



State of Nevada  
**MERIT AWARD BOARD**



**“Good Government, Great Employees”**

209 E. Musser Street, Room 101  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4204

Brian Sandoval  
*Governor*

---

**MERIT AWARD BOARD**

**October 21, 2016 – 9:30 a.m.**

**Blasdel Building  
209 E. Musser Street  
1st floor, Room 105 Carson City, NV 89701**

**And**

**Grant Sawyer State Building  
555 East Washington Avenue  
Room 1400  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101**

**The sites will be connected by videoconference. The public is invited to attend at either location.**

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
(pending Board approval)**

**Merit Award Board**

**Members**

**Present:**

Rosa Mendez - Chairperson and Representative, Governor's Office  
Melanie Young – Representative, Governor's Finance Office, Budget Division  
Harry Schiffman – Representative, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)  
Neil Lake – Representative, UNLV  
Rachel Baker – Representative, Department of Administration, Division of Human Resource Management.

**I. CALL TO ORDER –**

**Chairperson Rosa Mendez:** Called the meeting to order. She noted the great attendance and thanked everyone for taking the time out of their day to be present. Chairperson Rosa Mendez briefly stated the ground rules for the meeting and asked attendees to state their names for the record for introductions.

**II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FOR AUGUST 12, 2016– FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

Chairperson Mendez stated that she had no changes for the minutes and asked if there were any comments. Melanie Young stated she would like to make a clarification and have it on record in regards to the award for Haaland McIntire. She noted, at the last meeting we talked about the award for the estimated savings of \$11,573, but pursuant to NRS 285 070 Section 3A, the award may not exceed 10 percent of the actual savings. So the Treasurer’s Office has been notified to track the savings for state fiscal year ’17 and then at the end of the fiscal year, we will re-evaluate the savings and base the award on that. And at that time, if the award exceeds \$5,000, it would have to go to the Interim Finance Committee. Chairperson Rosa Mendez asked if there were any additional comments. There were none.

MOTION: Moved for approval of adoption of minutes for August 12, 2016 Meeting with the noted clarification.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**III. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**A. NRS 285 Update**

Chairperson Mendez moved to General Business. For informational purposes, it was advised that in regards to the housekeeping revisions discussed at the previous meeting, all proposed changes have been accepted and approved by the LCB with one exception to Section 285.0502A, in which there will be a change to the conjunction. Other than the one exception, they will be moving forward with DDR. Chairperson Mendez asked if there were any questions. There were none.

**B. Board Correspondence**

Chairperson Rosa Mendez stated at the previous meeting there was discussion regarding taking a formal piece for employees in appreciation for their time and efforts in developing and following through on their ideas. It has been brought to the Office of the Governor. Chairperson Rosa Mendez stated, they feel that it should really be under the signature of the Board.

MOTION: Create the piece and have it for Board signature. If Chairperson Rosa Mendez is not available, then another member or officer.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake

#### IV. EMPLOYEE SUGGESTIONS — FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

- A. Brandi Johnson
- B. Robert Shaw
- C. Lisa Swearingen
- D. Dale Ann Luzzi
- E. Giovanni Chavez
- F. David Funes-Nava
- G. Johnny Cervoni
- H. Crystal Madera-Cibrian (1)
- I. Crystal Madera-Cibrian (2)
- J. Katherine Keller
- K. Joanna DiBella
- L. Geralyn Johnson
- M. Christopher Smithen
- N. Caroline Fuentes
- O. Tony Gould

**Chairperson Mendez:** Advised due to the amount of suggestions, to keep discussion to three or four minutes.

**Chairperson Mendez:** started with the first suggestion on the Agenda, Brandi Johnson with DHHS. Suggestion is being revisited and is in regards to reducing state general fund expenditures for DCFS, case management services, by proposing that the State bill Medicaid for targeted case management for non-title E eligible clients. The Agency response initially had been that the scope of the suggestion was under the employee's purview or her actual classification or duties, and that the agency had already looked at this idea previously. **Brandi Johnson:** stated, that her initial request dated back to 2012, but because of budget demands, it was decided not to implemented it at that time. In addition, there were multiple changes with ACA and the newly eligible Medicaid and different focus that was taken by many of the agencies to maximize Medicaid revenue. In addition, the other point that I would like to make is that at no time was the – my offer of help to the other Agencies part of my prescribed job duties. I was afforded the opportunity to assist other Agencies in the event that I could provide that help. But my job description was not changed. My work performance standards were not changed and I was not responsible for the outcome or the implementation of any of the suggestions that I put forward.

**Chairperson Mendez:** asked if there was anything else to add? **Brandi Johnson:** answered, no. **Deborah Harris:** stated that she is the Deputy Director present to speak on behalf of Richard Whitley, Director, Department of Health and Human Services. It was noted that Mr. Richard Whitley was supportive of the suggestion, however there has been confusion because the suggestion was made both for DCFS and for Nevada Early Intervention Services which is an ADSD program. There was also DCFS Administrator

changes which might have led to some of the confusion. **Deborah Harris:** noted that the overall concern is compensating employees for suggestions that are within their job scope. They are receiving increased volume of suggestions, and it will just become something that the budget can't bear. **Priscilla Colegrove:** for the Division of Child and Family Services stated, we are not sure what the savings is going to be at this point. In the suggestion it was suggested savings could be in the millions. So we would ask to have the opportunity to figure out what the savings would be. We can't pay anything until we have realized those savings but we are working toward that end. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comment. **Neil Lake:** asked, what I have heard is they are implementing the suggestion as a result of Ms. Johnson's idea, is that correct? Is that what I'm understanding? **Chairperson Mendez:** answered, that's my understanding. **Deborah Harris:** stated, DCFS is looking at Ms. Johnson's suggestion, as well as other strategies. We are going to be implementing some kind of reimbursement model. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, is it a partial implementation of a suggestion? Is it the entire suggestion? **Deborah Harris:** answered, I believe it would be a partial implementation of her suggestion, because we are going to implement other strategies as well. I do believe some of Ms. Johnson's suggestion will come into play, but the division needs more time to implement and then come back and explain what was implemented on behalf of Ms. Johnson's suggestion and how much savings that represents. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, what timeframe are you looking for to get it to determination on the implementation process? **Deborah Harris:** answered, I'm thinking it may be even as many as two quarters. **Priscilla Colegrove:** stated, they would need until at least through the end of the State fiscal year for implementation. **Melanie Young:** asked, will it be easily identified between the other pieces of the targeted case management, as opposed to the other efforts that the Agency is doing to be able to identify a savings? **Deborah Harris:** answered, yes. It's multiple funding sources, and different kinds of Medicaid revenue, so we should be able to figure out what's targeted case management compared to the rest of it. Deborah Harris asked Brandi Johnson if she had any questions regarding the Aging and Disability Services Division's implementation. **Brandi Johnson:** stated that there was confusion regarding the two separate suggestions. **Chairperson Mendez:** advised it would be fine to speak on both suggestions, however, it is proposed that the first suggestion be tabled until they receive information regarding the implementation of cost savings.

MOTION:	Table the suggestion until more information is received regarding implementation of cost savings.
BY:	Chairperson Mendez
SECOND:	Neil Lake
VOTE:	The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved to Brandi Johnson's second suggestion. **Deborah Harris:** stated, Ms. Johnson's suggestion for early intervention services, the present condition or procedure described, was evaluations for early intervention services are primarily conducted as physician office visits, and specialized instruction and is supported by State General Fund, even when the child has the Medicaid or check-up coverage. Referrals for services as a result of EPSDT, which is Early Periodic Screening Diagnostic Testing services visit, are covered by Medicaid when medically necessary, even if the service is not

a Medicaid covered benefit. The use of EPSDT will increase Nevada's ranking for EPSDT services and have long-term savings as a preventive medical service. Additionally, the option of adding the EI services, to the division's cost allocation plan, and subsequent cost-based rate setting as an element of certified public expenditure process should be explored. The estimated savings or benefit was estimated at one million per year. **Julie Kotchevar:** stated, the first part of the suggestion was to add EI services, which have already been implemented. In regards to the second part, it was decided not to implement the suggestion but rather revise the way target case management is handled. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if EI was implemented prior to the suggestion. **Julie Kotchevar:** confirmed and stated, the second suggestion was that we start having kids see a doctor with EPSDT exam, and if they recommended specialized instruction as a result of that exam, that Medicaid has to cover it, even if it's not a covered service. It was determined that instead of doing that, it was better for us to actually revise the way that we were doing targeted case management, so we didn't implement the suggestion. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked Brandi Johnson if she had further comment. **Brandi Johnson:** gave thanks for the explanation. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if there was any further comment or questions. There were none.

MOTION: Reject second suggestion from Brandi Johnson based on agency response and information presented.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Harry Schiffman  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved to Robert Shaw who is with the Department of Business Industry, stating this suggestion has been heard before. The suggestion is related to requiring state employees to shut down their computers after completing their shifts. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, Mr. Shaw, why don't you go ahead and provide your new position regarding the latest correspondence from the Agency? **Robert Shaw:** responded, Mr. Campbell commented about the wake-on-LAN scenario - and the equipment that he has wasn't capable of performing a shutdown, my response to that was that wake-on-LAN does not need to be implemented on any machines to be able to do a shutdown, that it does have the capability to run a shutdown in a timed manner. **Doug Campbell:** responded that he believes Mr. Shaw is correct, and through many discussions, an alternative of running the patches earlier in the evening was offered. The challenge with that approach is that the patching process actually occurs after the reboot, following the download of the patches. This would delay startup by as much as 20 minutes, depending on the size of the patch that was distributed overnight. **Robert Shaw:** asked, Alteris has the capability of triggering the shutdown patch are on a shutdown patch "S" command, correct? **Doug Campbell:** confirmed, and added, with those two commands, one of them shuts the machine down, the other reboots the machine, so you would still be able to go ahead and trigger both of those through Alteris after the patch. **Melanie Young:** asked, if it was done in that method, would it be a forced shutdown, so every system would be shut down at a certain period of time at night? **Doug Campbell:** confirmed, and stated, yes, there would be a development project needed to sequester which machines can be shutdown, versus which ones have to be up for 24-hour operation, or on-call people who VPN into their machines from home. So there's a number of systems that will have to be excluded from this operation, but we

recognize that the majority of systems are not of those type. **Robert Shaw:** added, we've identified about 2,000 VPN machines that are used throughout the state. **Melanie Young:** asked, what kind of cost would it take to implement something like this? I'm reading in your notes, Mr. Shaw, there was an Alteris patch and update management consideration of about a million dollars to be able to implement this suggestion? **Robert Shaw:** answered, no. Stated, the reason for the decline in the savings that I'm estimating is based on the times that Alteris would actually be running and doing its patching and updating, rather than a five or six o'clock shutdown, that that shutdown wouldn't occur until eight to ten o'clock, in the evening. So we'd lose about half of what I suggested. **Melanie Young:** asked, this Alteris patch and update management consideration cost. Explain that to me. What is that \$970,000? **Robert Shaw:** answered, there's a \$970,000 difference in shutting machines off at five or six o'clock at night versus shutting them off at around ten o'clock at night, so that is a loss of savings that would incur by not shutting machines to allow Alteris to run. **Melanie Young:** asked, is there a cost to the State to implement this suggestion? **Doug Campbell:** answered, there is some administrative need for all of the Agencies participating in patching to identify which systems need to be left up and which systems can be taken down at the completion of the patching process. **Melanie Young:** asked, no equipment investment needed? **Doug Campbell:** answered, no. **Melanie Young:** stated, there wouldn't be a recognized savings to the State or many Agencies that have utilities included in the rent, but I'm not sure how we would be able to recognize the savings for that. It would be a recognized savings to the landlord, because a lot of times the utilities are included in that cost, so the State sees a fixed budgeted amount. **Robert Shaw:** replied, hopefully that landlord would then go out and spend more of his revenue in Nevada. **Chairperson Mendez:** stated, this particular item was noted in your letter that it almost appeared to be more of a cost than it did as a cost of leaving them on per se. **Robert Shaw:** confirmed and apologized for the confusion. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, it would be an automatic system wide shutoff for those computers that can be shut off? **Robert Shaw:** answered, there would need to be a determination of which systems can be identified that can be shut off, and which ones are used on a 24-hour basis, second shifts, things of that nature. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, can we associate a cost with that? **Robert Shaw:** answered, I don't know how many people we're dealing with. **Neil Lake:** stated, a concern is a direct savings to the state for the buildings that have power included in the utilities, that it is going to be difficult to get an accurate estimate. **Harry Schiffman:** asked, is there a way to override the shutdown then, if I actually needed to use my office computer? **Doug Campbell:** replied, at this time, we do not have a way to override the automated shutdown that's done by Alteris. **Harry Schiffman:** asked, where is the Agency's stand on this? **Robert Shaw:** answered that he hasn't personally gone to the Agency level and further commented that not every single machine, depending on what software you're running, aside from Windows, gets updated every single day, So the odds of you sitting in front of your machine, unless you have the clout that I often have, and you go in late at night, and you turn your machine, then you know you probably would have a lower percentage of actually being affected. **Doug Campbell:** agreed and stated our Agency's response to the original suggestion is we do recognize a power savings is achievable per the suggestion, but there's a lot of anecdotal evidence that shutting machines down increases the failure rate of the machine over time. **Melanie Young:** asked, is this possible to do on a pilot project with a specific agency, such as Business and Industry where you work, as opposed

to doing a state-wide implementation? **Robert Shaw:** answered, I'd be willing to do it on mine, and Mr. Campbell, we would have to work in tandem to do that. **Doug Campbell:** added, we would have to create two types of patches for your agency and sequester them from a regular patching process, and then divide the machines up in your agency between the two. **Melanie Young:** asked, so as a Board should we submit your suggestion to be studied by Business and Industry? She further stated she was not sure what kind of Board motion to take.

MOTION: Forward Mr. Shaw's suggestion as not applicable for state-wide, but applicable as a pilot project for his particular agency, award pending on the results from that implementation and associated savings.

BY: Chairperson Mendez

SECOND: Harry Schiffman

VOTE: No vote taken

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved to Lisa Swearingen with DHHS and DWSS. **Lisa Swearingen:** introduced herself as being part of the CPM Program and stated she would like to clarify her suggestion. She noted that two of her three suggestions had been rejected due to too much IT being needed, and ultimately the Agency settled on the suggestion of changing the process for interpretative services. This suggestion was implemented quickly, it began on August 1, and already has cost savings of \$45,000 in two months. It appears to be well received by the field, and it's going to be a continued savings of at least probably \$20,000 a month. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, do we have anyone from the Agency to address conflicts? **Steve Fisher:** introduced himself with the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services and stated that going back to 2014 and watching the monthly fiscal meetings closely, it was observed that the Interpretive Services costs were starting to ratchet up, and by September of 2015, it was suggested that the budget within Interpretive Services was definitely well exceeded. **Mr. Fisher:** further noted, that's why I put down on the suggestion that it was something that was under consideration. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, even though there was issues with running out of budget at one point in 2014, you still implemented Lisa's suggestion, and you're realizing the savings currently, is that correct? **Mr. Fisher:** confirmed. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, you're obviously in support, because you've implemented it? **Mr. Fisher:** confirmed. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, basically you're just saying that is incorrect, the Agency is in support, and the Agency has implemented and you are recommending award, is that correct? **Mr. Fisher:** answered, well, if there was a project or a process that was already under consideration, is that considered awardable? He further noted, if Lisa had not taken this on, this process would have been delegated to another employee to take on anyway. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, my clarification is, the Agency was aware of it, but did the Agency come up with that suggestion? I guess the question maybe you have is, or what you're asking is, would that same suggestion be developed by somebody else, is that what you're saying? **Mr. Fisher:** answered, well, the suggestion was to reduce costs in Interpretive Services, correct? **Chairperson Mendez:** answered, specifically, it said to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of that process. **Mr. Fisher:** stated, correct. And so the Agency knew

because of budget issues that we had to increase the efficiency of Interpretive Services. So was that her idea? Maybe I guess, but really the Agency already knew that up front. I mean we knew that going in that Interpretive Services had to be looked at and so that's where I'm coming from. **Harry Schiffman:** stated, nothing was stated by the Agency that you had looked for the cost savings. The cost savings that you're finding here came from the employee with the suggestion. **Steve Fisher:** replied, it's also the responsibility of a unit called the Eligibility and Payments Unit, Interpretive Services is their responsibility. **Deborah Harris:** stated, what we do is we allow release time during the certified public managers' program; employees routinely come up with capstone projects, which have to be cost savings to the Division, so what we're doing is we're paying, and we're sending them as part of their job responsibilities and to enhance their development to certified public managers' program. **Ms. Harris:** further stated that it is not feasible for the State to pay for the developmental activities and then compensate the employee for the suggestion, we still haven't addressed the issue of the employee is assigned to do these types of duties. **Harry Schiffman:** asked, are you saying that she came up with the suggestion, while she was doing our capstone project? **Deborah Harris:** replied, that is my understanding. It yielded financial results so she's putting it in as a suggestion, but it's a double dip because she was supposed to yield financial results as part of her capstone project. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comments. **Shane Chesney:** introduced himself as the Senior Deputy Attorney General and stated, I just noticed here in NRS 285.050 it talks about when an employee would be awarded, it says for which the act of developing or proposing is not a normal part of job duties as a State employee. The question is, was the capstone project a normal part of the job duties? **Deborah Harris:** replied, it's inside the normal duties if it's supervisory approved as part of the work, and its given release time, and it's paid for by the State. **Shane Chesney:** replied, well, certainly that's the argument, but I mean the counter-argument would be it's not in the job classification. So I would say it to the discretion of the Board as far as what to do. **Chairperson Mendez:** stated that, in her personal opinion, it may not be your job classification, but it's something that you know you have to do, and you have to provide, and that is also paid by the State. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any other input. **Harry Schiffman:** stated, even though it might not state in your job description, or your work performance standard, in a way you volunteered to do this – to do this job, and part of your requirements were to find cost savings. **Neil Lake:** stated he was on the fence. **Melanie Young:** stated she was conflicted as well. **Rachel Baker:** stated she can see the issue from both sides. **Melanie Young:** asked to table the discussion to allow for more research.

**MOTION:** This item to be tabled, pending further research, and also checking with the appropriate departments and agencies as how to interpret this with regard to specifically this suggestion and the CPM program.

**BY:** Chairperson Mendez

**SECOND:** Neil Lake

**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved onto Dale Ann Luzzi. Suggestion related to the State and use of AT&T phone services. The Agency response says that the State currently has full



options for conferencing which are limited to the Agency's location, and if the Agency is on the State Telephone System. The two options are the State and local vendor conferencing through AT&T and local providers. Currently there is no policy in place mandating agencies utilize either for a state telecom, and this is due the wide array of telephone systems and locations of the systems thereby limiting the ability to standardize system use. The organization is not recommending adoption. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if there was any additional input. There was none.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on agency's formal response.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Mr. Giovanni "Geo" Chavez. His suggestion is related to the use of the case tool, to automatically enter budget and any information into the AMPS and or on NOMADS in order to obtain an estimate of benefits to see if a client may be potentially eligible for staff benefits. **Geo Chavez:** introduced himself as being with the Division of Welfare and stated that his suggestion will calculate a little bit similar to what the system currently does, but there's another section where it actually bypasses. He stated, so I made two sections on the form, one of them primarily to be able to use for training purpose to help if they need. The form has actually been donated and it was not meant to be forced upon case workers, it's just meant to be a donation for the Agency to be able to use, a tool for everyone to use. Ideally the form itself has various different features. **Geo Chavez:** stated, from the review it sounded to me as if the individual either one did not understand how to use it, or might have been confused. The reason I created the form was that we used to get quite a few emails regarding basic common errors. Errors such as certification periods, categorical eligibility and you know some of the basic things that were on the manual that we do on a day to day basis. It's a little bit difficult in terms of coding due to the use of Adobe Java Script, but the sections have been simplified. In response to the review, this is not a complete waste of time and is being given as a donation. **Steve Fisher:** advised on the reason for the response of the suggestion. The Agency has developed spreadsheets and validation entry forms and so on and so forth over the years, over the past several years, one of the things they discovered was duplication of effort filling out these worksheets, spreadsheets, forms and then turning around and taking that information and entering it into the system. These forms have had to be removed or eliminated from the system. He would like to bring this back to the Board at a future meeting after having introduced it to the business process re-engineering team, which is made up of individuals throughout the Agency, and see if this form would in fact improve performance, and improve the business process. At this point, Mr. Chavez takes Chairperson Mendez through an example of how the new system would work. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, you have to create a profile first, or would this form actually take over all of that, and save you time for the paperwork or that way? Or is it just another form that they would fill out? **Steve Fisher:** answered, it appears to me that it's another form that they would fill out. It doesn't automatically take data from this form and automatically populate the system. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, it's not going to replace or improve what you're already doing, is that correct? **Steve Fisher:** answered, that's my

understanding. **Mr. Chavez:** stated, the form is not in conjunction with the program itself, essentially it is a calculator. **Nova Murray:** introduced herself as the Deputy Administrator for the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. She noted, it appears that you're putting data into places which allows you to make a mistake and that's what we eliminated by doing BPR, getting rid of that second data entry point. An example of an eligibility call was given. **Ms. Murray:** added, this is a really good recommendation, to give it to BPR to look at that process and see if it eliminates time for the eligibility workers with the BPR process. Noted, without doing a really full analysis of this, I would hesitate to say that the Agency is in support until that group looks at it, and makes that decision. **Melanie Young:** stated, does it hold personal identifying information and is it encrypted and different things like that, that if it's just saved on somebody's hard drive, what implications can come from that? I think we should recommend tabling this, until the Agency has an opportunity to look at it. **Steve Fisher:** asked, how often does the Board meet? **Melanie Young:** answered, as needed. A timeline was then discussed of how long to test the system out. **Melanie Young:** asked, if we gave you three, four months, could you get back with the Board and give us an outcome, respond similarly to the form that we send out with that information and then we could review it, have time to study it and ask questions if need be? **Steve Fisher:** replied, sure. **Mr. Chavez:** stated, I would recommend it for individuals that do review cases more so than trainers, it seems to be – it will be more beneficial to them, if it's a case worker that's doing it, there's quite a bit of help, but there can also be sections where someone can become reliant on it, and could potentially make them do errors, so more so supervisors and trainers, it seems to be more of a useful tool.

MOTION: This item to be tabled until an investigation is completed with the agency.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to David Funes-Nava. Mr. Nava introduced himself as a specialist with the Division of Welfare who has developed a working search engine with an interactive user interface in which he catalogued all of the memorandums, information memorandums, policy and procedures for the past five years so that the user is able to go ahead and search all of these, and as a result gets the benefit of having a list of related memorandums. **Mr. Funes-Nava:** stated, it is currently being used by supervisors and my co-workers. I get a lot of feedback especially referring to how much time it saved, and how helpful it's been. What I'm offering is something that is already working, so not just something that could be approved, but something that's already available to be used today for eligibility, and is being used today for eligibility. **Steve Fisher:** explained his response on the suggestion, stating the issues the Agency has with storing and search capability with finding documents. **Harry Schiffman:** asked, if you're using this system now, what are you looking to find something bigger and better? **Steve Fisher:** answered, yes. We're looking for a document management system which not only has search capability but manages documents; also provides the ability to work flow documents, to route documents from one person to another person. It's an all-encompassing document management system, which also has search capabilities. **Neil Lake:** asked, will you continue using the

suggestion until you have the new system in place? **Steve Fisher:** answered, I don't see any reason why not to continue using it. **Melanie Young:** asked, are you using it throughout the whole Division? **David Funes-Nava:** answered, most of the supervisors in my office, people who have left my office, share with some people in there, so it's not being used on wide scale at all. But it's fairly easy to use, and I believe it's an intuitive source, many people use search engines on a daily basis. I don't believe that this would be any more complicated. So training is probably minimal. **Steve Fisher:** agreed. **Melanie Young:** asked, what kind of recognized savings would be found from using this tool right now? **Steve Fisher:** answered, I know that there's some numbers out there, but to be honest with you, I don't know. **David Funes-Nava:** answered, I have limited information about the actual metrics, the statistics available at the Agency. I don't know how many employees we have. I don't actually know the average number of cases that individuals work, but the numbers I did put up there, I put an estimated of \$57,000 per 100 workers; I estimated 10 minutes of time being necessary or possibly being saved simply by having a search that you could use immediately. And then I had suggested that possibly five percent of your entire case load is being used for these types of cases, based off – and that's how I came up with the number. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, how do you confirm that, because they have to be confirmed or realized the savings made? **Neil Lake:** I think it's up to the Agency to determine what the actual savings are. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked, Mr. Fisher said that a very small group of people are using this, and not only that, when he gives it away, or when somebody takes it with, is what it sounded like, they take it with them, they go somewhere else, then they just give it somebody else, right, to use? **David Funes-Nava:** answered, at this point, yes, people go ahead and use it, and they can share it with other people, and that way it's a file that would be used on the desktop. **Chairperson Mendez:** shared her concerns regarding financing and the scale, stating the Agency already identified the issue, they're already looking into a solution.

MOTION:	Reject the suggestion due to Agency's involvement prior to the employee even coming up with the suggestion.
BY:	Chairperson Mendez
SECOND:	Melanie Young
VOTE:	The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Mr. Johnny Cervoni. **Johnny Cervoni:** introduced himself as being with the Aging and Disability Services Division. This suggestion is in regards to the Medicaid's billing system Harmony which has the capacity to allow use for mobile electronic devices. **Mr. Cervoni:** stated, you would be able to do your work in the field on a device, and not have to have that duplicate work where you write everything down, and then when you get back to your office, then type it all. The suggestion was previously rejected for cost reasons, but it has been noted that Harmony does not require a VPN or a laptop, any device such as a tablet would work. **Mr. Cervoni:** further stated, instead of needing a laptop, a VPN, and its hot spots and worrying about security, any tablet or device never needs to be connected to Wi-Fi or any sort of internet, because you would just plug it into your work station computer. He further noted the advantages of using a tablet versus traditional pad and pen writing. This would cut about 150 hours per

service coordinator per work year, which is about seven or eight percent of their total work time spent per 300 or 400 service coordinators, and with time not spent in duplicating the work, you could then use that time to be out in the field generating more money. **Melanie Young:** asked, you said that the Agency's already tested the mobile? **Mr. Cervoni:** answered, if you look at the Agency's response to my original suggestion when it was rejected, the previous Deputy Administrator, who is now retired, who had reviewed it on the first part of that, she had stated that it had already been looked at and it was too costly by their judging. **Melanie Young:** asked, your notes said there was a contract that went to the BOE? **Mr. Cervoni:** confirmed. **Melanie Young:** asked, have they purchased any mobile tablets or done a pilot project on this at all? **Mr. Cervoni:** answered, no because of cost issues. **Melanie Young:** asked if there were any representatives from the Agency. **Cara Paoli:** answered, I'm Deputy Administrator of Aging and Disability Services Division. **Melanie Young:** asked, have you reviewed this, yourself? **Cara Paoli:** confirmed. **Melanie Young:** asked can you give us a little bit of what your thoughts are? **Cara Paoli:** produced examples such as, it's not the best practice standard for the population being worked with, it's time consuming, it's distracting, they malfunction, it's a tax-payer burden, the effect it will have on the meetings, the IT costs. **Melanie Young:** expressed her concern with the requirement of a reduction of 50 employees. **Cara Paoli:** agreed. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if there were any more questions.

MOTION:                Reject suggestion based on the agency response.  
BY:                        Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND:                Harry Schiffman  
VOTE:                     The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Crystal Madera-Cibrian's two suggestions. **Crystal Madera-Cibrian:** introduced herself as owning her own business and wanting to respond to the Agency's decision on her Merit Awards that go with the same applications. Her response deals with verbiage with the Online Child Support Application. **Crystal Madera-Cibrian:** stated, I'm a tester currently for the online Child Support application. I was provided a document, it's called the DSD, and it has a requirement in it and then I track line by line the application, and I write bugs based on if it's working the way it should. My suggestions were outside of that scope. I own my own business; I'm required to follow discrimination laws. I found that there were some missing and that was my suggestion. I was also required to set up scenarios, they had me set up scenarios for different family settings. I set up them up mother father, father mother, as custodian, non-custodian, and then we do have same-sex partners in our population as well. I set up scenario where it was same sex, and the application doesn't allow for that. I suggested this verbally before writing the award, and they told me that they weren't going to do it. I kept telling my supervisor, you know I really think that it should be suggested, because it's not being considered. They actually did change the drop down menu for father and mother to consider other parents after this had been submitted. This research was done outside of work, so it wasn't within my work. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if anyone from the Agency was present. **Nova Murray:** replied, yes, I'm the Deputy Administrator with oversight of this program, although I did not complete these forms. The employee that

completed them works for me. Ms. Murray stated that she would like to address the two suggestions separately. First, adding the Civil Rights language to the application. **Ms. Murray:** states, currently there is not a requirement from our federal partner to make the change, in our strategic plan in October of 2015, we addressed the need to look at the policies, we can't go in and make all these changes at one time. Since the federal government is acknowledging us as being in compliance with the current statement, because it does say "sex" on the application, they've allowed us time to make those changes. So, we will eventually make them, and we are looking at new system, and a new application that will allow us to get into everything and model it and change it and make it look like our system. The Agency chose not to implement this recommendation at this point, because the Agency is in compliance. **Crystal Madera-Cibrian:** stated, I didn't only suggest "sex". I suggested all of the additional Civil Rights that are covered, and that includes I believe religion, gender, identity, sexual orientation and political belief. This is cost effective, because the child support application was actually just re-worked completely and the developers re-wrote the whole entire framework, so when I wrote these bugs, I felt that this would save the State money by putting this in now, rather than them re-writing it, and then later on being required to change it and hiring another developer. **Chairperson Mendez:** you said you write "bugs", and that's part of your position. Can you please tell me what that is? **Crystal Madera-Cibrian:** answered, a "bug" is a deficiency in the code. I was given the requirements that have been written, and I'm supposed to follow those requirements. I have trackers where I follow line by line and if there's any deficiency, I write a bug and say it doesn't match the tracker or the written requirement. These were not provided in the requirements. These are separate from the requirements. I just felt that they should be included to protect the State. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for clarification and Crystal Madera-Cibrian provided an example of a client log in for a child support application. **Shane Chesney:** agreed, noting the State wants to avoid litigation, advises to speak with DAG to avoid future law suits. **Cara Paoli:** addressed the cost issue, that changes will be made, but at a later date. **Neil Lake:** asked, these changes that you talk about that you are going to do, are you doing those changes based on her suggestions? **Cara Paoli:** answered, no, we are not. We have the information already in our strategic plan from 2015 to make the changes. This is a federal move. These changes have happened at the highest level. We've had our audit by the Civil Rights Department, so it's in the process. **Chairperson Mendez:** advised of the potential cost savings by avoiding lawsuits.

**MOTION:** Reject the decision for the Child Support Application for the Child Support online application, based on the two facts regarding additional cost to the Agency, and the fact that at this time there is no way really to estimate the savings that are required by statute.

**BY:** Chairperson Mendez

**SECOND:** Melanie Young

**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Crystal Madera-Cibrian's second suggestion. The discrimination suggestion is currently under review. **Crystal Madera-Cibrian:** stated,

it's just simply adding additional classes that we now consider to be part of the discrimination prosecution, which the federal government recognizes but not the State. **Melanie Young:** asked, when I read this one it looks like it was originally set up to be as a new requirement to the program, but then it's now been accepted and a part of that, is that the case? **Cara Paoli:** answered, when you apply on the application, your current circumstances or your previous circumstances and your relationships don't matter anymore, that matters on the other side of the house in the Welfare Agency, but it doesn't matter on the Child Support side. Parentage is what we're trying to establish. So in this instance, the federal government – we still have a little hang up with the federal government in that they still do paternity. So this is a really small population for us, because most instances now your parents are still male and female, and so they still are maternity and paternity, and it's a federal requirement to establish paternity. So this isn't a change to an application. This is a change to applications, systems, reporting, everything that we do down the process. So we have to understand from our federal partners what the requirement is with paternity and whether they're going to give that up. We're not ready to make the change without the federal government telling us what to do with this. So we are going to make a change we will not do it now. It is not cheaper to do it with a vendor. We've asked the vendor, we put it into a change order. The change order now goes to a committee. **Melanie Young:** addressed the concern of putting a savings amount on the award. **Crystal Madera-Cibrian:** addressed the concern of the monetary award as well, but stated, I think that it would be beneficial to take care of it now than wait for something to happen. **Nova Murray:** stated, a decision has not been made to make those changes. A general discussion about past funding and future budget funding ensued. **Chairperson Mendez:** again, raised the cost savings issue, stating, there isn't a way of estimating those cost savings, just because of the nature of the suggestion. **Nova Murray:** stated the Civil Rights statement is the one that we just talked about, talking to our DAG, and finding out what the liability is for our Agency in coming into full compliance at a future date, we are in compliance. **Shane Chesney:** replied, exactly, consult your Deputy AG, so that our office is aware of it, and can advise you on what you need to do.

**MOTION:** Table this suggestion regarding the overall statement until the Agencies are able to coordinate and consult.  
**BY:** Chairperson Mendez  
**SECOND:** Harry Schiffman  
**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Kathleen Keller with the UNLV and Libraries. This suggestion is in regards to replacing the work desk telephones with cell phones. **Mike Lawrence:** introduced himself with UNLV stating, it would cost the university significantly more money to implement this suggestion, simply because we also have other emergency services and utility services, like elevator and mediations, fire alarms, emergency phones and if we were to do away with all of our landline extensions, we still have the cost of supporting that. In addition, based upon our favorable contracts, the cost of a wireless device for the monthly service is higher than that of what our internal

campus users pay for phone service anyway. So based on these factors, we could not approve of this recommendation.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on the agency response.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Joanna DiBella. Her suggestion is related to initiating a mentoring program where employees can cross-train about other departments so they can perform their duties better. **Mike Lawrence:** our response there was that while we appreciate the idea, it's come up in several different formats, with several different committees off campus for the last several years. There have been different shades of a mentorship program that has been either implemented of some sort. There's currently a big initiative on campus, our top tier committee to move towards an employee on-boarding program, that involves a peer guide portion which would take someone from one department act and serve as a peer guide to someone in another department. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if there was any comment. There was none.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on the agency response and the additional information today regarding it not being an original suggestion, and already has been considered by the organization.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to GERALYN Johnson. Her suggestion was related to an appeal form to be sent out so the constituents can file them and appeal, thereby streamlining the process. The Agency's response is, putting a form in each Division would be counter-productive, and leave both employers and employees to mistakenly file an unneeded appeal; thinking that they must file an appeal because the form is included with the decision. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comment. **Rachel Baker:** stated, I don't see where or how a cost savings could be realized on this one. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comment. There was none.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on the fact that there is no cost savings that could be noted at this time.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Harry Schiffman  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to Mr. Christopher Smithen. He has suggested changing lighting for all State facilities to put motion detectors claiming the switching over would conserve energy and reduce electrical costs. The Agency says that this has been proposed in the past and it was already addressed in the State Capital improvement

plan in 2009. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comment. There was none.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on the fact that it was previously addressed and considered by the organization.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Harry Schiffman  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved to Caroline Fuentes with the recorder's office in the SOS - Secretary of State. Her suggestion is imposing a handling fee of three to five dollars for customer requesting to mail out return documents. The Agency said it chose not to implement because while the NRS does allow for a fee for special services, the Agency does not feel that this is a special service and this proposed fee would add additional burden to Nevada businesses penalizing those utilizing the traditional paper filing option.

**Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comment. There were none.

MOTION: Suggestion be rejected based on Agency input today and their response regarding not implementing the suggestion.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved to Mr. Tony Gould. He is with DHHS Welfare, and the suggestion states it is common practice to spend the budget balance at the year end. The Agency response states that some budget accounts for the general fund or highway fund are expected to be unspent and reverted back at the end of the year as a part of normal operations. The usual reversions are used to fund future year operations. Agencies are expected to be judicious in their spending, and not spend money unnecessarily, especially during these times of restricted resources. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked for any additional comments or concerns. There were none.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on the agency response.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

- V. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – (Note: No vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised during public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to five minutes per person and persons making comment will be asked to begin by stating their names for the record.)

**Chairperson Mendez:** Asked if there was any public comment. **Shane Chesney:** stated, that it was nice to attend the meeting, it's been 10 years since he has been to one and thinks it went great.



**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Sunset Subcommittee Report**

**Chairperson Mendez:** Moved on to the Board presence online within the website. It had been discussed about doing something such as using clip art. Chairperson Mendez asked for any thoughts regarding this idea, mentioning the great turn out at the meeting. Neil Lake: stated, it was a good idea to save the State money. **Melanie Young:** asked, would that create a cost to the Merit Award Board? **Chairperson Mendez:** stated she didn't know, but could possibly do some of the design work herself. **Melanie Young:** stated, with the \$1,100 budget, it was concerning to her as the money gets used up quickly.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Moved that the Merit Award Board meeting be adjourned.  
BY: Chairperson Mendez  
SECOND: Neil Lake  
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion