1		STATE OF NEVADA
2	EM	PLOYEE-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
3		MEETING TRANSCRIPT
4		APRIL 7, 2022
5		
6	PARKER:	Gwyn, I've been speaking with you.
7	DAVIES:	Yes, ma'am.
8	PARKER:	Thank you.
9	DAVIES:	I don't see you on the screen. That's all
10	PARKER:	Okay, no problem. We're here today.
11	DAVIES:	All right, I'll I'll go ahead and, uh,
12	mute if you're ready. I can	
13	PARKER:	Thank you.
14	MERRILL:	I'm using your phone.
15	PARKER:	We'll go ahead and start at nine o'clock
16	and then if you get	it, just write it down and bring it over.
17	JEANINE:	Perfect.
18	MERRILL:	I just have something who has it? Yeah.
19	PARKER:	Okay, we'll go ahead and start. It's nine
20	o'clock. Um, and we know people have busy schedules today.	
21	Um, I'm gonna call this meeting to ordered Thursday, April 7,	
22	2022. The Employee Management Committee. Um, it is 9:00 a.m.	
23	We have two meeting places, Grant Sawyer building in Southern	
24	Nevada and Las Vegas and, uh, Nevada State Library and	
25	Archives in Carson	City. I normally have a script, so forgive

me. Um, so in the North, if there's an emer -- I'm just gonna give some quick instructions. In the North, if there's an emergency, we're gonna go out the doors, depending on the emergency, we'll either go across Stewart or into the quad area, um, on the west side of the building and in Southern Nevada. Uh, can you give brief safety instructions down there? Is, uh -- is it co-chair dow -- down there?

DAVIES: I am not, yes.

PARKER: Thank you.

2.4

DAVIES: In the event of emergency, we'll head out that door, head east out to the parking lot and make sure everybody gets out the building okay. Um, and that's pretty much it.

PARKER: Okay. Awesome. So people in the North and the South buildings, I want you to remember to speak loud and clearly towards the -- wherever the camera is. 'Cause that's probably where your microphone's gonna be, so that everybody can hear you. We've got people that are, um, uh, as a -- a courtesy are -- are able to participate online. We wanna make sure that we can hear them and that they can hear us. So we'll keep side conversations to a minimum. Um, thank you. And, uh, then I'm gonna go ahead and move now to public comment. Is there anybody in the south wishing to make public comment?

DAVIES: We have nobody in the South wishing to

make public comment at this time ma'am 1 PARKER: Okay. Let me just, um, give this 2 disclaimer. No voter action may be taken upon a matter raised 3 during public comment until the matter itself has been 4 5 specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to five minutes 6 per person, and person's commenting will be asked to begin by 7 stating their name for the record. Is there any public comment online? Is there any public comment in Northern Nevada? Hearing none and seeing no actions on the screen in 10 11 front of me. We'll go ahead and move on to committee introductions and meeting overview. Um, start in the South 12 for Committee members. 13 Uh, present in the south, uh, is myself. 14 DAVIES: Uh, I'm Gwyn Davies. I am co-vice chair and I'm an employee 15 16 of the Department of Motor Vehicles. Todd Weiss, Deputy Attorney General. 17 WEISS 18 WRIGHT: I'm Ivory Wright, the EMC Clerk. Mary Jo Scott. I'm remote and I work at 19 SCOTT: 20 OPM Smart 21. 21 And then we'll go Northern -- Northern. PARKER: 22 MERRILL: Good morning, Ms. Mechelle Merrill, I work 23 for Locational Rehabilitation. Stephanie Parker and I work for NDOC. 2.4 PARKER:

Nora Johnson, Division of Human Resource

25

JOHNSON:

Management, Consultation and Accountability. Okay. Um, and then just wanna make sure PARKER: 2 that everybody signs in. And for the record -- since we have 3 people that are online. Nora, do you -- do you want them to 5 just say their names? I'm gonna go to the -- for the record for attendance. 6 7 That would be fine. JOHNSON: Okay. So, um, I can't read their names. 8 PARKER: 9 Sorry. Uh, Mr. Stolk, can you introduce yourself? Give us your name. Well, actually --10 11 MICHAEL: uh, correctional --PARKER: Oh yeah, go ahead and do it. I'm sorry, I 12 13 interrupted you. MICHAEL: Correctional Officer Michael Stolk. 14 Awesome. Um, and Senator. 15 PARKER: Senator Pete Goicoechea Present in Carson PETE: 16 17 City. 18 PARKER: Awesome. And then we have Tim and Deb Debra Boone-Sharp, State Prison Correction 19 DEBRA: 20 Officer. 21 Lieutenant Timothy Jones the State prison. TIMOTHY: 22 PARKER: Awesome, thank you. I just wanted to make 23 sure that we got that for the attendance record. Um, so next we're gonna move on to adoption of the agenda. 24

25

MERRILL:

We have a motion to draft chair to adopt

1 the agenda. We have a motion. 2 PARKER: Second Madam Chair is Gwyn Davies for the record. 3 DAVIES: I second. 4 5 PARKER: Okay. Any discussion? All those in 6 favor? 7 DAVIES: Aye. 8 MULTIPLE: Aye. 9 PARKER: Any opposed? So moved. We're gonna move on the next agenda items. I'm gonna take things out of order. 10 First I'm going to -- I -- I'd like to be able to entertain 11 somebody making a motion potentially. Um, and knowing if 12 there's any objections to combining agenda items number five, 13 six, seven, eight group for even 6607, 6612, 6620 and 6627, as 14 1.5 they've all are asking for the same thing, using the same criteria for what they're asking for. Um, and just the same 16 reasoning. All four of them have one, um, witness I do know 17 18 that's tied on a schedule, so I'll entertain a motion to combine those. 19 20 DAVIES: Madam Chair, this is Gwyn Davies for the record. Uh, so motion. 21 Okay. And second. 22 PARKER: 23 MERILL: Uh, Madam Chair, Michelle Merrill, for the record. Second motion. 24

Any discussion? All those in favor?

25

PARKER:

```
MULTIPLE:
 1
                        Aye.
                        Any opposed? So moved. And I think what
 2
         PARKER:
    we're gonna do here and did -- did -- did either of the
 3
   parties have any objections with that?
 4
 5
         LEATHERS:
                        No --no -- no objections.
         MERILL:
                        None.
 6
 7
                        Okay. And do we have, who do we have here
         PARKER:
 8
    for the agency?
 9
         CHRISTINA:
                        Uh, this is Christina Leathers for the
   record.
10
11
         PARKER:
                        Where are you?
12
         CHRISTINA:
                        I'm right here.
                        Oh, now I can see you. Okay. It's so far
13
         PARKER:
   away. I'm sorry. Okay. And, um, so Christina, um, and, uh,
14
   Fim -- Timothy Jones. Michael Stolk, Deborah Boone-Sharp,
15
   Alice Jacoby, I'm gonna swear you in real quick. Do you, uh,
16
   promise to tell the truth and nothing but the truth?
17
18
         CHRISTINA:
                        I do.
                        And, uh, and just say -- say your name and
19
         PARKER:
20
    say yes so that we confirm that you wanna, uh, go ahead
21
                        Christina Leathers. I do.
         CHRISTINA:
22
         TIMOTHY:
                         Timothy Jones. I do.
23
         DEBORAH:
                        Debra -- Debra Boone-Sharp.
                        Michael Stolk. I do.
24
         MICHAEL:
25
         PARKER:
                        Awesome. And Senator Goicoechea, please.
```

PETE: Senator Goicoechea. I do. 1 PARKER: Thank you -- thank you so much. And so go 2 ahead. 3 Uh, Madam Chair. Gwyn, I have a question. 4 DAVIES: 5 PARKER: Yes. DAVIES: Uh, Ms. Lake is with us. Does she not 6 7 also you, the swearing? She's -- she's representing the Grievance 8 PARKER: 9 so she doesn't have to be sworn in. It's my understanding from pre --10 11 DAVIES: Understand. I, yes --PARKER: Because she's not testifying for herself. 12 She's actually just representing it and sharing information. 13 DAVIES: I interrupt. Yes, ma'am. 14 PARKER: Awesome. And if you wanna make, um, I'm 15 normally we have hear from the grievance side, um, and we go 16 through that. We're gonna take things a little out of order, 17 18 but just to set the stage so that we all understand what's going on. Grievance Representative Lake, can you give a brief 19 20 description, so, and then we'll, um, hear from Senator Goicoechea, 'cause we know that he has another appointment. 21 22 JEANINE: Yes. Thank you. Um, I -- I don't know, 23 um, we wanted to go ahead and get Senator go get you, uh, taken care of first because he has a meeting at 9:30. Um, but 24

basically this is the same grievance that has been pending,

um, for almost two years. And it, uh, stems from a, uh, a pay increase that was granted to the department, uh, a 1.4 million, um, amount of money that was granted to the department in 2019 by the legislative subcommittee to fund 5 percent, uh, increases for retention and, um, recruitment at the Ely State Prison. And at the time, there was no distinction of who would get that 5 percent. And initially the employees were notified that they would be receiving the 5 percent all custody staff at the Ely State Prison. shortly after that, they received notification from the department that it was only for those employees who were newer, basically hired after 2009. And that, um, it was for the newer employees. And so we had our -- our members file grievances, obviously, because the -- there was in the language of the bill or the -- the money committee, there was nothing that said that it was for a specific group. It was, it -- it basically said it was for all custody staff and that those personnel would receive the plus five. So we have -- we had initially asked to have this, um, continued because we were attempting to reach out to, um, some of the senators that were on that Committee. We did reach out to them. We did speak with them. Many of them were, uh, had initially promised us that they would get us statements to that effect and then later came back and said that they couldn't provide those.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PARKER: Okay.

1.5

JEANINE: So we -- we went ahead and --

PARKER: Ms. Lake, thank you. I just wanted a real brief one because somebody on the committee did not receive paperwork ahead of time, so I just wanted to give her a little bit of background.

JEANINE: Okay and --

PARKER: Um, and -- and then you can do your full opening statement afterwards. Okay.

JEANINE: Okay. And then that's why Mr. Goicoecheo is here today. So we would wanted to take things out of order and have them go first.

PARKER: Okay. Thank you so much. Senator. Go -Goicoecheo, can you provide some -- some insight or your
testimony that you would like to share?

PETE: Yes, thank you ma -- ma'am. And, uh, to all the members, I really appreciate it. We got IFC going in Interim Finance Committee is going in at 9:30. I spoke to the chair, said if I did run a little late, uh, and, and also told, uh -- told him what I was, uh, what the hearing was about. Uh, again, I'm Senator Pete Goicoechoe representing Senate District 19, which, uh, does in fact cover the Ely State Prison. But so a number of, uh, almost half of, uh, the prisons in the state, I believe are in Senate District 19. So I -- I do rep -- represent a lot of the, uh, correction

officers. Uh, I'm just gonna speak to the fact that in the 2019 session, uh, I -- I did sit on the sub -- subcommittee, uh, for public safety. And, uh, I was a member of Senate Finance and also the other senators on the committee were, uh -- uh, former Senator David Parks. And, uh, former Senator Joyce Woodhouse, I believe was chair that, uh -- that subcommittee. But, uh, and we dealt with the appropriation to 1.4 in -- in -- in which contained the 5 percent rural, uh, retention and, uh -- uh, 5 percent increase for custody officers that were serving at the Lee State Prison. And I --I know in speaking with former Senator Parks and Woodhouse, um, it was our, at least my intention, and I think our understanding all three of us, that if this was to reach out to all custody positions, uh, that were in employed, uh, in the Ely State prison for the -- let's see, that would've been the 1921 biennium. And, uh, I -- I'm here to testify that -that was clearly my intent, and I believe it was the legislative intent. Uh, and again, that subcommittee, tha action was approved. It went through the formal committee and, uh, was approved, uh, bottom line with, I don't believe there was any objection. It only ended up after the fact. We heard that, uh, there was kind of a glitch with the, how it was written and through the Governor's Finance office. I'm only here to speak to legislative intent, but that is my legislative, was my legislative intent at the time.

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
believe as well as those on the subcommittee, there was never
    any objection to, oh no, this only pertained to -- to the ones
 2
    that didn't receive that increased 10 years prior. Uh, it --
 3
    it just didn't make sense. We wouldn't even have brought it
 5
    up. It wasn't even considered, it was just a 5 percent
    retention recruitment, uh, tool to use at Ely State Prison.
 6
   And I don't mind saying, uh, because I do represent, uh, the
 7
    district and, uh, warden Bill Nevada there, uh, you know,
    we're still close to 160 vacancies in that -- in that system,
    folks, we've gotta address this. And now this is something I
10
11
    need to be talking to my fellow legislators about, but there
   still is a -- a problem. And, uh, it was -- it was our
12
    efforts to try and fix up with that. Uh, again, Senator
13
    Goicoecheo, for the record, I'll step back and take any
14
1.5
    questions.
                        Okay. And, uh, Ms. Leathers, do you have
16
        PARKER:
    any, um, questions? Would you like to cross examine, ask
17
18
    questions?
                        Uh, no ma'am. My, uh, Christina Leathers
19
         LEATHERS:
20
    for the record, no question.
21
                        Okay. Any Committee members have any
         PARKER:
    questions for, um, Senator Goicoechoe or in Southern Nevada?
22
```

Uh, this is Gwyn for the record.

PARKER: Awesome. Mary Jo.

23

24

25

DAVIES:

no questions.

I, no --

SCOTT: No questions. Thank you.

PARKER: Thank you so much, Senator. We appreciate your time. And you can stand as long as you want. You can drop off whenever you want.

PETE: Okay. Thank you. And again, I really appreciate you taking me out of -- out of order and, uh, I appreciate you and what you do, and thank you all. And then to my constituents, uh, good luck. Let's hope we can get this resolved. Thank you.

PARKER: Thank you so much.

PETE: Thank you

1.5

PARKER: Thank you so much. So then we're gonna kind of go back into the regular group of things. So, um, Jeanine, you can give your full, um, your full opening statement now if you'd like and tell us where you were. Uh --- uh, we'll go ahead and start that way. Um --

JEANINE: Okay -- Okay. Well, um, to follow, uh,
Senator Goicoechoe, um, this matter has been pending for some
time and we, um, the Department of Corrections has argued that
the money was not, initially, was not sufficient and
therefore was not intended for everyone, all custody staff.
And once the funding for the 5% was allocated by the
legislature, the dollar amount had to be determined by the
NDOC fiscal team who then reviewed and approved, uh, what
their, what their figures and estimates were. And then later

by the Governor's office and the LCB. However, we have maintained the position that if there was some other intent, the legislature would've indicated specifically what that was at the time. The plain language of the statute was very clear. The intent was to fund all custody positions. in the language of the statute that the subcommittee recommended approval of general funds appropriations of 1.4 million dollars over the 2019/21 biennium to fund a 5 percent increase for a rural pay adjustment for all custody positions, including lieutenants, sergeants, senior COs and COs at Ely State Prison to help the department with the recruitment and retention efforts at ESP over the 2019/21 biennium at am as recommended by the Governor's office. And so and that -- and that's the language in the bill or in the appropriation, and it does clearly say all custody staff had the legislature chosen to limit the 5 percent to those who were hired after 2009, or to those who were not receiving any rural pay differentials as of 2019, they could have done so. There was no language that stated that recruiting and retention efforts for new or less experienced employ were employees, was the reason retention means to retain experienced staff. believe that the intent of the legislature was the limit for 5 percent to those hired after 2009, or those less experienced employees, the legislative subcommittee could have and would have added that specific language. As a matter of fact, they

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

added specific language that it was only for custody staff and no one else at the time that they did this. And again, management needs to prove some other hidden intent by the legislature if it's not written in the language. addition to the above and is pointed out by at least one of our grievance in this matter, the amount of money allocated for all custody positions matches with a 5 percent raise for all of the custody staff at the Ely State Prison without any exclusions to those hired before 2009. We provided that information on page two of our letter to the formerchair of this Committee via email on June 9, 2021. And Mr. So who may testify later also provided an analysis of the 5 percent increase and how that would benefit all custody staff given the amount approved by the legislature that was in his initial grievance. We believe the testimony today from Senator Goicoechea and some of the affected employees will, uh -- will show that all custody staff were clearly intended to benefit from the 5 percent given to the Department of Corrections for recruiting and retention efforts. Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PARKER: Thank you Ms. Leathers.

LEATHERS: Yes. Good morning, chair and EMC members for the record, my name is Christina Leathers, assistant to the Director for the Nevada Department of Corrections. Before your grievance is 6607, 6612, 6620 and 6627, all related to the 80th legislation of approval of 5 percent rule paid for

Ely State Prison and Ely Conservation Camp custody employees. The agency issued a series of agency memos regarding the salary adjustment based on those employees who were not already receiving the benefit. The memo dated July 25, 2019, issued to all ESP and EC staff, uh, addresses this issue accordingly. The mechanism for making a salary adjustment for a state employee is through a request for temporary adjustment to salary or an MPD five. This document only has one section for employee is authorized by legislature to receive session adjustment. Once the agency completes this document, it is then submitted to Human Resource Management for review and approval. As Senator Goicoechea stated, the GFO finalized the agency's budget, therefore, Indio -- Indio OOC believes we acted in due diligence and the application of the special pay based on the fiscal note provided with the Governor's approved budget, which was solely based on the employees who were not already receiving the benefit. Thank you.

PARKER: Okay. And I had on my script right now, but, so, um, did you have anybody else that you wanted to call? Um, Ms. Lake -- Ms. Lake?

JEANINE: Uh, yes.

PARKER: Huh?

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JEANINE: Yes. I -- I -- we have the three of the four employees, uh, online. So I would like to go ahead and just, um, talk to Mr. Stolk uh, Ms. Jones and Ms. Boone-

Sharp. Uh, it -- it won't be, say it won't be very long. 1 It'll be pretty quick. 2 No worries. 3 PARKER: Um, but I would like to start with Mr. 4 JEANINE: 5 Stolk and Mr. Stolk. Hello, this is Jeanine. How are you? Good, thank you. 6 MICHAEL: 7 Um, you filed this grievance in 2019, JEANINE: obviously because you did -- you weren't, uh, a part of the 5 8 percent increase. And when you first learned of the 5 percent, uh, for retention and recruitment, what was your 10 recollect -- recollection of how that increase would be 11 applied? 12 Uh, the way I understood it, we applied 13 MICHAEL: everybody employed Ely state prison in the -- the Custody 14 1.5 Commission. That was my understanding, and it was the way I read it. 16 Okay. And when you filed your grievance, 17 JEANINE: 18 um, did you do any research on the reviewing the legislative subcommittee's discussion and passing of that um, money of the 19 20 budget? 21 I did -- I did a great deal of research, MICHAEL: which -- which was all submitted in our original EMC. Hoping 22 23 that's all still there. Um, but understand, this follow up

meeting was really only to get the center's input as all of

our issues already been stated. Um, I -- I would like to

24

address something that was just Ms. Leathers at some point, if I can.

JEANINE: Sure. Go ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So you stated that the new 5 percent was a MICHAEL: rural pay, uh, increase. Not what it was. The original one back when I first started was a rural pay, which was -- was specifically intended because of where we are in our -- our rural area. Of course. Um, this current and the new 5 percent increase was for recruitment retention entirely different, has nothing to do with the other. Um, I do understand within my research in speaking to you and the first, uh, e EMT meeting, uh, how the -- the whole system works, but there's only so many subcategories to do, plus 5%. You understand that. But, uh, for me, and from my standpoint, that's not my fault. New one needs to be creative. Then for the new increase, which is not rural aid, it is recruitment and retention. So in, in my opinion, from where I stand, again, I'm not in your spot. I don't -- I don't know all the -- the -- the -- the finer tells of -- of how that works. it would be a simple process me to create a new subject category for recruitment -- recruitment and retention completely separate from rural pay to allow for the plus five to all employees, as was clearly the intent of legislation, which we have, uh, as senator's test. And -- and as well in that initial paperwork, my initial grievance that was, we did

the math, we had all the money to indicate that the -- the one-point quarter was approved was almost exactly to the penny enough to fund all of the custody employees, not just warrants hired after 2009.

1.5

JEANINE: Correct. And, um, in, uh, the letter to the Committee from June 9, 2021, which is included in the employee's packet, we, uh, did bring that up that the, uh, the -- the money was, um, incredibly close to the total of the 1.4 million, which would've covered all custody staff. Um, and also I wanted to know after hearing Senator Goicoechea's testimony, um, then your -- your position is still that the 5 percent should have gone to all custody staff.

MICHAEL: Yeah, I think that pretty much filled right there. And that was legislative intent, right from the Senator. That's what we were looking for. That's why we get in advance. That's why this has been on hold for two years now. Was waiting for just now we got that. I -- I see this is over

JEANINE: Thank you. And, um, I'd like to go to Tim Jones.

PARKER: So wait a minute, if I'm sorry. Ms.

Lake, each witness --

JEANINE: Oh, yes.

PARKER: Um, Ms. Leathers will get to do cross-examination. Sorry.

JEANINE: Yes, no problem. 1 2 LEATHERS: Um, uh, thank you Christina Leathers, So Officer Stolk. Um, are you aware 3 for the record. that, um, the agency has no authority to create, um, new codes 4 5 within, uh, the Division of Human Resource Management? MICHAEL: I am. 6 7 LEATHERS: Okay. 8 MICHAEL: (inaudible) Yes 9 LEATHERS: Okay, thank you. And, um, are you aware that once the, uh, Governor's, uh, approved budget was 10 11 provided, that direction was provided to the agency on, um, what process needed to be taken in order to implement the, uh, 12 13 plus 5 percent? I'm not sure I understand. I mean, I --14 MICHAEL: 15 LEATHERS: so, um ---- came to a conclusion and made a 16 MICHAEL: decision based on the information they received in their 17 18 interpretation, but I also believe does that doesn't mean the 19 interpret that correctly. 20 Uh, Christina record -- Leathers for the LEATHERS: record. Understood. So, um, let me rephrase the question. 21 22 So are -- are you aware that the division of Human Resource 23 Management provided the agency with the directive on how to process the special pay? 24

25

MICHAEL:

Yeah, our Human resources department, uh,

their interpretation and -- and their information.

2.4

PARKER: So I'm -- I'm gonna -- I'm just gonna redirect here because you're asking him to ask how somebody else interpreted something, and I just, I don't think that's appropriate. You can't answer for somebody else. Ask him if he has direct knowledge, yes. If -- not asking him how somebody else received something.

LEATHERS: Thank you, Chair. Christina Leathers for the record. Um, are you aware that, uh, the agency Human Resources Office has limited authority and therefore are given clear directives on how to process special pays

MICHAEL: Other than what you -- I'm not -- I'm not a part of any of that.

LEATHERS: Okay. Thank you.

MICHAEL: Well, the bottom line for me is this was interpretation and we now have a senator's exact wording and exact testimony as to what their intent was. There was zero intent to limit that 5 percent the people hired prior to or after 2009. They had zero intent for that. Therefore, I don't feel it's the department's Right. Whether it be HR, intern, finance Committee, or otherwise to change that interpretation.

LEATHERS: Right.

MICHAEL: Not close to the film.

PARKER: Okay. Did you have any other questions,

Ms. Leathers?

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LEATHERS: No, ma'am.

PARKER: And Jeanine Lake, you can call your next witness if you'd like, unless you wanna do any redirect with your witness, Mr. Stolk?

JEANINE: No -- no redirect. Um, I'd like to call, uh, Timothy Jones. And -- and basically all I really would like to ask, uh, Mr. Jones, is do you have anything to add that has not been said already? Um, by Mr. Stolk?

I -- I do. Jones for the record. So, Ms. TIMOTHY: Leathers brought up a memo that she had put out on July 25th stating the -- that there was a clarification on it, but she also put out a memo on July 2, 2019, that's right in front of me that says Revised slash Cost of Living Adjustment. my packet. And it flat says in there, the approved legislative adjustments for sworn uniform staff, specifically Lieutenant, Sergeant, senior correction officers and corrections officers. And it says that the change will be handled by payroll long to be seen after July 1st it needs. So from the very beginning, as I watched all the live input, uh, the meetings with the Senators and everybody, legislation, all that stuff, I watched it live. We -- we provided copies on CDs of all it, there was their intent the whole time to give it to all. And I spoke with Senator Goicoechea multiple times during all this.

JEANINE: Thank you, Mr. Jones. I have nothing 1 further. 2 Christina, Leathers for the record. 3 LEATHERS: Officer Jones, um, referencing Senator Goicoechea's uh, 4 5 testimony this morning. Uh, do you recall the statement, uh, he made that it was the legislator's intent, however, he's 6 unaware how the Governor's Finance Office finalized the 7 8 budget. 9 TIMOTHY: Yeah, but that's the thing though. attended, they passed it along there. So once it's passed by 10 11 legislation, I don't understand how it can be changed with the finance committee who is under the legislation. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Uh, Christina Leathers for the record. LEATHERS: the Governor's Finance Office, um, does not have a reporting requirement to the legislature. Um, however, they do have authority and governance over the agency's budget. Um, and No further questions. so, uh, thank you.

PARKER: Ms. Lake, did you have anything else? Um, uh, Ms. Jacoby's, not with us, but Ms. Boone Sharp is, and I just wanted to ask her if there's anything else that she would like to add at this point after, uh, what has been testified to today?

No, I agree with, uh, Sergeant Stolk and Sergeant Jones that, um, this increase was for all uniformed officers. And I can understand what they say too, is how can

CHRISTINA:

it be changed when it's under, uh, legislative intent. 1 JEANINE: Okay. Thank you. Um, given that we have, 2 um, that we have, uh, had this similar testimony previously 3 and the fact that Senator Goicoechea confirmed what we said 5 today, I don't really have anything further, um, for these officers today. And that would basically conclude our case. 6 Um, and so I -- unless the committee has some other questions. 7 And I will open it up for Committee 8 PARKER: members if you have any questions for Ms. Lake. And then -and that would be her closing portion to close. And then, uh, 10 11 Ms. Leathers will give you a chance to close out as well before we deliberate. Thank, so, any questions for, um, the 12 13 representative Ms. Lake in Southern Nevada? DAVIES: No questions here. Gwyn ahead for the 14 record. 1.5 PARKER: 16 Awesome. I don't have any questions, Mary Jo, for 17 SCOTT: 18 the record. 19 PARKER: Thanks. Um, and -- and Ms. Leather, do 20 you wanna go ahead and close? 21 Um, yes, thank you Chair. Uh, Christina LEATHERS: Leathers for the record. Um, I'll keep this brief. Um, while 22 23 the agency understands the intent of the legislature, NDOC was directed to process the special pays based on those not 24

receiving the benefit. Um, and as stated in my opening, the

mechanism for requests for temporary adjustments to salary is a MPD five form that the division of Human Resource Management requires. And the agency was told how to complete those forms and who to submit, um, those forms on the behalf. neither in support or, um, in non-support of these grievances. However, I am, um, required to follow the directives that I have been provided, um, at the time. And it is our understanding, it was my understanding that despite the intent of the legislature, and I do, uh, Mr. Stolk I do understand that it's not role pay. Um, and they specifically call it out to be recruiting and retention pay. However, the not make any changes to their form, and they did have us select rural pay, um, for the plus five. And unless, um, central payroll or central records can, um, inform the agency on a mechanism to allow for an employee to get a plus five and a plus five, um, there's no way for us to do it. Um, the final thing I would like to add is if the committee does rule in favor of these grievances and they are owed the, uh, back pay of the 5 percent, I do want it to be on the record that due to the state's current staffing challenges, uh, still claims are, uh, taking upwards at nine months if not longer to be paid. And so I would just, uh, like that to be on the record so that the employees are aware that it could take some time for any back pay to be paid out. Um, with that, that is all I have. Thank you.

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PARKER: Thank you. Okay. So, um, any questions for Ms. Leathers before we close this, uh, this portion and go into deliberation?

DAVIES: I -- I have -- its Gwyn for the record,

I just have one. I just wanna get a clarification if that's okay from Ms. Leathers. Um, with the -- there's been bandy about phrases, rural --

LEATHERS: Mm-hm.

1.5

DAVIES: -- retention, and now I notice on the call up on the memo it says, call, we are talking about the same thing regardless of how you choose to paint it. Correct.

LEATHERS: Uh, Christina Leathers for the record. So actually in 2019, there was two things that the agency was awarded. Um, excuse me, all employees were given a 3 percent, uh, cost of living adjustment. Um, and then in addition, the Ely State Prison and the Ely Conservation Employees, uh, custody, which included Lieutenant, Sergeant, Seniors and COs were granted a 5 percent.

DAVIES: Five percent, which is identified as a call I get, but that's what we're talking about. It's -- it's that 5 percent.

LEATHERS: Um, there's two different one -- one is a cola. And so they actually, the EV employees got the 5 percent and the cola, so they have got two.

DAVIES: Okay. Thank you very much. No -- no --

no further clarification needed. That's it for me. Thank 1 you. 2 SCOTT: This is Mary Jo Scott for the record. 3 4 PARKER: Yes. 5 SCOTT: I just have one point I think I'd like to 6 clarify in the budget, um, for E375, it does mention rule. states this request funds the continuation of a 5 percent 7 increase for rural pay salary adjustment to all custody 8 positions, lieutenant and below for both Ely Conservation Camp and Ely State Prison. And it also states this is to engage 10 11 competitively in the local market to incentivize custody recruits and retention. So I -- I just wanted for the record 12 13 to clarify that it does mention rule and the reason the for the 5 percent is to engage competitively. That's all I have. 14 1.5 Thank you. 16 PARKER: Thank you. Okay. So we're gonna close and we'll deliberate now. So, um, anything from my colleagues 17 18 and all Committee members? Any questions? This is Gwyn. I keep hearing the word 19 DAVIES: 20 all. 21 I -- I keep hearing the word all. PARKER: 22 -- I agree. 23 I -- I -- it seems to me just from what I've read and -- and -- and the testimony given and -- and 24

thank you to all the who participated, that the NDOC kind of

had its hand shackled floor got kicked in the lake on this one because do this. But the legislative intent was to provide it to all, it says all. And then NDOC got told, here's a nice glaring sign that says do all and meanwhile put your hands behind your back and, uh, go for a swim. Because if -- if you don't provide someone the methodology, facility, or tools to -- to actually enact something, that's not gonna happen. So I --I -- I -- I wouldn't be surprised if we -- we don't, you know, why didn't we, a grievance from the NDOC saying, why didn't we get the tools to do this when you told me to do this? You -- you can't give me a -- a gallon of paint and no brush and tell me to go paint the building.

PARKER: So I'm --

1.5

DAVIES: I'm afraid there's, yeah, there's —
there's — there's obviously there's very real victims in the
— we have the officers here, but, uh, you know, there's not
so tangible victim in that the NDOC was told to do, was told
by legislature to do something, and then the GFO came along
and said, um, I can make all thoughts of abbreviations for GFO
at this point. But, uh, ification comes to mind, the
government — the Governor's finance and application
department, and said, here's the money. I've hidden the
money. And I don't think that's particularly fair. And I
think that — that — that we would best serve, uh, all
parties, including, um, departments of the state by — by

taking a state at this point, saying, you are not the 1 legislature. You are the GFO. And you have, you may have 2 absolute authority over us as employees, but you have an 3 absolute responsibility to answer to the legislature for your 4 5 failure to do as you have been directed by, uh -- by have only, which the citizens state, uh, sent there to do their 6 work. Anyway, that's enough of Gwyn mouthing off for now. 7 I agree. I-- I-- I don't know how 8 PARKER: many, um, employees are still at, uh, Ely State Prison that

many, um, employees are still at, uh, Ely State Prison that would qualify for this, but I am sad if they all have been trying to do something about this. Um, and unfortunately we just have, uh, these four that we can actually make a decision about. So, um, do you wanna Michelle?

MERRILL: Um, if my fellow chair people are good with it, I'd like to go forward with a motion chair.

This is Michelle Merrill for the record. Is that okay with the South?

PARKER: Yep. Can you guys hear okay?

DAVIES: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MECHELLE: Um, Michelle Merrill, for the record, I moved Grant combined grievances numbers 6607, 6612, 6620 and 6627, based on testimony and based on the plain language and intent by the legislative subcommittee in decision unit E375 and the 2021 agency requested in governor's recommended budgets for retention of custody staff at the Ely State Prison

```
and Conservation Camp. The employer failed to establish that
 1
    the 5 percent was for certain, and not all we have a motion.
 2
                        Do we have a motion, do we have a second?
         PARKER:
 3
                        Can we have discussion?
 4
         DAVIES:
 5
         PARKER:
                        Yes.
                        Oh, do we need, well, do we need a second?
 6
         DAVIES:
 7
                        Second, then I'll ask for discussion.
         PARKER:
         DAVIES:
                        Uh, I would be honored to second that.
 8
 9
    This is Gwyn Davies for the record.
                        All right. And then we'll go ahead and do
10
         PARKER:
11
    discussion.
         DAVIES:
                        Do we need a friendly amendment that
12
13
    states and direct the DHRM to provide a methodology for the
    implementation so that NDOC doesn't continue to try and do the
14
   best of stroke with both hands shackled behind his back?
1.5
16
                         Agreed. So let me, Michelle Merrill, for
         MERRILL:
17
    the record, let me make an amendment to what I previously
18
   motioned and add that we would, uh, instruct DHRM to create
    documentation, allowing the NDOC to process this 5 percent,
19
20
    um, pay differential for all custody staff with appropriate
    documentation. Retroactively -- retroactively.
21
                         Ma'am, we're in, I know, uh, do I need
22
         DAVIES:
23
    second that or, because I already --
                        We have an amended, um, motion and so we
24
         PARKER:
```

need a -- a -- a second on that amended motion.

DAVIES: Um, uh, for the sake of process, I would, uh, amend the second, uh, I'm receiving a -- I-- I know we're in deliberation and we don't accept testimony or, um, but, uh, I would like if it is permitted by my fellow, uh, members to, uh, consult with both parties who are Ms. Lake and Ms. Leathers, uh, just in case we've missed anything in that implementation amendments.

PARKER: Okay.

1.5

DAVIES: Is that acceptable to you chair?

PARKER: Um, yes. I'm gonna let you direct that since you're down there with both of us.

LEATHERS: Christina Leathers, for the record, I would just ask that the Committee, um, be more concise in the motion and the, um, what is being asked of DHRM. So there is a form and there's a mechanism, but it only allows for one type of special pay, and so to allow for more than one type of special pay for an employee.

DAVIES: Okav.

PARKER: So if I may, this is Stephanie Parker for the record. I think that's something that DHRM needs to figure out if it needs to be two forms, if they need to modify a form. Um, we're not -- we're not gonna get into the nuts and bolts of their process and how they can do this. The bottom line is we're directing them to identify a -- a mechanism period to provide the retroactive 5% increase, as

was stated in the legislature. The -- the legislative intent, 1 um, budget IOC overview. Okay. Am I wrong here? Does anybody 2 disagree with that? 3 Uh, I agree with you honor, but can we 4 DAVIES: 5 ask the same question? Was asked the, uh, Ms. -- Ms. Leathers had a chance to ask the, to Ms. Lake please for the 6 second balance? 7 I would just like that to say that I 8 JEANINE: Yes. 9 -- I like the idea of it being more broad, that, um, we just -- the committee just direct the this to be done because don't 10 11 want this to get bogged down any longer with, you know, what do we do, how do we fix this? And going on and on and on with 12 a new code. I just want, we want this resolved and we want it 13 to be paid and the state will have to figure out how to do 14 1.5 that. 16 DAVIES: Thank you, Ms. Lake. Thank you. That was Jeanine Lake for the record. Um, I have nothing else here, 17 18 ma'am. We have a motion. And -- and you seconded it, I believe? 19 PARKER: 20 DAVIES: Yes, ma'am. Co Chair Davies. And so any discussion on 21 PARKER: the amended motion? All those in favor? 22 23 DAVIES: Gwyn Davies, Aye. 24 MULTIPLE: Aye.

Any opposed? So moved. Uh, and so

25

PARKER:

```
grievance, uh, so, uh, grievance -- grievance is 6607, 6612,
6620 oh and 6627. The motion was that based on testimony and
based on the plain language and intent by the legislative
subcommittee and decision unit E375 in the 2021 agency
requested in governor's recommended budgets for the retention
of custody staff at the Ely State Prison and -- and
Conservation camp. The employer failed to establish that the
5 percent was for certain, not -- not all custody staff and
not all custody staff. Um, in addition, we moved that DHRM
create documentation tools that allows for the -- I can't see
it. It allows for more than one type of special pay to the 5%
retroactive pay per decision unit in E375 and retroactively.
So, um, you'll receive a letter from the EMC. It could take
45 days --
                    It would be a DAG decision.
     JOHNSON:
    PARKER:
                    Okay.
                          Yeah.
                    Up to 45 days when normally would give
     JOHNSON:
them instruction Okay. Of how, when to expect a letter.
                    Yes.
                          The Nora Johnson, for the record,
     JOHNSON:
the -- the timeframe is still a 45-day timeframe, but this
would be an actual written decision,
     PARKER:
                    Right.
     JOHNSON:
                    Rather than a letter.
```

Okay. Thank you.

Mm-hm.

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PARKER:

JOHNSON:

PARKER: Thanks. And so we thank you all for coming. We thank you for participating in this process. Um, and you know, it's been a long and arduous one 'cause I know I started before I was here. But, um, we appreciate your patience in sitting through this.

JOHNSON: Um, thank you so much.

PARKER: Thank you so much.

JEANINE: Thank you.

DAVIES: Uh, closing public record.

PARKER: Huh?

1.5

DAVIES: Closing public record comment, I mean.

PARKER: Yeah. Yes. I'm gonna do public comment right now. Ask for public comment. Remember, no vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised during public comment until the matter itself has been specifically included by an agenda as an item upon which action comments will be limited to five minutes per person and persons commenting will be asked. And again, by stating the name for the record, any -- any public comment in Southern Nevada.

DAVIES: Nobody appears to wanna make public comment at this time. Thank your ma'am.

PARKER: Anyone online? Anyone in Northern Nevada?

Okay. For adjournment then. Thank you. Oh, wait minute, can you just say adjourn? Adjourn. Thank you everyone appreciate it. And the team's thing did work well.

Thank you ma'am. Did really well. DAVIES: Thank you. Thank you, everyone. PARKER: JEANINE: Thank you guys. Okay. LEATHERS: Thank you. Thank you. \*\*\* END OF MEETING \*\*\*