

MINUTES OF THE
INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE'S
SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW PUBLIC WORKS BOARD MATTERS
(NRS 218E.405)
February 2, 2010

The Interim Finance Committee's Subcommittee to Review Public Works Board Matters (NRS 218E.405) held its second meeting of the 2009-11 Interim on February 2, 2010, in room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Bob Coffin, Chairman
Senator Bernice Mathews
Senator William J. Raggio
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblyman Joseph Hogan

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Tracy Raxter, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Eric King, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division
Eileen O'Grady, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Patti Sullivan, Secretary, Fiscal Analysis Division

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

None

EXHIBITS:

[Exhibit A](#) – Agenda and Meeting Packet
[Exhibit B](#) – Attendance Record

I. ROLL CALL.

From Carson City, Chairman Coffin called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Subcommittee to Review Public Works Board Matters to order at 1:37 p.m. and asked for the roll call. All members were present in Carson City except Assemblyman Hogan who was present in Las Vegas.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2009, MEETING.

Chairman Coffin asked the Subcommittee for approval of the minutes of the meeting held on November 18, 2009.

SENATOR MATHEWS MOTIONED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2009, MEETING.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION TO THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 3, 2010, REGARDING THE REQUEST TO REDUCE STATE FUNDS AND THE AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE AND EXPEND AGENCY FUNDS FOR CIP PROJECT 09-C05, MEDICAL EDUCATION LEARNING LAB BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA HEALTH SCIENCES SYSTEM, DUE TO A FAVORABLE CONSTRUCTION BID.

Gus Nunez, Manager, State Public Works Board (SPWB), stated the SPWB requested the withdrawal of Agenda Item III. He apologized to the Subcommittee for any inconvenience the withdrawal may have caused.

Chairman Coffin said it was not an inconvenience for the Subcommittee to withdraw Agenda Item III. He asked if it was the wish of the university and the SPWB not to process this request at this time and wondered if it would be a temporary or permanent withdrawal. Mr. Nunez replied it would be a permanent withdrawal based on the current status.

Chairman Coffin thanked Mr. Nunez and noted a motion was not required from the Subcommittee since the item was being withdrawn.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION TO THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 3, 2010, REGARDING INFORMATION ON THE GRAVESITES LOCATED AT THE SPARKS MENTAL HEALTH CAMPUS, AND RELATED TO CIP PROJECT 07-C20, STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HEADQUARTERS AND LABORATORY BUILDING.

Mr. Nunez explained the SPWB was in the process of implementing the master plan developed for the gravesites and cemetery at the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS). He said Chris Chimits, Deputy Manager, SPWB had prepared a PowerPoint presentation (page 31 of the meeting packet, [Exhibit A](#)) with information regarding the gravesites and cemetery. Mr. Chimits identified himself and directed the Subcommittee to page 32 of the meeting packet. He pointed out an aerial photograph on which a heavy green line was drawn. He explained the green line depicted where a wrought iron fence would be erected around the perimeter of the property for the cemetery. Also on page 32 were

photos of the Sparks Pinion Park, which had been located on the property. He informed the Subcommittee the Division of State Lands had terminated the park lease with the city of Sparks in compliance with Senate Bill 256 (2009 Legislature). The city was given a 180-day notice for compliance and the city subsequently removed all the improvements made to the park including playground equipment, basketball hoops and the perimeter fence; however, at the request of the committee working on this project, the city left the sod, landscaping irrigation systems and the concrete flat work. Referring again to page 32, Mr. Chimits called attention to a red dashed line on the aerial photograph and said it was the proposed location for the re-interment of 32 graves and the memorial monument. This section of the property was selected by a consensus of the stakeholders of the project, who considered it to be the nicest portion of the cemetery. The stakeholder group also thought the location would show the greatest degree of respect for the deceased and the headstones would be able to be positioned in sod. Page 33 showed a photo of an existing headstone alongside a photo depiction of a proposed new headstone. Mr. Chimits noted a professional archaeologist would be present during the exhumation to identify any Native American remains that might be buried there in addition to the person who had already been named. Page 34 showed a photo of the approximately seven foot tall granite obelisk monument to be situated in the center section of the 32 relocated graves. He explained each of the four sides of the obelisk would have a bronze plaque containing the known names of those in the entire cemetery. Another photo on page 34 showed the five foot high black wrought iron fence that would surround the property. Mr. Chimits emphasized the most important part of the process for the SPWB and the stakeholders had been to move the project along in an orderly and methodical way with open communication with the nonprofit group Friends of Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services Cemetery (Friends), the different tribes, and the families. The SPWB worked to communicate with these groups to reach consensus before decisions were made. Page 35 showed information about the website administered by the Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services (MHDS) to provide information for the general public; the planning and design process; the 600 known names of the deceased; the monument design; posting of the hearings, workshops and minutes; the schedule of work; links to the Friends website; and links for public opinion, comments, and suggestions. Page 36 showed a schedule of work by month in 2010. Mr. Chimits explained the ground penetrating survey for the center section of the cemetery would be completed in February, the design documents for improvements in March, the bid and award process in April, and the exhumation of the 32 graves with the archaeologist present in May. In May, June and July the perimeter fence would be erected, the site cleaned, and the granite monument installed. Mr. Chimits advised that a public ceremony would take place in August and all of the families would be invited to attend. He thought the public ceremony would offer closure on this process for the families. Lastly, Mr. Chimits informed the members the total project budget was \$350,000 with \$26,952 spent to date, leaving a balance of about \$326,048 to complete the rest of the work (page 36, [Exhibit A](#)).

Chairman Coffin congratulated MHDS on the content of the website as well as the upkeep of the information, which included illustrations showing the progress of the project to date. He commented the website was a lot of work for the agency, but was great for the state because it showed the intent of the state's desire to respect those who were buried there. Chairman Coffin recognized that Senator Mathews and Assemblywoman Smith had been instrumental in passing the 2009 cemetery legislation.

Assemblywoman Smith thanked the SPWB and said the process had been helpful. She felt it had been a long road for the families of loved ones buried at the cemetery and knew the families appreciated the effort as well. Mrs. Smith said she knew the state had to do what was right and show respect for the people buried there, but in doing so another difficult issue was created and that was losing a neighborhood park in the neighborhood where she lived. She emphasized that she hated to lose a park and wondered if the SPWB had any information on the park issue, including what the city of Sparks did with the recently upgraded playground equipment. Mrs. Smith had tried to keep in touch with the city and understood they had been trying to acquire some land from the airport, which had been given to the airport by the federal government. The park was the only vacant piece of land in that entire neighborhood. She said it was a very isolated neighborhood with very few homes and the closest park for the children was located across the freeway and railroad tracks.

Mr. Nunez said the SPWB did not have any information regarding the relocation of the park, but could contact the Sparks Public Works Department and the Parks Department to find out. He asked Dr. Harold Cook, Administrator, MHDS, if he knew what had happened to the playground equipment, but Dr. Cook did not know. Mr. Nunez thought the city had probably stored the equipment with plans to utilize it in the future.

Mrs. Smith asked Mr. Nunez if the SPWB could get an update on the park for the Subcommittee as to whether there was anything the state could do to help in the process of relocating of the park. She expressed her frustration with the situation and thought maybe Senator Mathews might be of some help, or Senator Raggio who was considered to be the "father of the airport authority." Mrs. Smith thanked the SPWB for the work they had done on the cemetery project to date and asked to be informed when a date for the public ceremony was chosen.

Chairman Coffin cautioned that the project was not finished yet. He said the state did not want to make any mistakes, especially considering the possibility of hundreds of additional graves on the property. He asked for explanation about the cost and whether there were ways to save money in order to incorporate more graves into the cemetery, or whether the state would just take care of the 32 people and leave the other potential 600 graves as they were.

Mr. Chimits said there were believed to be about 600 unidentified graves in an area south of the graveyard. The SPWB did not plan to do anything with the existing graves on the south end of the property, because the Native Americans had a strong preference that nothing should be done to those existing graves. In completing the ground penetrating radar of the entire area it was found there was room to relocate other graves, but due to the consensus building process that the SPWB was careful to abide by, only maintenance and trash clean-up would be performed in order to leave the area in its natural state and not disturb any of the graves.

Chairman Coffin asked if all the remains were considered to be Native American in that part of the cemetery. Mr. Chimits said there might be some Native American remains there, but it was not known how many might be in that location. Chairman Coffin also wanted to know if there were any erosion problems at the site. Mr. Chimits explained the ground was stabilized so there was no risk of coffins being exposed. Chairman Coffin commented that the remains may not be in coffins and Mr. Chimits agreed that might be the case, but the sonar penetrating radar could not discern between a body and a coffin, it was just able to detect an object. The ground was thought to be stable and there was no evidence of erosion during the construction of the Agriculture Building.

Chairman Coffin asked if the area would be fenced, because he worried about the gravestones as historical artifacts becoming a target for thievery. He thought the gravestones could be put underneath the new monument or taken into the offices and kept as an example of how things looked before. Mr. Chimits responded that the area would be fenced and the 32 new markers would be set in concrete, making them difficult to damage or vandalize; the rest of the markers would not be touched or changed. Chairman Coffin asked what provisions would be made for the original markers and Dr. Cook reported the markers would be stored at the NNAMHS campus.

Chairman Coffin asked if there were any concerns before the Subcommittee signed off on the project. Assemblywoman Smith said the maintenance of the cemetery was discussed during the 2009 Session, but more information on that topic for the record would be helpful.

Dr. Cook acknowledged MHDS planned to provide maintenance of the area within the agency's budget constraints. However, due to the current budget situation he could not make explicit promises about any specific level of maintenance. Arrangements had been made for Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services to take over the utilities associated with the park area, specifically the electricity and water. The agency's intent was for staff to cut the grass and provide trash pick-up on the grounds, but it was unknown what impact future budget cuts would have on the agency's ability to maintain the site and the grounds.

Mrs. Smith observed that agency staff would already have to water and mow the rest of the property. She noted as time passed, the maintenance level would increase as the area would eventually require paint and upkeep of the monuments, but fortunately that would be a number of years into the future. Mrs. Smith said the Subcommittee was currently concerned about the maintenance of the grass and keeping the area clean. Dr. Cook said it was the agency's intent to maintain that part.

Chairman Coffin asked if the new monuments would be recessed low enough so a gang mower could go over the entire area without having to perform specific manicuring. He also thought it was important to occasionally clean up the area around the markers. Dr. Cook responded that regular lawn mowing, watering and the periodic removal of debris was what the agency intended.

Chairman Coffin asked how much money would be reverted from project 07-C20, which encompassed the entire project including the State Department of Agriculture Headquarters and Laboratory Building, as well as the cemetery. Mr. Chimits said the SPWB needed to complete the cemetery before it could be determined whether there might be funding for reversion. Mr. Nunez added the Agriculture Building was completed and there were no pending items, so when the cemetery was completed in August an exact amount of the money to be reverted could be given. He thought the project was financed entirely with bond funds so the reversion would go into the bond redemption account. Mr. Nunez indicated the reversion would be a small amount compared to the \$23 million original project cost.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THE STATUS OF THE GRAVESITES LOCATED AT THE SPARKS MENTAL HEALTH CAMPUS AND RELATED TO CIP PROJECT 07-C20, STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HEADQUARTERS AND LABORATORY BUILDING.

SENATOR MATHEWS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

- V. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION TO THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 3, 2010, REGARDING RECONSIDERATION OF THE ACTION APPROVED ON APRIL 9, 2008, BY THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE REGARDING THE REVERSION OF GENERAL FUNDS AND HIGHWAY FUNDS FOR CIP PROJECT 07-C29, SOUTHERN NEVADA TRAINING ACADEMY AND HIGHWAY PATROL SUBSTATION.

Evan Dale, Deputy Manager, SPWB, explained Agenda Item V requested a change in authority for project 07-C29, Southern Training Academy and Highway Patrol Substation. The project was brought before the Interim Finance

Committee (IFC) for cancellation at its April 2008 meeting. At that meeting, an estimated amount of money was reported to be reverted to the Highway Fund and approved by the IFC. Subsequent to the April 2008 meeting additional hours were incurred to close out the project and wind-up affairs. Mr. Dale thought approximately 13-14 hours of project management time was added to the project; therefore, the amount of money estimated to be reverted was \$1,900 less than was originally reported to the IFC. At the direction of Fiscal Analysis Division staff, the SPWB brought this issue to the Subcommittee to provide information about what happened with the project. Mr. Nunez further clarified that the funds were used to process the negative endorsements to the architectural engineering contracts, which was for the cancellation of existing contracts, as well as other items that emerged at that time.

Chairman Coffin thanked Mr. Dale for conveying this issue to the Subcommittee. He appreciated hearing about it because these issues were usually handled differently and the Subcommittee did not get to hear them. He said the Subcommittee members could probably agree that this was a relatively small issue and asked for a motion to reconsider the action of the IFC in April 2008.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE RECONSIDERATION OF THE ACTION APPROVED ON APRIL 9, 2008, BY THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Coffin asked for a subsequent motion.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOTIONED TO INCREASE THE HIGHWAY FUND APPROPRIATION TO \$271,754 TO ALLOW FOR THE ADDITIONAL FEES ASSOCIATED WITH CIP PROJECT 07-C29, SOUTHERN NEVADA TRAINING ACADEMY AND HIGHWAY PATROL SUBSTATION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION TO THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 3, 2010, REGARDING THE CIP PROJECT EXCEPTION REPORT PURSUANT TO NRS 341.100(8)(g).

Chairman Coffin asked Mr. Nunez to quickly review each project listed in the CIP Project Exception Report and indicated there were only a few issues the Subcommittee wanted to address.

Mr. Nunez identified the first item on page 55 of the meeting packet ([Exhibit A](#)), project 07-C05, Indian Springs Correctional Center Work/Camp and reminded the Subcommittee at the November IFC meeting permission was granted to remove demolition of certain existing structures from the project. He acknowledged the Subcommittee had asked the SPWB to provide an estimate of the cost to remodel those buildings and reported the estimates were being completed. After the estimates were completed SPWB staff would meet with agency staff to discuss and agree what would be done and the projected costs. He said after the decisions were made he would be happy to present the findings to the Subcommittee.

Chairman Coffin expressed that he was sorry to have missed the recent grand opening of the facility. Mr. Nunez said the grand opening was for Phase I and ultimately there would be another opening for Phase II. He explained the SPWB was finishing the commissioning process and when that process was completed the facility would be available for the agency to move in. Chairman Coffin asked when Phase II would be completed. Mr. Nunez could not provide the date, but would get it for the Subcommittee. Chairman Coffin asked if anyone from the Department of Corrections was at the Subcommittee meeting and Mr. Nunez replied no.

Assemblyman Hogan announced that he had attended the grand opening and commended the excellent presentation. He recognized the United States Air Force and the Forest Service for participation in the process. Mr. Hogan said the facility looked excellent and it appeared it would just be a short time until the inmates and the inmate firefighters were able to move into the facility. Chairman Coffin thought it was important for the Subcommittee to hear the information and he thanked Mr. Hogan for representing the Subcommittee at the grand opening.

Continuing, Mr. Nunez testified that projects 07-M07, Sewer, Wastewater Improvements and 07-M39, Window and Security Improvements were also approved at the November IFC meeting and since the matters were resolved neither would appear on future CIP Project Exception Reports.

Regarding project 07-M48, Surveillance and Cameras for the Northern Nevada Correctional Center (NNCC) and the Nevada State Prison, Mr. Nunez indicated the SPWB had put this project on hold by request of the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) in order to complete other projects at NNCC before moving additional contractors and construction activity into that facility. The plan for this project was for the SPWB to accept bids for the cameras starting on March 2, 2010, award the bid approximately three to four weeks thereafter, and then issue a notice to proceed. He said the existing projects were being completed at NNCC and the SPWB was ready to start with the surveillance camera project when the NDOC was ready. There were no questions from the Subcommittee on this issue.

Moving on, Mr. Nunez addressed project 07-P05, Veterans' Cemetery Expansion – Planning and project 09-C18, Southern Nevada Veterans' Cemetery Expansion. He explained that project 07-P05 was for the planning of the cemetery and project 09-C18 was for the construction of the cemetery. Mr. Nunez told the Subcommittee state and federal representatives of the Veterans Administration (VA) had reviewed the schematic design and submitted comments to the SPWB during a joint meeting. As a result of the meeting, the VA wanted to investigate the option of constructing a new building instead of building an addition and remodeling the current building. At the VA's request the SPWB would provide cost information and the logistics involved regarding the construction of a new building. Mr. Nunez indicated once the VA made a decision, the SPWB could determine whether approval of a scope change would be necessary, or whether the project would proceed as originally planned.

Chairman Coffin said he toured the facilities in southern Nevada with Office of Veterans' Services staff in December 2009 after attending a funeral for Senator Raymond Shaffer. He commented that the service and burial for Senator Shaffer was beautiful and done with dignity and emotion, especially with Senator Dennis Nolan playing the bagpipes. Chairman Coffin toured the facilities and noticed how busy it was. He acknowledged the inadequacy of the administration building, questioned whether remodeling would be a satisfactory solution and concluded a new building might be needed. Chairman Coffin asked Tim Tetz, Executive Director of the Office of Veterans' Services to testify and provide the Subcommittee with some insight about this project.

Mr. Tetz explained he had run the gamut of emotions on this project and now felt that the project was moving in a good direction. He was asked by the VA in December 2009 to re-approach the project from a variety of perspectives, including starting from scratch with a new building to meet the current business needs rather than remodeling the existing building. Mr. Tetz said his staff looked at the current business model and how interaction with customers was anticipated to be in the future. He said when staff and customers met at the cemetery to discuss burying a loved one it was one of the worst times in their lives. Mr. Tetz recognized it should not be an over-the-counter transaction such as those performed at the Department of Motor Vehicles. The current building design made it a transactional setting for the staff and the customer. If a new building were constructed a consultation environment could be considered in the design. This type of environment would make it more peaceful for staff to talk with customers to explain the available benefits. Furthermore, he explained the previous work and design on the project stemmed from the previous superintendent's ideas, including housing 6-7 additional staff in the building. Mr. Tetz testified the previous ideas were no longer relevant for how the operation should be run today; remodeling a building to accommodate the needs for additional staff that would not be located in the building would be wasteful. Many things had changed and the new team was looking at the current and future needs and putting those priorities into the right places. Agency staff asked the architect to take into consideration the agency's

new needs to develop a new building and an overall facility plan. The architect was working with the new ideas like more parking and a revised traffic flow at the cemetery. At a recent service for a veteran who was well known in the community, staff counted 84 cars in attendance, but the parking area was not large enough to accommodate 84 cars. He noted about once or twice a week staff encountered this type of parking problem. Mr. Tetz said stepping back from the original project, reflecting on where the project should go and then moving forward would not only meet the needs of the agency today, but also for future decades.

Chairman Coffin commented that, although no one was at fault, sometimes people were short-sighted in planning space for a cemetery, forgetting that it needed to continue for many years to come. A cemetery was often thought of in terms of real estate, or how many people could be buried there, yet at the same time there needed to be the ability to care for the families and make them comfortable at their most stressful time. He asked the Subcommittee to keep an open mind on the probable upcoming changes to this project and specifically asked Senator Raggio for his thoughts on the process.

Senator Raggio concurred with Chairman Coffin's remarks, especially regarding the concepts for dealing with the families and added he thought the cemeteries were well managed.

Assemblyman Hogan concurred with the remarks of both Chairman Coffin and Senator Raggio. He voiced that a longer view should be taken for the creation and proper support of cemeteries to ensure everyone would feel good about the care given to the veterans of the state from all prior wars.

Chairman Coffin was concerned about where the additional state funds would come from if the plan changed from remodeling the existing building to constructing a new building. Mr. Tetz said 100 percent of eligible costs would be paid by the VA. The VA would not pay for project management and some of the oversight and planning the SPWB offered, so the state would have to fund that portion. Mr. Tetz explained the original project envisioned in 2007 and the construction in 2009 included columbarium walls and double vaults, but burial needs had shifted since 2007. Driving the urgency of this project was the need for in-ground cremain plots. This had become a priority because it was predicted that there was only two and one-half years of in-ground cremain plots left before running out. The money set aside for the construction or placement of double vaults and columbarium walls, which were an expensive piece of the project, would not be needed. Since the SPWB budget was a percentage of the overall cost of the project, some of the funding would be shifted as the scope of work changed. Referring to a recent conversation with the VA, Mr. Tetz indicated the Office of Veterans' Services would prepare a plan for federal funding for a new project in addition to the current project for the 2011 CIP and the next round of expansions. Approximately two years or more from now the Office of Veterans' Affairs would consider another expansion of the cemetery for single burial plots and

columbarium walls. That expansion would not be a part of the new building project, but rather another future project.

Chairman Coffin asked how much land was needed for in-ground cremains interment. Mr. Tetz replied the usual allowance for in-ground cremains was a 5x5 plot and the normal allowance for a double pre-placed or a single pre-placed vault was a little larger at about 5x8. Chairman Coffin thought the cemetery land would eventually run out and people would have to be told that there was no land available. He wondered if it would be prudent to start encouraging people to select columbarium interment now. Mr. Tetz said the trend toward columbarium interment had moved faster than anticipated in southern Nevada, but not as quickly as in Fernley where the majority of cremains are put into the columbarium wall. In southern Nevada the columbarium wall was far outside the main focus of the cemetery so many people did not realize that area would be the center of the cemetery at some point in time. There were about 60 acres of available land in southern Nevada, half of which would be developed by the time this project was completed. He talked with the congressional delegation about acquiring some land across the street so that in his lifetime the Office of Veterans' Affairs would not have to tell any veteran's family that there was not a place for their loved one to be buried. Chairman Coffin suggested it would be important to think of even longer-term planning than our lifetimes, possibly as far out 100 years might be appropriate.

Chairman Coffin asked about bringing some of the columbarium space closer to the center of the cemetery to alleviate the long walk. Mr. Tetz said the master plan dictated the overall plan of the cemetery. When the cemetery was first envisioned in 1991 and the entire acreage was planned, columbarium walls – which are now the trend – were not in fashion. Nevada was one of the first states to get funding for a columbarium wall for a federal cemetery. As the southern Nevada cemetery expanded south and moved closer to the columbarium wall, the columbarium wall would become the centerpiece, along with the freedom tree that was moved to that area in 2006. The current problem was the transportation of family members from the chapel, which was once thought to be the center of the cemetery, to outer-lying burial areas. The distance to travel on foot was too far for those that are not spry and able-bodied. He said the agency was considering putting up a mini-committal shelter so family members would not have to travel so far, and was also looking at other methods to move people around the campus that would not require them to travel by car to the burial location. Chairman Coffin pointed out that maybe the original planning could have been better, but the agency was making the best of the situation. Unfortunately there was no way to put a columbarium wall on the north side, so the goal would be to make the families feel more comfortable as the cemetery moved south.

Chairman Coffin asked Mr. Tetz when more information would be available for the Subcommittee. Mr. Tetz said he had a meeting scheduled with the architect the week of February 8, 2010, to review the preliminary plans. He would then

take those preliminary plans to the VA in Washington D.C. in the later part of February 2010. The deadline for 90 percent completion was September 1, 2010, so that on October 1, 2010, federal funding could be obtained and construction could begin in 2011. Chairman Coffin thanked Mr. Tetz for his testimony.

Moving on, Chairman Coffin asked Mr. Nunez to give the Subcommittee an update on the Elko Readiness Center, the North Las Vegas Readiness Center and the Field Maintenance Shop at the Las Vegas Readiness Center. Mr. Nunez indicated the Bryan Commission would meet on February 12, 2010, to discuss the findings and issues associated with the collocation of the new Elko County Readiness Center with the existing University of Nevada, Reno Fire Science Academy in Carlin. The Bryan Commission would then provide that information to Adjutant General William Burks so a decision could be made regarding the project. The Nevada National Guard would like to have the project under construction, or at least have a construction contract, by September 30, 2010. Mr. Nunez said he hoped to have the information for the Subcommittee at its next meeting. Chairman Coffin asked who was on the Bryan Commission besides former Governor Richard Bryan. Mr. Nunez reported that representatives from the Fire Science Academy; University of Nevada, Reno; Nevada National Guard; and Elko County made up the Bryan Commission. A representative from the Board of Regents was also requested to attend the February meeting.

Assemblyman Grady asked Mr. Nunez whether the National Guard was still holding out for the Elko airport location, but the university was hoping for utilization of the Carlin facility. Mr. Nunez explained General Burks was recently informed by the National Guard that the mission of the Guard unit in Elko would change in 2015. While the Elko airport would serve the needs of the future mission in 2015, the rest of the mission would be very well served at the Carlin facility. From discussions with General Burks and the SPWB, Mr. Nunez said it appeared the General was very interested in the Carlin facility to meet current and future needs of the Guard. With respect to the Carlin facility, General Burks had visited the area to look for a rifle range, but because of the large size of the property, he would also consider other types of training facilities for the Guard to be located there. Mr. Nunez said he hoped to have more information from the General to report to the Subcommittee at its next meeting.

Senator Mathews said she was pleased to hear General Burks was interested in the Carlin facility and thought the state would be in a better financial position if the Guard moved there. She asked if the General wanted two facilities. Mr. Nunez explained two full facilities were not needed, but a mandate from the National Guard and Homeland Security would dictate the need for some type of facility (possibly renting a hangar and an office) at the Elko airport to station two helicopters. Mr. Nunez said the other types of facilities General Burks had discussed would, in his opinion, be best fitted by the Carlin facility.

Chairman Coffin cautioned not to lose sight of the fact the state already had a substantial amount of cash invested in the Elko property and thought it was about \$1 million dollars. Mr. Nunez said the schematic design and an environmental assessment investigation had been completed, but did not recall the exact amount invested to date. He said the environmental assessment was about \$100,000. Chairman Coffin said he wanted to make sure the Elko property was not left out in order to chase new goals. He said if anyone could come up with a solution that was right for everyone, it was former Governor Bryan. He said he would be interested in hearing about the outcome as soon as possible. He thanked Mr. Nunez for the update and asked to move on to the next item.

Regarding project 09-C13, Field Maintenance Shop at the Las Vegas Readiness Center and project 09-C14, New Readiness Center in North Las Vegas, Mr. Nunez reported the design funding from the federal government for both projects had recently been made available. The SPWB was proceeding with the designs, and both projects were moving ahead.

Lastly, Mr. Nunez said the Parking Lot Expansion at the Henderson Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) was also moving ahead. As requested at the last Subcommittee meeting, the SPWB made contact with the city of Henderson regarding lifting the street parking requirements during construction of the additional parking at the DMV. The city was very responsive to the request; for the interim period during construction, DMV customers would not be ticketed for parking on the street. Chairman Coffin said a debt of gratitude was due to the city of Henderson for reconsideration of its enforcement of street parking adjacent to the DMV.

Chairman Coffin asked for any additional questions regarding the Project Exception Report and seeing none said he would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE PROJECT EXCEPTION REPORT.

SENATOR MATHEWS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senator Mathews asked Mr. Nunez if the New Readiness Center in North Las Vegas was located at the airport and he said it was not.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. DISCUSSION REGARDING TOURS OF CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE CIP PROJECTS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Chairman Coffin said the Subcommittee might recall a discussion at the last meeting regarding having members become acquainted with both present and future CIP projects through tours. He emphasized it was important for new

legislators and legislators who would be serving on the money committees to get out in the field and tour various projects. Chairman Coffin did not expect a lot of projects for the 2011 Session, but thought it was the responsibility of leadership to get legislators together to tour the current projects, as well as those slated for the future, in order to make sound recommendations to the next Legislature. He said there were places to see that would benefit the legislators in their duties; it was a disservice to members who have never been on the premises of a building and were expected to make a rational decision about a project. Chairman Coffin thought that with the large amount of funding involved in CIP projects the tours were important. The tours would have to take place in the interim, because it would be impossible to schedule them during the 120-day session. He thought the Subcommittee should take the lead on organizing the tours, and discussed possible locations with Eric King, Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division and Mr. Nunez. Mr. King suggested organizing a tour to familiarize the Subcommittee with some of the deferred maintenance projects including the Nevada State Prison. He also suggested touring other state agencies with existing facilities that would require deferred maintenance in the future, but did not think it was necessary to focus only on projects that could be proposed for the 2011 Session.

Using the Grant Sawyer State Office Building as an example, Chairman Coffin said although no current work was being performed nor were there any projects planned, the legislators who may potentially serve on the money committees could benefit from becoming familiar with how that building worked. A tour of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building and the surrounding grounds could be done in two hours. If a legislator saw that building only once in their career he or she would be familiar enough to make good decisions. Chairman Coffin stressed for Mr. Nunez to work with Fiscal Analysis Division staff to start planning optional tours for the legislators.

Assemblywoman Smith applauded Chairman Coffin's comments and noted that she had been talking to staff about this subject as well. Generally speaking, she thought current and new members should know what all the state buildings looked like and how they functioned and she was committed to work hard to make that a reality.

Chairman Coffin said he was glad Mrs. Smith mentioned the importance of knowing how the building worked, as well as the physical structure. He thought that through familiarity with the buildings the legislators would better understand the mission of the agency housed there and what the agency employees needed to perform their jobs. Chairman Coffin considered that information useful when making decisions.

Senator Mathews recalled that tours were held when she started her legislative career. Also, the Chamber of Commerce from Reno, Sparks and Las Vegas briefed the legislators about things that were happening in their cities outside of the government buildings. She said the information provided from the Chamber of

Commerce was valuable, but unfortunately not shared any longer. Mrs. Mathews thought the time used in the past for touring was time well spent, especially for tours to areas in which legislators were not primarily located. She said typically the legislators in Las Vegas did not know what was happening in Reno and vice versa. Mrs. Mathews realized funding for the tours would be an issue at this time, but wanted to keep the idea as "food for thought" because there would be a time when it would be feasible again.

Chairman Coffin said he intended to bring up the idea at the IFC meeting on February 3, 2010, to encourage the leaders of the money committees to make tours a reality before the 2011 Session.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT.

Chairman Coffin asked if there was anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas who wanted to testify or anyone from the general public who would like to comment on any of the agenda items. No one came forward in Carson City and Assemblyman Hogan said he was by himself in Las Vegas.

IX. ADJOURNMENT.

Since there was no further business to come before the Subcommittee Chairman Coffin adjourned the meeting at 2:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Sullivan, Subcommittee Secretary

APPROVED:

Senator Bob Coffin, Chairman

Date: _____

Copies of exhibits mentioned in these minutes are on file in the Fiscal Analysis Division at the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. The division may be contacted at (775) 684-6821.