STATE OF NEVADA 1 EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 2 MEETING TRANSCRIPT 3 NOVEMBER 18, 2021 4 5 They call that? What's that? I don't 6 RUSSELL: 7 know how I know that. Okay. I'm un I -- I'm unmuting. 8 PARKER: 9 after nine. 10 Looks like they're all there down there. RUSSELL: 11 All righty. Good morning to North. 12 DAVIES: Huh? You said --13 RUSSELL: Good morning to the North. 14 DAVIES: 15 PARKER: Good morning. Can I call the meeting to 16 order, um, Employee Management Committee. Today's Thursday, November 18, 2021. It's 9:03 -- 9:02 a.m. There are two 17 18 locations, the Nevada State Library in Carson City, and the Grant Sawyer Building in Las Vegas. This in-person meeting 19 20 will comply with the Governor's mandate of social distancing 21 and mask wearing for, uh, for all individuals, whether 22 vaccinated or not vaccinated. Masks must be worn properly to 23 cover the nose and mouth at all time. The sites are connected by video conference microphones and cameras in Carson City. 24

They're in front of the committee, so we will need to project

our voices and our faces that way. Um, and then in Las Vegas, can you instruct everybody where your cameras are and your microphone and where to speak to. Thank you. Thank you. Evacuations in the North, we will follow staff depending on the, um, the emergency. We will either go to the front of the building, um, out to the foyer and to the right or to the left. But staff will direct us. You wanna instruct them on evacuation down South.

WRIGHT: Ours will be out the door to the left, all the way out to our parking lot.

DAVIES: Thank you, Wright.

2.4

PARKER: Awesome. Thank you. I won't look at the camera at all times 'cause I gotta read my notes. Uh, let's see here. Okay, first public comment. Uh, no voter 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 name for the record. Is there any public comment in Las -- Las Vegas?

DAVIES: We have no member of the public here, unless the board member wants to say anything. No public comment in the South.

PARKER: All right. Thank you. Okay, Northern

Nevada, any public comment? Yes. I'm just gonna go over here

so they can see. Yes. Right. Yeah. There you go.

SMITH: Uh, my name is Mandy Bo Smith. For the record, I serve as the Deputy Administrator in DHRM, uh, assigned to the Labor Relations Unit. Um, I am making comment today to inform the committee that, um, since our -- our dear Denise retired last week, uh, we have appointed Matthew Lee, who is a supervisory personnel analyst in the labor relations unit to, uh, a temporary assignment of also supervising the EMS, uh, unit. Uh, while we're trying to find a worthy replacement for Denise, which will never happen, we all know, but we will try. Um, so, uh, I wanted to inform the committee that if there are questions or concerns and you need to consult the supervisory analyst for the time being, it would be Matthew Lee. All right. Thank you.

PARKER: Thank you. Awesome. Any other public comment?

RUSSELL: I'll just say for the record, even though

Denise is not here, we appreciate her service. Um, I didn't

get safe either, so, um, just wanted to show our appreciation

of the committee's appreciation for all the service that she's

done and wish her a great retirement.

PARKER: All right. Now we'll move to item number three on the agenda, which is committee introductions. Um, we'll do a short meeting. We're gonna call it overview. So we'll start up here in the North. To my right.

BAUER: Jennifer Bauer, State Public Charter 1 2 School Authority. Stephanie Parker, uh, UNR. 3 PARKER: Sandie Geyer, Attorney General's office. 4 GEYER: 5 JOHNSON: Nora Johnson, interim EMC coordinator. Start Mary. 6 DAVIES: 7 And Mary Jo Scott, Governor's Finance SCOTT: office OPM SMART 21. 8 9 DAVIES: Gwyn Davies, Department of Motor Vehicles. Todd Weiss, Deputy Attorney General, EMC. 10 WEISS: 11 RUSSELL: Teresa Russell, UNLV. WRIGHT: Ivory Wright, EMC Admin Clerk. 12 13 PARKER: Matthew, can you come up so that they can 14 at least see you? I'm sorry. It's okay. Matthew Lee, supervisory 15 LEE: analyst over EMS and LRU right now. 16 Awesome. Thank you. Today it doesn't --17 PARKER: 18 so we don't have any actual hearings on the agenda today. So what will happen just for anybody in attendance, we will be, 19 20 um, just going through grievance submissions to d -- to discuss and determine if possible action, uh, that we will 21 22 take, um, if the grievance can either can be answered without 23 a hearing, if the matter is based upon any EMC's previous decision or does not follow within the EMC's jurisdiction. 24 So

25

let's move to, oh, go ahead.

1 DAVIES: Madam -- Madam Chair.

2 PARKER: Yes.

3 DAVIES: Motion to adopt the agenda.

PARKER: Okay.

RUSSELL: Teresa Russell. Second.

PARKER: Oh, I missed that. Okay, sorry. So we have a first and a second is, uh, is there any discussion?

All those in favor? Aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

PARKER: Any opposed? Motion passes. Now we'll move to to five. I had tried to skip number four. Sorry. So, number five, discussion, ensure and determination of possible action of the following. Agree. We'll start with number five is 7601 for Banks. Veronica Banks. You wanna start on this one. First I should have asked. I wanna make sure everybody got their packets were able to review. Okay.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.

PARKER: Yes.

BAUER: Um, there appears to be a lot of concerns made or allegations and -- and significant concerns in the contents of this grievance by the grievance, but I just don't see that we can offer any resolution. I don't think we have authority or just -- jurisdiction. Um, and I know that Teresa always brings up a good point that we're not limited to the proposed resolution by the Grievant, but I just don't know

that we can do anything here for the Grievant.

PARKER: Thanks. I agree. I don't -- I -- yeah, I don't think we anything. I -- I couldn't find anything we could do. And we don't take passion on other employees either.

BAUER: Correct.

PARKER: So --

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GEYER: Madam Chair, Sandie Geyer for the record.

PARKER: Yes.

Um, in addition, uh, and one of -- part of GEYER: the response, uh, it was indicated that some of the complaints that she did rise to the, uh, administration have been resolved. Um, in -- in reading through all of this, there was a lot, uh, as we all know, um, you know, uh, one of the things that stood out to me was, um, the retaliation part that she felt as though she was being, um, that was being used against her for what she called as a whistleblower. And it appears that that would've been her correct avenue is to file a whistleblower. So it would give her the protection because when they do that, it -- it becomes anonymous. And -- and then there's not necessarily that opportunity for retaliation, but it appears that she just went ahead and -- and had these discussions and made these complaints knowingly that against the individuals that she felt were in violation, uh, that she -- she put herself out there unfortunately, to -- to receive

some of this. Um, Ms. Banks also has an additional, uh, grievance that, um, that -- that comes back to some of the same allegations in this grievance -- grievance itself, where she indicates that she, um, believes that part of the issues was her underlying medical conditions and her placement. and the, um, what she indicates as the, uh, the cor -- the correctional or the corridor, or -- or, um, sorry, I'm probably screwing that up. Um, sorry. Um, anyway, so -- so she's indicating that, you know, she was placed in this, the end of this -- end of the bubble, basically, is what it's, and that, um, while she was working in there, she was also back up for unit eight, which was the COVID wing. And then -- and then I think that this is kind of how that ball had started is that she felt that couldn't have been there. But I do agree with both, uh, the chair and my colleague here in the north, that I don't believe that at this point in time there is anything that this committee can actually do to resolve this particular grievance. Only because part of it has been resolved. And then again, other additional issues have been raised in another grievance that she did file with regards to specifically the medical situation.

PARKER: Okay. Thanks. I'm gonna disagree with myself right now, and, but I need to look at NHC 284.6951.

Okay. Because I'm looking at the HR version now.

GEYER: Good job chair.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 PARKER: And, um, yeah. Okay. So it states if an employee's not satisfied, da da da da, da, to a request may 2 pursuant to NAC data, including without limitation, reasonable 3 attorney selected in accordance with subsection two. 5 know what that one says, but it says, um, the employee alleges that the employee was retaliated against in violation of 6 subsection three. I don't know what NRS 280. I wish this had 7 links. 2817551.755. I may have to disagree with myself. 8 9 BAUER: So, Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. You're looking@thehr.nv.gov website? 10 11 PARKER: Yeah. With the always updated regulations 12 BAUER: because the legislative website is not codified timely. 13 and you are looking at Nevada Administrative Code 284.6951, 14 1.5 correct? 16 PARKER: Yes. Submission of complaint to Employee 17 Management committee. 18 BAUER: Perfect. Thank you. In case the committee wanted to follow up. 19 20 Oh, sorry guys. I'm seeing, and I'm just PARKER: thinking you guys can see with me. 21 22 Since we're on our cell phones not BAUER: 23 shopping on eBay, also Denise, who sees Moore's legacy. will go to NRS 281755. 'Cause I do not have that one 24

memorized. I don't care. Can we ask, um --

```
PARKER:
                        Yes, I think yes.
 1
                        For some clarification on that.
         BAUER:
 2
                        Counsel, can you also look at that?
 3
         PARKER:
                        Oh, why don't --
 4
         WEISS:
 5
         BAUER:
                        21755 is the rights for a mother, um, to
 6
    express breast EV milk under certain circumstances.
 7
    would not be the goal that I've seen.
                        Thank you. Thank you.
 8
         PARKER:
 9
         WEISS
                        6951.
                        I thought that was the NAC they were
10
         PARKER:
11
    looking at, but then they changed to the NRS.
                        Is it NRS or NAC?
12
         RUSSELL:
13
         BAUER:
                        Teresa's, correct. Sorry, Mr. Chair, this
    is Jennifer.
14
15
                        Thank you.
         RUSSELL:
                        It's NAC 284.6951.
16
         BAUER:
                        Yeah. Submission of a complaint to the
17
         PARKER:
18
    EMC.
                        Correct. Yeah.
19
         BAUER:
20
         DAVIES:
                        And what part are we looking at?
21
                        And then EMC.
         PARKER:
22
                        Right. I -- I'm sorry, what sub -- is
         DAVIES:
23
    there a subpar paragraph was addressing or?
                        Yeah, it didn't give what that -- what the
24
         PARKER:
25
    281755 is, but, uh, NRS 281755. But Jennifer looked it up and
```

```
found that it had to do with, uh, the breastfeeding. So that
 1
    would not be applicable.
 2
                        You shouldn't have reasonable alternative.
 3
         BAUER:
    So with subsection two.
 4
 5
         PARKER:
                        I have my glasses today. Yeah.
                                                           So that
 6
    doesn't have anything to do with this.
 7
                        Simon, I agree with my first stance then?
         PARKER:
                               This is Gwyn. Can I ask, are we
 8
         DAVIES:
                        Yeah.
    still dealing with agenda item number five or are we ventured
10
    into six?
11
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
                              No, we're -- we're at 57601
    grievance number 7601.
12
                        Okay. All right.
13
         DAVIES:
         BAUER:
                        He is referring to this, otherwise it's
14
    not, if they're not satisfied, it's regarding break times or a
15
   mother of a child under one expression. That's what the NAC
16
    references.
17
                        The 281755.
18
         DAVIES:
         BAUER:
                        Yeah.
                               Mm-hm.
19
20
         DAVIES:
                        Right.
21
                        But the, well, even the other one, um,
         BAUER:
    that if they're not satisfied with the response from the
22
23
    department or agency to 2845243, both of them reference the
    same thing. Either break time or mother to express milk.
2.4
```

25

DAVIES:

Right.

BAUER: So this -- it's --1 It doesn't fall under this. DAVIES: 2 3 BAUER: No, not a bit. All right. I think that this -- the -- we 4 DAVIES: 5 were the wrong venue for the --That's retaliation. She's gotta go 6 BAUER: 7 through a different --8 DAVIES: Yeah. 9 BAUER: -- venue. We were the wrong venue and for several points, and she should have filed the whistleblower 10 11 and --BAUER: Right. 12 13 DAVIES: Sorry, ma'am. That -- sorry, Madam Chair. This is, this is Gwyn. I was, uh, there was a sidebar 14 developing there and -- and I apologize. I'll identify myself 15 16 and say, you know, uh, it's my -- I -- I scanned this down, 17 uh, absolutely refuse to print pages upon pages of redaction. 18 Um, and then my -- my, when I skinned it down and read through what was there to be read, I was of the opinion that, you 19 20 know, it, there was accusations of financial, impropriety, 21 fraud, whatever you wanna call it. And -- and that isn't our 22 venue and should have been felt, uh, as a whistleblower. And, 23 uh, I -- I -- I commend my colleague for punching that out, um, because that's -- that's what I had written down. Um, you

know, and there are protections provided by that. I didn't

24

even write down the protections part. And that's what I'm, uh, commending the council, uh, the committee members for. I just said, we're not the venue for it. And I said that, uh, you know, this one, uh, sorry, wrong place. And as to the issue of, give me the shift, I want, the department has the right to manage and staff per its, uh, per its needs and per its bidding arrangements. So --

PARKER: Awesome.

1.5

DAVIES: -- I open to my fellow two colleagues down here in the South, or yes.

RUSSELL: Teresa Russell for the record, at this point in time, I don't have anything additional to add.

with Gwyn and my colleagues in the North as well regarding the whistleblower and that it's a different venue regarding a different shift. Um, I believe they did try to accommodate her -- her ADA accommodations. I don't know that, um, switching her shift to midnight was, um, wholly accommodating her. Um, unless it was for the safety of the agency, and I believe that is what they were stating. So other than that, um, regarding the accommodation, because the supervisor did state that the, um, physician stated that they could revisit it every three months and they didn't have any other type of health, um, statements stating otherwise.

PARKER: Okay. Yeah.

SCOTT: Pardon me. 1 So I don't know if we wanna go into the 2 PARKER: details of the case itself, you know, 'cause we're not 3 determining merit. Right. Whether or not we have 4 5 jurisdiction. 6 SCOTT: Okay. So, yeah. Other -- other than 7 that, I think the only thing, um, I think they did accommodate her on the things that she was asking for, and other than 9 that, the whistleblower, it's a different venue. 10 Okay. So, um, do you have a motion? PARKER: Ms. Chair. This is Jennifer. Yes. I 11 BAUER: move to answer grievance number 7601 without a hearing based 12 on the fact that the employee, uh, the employee management 13 committee lacks jurisdiction over this matter. 14 Teresa Russell, for the record? 15 RUSSELL: 16 PARKER: Yes. I'll second. 17 RUSSELL: Awesome. We've got a first and a second. 18 PARKER: Any discussion? All those in favor? 19 20 RUSSELL: Aye. 21 BAUER: Aye. 22 SCOTT: Aye. 23 DAVIES: Aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. We'll move 24 PARKER:

25

on to number six, which is 8013.

SCOTT: 1 No -- no. Got 8013. PARKER: 2 I saw a different name there. Oh my God. 3 SCOTT: 8013. Thanks. The event date of the 4 PARKER: 8/2/21. Did I --5 DAVIES: Madam chair? 6 7 PARKER: Yes. This is Gwyn, for the record, I just --8 DAVIES: 9 I'm just asking for clarification. Are we hearing this -- are -- are we -- we're not hearing it in this, I -- I apologize 10 11 for the court terminology. This is before us because the grievance is a correctional sergeant and not a correctional 12 officer. And correctional officers would have been provided 13 with an alternative, uh, venue due to the contract. 14 Is that why it's here? Or should it have gone the other route? 15 16 PARKER: That's what I'm wondering. That's what my 17 notes. 18 DAVIES: Can we refer -- can I -- can that direct that question to Ms. Bo Smith? 19 20 PARKER: Yep. 21 SMITH: Uh, Maggie Bo Smith for the record, um, this grievance, while she is in a job classification and 22 23 medical bargaining unit, um, she, the date of incident determines which happened goes through, so prior to July --24

I'm sorry.

25

PARKER:

```
SMITH:
                        Prior to July 1, 2021. Um, it would have
 1
    come before you anyway. Um, and the date of incident is prior
 2
   to July 1, 2021.
 3
                        Actually, the date event is August 3,
 4
         PARKER:
    2021.
 5
                        Yeah.
                              But Sandie Geyer for the record,
 6
         GEYER:
 7
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
 8
         GEYER:
                        Um, with regards to being in a, uh,
 9
    collective bargaining unit, do they not have the opportunity
    to choose which path they want to go through?
10
11
         SMITH:
                        Maggie Jo Smith, for the record, uh,
   member, Geyer, you are correct. They -- but only in three
12
    cases if they're breathing disciplinary action, uh, for a
13
    suspension, demotion, or dismissal. Um, I'm sorry, I need to
14
    clarify. Uh, Sergeant Banks is in a job prosecution of
15
    correctional sergeant. She is not in a bargaining unit that
16
    is currently covered by exclusive representative. She is in
17
18
    Berkeley, unit J. That is why it's coming before you.
                        That was my question. Thank you.
19
         DAVIES:
20
         PARKER:
                        Thank you.
                        Yeah, I apologize.
21
         SMITH:
                        That's all right. Thank you. All right.
22
         PARKER:
23
         BAUER:
                        Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
24
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
```

So, uh, I think Member Geyer touched on

25

BAUER:

this earlier. This probably is in relation to the previous, uh, grievance and, um, is probably in relation to the similar set of events. Um, however, I think that she is alleging, um, the request for reasonable accommodation was not granted in accordance with her expectations. And she's alleging that the re — the request for reasonable accommodation is, um, being mishandled while serious allegations they do not belong at this venue. Um, those are allegations that the ADA has precedent over and, um, belong in, um, probably the, um, EEOC and or the, um, DHRM EEO unit. I don't want to put in the motion that we limit where the grievance should go for her remedy, although it is not this place. It is not the DMC.

JOHNSON: Nora Johnson for the record. Um, just for

DAVIES:

JOHNSON: Nora Johnson for the record. Um, just for the purposes of a clarifying decision, that doesn't actually steer an employee to a specific path. A decision can be written that while, as an example, while the EMC last jurisdiction relief could be provided in another venue and allow the employee to search that app.

PARKER: Absolutely. Thank you. And I like that.

And none of our -- none of our decisions should actually restrict where an employee can go. You know, that those venues should re determine whether or not they can. I like that. Thank you, Nora. Okay. Yeah, I did have also ADA.

This is in our jurisdiction, so, but, um, anybody else?

I feel the nail's been hit on the head.

1	PARKER:	Mm-hm. Yes.
2	BAUER:	Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
3	PARKER:	Yes.
4	BAUER:	I move to answer grievance number 8013
5	without a hearing b	ased on the fact that EMC lacks
6	jurisdiction. And	then, uh, not part of the motion, but I
7	recommend that our	answer include that language, nor has the
8	standard template language about remedy may be available in	
9	another venue.	
10	PARKER:	That sounds great. We've got a motion.
11	Do we have a second?	
12	RUSSELL:	Teresa Russell for the record. I'll
13	second.	
14	PARKER:	Okay. Any discussion? All those in
15	favor? Aye.	
16	DAVIES:	Aye.
17	RUSSELL:	Aye.
18	JOHNSON:	Aye.
19	PARKER:	Any opposed? Motion carries. Okay, we're
20	gonna move on. 782	1, Pratt, is that right?
21	BAUER:	Mm-hm.
22	PARKER:	Yeah. Kameron Pratt. So anybody wanna
23	start or?	
24	BAUER:	Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
25	PARKER:	Yes.

```
BAUER:
                   Um, the substance of this grievance is
over a written reprimand. And, um, it -- in my recollection
and in my check of the EMC database, there isn't anything
substantially similar to the, um, the complaint here regarding
the written reprimand. And typically because it's a written
reprimand, that's, it's usually so dissimilar that we normally
hear those. So, um, we need to hear this grievance.
                   Motion that we schedule this grievance
     DAVIES:
then.
     PARKER:
                   Are you making the motion already?
                                                       All
right.
                   I -- I -- I'm sorry. I'm just --
     DAVIES:
                   That's okay.
     PARKER:
                   I'm the local engine. The could.
     DAVIES:
push, push, push.
                   All right. We have a -- and we have a
     PARKER:
minute. We still have a -- a exception where we can discuss
too. So we have a motion. Do we have a second?
                    Teresa Russell for the record. I'll
     RUSSELL:
second.
                   All right. Now discussion.
     PARKER:
discussion? I agree with the recommendation and the motion.
Anybody? Okay. All those in favor? Aye.
     MULTIPLE:
                   Aye.
```

Any opposed? I mean, aye. Any opposed?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

PARKER:

Motion carries. That's 7930. Franklin.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.

PARKER: Yes.

1.5

BAUER: Um, uh, I'm gonna ask Teresa to, um, dig into her memory with me please. Uh, I believe the substance of this grievance is over at performance card, and I believe, um, a performance card is not technically considered part of the progressive discipline in the state's processes. So I think, um, as Department of Corrections uses it, I think it's just a matter of coaching in 10 amount to a letter of instruction. Um, it is, Teresa, do you recall similar instances in the 30 years you've been on the EMC?

RUSSELL: Oh, Teresa Russell.

BAUER: Sorry. That was -- that was a compliment because she, Teresa is one of the most tenured members of this committee.

RUSSELL: Um --

DAVIES: This is an earthquake heading that way now.

RUSSELL: Yeah. Teresa Russell, for the record, I'm in agreement that the performance cards are similar to an LOI, however, depending on how worded, which is where we generally can look at them is if, is it strictly an LOI for instructional purposes or does it cross the line into discipline state? If there's anything stating if you do or

don't do something or other, it will proceed into further discipline.

DAVIES: Madam Chair Gwyn, for the record.

PARKER: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DAVIES: Um, I, not to disagree with everything that was said, 'cause I -- I agree with all of it, but my -my reading of the grievance was that the grievance wasn't about the -- the card itself. My -- my reading was, the grievance was about the fact that the card was discussed openly before the grievance was, uh, given the, uh, the action, the card, the correct -- the training, whatever we're gonna call it. And my -- my reading of the grievance is, Hey, if -- if you're going to, uh, adjust my course, adjust my course first with me, not with everybody else in the hallway. And that's my understanding of it. And, uh -- uh, you know, I -- I don't see a challenge to the content of this card at all. I -- I see a, you spoke with everybody else, and then everybody else spoke with me, and then you spoke with me. And, um, I didn't, I was uncomfortable with this because it was, seemed to be based on hearsay all the way through. And then at the very end, uh, in -- in, uh, grievance, the last grievance comment, step three says that they will provide the witness list. Well, if they can get those witnesses to testify, then I believe we should hear them. But if the witnesses don't testify, then it's hearsay and there's no

case. Now that's going beyond the, whether we have jurisdiction and whether we should hear it or not. Um, I -- I know. Um, but I'm just saying that with that in mind, maybe we should allow it.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.

PARKER: Yes.

1.5

BAUER: I -- I agree with Gwyn and thank you Gwyn for pointing out that there's -- there's two parts to this grievance. Um, as it progressed through the steps, there was a little bit of a shift in the concern. Um, however, in the very beginning at step one, the proposed resolution did address the, um, confidential matter, but it also talked about specifically wanting the performance card removed. So step one, proposed rele -- resolution included wanting the performance card removed. And then as it progressed through the steps, um, then the grievance comments shifted to, um, the allegation being of confidentiality being broken and not the performance card. So I'm not sure which it is.

DAVIES: No, I -- I to, uh, this is Gwyn for the record. I -- I -- I totally agree with you. The proposed resolution, um, the, from the second paragraph, furthermore, on, uh, you want the card removed for -- for misconduct of somebody else, uh, that makes no sense whatsoever to me. And -- and this is just to me, you know, uh, I want that road removed because I had a flat tire on. It wasn't, was the

tire's fault that it picked up a nail? Wasn't the road's fault that it was there? So, no, uh, I see no validity in, uh, removing a card because somebody mishandled the card. card -- the card should have been challenged if the card was challengeable, which, uh, to Teresa's wife's counsel on your own seem to agree that the charges, the card is not challengeable unless it's been poorly written, but it's not being challenged on that fact. She wants to, uh, sh -- sh -uh, I'm assuming that, uh, Marquis, Marquis could be male or female. So I -- I will withdraw the sheet. Um, they are assuming that, uh, we're going to remove the card without looking at it just because it was mishandled. I think the question is, was the card -- was the card mishandled? Was the discipline mishandled? Was the training mishandled? -- and with no reference, the card stands as far as I'm concerned. So I would say they're requesting, I would say they're requesting, uh, a grievance on the mishandling of, uh, their disciplinary process, not the content of the process. And my question to the committee is, do we have jurisdiction over that process? Was that process, you know? Right. And this is Stephanie Parker for PARKER: I go further to say on the bottom of that, the record. furthermore, it says, instead of threatening disciplinary

action in an email to all staff, so as Teresa said, you know,

unless they're quoting discipline in some manner attached to

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that, then I -- I -- I think this warrants a hearing for the performance prior for the (inaudible).

RUSSELL: Teresa Russell, for the record, I'm in agree -- I'm in agreement that going off from the documentation, although I will admit I didn't print out more than the grievance itself without knowing the specific -- without knowing the specifics. We don't know if this actually warrants what they did or if they crossed a line. And that would be the purpose of the hearing, is to get further facts.

PARKER: Nice. Okay.

GEYER: Madam Chair, Sandy Geyer for the record.

PARKER: Yes.

GEYER: Um, one of the things that kind of stood out to me was the fact that this was -- this performance card was based on a -- an email that was sent, um, where the grievance indicates that they were looking for guidance and to other internal officers within their same institution. Um, what, in addition to that, I have very serious concerns about the confidentiality. Um, we all have been, um, constructed about the importance of confidentiality. I -- I know, at least in my agency, he signed a confidentiality agreement. And with that comes, uh, a level of responsibility in addition to an understanding that if you break that confidentiality, you have a potential of being reprimand for that. So, you know, while -- while I think that that, you know, we have two

different issues here, um, I do think that -- that it is not, 1 um, it, I -- I don't think that we should ignore the fact 2 that, you know, an actual AR was -- was actually growth 3 violated. And -- and perhaps maybe that is something that we 5 should also consider if we are gonna move forward and have, and place this on for hearing. 6 7 Madam Chair, may I make a motion then? DAVIES: 8 PARKER: Absolutely. 9 DAVIES: I would motion that we schedule this for hearing and request, uh, or advise the, uh, parties that they 10 11 are able to call witnesses and that they should do so. 12 PARKER: Okay. We have a motion, we a second. Teresa Russell for the record. 13 RUSSELL: second. 14 Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye. 15 PARKER: 16 RUSSELL: Aye. 17 **GEYER:** Aye. 18 JOHNSON: Aye. 19 DAVIES: Aye. 20 Any opposed? Motion moves forward. PARKER: 21 Um, Nora Johnson for the record, for the JOHNSON: letter scheduling hearing. It will just be placed in the 22 23 letter that Ms. (inaudible) will go to hearing in this scheduling order. That does line out the procedure for 24

calling witnesses. So that won't be specific in the language.

Then we'll have instruction and always call DHRM for more information.

PARKER: Awesome. Thank you. Okay, we're gonna move on to 7871. Manning.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.

PARKER: Yes.

1.5

BAUER: I -- I feel for this grievance, I sympathize for the concerns that he is bringing up, but there's nothing we can do about the process that the hearings division follows for appeals. So, um, again, concerns about the allegations, concerns about the process, and whether it's being adhered to or not, but nothing we can do for him.

GEYER: Madam Chair, Sandie Geyer for the record.

Um, I agree with, uh, Jennifer, that, um, I -- I think that
this is outside of our jurisdiction.

PARKER: All right. Any, uh, any other comments?

I'm in agreement. I, Stephanie, for the record. Oh, go
ahead, Gwyn.

DAVIES: Sorry. You're in agreement, ma'am. Okay.

I'm -- I'm just -- I'm -- I'm just, are we thinking inside the box too rigidly when we say there's nothing we can do? It's just a question. 'Cause the proposal resolution is that he's -- he's been, again, Manning Scott -- Scott Manning. Okay.

He's, he's saying that he's, he's suffered an injustice due to the fact that a process has not been followed correctly. And

-- and for us to say, well go back to that process, seems that we'd be failing someone. I mean, I just wanna say, you know, this -- this, I think this person has a right to be heard, even if -- if all we can say is yes, we hear you, and you have been, and we'll stand by that decision. He's asking for, uh, suspension to be set aside and, and charges to be removed from his record and back pay for the suspended period to be received. That's the kind of thing that we should be able to handle. Why is he asking to come to us? Because another process has failed him. Uh, I'm -- I'm just afraid that we're gonna go, well, we're not the right venue. Well, what venue does this man have? Uh, he, you know, he feels he has a right to be heard. And I think he does have a right to be heard. And I think we can -- I think we should schedule it for a hearing and, and, uh, hear him. And then if it's not shown, it's not shown. If it is shown, let's try and do something. But --

JOHNSON: Nora Johnson for the record.

PARKER: Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHNSON: Um, just definitional, uh, procedural, the grievance process is for something that arises an injustice that arises between the employee-employer relationships. And while his suspension, when you follow through in the hearing, officer process did qualify in that grieving the hearing officers who are not actually his employer, may not be

appropriate. 1 Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. BAUER: 2 Did -- did you -- did you have a follow up 3 PARKER: 4 to that Gwyn? 5 DAVIES: No, I -- I -- I -- I hear it. And 6 -- and those are the arguments being made. And -- and I have a nasty want to agree with those comments, but I also have a 7 8 -- a fear, uh, a fear that we may fail in -- in our mission. 9 PARKER: I -- and I think, and let, if I can, I think what you're saying is there, but we put language in 10 11 there that there are other venues that may be more appropriate. 12 13 DAVIES: Yes. Like we do with the other ones that we 14 PARKER: 1.5 don't have jurisdiction over. 16 DAVIES: What are the venues? That's what, I don't know. That's what I'm afraid that -- that we say there are 17 18 other venues, but what are, so I don't wanna send him back to a hearing master who hasn't scheduled him for hearing, is he, 19 20 you know. 21 Okay. Understood. Jennifer Bauer. PARKER: 22 BAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Jennifer. 23 So, um, I understand your concerns, Gwyn, and I -- I agree. It -- it seems that the process may or may not have failed 24

this agreement, but the problem is we don't exist. And so to

Nora's point, we don't exist to adjudicate matters that rise to the level of where a hearings officer needs to hear them and decide upon those, because hearings officers in the appeals division, or hearings division, I forget what they're called, um, that's a quasi or actual judicial proceeding.

Those, those hearings officers have a juror's doctorate. So that process exists in a much more, um, judicial manner for a reason. And so, DAG I think you can correct me if I'm wrong, but the venue, if a grievance or if an employee has a concern with that process, would be a court of competent jurisdiction.

1.5

WEISS: Yeah, that's correct. I mean, there's no,
I mean, this -- this body has no ability to tell the hearings
division or the hearings officers how they should be doing
anything. Um, it would be a completely flat recommendation,
uh, if it were to be made.

PARKER: Okay. So I think -- so that probably answers the question and may -- maybe that is helpful for your question. When is, um, it would refer them to a court of comp T whatever. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Nora Johnson, for the record. I know that should an employee go through the hearing officer's process, and this is just procedural, uh, procedural FYI, if an employee goes through the hearings officer's division for an appeal of suspension, demotion, dismissal, or voluntary transfer, if they do not like the outcome of that, they can't

file for judicial review. It is on their dime and their time, however that may be, and again, with the appropriate language in a letter, that may be a venue that they could follow. If they wanted to fight with the hearing officers regarding their processes that handled, it would be judicial review.

2.4

GEYER: Madam Chair, Sandie Geyer for the record.

Um, thank you, Nora, because that is absolutely the correct venue for -- for that process. However, um, since this grievance now has filed a grievance and did not file for judicial review, they are probably going to be out of time in being able to file for that -- for that, uh, for that judicial review.

that could be procedurally correct. I'm not even remotely arguing with, uh, member Geyer. I know we have received appeals that may or may not have been filed in a timely manner. And even as the intake clerk, it was not up to us to make that determination. It would be the hearing officer upon their intake, and they could strike it down immediately for lack of timeliness, or depending on the documentation and evidence submitted could go a different way. That it's, but member Geyer is absolutely correct about the window. Oh, sure.

PARKER: Thank you, counsel.

WEISS: Yeah, I, um, Madam Chair, just to clarify

how that process would go, um, at -- at this point, he would've to file, uh, some sort of writ in a -- in a court of proper jurisdiction, arguing that something that legally needs to be done has not been done. And the court needs to enforce that to be done. Um, he couldn't file a petition for judicial review yet because there hasn't been a final determination by the hearings officers. The court would say there's nothing final for us to -- to review at this stage. So it's kind of a, it'd be kind of a two-step process, um, for Mr. Manning. But that's what he would've to do to force the hearing officer's hand in, you know, hearing the matter and rendering a decision.

PARKER: Thank you.

1.5

DAVIES: So we're agreed. It's not in our wheelhouse then, but the only thing we're -- are we gonna stick with the alternative venues phrasing, or are we going to go with advise judicial review and just leave it at that without being specific? Stick to the alternative venues.

PARKER: Stick to the alternative venues. I think.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. Um, consistent with the advice that we just received from the DAG, I think we should definitely steer clear of advising any legal process. Um, and we definitely should, uh, steer clear of advising judicial review because it appears this might not be at that step, and that's not our, um, advice to give.

1	PARKER:	And it may send them in a
2	BAUER:	It it would be improper to advise on
3	that matter.	
4	PARKER:	Awesome. Okay. Do we have a motion?
5	GEYER:	Madam Chair, Sandy Geyer for the record, I
6	motion that we, um,	do not have this grievance move forward
7	with a hearing, but	in our decision to make reference that
8	there is other venu	es that, uh, similar to what we are saying
9	in our other grieva	nces, where we're indicating that they have
10	another opportunity	at a different venue to proceed.
11	PARKER:	Okay. So we have a motion. Do we have a
12	second?	
13	RUSSELL:	Teresa Russell for the record. I'll
14	second.	
15	PARKER:	Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye.
16	GEYER:	Aye.
17	RUSSELL:	Aye.
18	BAUER:	Aye.
19	PARKER:	Any opposed? Oops. Sorry.
20	DAVIES:	I I'm gonna vote no.
21	PARKER:	One nay. And a motion carries. We're
22	gonna move on to nu	mber 10, which is Avram Avram. That's
23	the book I made my	notes.
24	DAVIES:	This is 8208 Avram.
25	PARKER:	Mm-hm. Ready?

DAVIES: I'm ready to give a motion. 1 I know. PARKER: 2 Motion that we answer this as we've 3 DAVIES: answered the others with regards to the Governor's mandate. 4 5 We don't have an authority. So, okay. So that's his motion. 6 PARKER: I'11 7 wait until discussion. What was the motion? 8 BAUER: 9 PARKER: Can you say your motion again? I'm sorry. Uh, I apologize. This is Gwyn 10 DAVIES: 11 for the record. I didn't identify myself earlier. Uh, again, 12 I apologize. Um, motion that we answer this grievance is we have answered other grievances, uh, of a similar nature. 13 we do not ha -- this motion, uh, is beyond the scope of our 14 15 jurisdiction. We don't have the authority to address the 16 governor's mandate. Okay. We have a motion. 17 PARKER: 18 BAUER: Ms. Chair, friendly amendment. PARKER: Yes. 19 20 This is Jennifer. When were you on the BAUER: 21 committee or were you on the hearing two weeks ago I think you chaired it, correct? 22 23 DAVIES: Yes, ma'am. I accept your friendly amendment. 2.4

Go wait, go ahead.

25

PARKER:

BAUER: So the friendly amendment would be that, um, we move to answer grievance number 8208 without a hearing based on, um, previous decisions and that the E M C lacks ju lacks the authority to supersede a Governor's mandate. Is that what you recall Gwyn?

DAVIES: Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RUSSELL: Teresa Russell, for the record, I'll second.

second. PARKER: So does he have to say that he accepted her amendment? Gwyn, did you accept that that amendment? I did. I -- I knew what Jennifer was DAVIES: gonna say and I accepted it before you said it, because --PARKER: Okay. Awesome. Okay, so we got a first, a second. And, uh, first in amendment, accepted amendment. And a second. Any discussion? I have a question on this one. Um, although I -- I -- I completely agree, we don't have any authority to change the Governor's mandate. I thought that there were still questions in here that the, uh, employee was asking their employer, which still have not been answered, and some things that the employer should have been able to answer. Okay. You're gonna make me look at it, aren't you? So I -- I don't know that home testing was answered yet. Um, and then he wanted to know who would be receiving his PHI. the only two. I mean, I don't know. It's simple as that has

nothing to do with, um, but it's an answer. His resolution is

get answers for those questions. Oh, no.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.

PARKER: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Um, I sympathize with, um, an employee's BAUER: concerns about not getting answers to questions, but I hesitate to hear grievance on this matter, um, for which we have received countless grievances, um, just to get an employee an answer. Um, because the -- the vaccination and the testing guidance has been pretty clear on how the testing will be conducted. So, um, I -- I don't think that any home testing or anything like that was in the guidance that's provided by, and the, the directive that's been provided by the Governor, um, the, um, personal health information, um, is -- it's a path we may not want to go down as an employee management committee because yes, we can hear the matter and we can provide an open public venue for which a lot of work will go into it to get an employee an answer. But that's not our realm to -- to delve into protected information like PHI because, um, uh, a lot of the concerns that people have regarding their medical information, a lot of people like to throw around, um, that it's a violation of HIPAA and it's not.

PARKER: Right.

BAUER: And the EEOC has opined on that. So that's a sticky widget that I don't know, we want to go down as an EMC, um, and provide an open meeting on that subject

```
where it's not our role to, um, adjudicate matters that
involve HIPAA. Does that make sense? Or that don't?
                    Well, yeah. Discussing, yeah. HIPAA,
     PARKER:
yeah. My -- my thing is that my -- I guess what my stance was
was the relationship between an employee and employer or an
employee asked a question. I don't care how trivial it is.
mean, or, and -- and it, it looks like a simple answer
actually. You know? But if you can't even get that, or this
person can't get Elizabeth, okay, so if this person cannot get
that, that's what I'm basing it on. I -- I know we can't do
anything about the others, but, um, yeah, that just was an
issue I have. I -- and -- and I don't wanna lump everything
into just because they're related to vaccines and testing
because the, this one was not similar to the other ones that
I've read that had to do with that because it actually had
still had unanswered questions that should have been able to
be answered. So I don't know. Any other discussion?
Now call for a vote.
    BAUER:
                    Aye.
                    All those in favor? You can't do it yet.
    PARKER:
All those in favor?
    RUSSELL:
                    Aye.
     GEYER:
                   Aye.
    BAUER:
                   Aye.
     DAVIES:
                    Aye.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
1
         PARKER:
                        Any opposed? I'm abstaining. Yeah, I'm
 2
    opposing.
 3
         UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:
                                        I -- I oppose.
                                                        I just I do
    too. Yeah. Based on the fact that, you know, that there's
 4
 5
    unanswered questions within the grievance and while core of
 6
   the grievance -- the grievance itself on the mandate cannot be
 7
    addressed through this venue, um, I think that there was not
    due diligence done on behalf of the, uh, agency for that, the
 9
    tally.
10
                        So what's our tally now? So I know we
         PARKER:
11
    have two up here that are nay or were there any down there?
                        Madam Chair?
12
         JOHNSON:
                        No. Yeah. Oh, sorry. Sorry.
13
         PARKER:
                        For the record, I have the vote. Uh, four
14
         JOHNSON:
1.5
    two.
16
         PARKER:
                        Thank you. Okay.
                        With, um, chair Parker and member guy
17
         JOHNSON:
18
    voting a.
                        Okay. All right. So the motion carries.
19
         PARKER:
20
         DAVIES:
                        Um --
21
                        Oh.
         PARKER:
22
                        Just one procedural thing.
         DAVIES:
23
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
                        Um, Nora, you stated the nays names, but
24
         DAVIES:
   there wasn't a roll call vote. So you strike those names,
25
```

1 please. They can be struck from the record for the 2 JOHNSON: meeting, but normally we do put it in the motion. 3 PARKER: 4 Okay. 5 DAVIES: I've just, again, it wasn't a roll call 6 vote, so name shouldn't have been quoted is all I'm saying. 7 Right -- right. Okay. PARKER: That can be put placed in the minutes for 8 JOHNSON: 9 sure. 10 Thank you. DAVIES: 11 PARKER: Thanks. Motion carries. So now we're gonna move to grievance number 8003. Duffy. 12 Do you want this? 13 WEISS: Ms. Chair. This is Jennifer. 14 BAUER: Yes. 15 PARKER: 16 BAUER: Um, I think that this grievance is, um, alleging something similar to many of the other grievances 17 18 that we've heard or will, um, or not her, but read or we'll read and discuss today. But, um, she's alleging bullying and 19 20 intimidation for mandating, um, a virus enforcing discipline. And, um, that's not anything that we have jurisdiction over. 21 22 PARKER: Anyone else. Is that her job? She's just 23 with her. Yeah. Teresa Russell for the record. 24 RUSSELL:

25

PARKER:

Yes.

```
1
         RUSSELL:
                        I'm in agreement with Jennifer. This
    seems to be the closest grievance subject matter that, um,
 2
    we've had the prior hearing on and the fact that we do not
 3
    have jurisdiction over harassment or intimidation.
 4
 5
         PARKER:
                        Okay. Anybody else?
         BAUER:
                        Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
 6
 7
         PARKER:
                        Yep.
                        I'm believe that we answer grievance
 8
         BAUER:
    number 80038 on EMC previous decisions and the fact that the
10
    committee does not have authority to supersede a Governor's
11
    mandate.
                        Teresa Russell, for the record?
12
         RUSSELL:
13
    second.
14
         PARKER:
                        Okay. We got a first and a second. Yeah.
    Any discussion? Hearing none. All in favor?
15
16
         GEYER:
                        Aye.
17
         JOHNSON:
                        Aye.
18
         DAVIES:
                        Aye.
19
         RUSSELL:
                        Aye.
20
         BAUER:
                        Aye.
21
                        Any opposed? Motion carries.
         PARKER:
                                                         Yes.
                                                               This
22
    8004. Matthew.
23
         BAUER:
                        Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
24
25
         BAUER:
                        Um, just like the committee meeting two
```

weeks ago, I sympathize with all these grievance. I -- I sympathize with their -- their concerns over, um, a very contentious and very political issue that is occurring. But again, we don't have the ability to provide them any rev, we don't have any jurisdiction over this matter. It's a Governor's directive under an emergency declaration.

1.5

PARKER: Right. And let me ask you guys a question. Are we just telling that this is not the proper venue? We are not the venue. We -- the other thing is we are not the venue for this, because this one also cites how hostile work environment, so on -- on any of these that are citing harassment or we are not the venue and I'm thinking that they need to just be told that there's other venues.

BAUER: Well, so I don't think we wanna go down that path. Yes, there are other venues obviously available that someone can pursue. Um, the definition of hostile work environment is, um, very clearly stated and it must be in accordance with a protected class. And, um, the unvaccinated or not a protected class, EEOC has opined on that matter. So I don't think we wanna go down that sticky widget path. Um, if -- if a grievance or anyone for that matter has concerns about a Governor's declaration and a Governor's emergency director -- directed pursuant to, they're more than welcome to pursue it legally in a court. But, um, I don't know that we wanna even go down the path of whether there is a hostile work

environment allegation and whether that allegation is valid. So I would be in favor with a motion consistent with the rest of the motions for this same exact issue or the same exact grievance substance.

PARKER: Okay. So I -- and -- and so I -- in reviewing the letters from the previous decisions, I have an issue with using the same NAC for different things. And so, because based on that 284.695, the AMC lacks jurisdiction 284.695 does not say that we don't have jurisdiction. It says if we don't have jurisdiction. So, and we referenced that and just, uh, I -- I don't know, and I could be wrong, but I looked at it earlier and I thought.

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. Um, I -- I appreciate your concerns and um, um, I believe 695 mentions that an employee or EMC can decide to not hear or decide on the, um, grievance without a hearing based on previous decisions and getting to it. Um, or if the matter does not fall within its jurisdiction. So I -- I think you're looking at --

PARKER: Looking at this entire state.

BAUER: And I see 284.695, um, subsection one answer the request without a hearing. If the case is based on the committee's previous decisions or does not fall within the jurisdiction.

PARKER: So to say, based on NAB 284.695, the EMC

1.5

_ -

last jurisdiction over the substance of this grievance and does not have the authority to supersede a mandate from the Governor. That right there tells me that that's based on 284.635 and that's not accurate. You know what I mean?

BAUER: It is, but the -- the language probably should reference that we're decided consistent with previous decisions instead.

JOHNSON: Nora Johnson for the record.

PARKER: Okay.

JOHNSON: Um, the, the first letter, uh, decision number 2921, excuse me, and 3021, uh, show that the EMC elect jurisdiction over the substance of the grievance cannot supersede the Governor's mandate. That court was taken in reference to decisions 29 and 30 to show that that was -- those were the prior decision numbers for the reasons of the forthcoming decisions. That template letter has been used with clarifying language as to why the EMC lacks jurisdiction for at least two to three years before I even landed in this office.

DAVIES: So --

BAUER: Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. So for these letters that Stephanie is looking at, or sorry, Ms. Chair is looking at, um, are the original decisions for the substance of this grievance that we're discussing, right?

JOHNSON: 29-21 and 30-21, Andrews and Kaplan.

BAUER: Yep. 1 Were the original decisions. JOHNSON: 2 BAUER: Perfect. 3 Being used as the precedent's for the 4 JOHNSON: 5 prior decision? 6 BAUER: Perfect. So these cases are the precedent 7 that we are relying upon for the decisions to answer the grievances without a hearing today. So that the language would be, um, as I'm about to move in a motion, the language would be slightly different that based on NACS 284.695, um, we 10 11 are answering the grievance without a hearing based on previous decisions and that we do not have authority to 12 supersede a mandate from the Governor. 13 14 PARKER: That -- that would make better sense. 15 Yeah, that would make sense. Yeah. If these haven't gone out 16 yet though, right? Yes, they have. Ms. Chair, Jennifer again. So these 17 BAUER: 18 letters I believe you're looking at are from the original cases. 19 20 PARKER: From October and November. 21 Yeah. From the, the very first time the BAUER: committee heard grievances on related to this -- this matter. 22 23 Yeah. 2.4 PARKER: Okay.

So what we're -- what we're looking at

25

BAUER:

today is whether we decide to hear these grievances or answer that hearing based on these cases that came before the committee last month.

PARKER: Okay.

BAUER: This is Jennifer, again, for the record. So to your point, I agree that this language exactly verbatim doesn't apply to these cases today. Um, and the motions and the answers and the letters subsequently, I think look a little different.

PARKER: Okay.

BAUER: And not say that, um, lack jurisdiction say that we're presiding based on previous decisions and that we can supersede a government.

PARKER: Okay.

BAUER: Is that helpful?

PARKER: I can do that, yeah.

BAUER: Okay.

PARKER: Yeah, that, sorry.

GEYER: Madam Chair, Sandie Geyer for the record, I agree with my colleague, Jennifer, that that would be the appropriate language going forward. Uh, not only for these grievances today with regards to the same subject matter, but any grievances that we may hear in the future, we should be consistent in referencing, uh, the language that has already been discussed in that motion by Jennifer.

1	PARKER:	Agree. Awesome. Thank you. Anybody
2	else? So you made	a motion, Jennifer made a motion and I
3	interrupted her and	l I'm sorry. But, um, but I thank you for
4	your clarification.	So you're revising your your motion to
5	include that langua	age, right? Or for
6	BAUER:	It did.
7	PARKER:	Okay.
8	BAUER:	It had, I can restate it if you want.
9	PARKER:	Um, now does anybody need her to restate
10	it? 'Cause I	
11	RUSSELL:	Yes, please.
12	PARKER:	Okay.
13	BAUER:	I move that we answer grievance number 804
14	without a hearing k	pased on EMC's previous decisions and the
15	fact that it does r	not have the authority to supersede a
16	Governor's mandate.	
17	RUSSELL:	Thank you.
18	PARKER:	Awesome. Thanks. Got a motion? Do we
19	have a second?	
20	SCOTT:	Ms. Mary Jo Scott, I second that motion.
21	PARKER:	Is there any discussion? All those in
22	favor?	
23	RUSSELL:	Aye.
24	DAVIES:	Aye.
25	GEYER:	Aye.

1	BAUER:	Aye.	
2	JOHNSON:	Aye.	
3	PARKER:	Oh, sorry. Any opposed? Motion carries.	
4	Next.		
5	DAVIES:	Madam chair?	
6	PARKER:	Yes.	
7	DAVIES:	Before we go, uh, is this Gwyn for the	
8	record. Madam Chair, before we go onto the next item, item		
9	11, can I suggest that we take a break seeing as how my pills		
10	make me want to go somewhere?		
11	PARKER:	That will work. Okay. We'll go ahead and	
12	take a break and let's come back at 10:25 at that time.		
13	DAVIES:	Yes ma'am.	
14		[RECESS]	
14 15	DAVIES:	[RECESS] Can you hear us?	
	DAVIES: PARKER:		
15		Can you hear us?	
15 16	PARKER:	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like	
15 16 17	PARKER: DAVIES:	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like	
15 16 17 18	PARKER: DAVIES: they're having the	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like same issues.	
15 16 17 18	PARKER: DAVIES: they're having the PARKER:	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like same issues. All righty.	
15 16 17 18 19 20	PARKER: DAVIES: they're having the PARKER: DAVIES: PARKER:	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like same issues. All righty. Yay.	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PARKER: DAVIES: they're having the PARKER: DAVIES: PARKER:	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like same issues. All righty. Yay. I saw you guys with your thumbs up all	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PARKER: DAVIES: they're having the PARKER: DAVIES: PARKER: down there. All reserved.	Can you hear us? We can't hear you. I just got a green ring. It looks like same issues. All righty. Yay. I saw you guys with your thumbs up all	

you might not be able to hear that. 1 Sorry. Can you guys Okay, say something 2 BAUER: so I can see if I can hear you. 3 Ook followed by shim, Shama. Flemmi, 4 DAVIES: 5 Flay. PARKER: Okay. That's better. 6 7 Spell those words. Nora. I, dare you. DAVIES: Nora Johnson. For the record. Sometimes 8 JOHNSON: 9 when I'm typing fast enough, my regular words probably do actually spell that out verbatim. 10 11 DAVIES: Are we back on the record, ma'am? PARKER: Yep, that's on the record. Number 13 8001 12 13 Burge. Burge. Sorry. JOHNSON: Think it looks like Burge. 14 Okay, Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. 15 BAUER: 16 PARKER: Yep. I'm just rereading me to make sure that 17 BAUER: 18 it's substantially similar and, um, I do see that it is substantially similar. So, um, motion. 19 20 PARKER: All right. 21 Um, Jennifer Bauer, for the record, I move BAUER: that we answer grievance number 8011 without a hearing based 22 23 on EMC's previous decisions. And the fact that it lacks jurisdiction is superseded Governor's mandate lacks authority, 24

sorry, authority to supersede a Governor's mandate.

25

1	PARKER:	Right. We've got a motion. Do we have a
2	second?	
3	DAVIES:	This is Gwyn. I'd like to second that.
4	PARKER:	Any discussion? All those in favor? Aye.
5	RUSSELL:	Aye.
6	GEYER:	Aye.
7	BAUER:	Aye.
8	JOHNSON:	Aye.
9	PARKER:	Motion carries. Moving on to 8012. Is,
10	um, Rizzi Rizzi.	Second page. Oh, page like Pleasant
11	Bill. We don't have	e those phones anymore.
12	DAVIES:	We have to change some settings.
13	BAUER:	Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
14	PARKER:	Yes.
15	BAUER:	I see that this grievance is, um, almost a
16	copy paste of other	s that we have looked at. So, um, I don't
17	see anything differ	ent here, and I'm ready with almost
18	whenever you're ready.	
19	PARKER:	Ready.
20	BAUER:	Jennifer Bauer, for the record, I move
21	that we answer grie	vance number 8012 based on EMC's previous
22	decisions and the fa	act that it lacks authority to supersede a
23	Governor's mandate.	
24	PARKER:	A motion. Do we have a second?

GEYER: Second.

```
1
         PARKER:
                        Sandie Geyer. Second. Any discussion?
    All those in favor?
 2
 3
         GEYER:
                        Aye.
         PARKER:
                        Aye.
 4
 5
         RUSSELL:
                        Aye.
 6
         DAVIES:
                        Aye.
 7
                        Yes. Yes, ma'am. Okay. Motion carried.
         PARKER:
    All right, so the next one, 15 is, uh, Gutierrez, um, 8015.
 8
 9
         BAUER:
                        Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
10
         PARKER:
                        Yep.
11
         BAUER:
                        I move that we answer grievance number
    8015 based on EMC's previous decisions and the fact that it
12
    lacks authority to supersede a Governor's mandate.
13
14
         PARKER:
                        And we've got a motion. Do we have a
    second?
15
                        This is Gwyn. I'll second it.
16
         DAVIES:
                        Any discussion? All those in favor?
17
         PARKER:
18
         RUSSELL:
                        Aye.
         GEYER:
                        Aye.
19
20
         DAVIES:
                        Aye.
21
         BAUER:
                        Aye.
22
                        Any opposed? Motion carries.
         PARKER:
                                                         8023
23
    Whitaker. Next.
                        Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
24
         BAUER:
25
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
```

```
1
         BAUER:
                        I move that we answer grievance number
    8023 without a hearing based on EMC's previous decisions and
 2
    the fact that it lacks authority to supersede a Governor's
 3
   mandate.
 5
         PARKER:
                        All right. We've got a motion.
                                                          Do we
 6
   have a second?
                        Teresa Russell for the record. I'll
 7
         RUSSELL:
    second.
 8
 9
         PARKER:
                        Any discussion? All those in favor?
10
        MULTIPLE:
                        Aye.
11
         PARKER:
                        Any opposed? Motion carries. Next one,
    8075 Gibbons.
12
                        Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
13
         BAUER:
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
14
15
         BAUER:
                        I move that we answer grievance number
    8075 based on EM -- without a hearing based on EMC's previous
16
    decisions and the fact that it lacks authority to supersede a
17
    Governor's mandate.
18
                        Got a motion. Do we have a second.
19
         PARKER:
20
         SCOTT:
                        Mary Jo Scott, for the record. I second
21
   the motion.
22
                        Okay. Is there any discussion? All those
         PARKER:
23
    in favor?
2.4
         MULTIPLE:
                        Aye.
25
         PARKER:
                        Any opposed? Motion carries.
                                                        Next on the
```

agenda number 18, um, 8079. Graham. 1 You mean Johnson, ma'am. DAVIES: 2 PARKER: Huh? 3 Oh, Graham, I heard Brown. I apologize. 4 DAVIES: 5 PARKER: Jason Graham, what did you hear? DAVIES: I heard Brown. 6 7 Oh, sorry. It's my mask. PARKER: Sorry. It's Jason Graham. 8 DAVIES: 9 BAUER: Ms. Chair this is Jennifer. I'm sorry, Gwyn, go ahead. 10 PARKER: 11 DAVIES: I got confused. I apologize to everybody for, uh, interrupting the process, but I need clarification to 12 make sure we're on the same one. 13 PARKER: That's all right -- that's all right. 14 Continue. Jennifer Bauer. 1.5 16 BAUER: Jennifer Bauer. For the record, I move that we answer grievance number 079 without a hearing based 17 18 on EMC's previous decisions and the fact that it lacks to or authority to answer or, wow, I'm getting tired. Start over. 19 20 Jennifer Bauer for the record. Oh, I -- I move that we answer grievance number 8079 without a hearing based on EMC previous 21 decisions and the fact that it lacks authority to supersede a 22 23 Governor's mandate. We've got a motion. Do we have a second? 2.4 PARKER:

Teresa Russell. I'll second.

25

RUSSELL:

1	PARKER:	Any discussion? All those in favor?
2	MULTIPLE:	Aye.
3	PARKER:	Any opposed? Motion carries. Number 19
4	is 8094 for Hall.	
5	BAUER:	Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer.
6	PARKER:	Yes.
7	BAUER:	I move that we answer grievance number
8	8094 without a hear	ing based on EMC's previous decisions and
9	the fact that it la	cks authority to supersede a Governor's
10	mandate.	
11	PARKER:	We have a motion. Do we have a second?
12	GEYER:	Sandie Geyer. I second that motion.
13	PARKER:	Okay. Discussion. All those in favor?
14	MULTIPLE:	Aye.
15	PARKER:	Any opposed? So moved. Number 20 is
16	number 8139 Demaline.	
17	BAUER:	Ms. Chair, this is Jennifer. I move that
18	we answer grievance	number 8139 without a hearing based on the
19	EMC's previous deci	sions and that it locks authority to
20	supersede a Governo	r's mandate.
21	PARKER:	Awesome. Got a motion. Do we have a
22	second?	
23	DAVIES:	Davies Gwyn. I'll second.
24	PARKER:	Any discussion. All in favor?
25	MULTIPLE:	Aye.

PARKER: Any opposed? So moved. Uh, next on the agendas item number 21, public comment. No voter action may be taken upon a matter raised during public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda 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 name for the record, any public comment in the south? DAVIES: Nobody. We --Nobody. RUSSELL: All right. Anything in the North? Seeing PARKER: none. Look for adjournment. DAVIES: Yay. PARKER: 10 --

DAVIES: Life I'm giving myself, I -- I held on as long as I could before I had the call for audio break.

PARKER: Thank you staff. Gosh. All right. Thank you guys. Thank you. I'll take those.

JOHNSON: Thank you everybody. Bye.

MULTIPLE: Bye.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PARKER: All right, now let's finish the discussion. Yes. That's the stuff I do. I care about all this. That's stuff. You're good. I brag on somebody for coming back late, so, so, you know, I gotta get.

WEISS: We also want things by you. Uh, just sort

of the temperature check. Yeah. The show Burton and Night have. PARKER: *** END OF MEETING ***