is finished, if we go further into either final design or alternative delivery, we could hire this consultant to move forward with us. It's not in their current scope. It's at our option later.

Savage: Perfect. Thank you, Mr. Terry. One last comment. I think it's a positive comment. On Page 81 of 139 in the backup documentation, I think it's very evident that the Department is making good strides on showing this Board and the public as to what subcontractors, what subconsultants, work is in progress with the Department. This is on Page 81 of 139, a very informative breakdown is what I'm trying to say. I think the Department has heard what the Board has commented in the past several months, and this is a very informative and practical informational sheet for NDOT commitments in progress for subconsultants. So, I thank you for that, and that's all I have at this time, Governor.

Sandoval: Thank you. Any other Board Member questions or comments with regard to Agenda Item No. 5? Mr. Controller?

Knecht: Thank you, and I'd like to ask Mr. Gallagher as Counsel to this Board, in view of the exchange between Member Savage and the NDOT staff, if we approve this item as submitted, will there be any defects or flaws or problems or will the staff have all the authority it needs to make any changes that are necessary to the annual funding plans and to proceed as expeditiously as possible in the manner that Mr. Terry and the rest of the staff discussed here on the record?
Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel for the Board. Mr. Controller, to answer your question, I believe there is sufficient materials and the clarification discussion that has been presented that will allow staff to move forward as it intended when it submitted the backup paperwork for the Board's consideration.

Knecht: Thank you, Mr. Gallagher.

Sandoval: Any further questions or comments with regard to Agenda Item No. 5? Mr. Almberg?

Almberg: I got a quick question, just some clarification on No. 1 on Page 10 of 39. We got a breakdown of the estimated hours associated with different tasks here. And so, on task number two, public relations and outreach, NDOT had original estimate of man hours of 4,760 hours. It's agreed to only 412 hours. Same thing with Right-of-Way, number seven. NDOT had an estimate of 2,600 hours. And agreement is 110 hours. I mean, there's just quite a substantial change in—so, did our scope of the work change, just understanding of what scope of the work was? What's the difference in those hours?

Terry: Again, John Terry, Assistant Director for Engineering, and I believe it is—and thank you for the heads up that you would be asking this. I believe it is a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the scope on the very first round of negotiations, which got cleared as the negotiations proceeded of what we really wanted for those particular items. And if you got any differences with that answer, I think we have our Project Manager in Las Vegas, but I'm pretty sure that it just got cleared up as the scope got finalized. When we negotiate these things, we negotiate the fee, but we also often times adjust the scope or clarify the scope as we go, and I just think there was a difference of opinion of what the scope was that got cleared up as negotiations went on.

Almberg: Yeah, I just wanted a clarification. My only—with that answer, our numbers are the ones that are changed, and so did they clarify to us what the scope should be and so we readvised our scope?

Terry: Is Dwayne down there? Can get an answer to that? I don't know.

Wilkinson: Dwayne Wilkinson, NDOT Project Management, down here in Las Vegas. In regards to the public involvement item, there was clarifications on the scope, as John described. It was believed originally when we did the budget, which is the first column, that we were going to do a lot more public involvement. But as we
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got into the process, talked to FHWA and others, we decided our scope was
greater than what we needed, so we reduced our scope. But that was the original
budget item that set that, and we didn't go back and redo the budget. So, that's
part of the reason why that number on public involvement is higher than the
consultant's number, and then in Right-of-Way, a lot of that work is being done
by subcontractors. So, that's part of the reason why that number is less than
what's shown there. There's really no change of scope in the Right-of-Way work.
We actually don't have to do a public meeting for this project. It was done back
when the original EA was done in 2007, but since it's been so long, we have
decided to go ahead and just do one public meeting so we can go ahead and
reengage the public and let them know where we're at with the project at this
time. So, that answer the question?

Almberg:  It does. Just one clarification, with the railroad Right-of-Way, some of that is
still the same scope of work that is being completed by other subconsultants or
subconsultants of this main consultant?

Wilkinson:  They'd be subconsultants of this main consultant.

Almberg:  So, we just—in these man hours here is strictly for the main consultant. This does
not include man hours for their subconsultants.

Wilkinson:  Right, this is just the main consultant. We don't get the man hours on this list.
We get an overall price that's shown on the next page for the subconsultants.
That's what's shown in this memo anyway.

Almberg:  Okay. No, I understand for clarification, so thank you. Thank you, Governor.

Sandoval:  Any other questions or comments? Mr. Nellis, anything further?

Nellis:  That's all on this item, sir.

Sandoval:  Thank you very much. If there are no further questions or comments, the Chair
will accept a motion to approve the three agreements over $300,000 as presented
in Agenda Item No. 5.

Almberg:  So moved.

Hutchison:  Motion to approve.

Sandoval:  That was Lieutenant Governor who moved to approve. Mr. Almberg has
seconded the motion. Any questions or comments on the motion? Hearing none.
All in favor say aye. [ayes around] Those opposed, say no. That motion passes unanimously. Thank you. We'll move to Agenda Item No. 6, Contracts, Agreements, and Settlements. Mr. Nellis?

Nellis: Thank you, Governor. There are three attachments under Agenda Item No. 6 for the Board's information, and beginning with Attachment A, there were four contracts and two emergency contracts that can be found on Pages 4 and 5 of 20 in your packet. And the first project is for Ruby Valley, Elko, Ely, and Panaca Maintenance Stations in Elko, White Pine, and Lincoln Counties for fuel station upgrades. The Director awarded the contract to Bramco Construction in the amount of $2,224,447.

The second item is a resurfacing project located on State Route 278 in Eureka County. The Director awarded the contract to Road and Highway Builders in the amount of $2,373,373.

The third item is also a resurfacing project located on State Route 226 in Elko County. There were two bids, and the Director awarded the contract to Road and Highway Builders in the amount of $1,818,818.

The fourth project is located on State Route 659, Washoe County, for slurry seal. There were three bids, and the Director awarded the contract to Sierra Nevada Construction in the amount of $459,007.

Item No. 5 is an emergency project located on State Route 207, Kingsbury Grade in Douglas County for pipe-lining and drainage improvements. There were five bids, and the Director awarded the contract to Q&D Construction in the amount of $4,433,000.

And lastly, Item No. 6 is an emergency contract for extensive concrete deck failure on a bridge structure on I-15 in Clark County. It was awarded to Aggregate Industries in the amount of $8,760.88. And with that, does the Board have any questions on these contracts before we turn to Attachment B?

Sandoval: Any Board Member questions with regard to the contracts? I hear none. Mr. Nellis, please proceed.

Nellis: There were 44 executed agreements under Attachment B that can be found on Pages 13 through 15 for the Board's information. Items 1 and 2 are an acquisition and a cooperative agreement. Items 3 through 17 are facility and interlocal
agreements. Items 18 through 24 are leases and Right-of-Way access agreements, and then lastly, Items 25 through 44 are service provider agreements. And does the Board have any questions on any of these agreements before we turn to settlements?

Sandoval: Thank you, Mr. Nellis. Any Board Member questions? Mr. Almberg?

Almberg: Thank you, Governor. Number 31, this is $137,000 for the reconstruction or replacement of one cattle guard?

Malfabon: I think we'd have to look into, Thor, if this included some additional fence reconstruction and patching that typically adds to the cost of these cattle guard projects.

Dyson: So, Thor Dyson, District Engineer. The total cost of that cattle guard was, again...

Almberg: $137,000?

Dyson: Yeah, I'll take a look, but I think there was some additional work in addition to the cattle guard itself. Typically, a cattle guard is, you know—depending on the width of the road and how bad the road is—so, you got the actual cattle guard cost for the width of the road, and then you may have some additional work with fencing along there, because cattle guards tie into fencing, and also the pavement before and after. I don't know the whole—all the details, but I can hopefully get back to you before this Board Meeting is over.

Malfabon: And just to add to that, this is a competitively bid project, so you get informal bids typically from three contractors on these types of projects. So, it would have been perspective of the scope of work.

Dyson: I'll get you the scope—I'll get you a more detailed discussion on the scope, but yes, Director Malfabon is correct. It was competitively bid.

Almberg: All right, thank you.

Dyson: The other quick comment since I'm up here, I was updated regarding the Glendale project. Remember the status of the Glendale project? The open grade, I just was informed—because they worked all last weekend. The open grade is actually the final [inaudible] one-inch. It's 90% complete, and we're very confident we'll have a couple of days left of warm weather and we'll finish it.
Sandoval: Other questions with regard to the agreements? Mr. Nellis, you cleared the decks. [laughter] There are the settlements?

Nellis: Yes, sir, there is one settlement on Page 17 of 20 for the Board’s information. The settlement provides for an additional $848,600 to bring the settlement total to $1,904,600 to be paid to Ferris Investments for an Eminent Domain Action. This is for Project Neon, and the combined properties total .6 acres and were improved with 10,783 square feet of mostly office space. One parcel was improved with a Clear Channel Billboard which will be relocated on a footprint that’s retained by the land owner. And with that, does the Board have any questions for Mr. Gallagher on this settlement?

Sandoval: Board Members, any questions on this settlement?

Hutchison: Governor?

Sandoval: Yes, Mr. Lieutenant Governor.

Hutchison: Thank you. I just wanted—Dennis, if you could just maybe shed some light on what we intend to do—what NDOT intends to do with the remainder of parcels that we acquired in the settlement. You know, I know—and I read the materials, and it sounds like—makes all the sense in the world. I know this has already been approved. I was just—the one lingering question I had was now that we’ve got the remainder of parcels, do we plan to turn around and sell that? Do we—is it something that we would use in the future for NDOT purposes or what are our plans?

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel to the Board. Lieutenant Governor, it’s my understanding that the additional property will be used through the construction process, and after the project is wrapped up, the Department will evaluate whether or not it needs that property, and if not, it will dispose of it as surplus property.

Hutchison: Okay, thank you. Well, again, I’ve said it before to you, Dennis, and to the AG’s office in so many of these condemnation cases, great job on this. I read the memo, and we think there was some significant potential exposure. This looks like a very good deal that you’ve worked out with the plaintiffs in the case, and my congratulations to you. Thank you for the update.

Gallagher: Thank you, sir.
Sandoval: Any further questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 6? Mr. Nellis, do you have any further presentation?

Nellis: That concludes this item, Governor.

Sandoval: Thank you. If there are no further questions or comments, we'll move on Agenda Item No. 7, Old Business. Director Malfabon.

Malfabon: As part of Old Business, we have the Report of Outside Counsel Costs on Open Matters and the Monthly Litigation Report, and our Chief Deputy Attorney General, Dennis Gallagher, is able to respond to any questions.

Sandoval: Questions from Board Members on Agenda Item No. 7?

Martin: Dennis, on the Nassiri Case, what was the—just in a nutshell for a contractor, what was the—what was the one, two, or three key points in the Supreme Court decision? Rudy made the statement that this will help NDOT a lot in the future. What were the one, two, or three key points in this thing? We've spent $2 million in legal fees on this case, and to have the Supreme Court come down in our favor is certainly a huge victory for you and your office, but I'd like to know what those one, two, or three key points were.

Gallagher: For the record, Dennis Gallagher, Counsel to the Board. By way of just a very brief background, the case has been around for over five years. Mr. Nassiri initially asserted ten or 12 different causes of action against NDOT. Through motion practice, we reduced it down to three, all related to breach of contract type of causes of action, went to the District Court to try to get those dismissed. District Court didn't find in favor of NDOT, so we took it up to the Supreme Court on a writ, and writs are relatively rare that they're granted. And in this particular case, the Court took its time in the opinion and went through those three remaining causes of action and breach of contract and basically said there was no evidence to support any of those claims. In addition, Board Member Martin, you mentioned the attorneys' fees. Since one of the allegations was a breach of contract, that contract was the initial settlement agreement that we had entered into in the initial transaction. That settlement agreement has an attorneys' fees provision in it, and we intend to seek the attorneys' fees from Mr. Nassiri as well as cost under that contractual relationship that we had, because the Court found that settlement agreement was very clear on a number of issues, and it didn't deal with any subsequent project and the flyover and that there was no deceit by anyone at NDOT. And while I'm explaining this, I would like to also thank John
Terry, who was the Project Manager on that and the State's key witness. So, Frank, I hope that answered your question.

Martin: I didn't hear, what lesson did we learn? Breach of contract, okay. Dig down just an inch.

Hutchison: Hey, can I jump in here, Dennis, because you sent me the opinion, and you know I've talked about this a little bit. First off, we should have won this case a: the District Court level, right, Dennis? And that's what the Court said. We should have [crosstalk] we should not have to spend $3 million, because we should have won this at the District Court level. I thought there was some important decisions that were made concerning the statute of limitations argument that had been proffered, and Dennis, that you and Bill had argued hard on that, as well as the view question that—you know, can you have impairment of the view and damage [inaudible] impairment of view. I thought that these kind of issues were going to surface in the future, I think, Frank, with, you know, impairment of views and statute of limitations questions that we'll be able to rely on now at NDOT with this decision that will, I hope, get us out of the case very early, as we should have gotten out of the case early with the Nassiri action.

Martin: Now I get it. [laughter]

Hutchison: And because I'm a public servant, you won't be receiving a bill. [laughter]

Gallagher: No, no, go ahead.

Sandoval: Any other questions or comments with regard to Agenda Item No. 7? Anything else, Rudy, you wanted to present?

Malfabon: No, Governor, just to mention that we are continuing to deliver safety projects that are important to drive down those number of fatalities and serious injuries. Next year, we have the widening project on US 50 to 95A, which will put the fencing out the rest of the way out so we can protect drivers from wild horses and feral horses.

Sandoval: And I will comment that I was driving on North Virginia, and I saw that that project has been completed. I thought that was well done. Thank you. All right, we'll move to Agenda Item No. 8, Public Comment. Is there any Member—oh, Thor. [laughter]
Dyson: So, Thor Dyson, District Engineer for NDOT. I spoke with Jenny Eyerly and some of my staff. The breakdown of the cost for that cattle guard—I got to have my glasses off to read. Most people have to put them on to read, but the actual cattle guard cost was $86,000, so just to get the cattle guard from the supplier that meets all Buy America requirements. And I'm sure it's a supplier we've used before. I don't have that information right now, but it was $86,000. There is some force account work in there if required for $20,000. So, if something is encountered and it's required to do additional work, we have that. And then additional costs, $1,000 for material testing, $2,200 for uniformed traffic control officer, $15,000 for traffic control, and that's pretty standard. It's right there by a ramp. We've had a lot of concerns and complaints, and then $2,000 for pollution control and $500 for dust control. And we expected something along those lines, but great question. That's kind of a breakdown on the cattle guard.

Malfabon: Thank you.

Dyson: Thanks.

Sandoval: Thank you, Thor. Any public comment from Carson City? Mr. Almberg.

Almberg: I'd just like to go back and thank Reid. We got a project going on over in the Ely area of Highway 6, and during the construction of it, it was discovered that there was—that actually was a part of White Pine County's bike plan, and some of the rumble strips and such did not meet the bike plan stuff. And so, Reid and his staff went back and worked with the contractor, and they came back with a no-cost change order to get that stuff incorporated in the contract. So, thank Reid for everything that he did to make sure that that happened and got included in there and would also like to thank Tracy down in Las Vegas. I had had a request from Mr. Heller's office for some veterans thing in Caliente. They were having some issues down in there. I got with Tracy, and Tracy went back, and I just got word back that they had completed everything down there. And so, I thank Tracy, all her staff, and NDOT for taking care of that. That was for some veteran issues down there in Caliente and we need to be very thankful for those people that stood up and fought and keep us what we are today. So, thank you, guys.

Sandoval: Thank you. Is there any public comment from Las Vegas?

Hutchison: Governor?

Sandoval: Yes, Mr. Lieutenant Governor.
Hutchison: Governor, I just wanted to go back to your opening comments about what happened in Las Vegas. I just got to kind of collect my thoughts here before I could express them, and first off, I want to thank you for your leadership as always, Governor. I don't know what—I don't know what we're going to do without you in the future, Governor, frankly.

Savage: Amen.

Hutchison: And what you did and how you've comforted the state and the class and the grace that you've shown has always—and leadership has been tremendously appreciated throughout the state, but particularly, here in my hometown of Las Vegas. You know, I was born and raised here. I've raised with my wife, Carrie, six of our—all six of our children. We have five of our grandchildren here, and what happened in Las Vegas will no doubt be remembered as one of the darkest days, if not the darkest day in the history of the city and certainly in the history of our state and ranks up there with our country. But it was also, as you said, and I thought you said it well, among our finest hours when we saw what the response was to this, Governor. It was in the best and highest traditions of Las Vegans and Nevada and Americans, and you visit with those families. I spent a significant amount of time this last week just visiting with the families and the victims in the hospitals, and those are some of the finest people on the planet earth. And the way that they've conducted themselves and handled themselves, and they're so grateful for what the people of Las Vegas and Nevada and the country have done for them. I'm just grateful that I've been able to see what we've all known for those of us who have lived in Las Vegas, that there is the heart and the soul and the compassion of a city that was revealed in the aftermath of October 1st, and it's inspiring to me to know that we'll remember, you know, these glimmers of light that were shining in the darkness. And again, I want to thank everyone on behalf of everybody who lives in Las Vegas and the victims and their families and those of us here for the compassion and love that's been shown throughout this past week. Thank you.

Sandoval: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. I appreciate all your support and everything that you've done during this time, you've shown true leadership. All right, any other public comment either north or south? I hear none. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Savage: So moved.
Sandoval: Member Savage has moved to adjourn. Is there a second?

Almberg: Second.

Sandoval: Second by Member Almberg. All in favor say aye. [ayes around] This meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.
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