

1 STATE OF NEVADA

2 MERIT AWARD BOARD

3 MEETING TRANSCRIPT - APPROVED

4 NOVEMBER 4, 2025

5
6 POWELL: All right. So welcome everybody. Let's call to
7 order today's Good Government, Great Employees meeting, also
8 known as the Merit Award Board. Today is November 4th, it's
9 just about 9:00. And as part of our agenda Item 1, we'll do a
10 roll call. So board, I think we still have one, two, three,
11 four members. We have one seat vacant still from the
12 governor's office. So starting with myself, my name is Shayne
13 Powell, I'm the chair, I'm here. And it looks like we have
14 Carrie Hughes, our DHRM also serves as the secretary. And then
15 we have Brian Miller here from AFSME and then Tracey Cook down
16 South. Hello. And then we also have Kelsey Walsh in attendance
17 too and she's also with DHRM and she keeps this ship afloat as
18 her official title. Announcements. Do we have any
19 announcements aside from I'm back? I was replaced and I'm
20 back. So it's my only announcement. Does have any -- anybody
21 else have anything they care to share?

22 KELSEY: No.

23 MILLER: Negative.

24 POWELL: All right. I guess one announcement is we have
25 33 agenda items today, so this could take a while, but as part

1 of this, the Merit Award members may adjust agenda items out
2 of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the board.
3 So we have with us Brandon Broome, and we also have, was it
4 Madeline Ashford?

5 HUGHES: Kelly.

6 POWELL: Oh, I'm --

7 MADELINE: Madeline Kelly.

8 POWELL: Oh, sorry. I have Madeline Ashford right next
9 to you. I apologize for that. All right.

10 MADELINE: You're okay.

11 POWELL: So what we're going to do is those are action
12 items, I believe 9, yes. 9(C) and 9(Y). So we're going to put
13 those ahead of action Item 9(A). So we're actually going to go
14 9(C), 9(Y), and then 9(A). We'll resume the list sequentially
15 after we move those two to the front. Does that sound fair to
16 everybody?

17 HUGHES: Mm-hm.

18 POWELL: All right, great. So with that being said, call
19 the order, welcome roll call announcements. So I'll accept a
20 motion to consider agenda item 1 complete.

21 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to consider agenda item 1
22 as complete.

23 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

24 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I will second.

25 POWELL: Thank you. We have a second. So all those in

1 favor of considering action or agenda Item 1 complete, state
2 your affirmations or otherwise.

3 MILLER: Aye.

4 HUGHES: Aye.

5 POWELL: Aye.

6 KELSEY: Tracey, you're muted. She's still muted.

7 COOK: Sorry aye.

8 POWELL: That's all right. Okay. So agenda item 1 is
9 complete. Moving on to agenda item 2, public comments. Just a
10 reminder that no vote or action may be taken upon a matter
11 raised during public comment until the matter itself has been
12 specifically included on an agenda item as an item upon which
13 action may be taken. Comments will be limited to five minutes
14 per person, and persons making comment will be begin by
15 stating their name for the record and to spell their last
16 names. And we do have some public in attendance. So you're
17 welcome to speak now first by introducing yourself, but you're
18 also willing to, I mean, welcome to speak to your particular
19 agenda item as it's raised. So do you have any comments now
20 during the public comment period? All right. It looks like,
21 no. So I don't think we have anybody or any phones anywhere.
22 Any other public comment? Going once, twice sole. All right.
23 So I'll accept a motion to consider agenda item 2, public
24 comment complete.

25 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion that we consider agenda

1 item 2 closed.

2 POWELL: All right, do we have a second?

3 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

4 POWELL: All right, the motion carries. Agenda item 2 is
5 complete. So moving on to agenda item 3, possible action
6 approval of minutes from previous meet -- meetings from May
7 15th, 2025. If you've all had a moment to look at those many -
8 meeting minutes and would like to correct something or to
9 discuss anything on those, please let me know.

10 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to accept.

11 POWELL: All right, we have a motion from Brian to
12 consider the May 15th meeting minutes as complete and as
13 accurate as possible. We have a second?

14 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

15 POWELL: All right, we have a second. The motion
16 carries. Please state your affirmations or otherwise.

17 HUGHES: Aye.

18 POWELL: Aye.

19 COOK: Aye.

20 POWELL: All right, action item 3, complete. Moving on
21 to action item 4, re-discussion of tabled suggestions from the
22 July 17th, 2024 meeting. Starting with action item 4(A), a
23 suggestion from Eli Fuller. Just to remind everyone, Eli
24 Fuller's suggestion from the division of insurance was to buy
25 Adobe licenses at the group rates. The agency's response was

1 to deny. And the further exposition from the agency was that
2 the agency already buys licenses at a group rate through a
3 vendor. And if it -- and additionally, the idea of storing
4 documents electronically is not a novel concept. Does anybody
5 have any opinions on the additional information we gathered
6 from the administrator, the division of insurance? Hearing
7 none, I'll accept a motion to concur with the opinion of the
8 division insurance for action item 4(A).

9 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion that we concur with the
10 department's refusal of the suggestion.

11 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

12 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

13 POWELL: Great, thank you. In that case, please state
14 your affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item
15 4(A) to concur with the division of insurance to deny the
16 suggestions submitted by Eli Fuller.

17 COOK: Aye.

18 HUGHES: Aye.

19 MILLER: Aye.

20 POWELL: Aye. All right. Motion carries. Considering
21 action item 4(A) complete moving on to action item 4(B) was
22 for Sawnte Strawter, from the Division of Social Services, and
23 this was to email notifications to clients. The administrators
24 response was to deny this because CMS, Centers for Medicaid --
25 Medicare Services, something about that point and the U.S.

1 Department of Agriculture all participate in a federal program
2 called E-Sign requiring participants to opt in by law. So
3 without that, the state cannot default to paperless contacts
4 without their first opting in to the program. It's not
5 something the state can decide to do on its own gumption
6 without the beneficiary opting in for that. And I have
7 comments about this one too, is this -- this suggestion was
8 previous suggested from the division. So it -- I consider this
9 ineligible under the provisions of NRS 285.050(a). That being
10 said, is there a motion to concur with the opinion of the
11 Division of Social Services as it relates to action item 4(A)?

12 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
13 Department.

14 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

15 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

16 POWELL: Thank you. Members in attendance, please state
17 your affirmations or otherwise as it stands to concur with the
18 division's opinion for action item 4(B).

19 MILLER: Aye.

20 HUGHES: Aye.

21 COOK: Aye.

22 POWELL: Aye. All right, consider action item 4(B)
23 closed. We concur with the -- the opinion of the Division of
24 Social Services. Moving on to action item 4(C) from Paula
25 Turner. Paula Turner's suggestion was to allow beneficiaries

1 to apply for benefits on computers in the workplace and public
2 places. The response from the division was to deny this. They
3 have stated they had previously provided -- piloted a program
4 in grocery stores and the engagement was underwhelming.
5 Furthermore, if someone does undertake one of these online
6 applications and finishes, they have to appear in person
7 anyways for an eligibility screening per federal guidelines.
8 So regardless of where the person applies, be it online in a
9 computer that we provide, or at the office, they're going to
10 end up at the office eventually. So they decided that it did
11 not provide any sort of calculable time saved nor money saved.
12 So it was of the division's opinion that this should be
13 denied. So I'll accept a motion to concur with action item
14 4(C) of the division to deny the suggestion from Paula Turner.

15 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur to deny.

16 POWELL: Thank you -- thank you, Brian. Do we have a
17 second?

18 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

19 POWELL: All right. Board members, please state your
20 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item 4(C).

21 HUGHES: Aye.

22 MILLER: Aye.

23 COOK: Aye.

24 POWELL: Aye. All right. We'll consider agenda item 4(C)
25 complete. Moving on to action item five, James Hawk,

1 suggestion tabled from the July 17th, 2024 meeting. James Hawk
2 from the Department of Corrections suggested that they use
3 USPS instead of FedEx to mail correspondence from remote to,
4 excuse me, two remote facilities. The Department's opinion was
5 to deny this because FedEx is both quicker and trackable, but
6 regardless of cost savings, they've determined that FedEx is a
7 more reliable option, so they will not be implementing this. I
8 have no comment as it relates to that. So I'll accept a motion
9 to concur with the Department of Corrections opinion to deny
10 the suggestion from James Hawk, action Item 5(A).

11 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, a motion to concur with the
12 department.

13 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

14 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

15 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

16 POWELL: Thank you both Brian and Tracey. Board members,
17 please state your affirmations or otherwise. As we concur with
18 the Department of Corrections decision to deny the suggestion
19 in action item 5(A).

20 MILLER: Aye.

21 HUGHES: Aye.

22 COOK: Aye.

23 POWELL: Thank you. The motion carries. All right,
24 moving on to action item 6(A), table suggestions from the
25 October 23rd, 2024 meeting. Item 6(A) is from Jesse Olson.

1 Jesse Olson was -- is from the Department of Transportation.
2 The suggestion was to overhaul the training courses. I believe
3 this one kind of made its way because training is sort of
4 centralized and decentralized. Agencies hold their own
5 training and then we also have statewide training. So we had a
6 reply from the administrator of DHRM, and they've, oh, sorry.
7 Let me make sure my columns are --

8 HUGHES: I think you might be referencing a later
9 suggestion.

10 POWELL: Yeah, sorry about that. Okay, sorry. My columns
11 -- bear with me a moment. It seems I shifted my columns down
12 one, so I'm replying to the wrong one. Sorry for the delay. I
13 don't know where I went wrong here. Okay, back on track. Okay.
14 So this one was in regard to some sample testing that the
15 department performs. And the suggestion was that it could be
16 done in a different manner, which to save money and time. And
17 the agency contends that any errors in the tracking have not
18 borne any additional cost. And that that's part of routine
19 business, that sometimes these samples aren't right. And
20 that's just the nature of the business. And they went back to
21 their billing and they stated that there was no any delays or
22 rejected billing because a lot of this stuff is federally
23 funded. So they noticed that there was no impairment to any
24 sort of charges that were being considered allowable on that.
25 So with that being said, I'll accept a motion to concur with

1 the agency's decision to deny this suggestion.

2 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to deny.

3 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

4 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

5 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
6 affirmations or otherwise as relates to action Item 6(A) from
7 Jesse Olson through the Department of Transportation.

8 MILLER: Aye.

9 COOK: Aye.

10 POWELL: Aye.

11 POWELL: All right. Sounds like we have the majority, so
12 the motion carries. We'll consider action Item 6(A) complete,
13 the board concurs with the Department of Transportation.
14 Moving on to action item seven, tabled suggestions for the
15 November 14th, 2024 meeting. That's 7(A) from Lori Rice. Lori
16 Rice submitted a submission to the Department of Corrections
17 to install a pepper spray system. Make sure I -- I haven't
18 lost my columns again. All right, I think we're on the right
19 ones.

20 HUGHES: Mm-hm.

21 MILLER: Yeah.

22 POWELL: All right. So The Department supplied that an
23 overhead pepper spray system would cons -- expose all inmates
24 to the irritant, not just a number of targeted individuals.
25 This is for like a -- a wide range, installation wide riot.

1 This is not for targeted individual. And the department also
2 wants to remind people that caseworkers, correctional
3 officers, counselors, medical staff, would all be exposed to
4 these pepper -- pepper spray vapors. So, dangers aside, the
5 system is also very expensive and the pepper spray has a
6 useful shelf life of five years. So the system would require
7 flushing and refilling also. So the costs, while not presented
8 on the suggestion as to what the savings would be, they are
9 very prohibitive and potentially dangerous. So I'll accept a
10 motion from the board to concur with the Department of
11 Corrections opinion to deny the suggestion, which is item
12 7(A) .

13 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

14 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

15 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I'll second.

16 POWELL: All right. Board member, state your
17 affirmations otherwise, as it stands to for the board to
18 concur with the Department of Corrections opinion to deny the
19 suggestions 7(A) from Lori Rice.

20 COOK: Aye.

21 POWELL: Aye.

22 MILLER: Aye.

23 HUGHES: Aye.

24 POWELL: All right. Motion carries. Consider action item
25 seven complete. So we're moving on to action Item 8, table

1 suggestions for the May 15th, 2025 meeting. Item 8(A) is from
2 Philip Morales. Philip Morales from public safety. Each
3 division performed their own background checks rather than
4 going to a centralized unit. this one went around quite a bit,
5 as we all may or not recall, just because we couldn't really
6 get an idea as to money or time saved. And so in the opinion
7 from public safety, they've stated in their latest opinion
8 that this action doesn't save time, it just shifts
9 responsibility. And then my comment to that is, pursuant to
10 NRS 285.050(g), any suggestion that merely shift costs around,
11 but doesn't reduce any -- that realizes savings are
12 ineligible. So this was basically moving one function from one
13 activity to another. Saving one unit time, but adding that
14 burden to the other. So I'll accept a motion to concur with
15 department of safety's opinion to deny the suggestion 8(A)
16 from Philip Morales.

17 MILLER: Pardon me. Brian Miller, motion to concur.

18 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

19 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

20 POWELL: Thank you, Tracey. Board members, please state
21 your affirmation or otherwise as it relates to action item
22 8(A) as we concur with public safety's opinion to deny the
23 suggestion from Philip Morales.

24 HUGHES: Aye.

25 COOK: Aye.

1 POWELL: Aye. All right. Ayes have it. Motion carries.
2 Moving on to action item 9. As we previously said, we're going
3 to not start with item 9(A), we're going to go to 9(C). This
4 is from Bryndan Broohm, who we have in person. This is
5 Department of Transportation, installation of solar car parts.
6 And the opinion from the agency as the cost themselves have
7 such a long return on investment, that it's almost
8 incalculable considering that Nevada has the second lowest
9 price per kilowatt hour energy rates in the nation. So the --
10 it was the opinion of the agency to deny the suggestion. But
11 that being said, we do have Mr. Broohm in attendance with us,
12 so if you'd like to speak to that, please let us know.

13 BROOHM: I don't have any suggestions. No -- no comment.

14 POWELL: Okay. In that case, I'll accept a motion for
15 the board to concur with the department's opinion to deny the
16 suggestion to install solar carports.

17 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
18 department's decision to deny the suggestion.

19 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

20 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

21 POWELL: Thank you, Brian, we have a second. Board
22 members, please state your affirmations or otherwise as it
23 relates to agenda item 9(C).

24 COOK: Aye.

25 HUGHES: Aye.

1 MILLER: Aye.

2 POWELL: Aye. Motion carries. The board concurs with the
3 department's decision to deny agenda item 9(C). All right, so
4 now we're moving to 9(Y). 9(Y) is -- make sure I don't get
5 this backwards again. This was thermostat automation, yes. And
6 as well as lighting. And this is from the Division of Social
7 Services. The response from Social Services with the Allstate
8 owned buildings have scheduled temperature control as well as
9 automated lighting to the greatest extent possible of its
10 abilities. And then DSS states that every lease they enter
11 into is considered full service, which includes HV and
12 electricity usage. So regardless of how little or how much
13 energy is consumed, that it will not affect their lease rates.
14 So the division has made the opinion to deny the suggestion
15 9(Y). Any comments on that from public?

16 KELSEY: No comment.

17 POWELL: All right, thank you. I'll accept a motion from
18 the board to concur with the division's opinion to deny the
19 suggestion 9(Y).

20 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
21 department in denying the suggestion.

22 POWELL: Thank you. Do we have a second?

23 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

24 POWELL: All right, we have a second. Board members,
25 please state your affirmations or otherwise as it relates to

1 action item 9(Y).

2 HUGHES: Aye.

3 MILLER: Aye.

4 POWELL: Aye.

5 COOK: Aye.

6 POWELL: The motion carries. The board concurs with the
7 opinion stated. I did want to call attention real quick if we
8 can pull up the actual paperwork for action item 9(Y). At the
9 very bottom of page one, it says, this is suggestion number
10 one of two. So do we have any information on where suggestion
11 two is?

12 KELSEY: The agency sent it back to me after the agenda
13 was already posted, so we couldn't add it.

14 POWELL: Okay.

15 KELSEY: So it will be on the next.

16 POWELL: All right.

17 KELSEY: The next meeting.

18 POWELL: So knowing that if you had a second suggestion,
19 it will be heard at the next meeting because the agency did
20 not reply in time as to that suggestion. So yeah, there --
21 there's a cutoff and this packet is about 300 pages. So I
22 apologize if the one that you're most interested in is not
23 being heard today, but it will be heard at the next meeting.

24 MADALYN: No, it's okay. I don't mind.

25 POWELL: Okay. I apologize for that. But Kelsey has a --

1 like I said, these -- these are gigantic packets and we had 33
2 today, so I -- I apologize that we couldn't get the second one
3 in time, but sometimes the agencies need a little time to
4 review these as well. So, but it will be on the next one for
5 sure.

6 MADALYN: Can I ask when the next one is by chance, or
7 would I get another email?

8 POWELL: Yet we -- we -- action item 11, which is when
9 we're done with all these, we -- we can set up another
10 meeting, but I can move that ahead as the chair and we can
11 discuss that next. So you don't have to sit here for two hours
12 and listen to all these suggestions. So --

13 KELSEY: She will get an email though.

14 POWELL: She will get an email. But we can also, for
15 your consideration, we'll move action item 11, following
16 action item 9(Y), which we've done, if that sounds suitable to
17 you. Okay.

18 MADALYN: Yeah, that's okay.

19 POWELL: All right. So with that being said, I am going
20 to make action item 11 our next order of business. So
21 discussion of upcoming meeting date.

22 HUGHES: So I do want to comment on that and I'll defer
23 to Kelsey. We were talking about that prior to the meeting.
24 I'd like to re -- remind the board that the decision has been
25 made previously that we would have a meeting once every six

1 months or if we had seven or more suggestions to consider. So
2 I'll defer to Kelsey at our status currently.

3 POWELL: Sure.

4 KELSEY: Right now there's three.

5 POWELL: Three, so --

6 KELSEY: That aren't on this.

7 POWELL: Okay. Including --

8 KELSEY: And that one is hers and then two are like
9 that. She has an answer, just it couldn't make it onto the
10 agenda because of the cutoff to post this.

11 POWELL: Okay.

12 KELSEY: Two are still pending, but --

13 POWELL: Okay. So we've got three, so we're not quite 50
14 percent of the way there for us to officially schedule a
15 meeting. So it might be in everyone's best interest just to
16 send that email out when the next meeting's being held. Just
17 because we don't have enough workload to get us our next
18 meeting going like pen and set in stone as to when we should
19 have it. Is that -- is that acceptable to your needs that
20 we'll just keep you informed when the next meeting?

21 MADALYN: Yeah, that's okay.

22 POWELL: All right. I do appre -- I appreciate your
23 flexibility and I apologize for the inconvenience. With that
24 being set, I'll accept a motion to consider action item 11
25 complete as we don't have quite enough to set a meeting in

1 stone, but at the bare minimum, we will have one, six months
2 from today. So what would that be? May at the latest, but it
3 seems like the pace we're getting these, I can't say for
4 certain, it'll be before May, but it certainly looks like it
5 will be because we -- we've have 26 from our last meeting and
6 that wasn't that long ago. So I -- I, I'd say remain hopeful.
7 Sorry, that was a long-winded way of asking for motion to
8 consider action item 11 complete.

9 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to -- action Item 11
10 consider done and done.

11 POWELL: Thank you. Do we have a second?

12 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

13 POWELL: All right. Board members, please state your
14 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item number
15 11 being complete.

16 COOK: Aye.

17 POWELL: Aye.

18 HUGHES: Aye.

19 POWELL: All right. Action item number 11 is complete.

20 And to our public who's attending, you're welcome to stay for
21 the whole thing. It's nice to see some faces and for you to
22 hear and see how the process works. But you don't have to stay
23 if you don't want to because this may not be everyone's cup of
24 tea, but you're welcome to. All right, in that case, we are
25 going to rewind and resume back at action item 9. Those are

1 all the current suggestions. And we'll start at 9(A). 9(A), it
2 looks like department taxation. And it's -- sorry, my columns
3 are off. Is this from Altares-McKenna Rochelle?

4 KELSEY: Mm-hm.

5 POWELL: All right. From the Department of Taxation. And
6 this is to eliminate emailing the form I -- IRS 1095-C, which
7 is the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare Coverage.
8 This used to be a mandatory mailing in 2025. It was optional
9 and the agency contends that it was aware that it was optional
10 and it plans to put this in place. It's just the systems
11 itself were not available at the time. So the board, the
12 agency contends that while they appreciate the suggestion,
13 they already had plans to implement it. And looking back at
14 the date of the submission, just to make sure she didn't
15 suggest it before the federal guidance was issued as her --
16 her date of submission was after that federal guidance was
17 issued. So I believe it is safe to concur with the agency that
18 the idea had already existed prior to her suggestion. So with
19 that being said, I'll accept a motion from the board to concur
20 with Department Taxation's opinion to deny the suggestion.

21 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
22 department in denying this suggestion.

23 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

24 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

25 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie -- Tracey. Excuse me. Board

1 members, please state your affirmations or otherwise as it
2 relates to concurrent with the opinion of action item 9(A).

3 MILLER: Aye.

4 COOK: Aye.

5 HUGHES: Aye.

6 POWELL: All right. The motion carries, considered
7 action Item 9(A) completes. Moving on to action item 9(B),
8 Elizabeth Anthony, Department of Corrections, PPE
9 sterilization. The suggestion was to install like autoclave-
10 type things that sterilize used personal protective equipment
11 like N95 masks for reuse. And the agency contends that the
12 governor's proclamation that the pandemic is over. So these
13 quarantine procedures have been eliminated by the Department
14 of Corrections. So they are not reusing any sort of protective
15 equipment when it comes to quarantine efforts. So I'll accept
16 a -- a motion from the board to concur with the opinion of the
17 Department of Corrections.

18 MILLER: It's the UV sterilizer?

19 POWELL: Yeah, it's -- that's like a little toaster oven
20 and it's like it -- you put the used equipment in there and
21 the UV lights do its magic and make it usable again. But as
22 the statement from corrections, it was rather brief, but it
23 says they do not have any quarantine procedures in place
24 considering that there is no pandemic anymore.

25 MILLER: Okay. Hopefully there's not -- not another

1 pandemic, but if there is, this might be a good idea, but it's
2 -- we have to go with what we got presently so I move the
3 motion to deny.

4 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

5 POWELL: All right, thank you. We have first and a
6 second. Board members, please state your affirmation otherwise
7 as it relates to action item 9(B).

8 COOK: Aye.

9 HUGHES: Aye.

10 POWELL: Aye. All right, majority motion carries.

11 Consider action item 9(B) complete. Just a reminder, we've --
12 we heard 9(C) out of order so we've been moving on to 9(D) and
13 that's from Glen Church Jr., Department of Transportation,
14 equipment pads for traffic diversion. This one basically has
15 to do with the Highway I-15 being closed when there's hazmat.
16 And Mr. Church's suggestion is to order and store, I guess
17 they're kind of like temporary pieces of pavement that you can
18 build like a highway, sort of a roadway, a pathway away from
19 this without closing I-15 when these things happen. The
20 Department of Transportation opinion that aside from storage
21 buying these is cost prohibitive and that does not include the
22 factors of transporting it to a scene, nor does it calculate
23 the storage. So they've chosen not to deny this. And
24 furthermore, the submitter did not include any sort of cost
25 savings. So it's hard to argue in their favor in terms of

1 money being saved that they do not conclude that because the
2 form itself does have the opportunity for the submitter to put
3 what they believe costs to be safe. So if they don't fill that
4 out completely, it's hard to argue in their favor. So with
5 that being said, I'll accept a motion from the board to concur
6 with the Department of Transportation's opinion to deny action
7 Item 9(D).

8 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to deny concurring with
9 the department.

10 POWELL: Do we have a second?

11 MILLER: Brian Miller.

12 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

13 POWELL: Thank you. I have two seconds, second and a
14 third. Board members, please state your affirmations otherwise
15 as it relates to action Item 9(D).

16 MILLER: Aye.

17 COOK: Aye.

18 POWELL: All right, aye. Motion carries. Action Item
19 9(D) complete. Action Item 9(E) and this one, we have to do a
20 little more research as to the legislative intent, but we're
21 getting a lot of printing and scanning savings. So I am -- in
22 future meetings, I'm either going to by the power vested in me
23 hear them all at once, or just to say that they are no novel
24 ideas. If they're just some procedure to cop -- reduce paper
25 or scan things because we get a lot of these. And part of the

1 statute is, it says, has to be novel, but it also says at the
2 agency level. So if -- if every agency in the state finally
3 submits one for copy and scanning, I might be able to just to
4 deny them all unless there's something novel in them. But I
5 think in the future I might group them together, as it says, I
6 may, and we'll just do them all in a lump sum. So I'm -- we'll
7 work with Kelsey in the future to adjust our agenda items so
8 that we can hear all of our printing and scanning ones at the
9 same time and save ourselves some time if we find that they're
10 not novel. So that's not relating to this particular action
11 item. It just reminded me because we're hearing our first save
12 paper one for -- for this meeting. So this one is from Lisa
13 Leavitt-Cronin from departments or division of social
14 services. This is a suggestion to print less, scan more. the
15 agency, their response was this is not the first time they've
16 got that -- that TSS itself has gotten an idea to scan their
17 documents and print less. So it's their opinion that they will
18 deny this. So I'll accept a motion from the board to concur
19 with DSS opinion.

20 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

21 POWELL: Thank you. Do we have a second?

22 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, a motion second.

23 POWELL: All right. Board members, please state your
24 affirmation reserve or otherwise as it relates to action item
25 9(E).

1 COOK: Aye.

2 MILLER: Aye.

3 HUGHES: Aye.

4 POWELL: Aye. All right. Motion carries. Consider action
5 item 9(E) complete. Action Item 9(F) from Erich Drakeley from
6 Department of Motor Vehicles. This is to automatically charge
7 a late fee for various things within the DMV system and the
8 opinion of the DMV. As that DMV policy DL 7.15 indicates seven
9 reasons why wait -- late fees can be waived. And so the system
10 does not understand that. So it could be causing more harm
11 than good if we automatically affix a late fee to some sort of
12 penalty because there are seven exclusions that would cause
13 someone to who would appear at face value to have garnered
14 some sort of late penalty that they shouldn't be charged. And
15 so they contend that going and finding all these errors after
16 the fact is actually costs more than the current system and
17 that the current implementation of the system handles it. So
18 I'll accept a motion from the board to concur with the DMV's
19 opinion to deny the suggestion in action Item 9(F).

20 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to deny.

21 POWELL: Thank you. Brian, do we have a second?

22 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes --

23 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

24 POWELL: Thank you both. Board members, please state
25 your affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item

1 9 (G) .

2 HUGHES: Aye.

3 COOK: Aye.

4 POWELL: Oh, I apologize, 9(F). Sorry.

5 HUGHES: Aye.

6 POWELL: Aye.

7 COOK: Aye.

8 MILLER: Aye.

9 POWELL: Thank you. I appreciate it. Sorry for that.

10 Okay, action item 9(F) is closed. Moving on to 9(G) from --

11 I'll start with the DMV from -- from Boris Cordell Grinberg,

12 do I have that correct? Oh, I got those. So Cordero Gomez,

13 sorry, my columns are off here. This is cleaning your product

14 disposal. So the suggestion was that state agencies that have

15 disposed cleaning product can dispose it for a certain fee and

16 the individuals determine that another agency, I believe it

17 was agriculture, will dispose of these materials for free. And

18 so while the agency appreciates the idea that B&G already has

19 a statewide policy in place as it relates to chemical

20 disposal, and if it is not, or excuse me, B&G is building in -

21 - in grounds. So buildings that are owned and maintained by

22 the state, and then buildings that are occupied by the state,

23 but we rent them that they all have cleaning companies like

24 why is the -- the word escaping me at the moment? Janitorial

25 services that they're responsible for the disposal of their

1 own expired chemicals. So while -- if there wasn't a policy in
2 place by B&G, there would be a savings realized that they
3 cannot supersede public works' own policies to dispose of
4 these chemicals themselves. So the -- it was the opinion of
5 the agency regretfully that they have to deny this proposal.
6 So I'll accept a motion from the board to concur with the DMV
7 on action item 9(G).

8 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
9 department in denying the suggestion.

10 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie, do we have a second?

11 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

12 POWELL: Second. Board members, please state your
13 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to item 9(G).

14 MILLER: Aye.

15 COOK: Aye.

16 POWELL: Aye. All right. We'll consider action Item 9(G)
17 closed. Moving on to action item 9(H). That is from Boris
18 Grinberg, I apologize for melding those two names together.
19 This is from the Secretary of State, and this is to create a
20 mobile app for conducting various Secretary of State business.
21 So Secretary of State does things, all sorts of licenses, and
22 their suggestion was to create an app that just lets people
23 scan these documents from their phones. And this one had two
24 opinions, one from the Secretary of State himself as well as
25 from the Department of Administration. And they both have

1 stated that there is already a project underway at the
2 department prior to the suggestion that was submitted by Boris
3 Grinberg. So taking what they say at face value, that -- which
4 is to deny it because these -- this project was already
5 underway is just such a large project that has taken multiple
6 years. So I'll accept a motion from the board to concur with
7 the opinion of Secretary of State to deny action Item 9(H).

8 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

9 POWELL: Do I have a second? And thank you Brian.

10 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

11 POWELL: Second. Board members, please state your
12 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(H).

13 MILLER: Aye.

14 HUGHES: Aye.

15 POWELL: Aye.

16 COOK: Aye.

17 POWELL: Motion carries. Consider action Item 9(H)
18 complete. The next suggestion from Juan Hernandez. So it's a
19 Department of Transportation, is copilot licenses. The opinion
20 of the agency was to deny these licenses, not so much just the
21 licenses themselves, but a supplemental license called Gen AI
22 because we all know that the state has rolled out co-pilot
23 already. So that part of the suggestion predates the
24 submission from this. But the second part is the Gen AI
25 license and it says the estimates provided by the person

1 submitting the suggestion in terms of the costs of the
2 licenses and the actual amount of money saved while we use AI
3 to augment our day-to-day work are both mathematically
4 incorrect and unquantifiable. So the estimates provided in a
5 suggestion do not agree with what the department says will be
6 savings made and then the cost per license. So taking their --
7 they both provide calculations and they do appear that they've
8 done their due diligence in saving those that it does look
9 like the savings would be almost non-existent. And part of the
10 other suggestion is that co-pilot was rolled out prior to this
11 suggestion. So half of the suggestion is already moot. And
12 then the second half is the cost savings, which the department
13 does not believe will be realized. So I'll accept a motion to
14 -- for the board to concur with action Item 9(A) -- 9(I)
15 excuse me.

16 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur with the denial.

17 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. We have a second?

18 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

19 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
20 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(I).

21 HUGHES: Aye.

22 POWELL: Aye.

23 COOK: Aye.

24 POWELL: Aye. All right. The motion carries. And I'll
25 have to excuse myself for just a moment. I'm a little

1 congested. So we're going to pause at action item 9(J) just
2 for a moment. So I'll be right back. Sorry for that. I don't
3 think it made much of a difference.

4 MILLER: No worries.

5 POWELL: I sound just as bad. All right. So resuming
6 action Item 9(J), this is from Heather Hill, Nevada System of
7 Higher Education. This one was tablets for inmates inside the
8 Department of Corrections. So this one, traverse departments.
9 Ms. Hill's suggestion was to provide tablets for prison
10 inmates for -- for learning purposes. The Department of
11 Corrections chose to deny this because tablets are already
12 available to prison inmates. So this was probably just --
13 there were two departments that don't really know how each
14 other work. And so this -- this one made it just because they
15 didn't know that such equipment was already available. So I'll
16 accept a motion for the board to concur with the Department of
17 Corrections decision to deny this suggestion.

18 MILLER: Brian Miller, a motion to concur.

19 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

20 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

21 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
22 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(J).

23 MILLER: Aye.

24 COOK: Aye.

25 POWELL: Aye. Motion carries so consider action item

1 9(J) complete. Moving on to action item 9(K), this is another
2 question that I'll need to get some clarification on because
3 the statute says NRS 285.060 that or 070, I apologize that
4 suggestions submitted by people are limited to two per year.
5 And so this will be the person second. And my question, was it
6 by fiscal year or calendar year? But I think it's calendar,
7 but I'm just going to make sure about that because we make our
8 payments to recipients based on fiscal years. So it kind of
9 makes me wonder as to what that limitation is. If either of
10 these from Heather Hill were approved, then they would be
11 eligible for one more. But that being said, if everybody
12 knows, if it's calendar year for sure, then I'll say it's
13 calendar year. But if not, then I'll do a little research and
14 see if it's by fiscal year or calendar year for suggestions.

15 HUGHES: So DHRM can reach out to legal counsel.

16 POWELL: Okay.

17 HUGHES: And get that question, so are you thinking that
18 we would table the second one?

19 POWELL: No, the sec -- we'll, just -- if neither of
20 Heather Hills are approved, then they cannot submit anymore
21 for the rest of the calendar year, which would probably be
22 immaterial. But if we go by fiscal year, then they would be
23 ineligible to submit another one until July 1st. So that's the
24 only reason why I've thought of this. So if it's calendar
25 year, they're good, but fiscal year, then we can't take

1 anymore from Heather Hill until the next fiscal year. The
2 second one is action item 9(K), as I previously mentioned. And
3 she, Heather Hill, this is dental care for inmates. The idea
4 was to use the students that are enrolled in dental technician
5 programs or oral hygiene to offer dental care to the inmates
6 because they don't receive it. And the board, excuse me, the
7 Department of Corrections, I apologize, mentioned that there
8 is full-time staff, dentist hygienist, oral surgeons on staff
9 that is available to any person incarcerated within the
10 system. So I think the idea is interesting because it could be
11 a way to save some money, but the -- as it was presented, it
12 was suggesting that prisoners do not receive any sort of
13 dental care whatsoever. And this would be a need to fill that
14 gap. So I think it might be a worthwhile -- worthwhile
15 endeavor if we're ever into some sort of financial crunch and
16 we can't afford such thing, but it's part of their
17 constitutional right to be treated well, so we don't have to
18 go down that road at this point. So I'll accept a motion for
19 the board to concur with the Department of Corrections
20 decision to deny Action Item 9(K).

21 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

22 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

23 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

24 POWELL: Board members, please state your affirmations
25 or otherwise as it relates to the board's decision to concur

1 with the opinion of 9(K).

2 MILLER: Aye.

3 HUGHES: Aye.

4 POWELL: Aye. Motion carries. 9(K) is closed. Moving on
5 to 9(L), Gloria McDaniel Humphrey or Humphrey McDaniel, I
6 apologize from the Department of Motor Vehicles. This is
7 another paper savings. The suggestion from the submitter was
8 to not automatically print a receipt when a transaction is
9 completed at the DMV and the director of the DMV says it is
10 the policy of the DMV to provide a receipt for every
11 transaction. It did not go into the details why, but it -- I
12 have no opinion one way or the other as to what people do with
13 their receipts, but they're not going to implement this even
14 if there are some sort of paper savings because they will
15 continue to provide receipts for these transactions. So I'll
16 accept a motion from the board to concur with DMV's pinion to
17 deny action Item 9(L).

18 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
19 department in denying the suggestion.

20 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

21 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

22 POWELL: Thank you. The motion carries. Consider action
23 Item 9(L) complete. Moving on to action item 9(N) from the
24 Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation. And that
25 is from Charles Jackson. And this is a suggestion about

1 employee recognition, reserve parking for employee of the
2 month, employee of the quarter, things of that nature. The
3 department says, well, this is a pretty good idea. The costs
4 are pretty substantial, just erecting some sort of, kind of
5 like a denoter, like a handicap spot in every state-owned
6 building. But the real challenge is that the state operates in
7 many non-state-owned buildings. And so we cannot go digging
8 into the ground or marking parking spots as reserved for state
9 employees, particularly because in a lot of state buildings,
10 the parking lots are communal. So there could be five or six
11 businesses also using this parking. So it would not be
12 reasonable to expect other businesses sharing communal parking
13 to adhere by our employee of the month. And then furthermore,
14 if one agency adopts such a regulation, then that would lead
15 itself to potential grievances, as why doesn't every other
16 department observe the same recognition of an employee of the
17 month or an employee of the quarter. So I'll accept a motion
18 from the board to concur with the agency's decision to deny
19 this suggestion 9(M) .

20 MILLER: Brian Miller, a motion to concur.

21 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

22 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I'll second.

23 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Board members, please state
24 your affirmations so otherwise as it relates to action Item
25 9(M) .

1 MILLER: Aye.

2 POWELL: Aye.

3 COOK: Aye.

4 POWELL: Sounds like we have majority, motion carries.

5 Consider action item 9(M) complete. Action Item 9(N) from
6 Tanya Keith. Why is mine Daniel Jacobs? Sorry, it seems I have
7 done a number on my workbook here. Everybody's name up one, so
8 I'm reeling in real time as I try to get back in sync here. So
9 9(N), Daniel Jacobs, Department of Corrections, hire part-time
10 correctional officers to reduce overtime. The de --
11 department's opinion was to deny this because the department's
12 fiscal year 26/27 budget includes 90 full-time correctional
13 officer positions to the person's suggestion was that using
14 these part-timers would fill the gaps for the overtime because
15 they have muster pay, holiday pay, and all these other things
16 where they -- they're incurring additional expense because
17 they have to have correctional officers on deck. And so the
18 department believes that with these hiring of the additional
19 90 full-time equivalents that this will solve the overtime
20 problem. I did look at their budgets and that is true that
21 they do have quite a number of PCNs. They're position control
22 numbers they're trying to fill to get new bodies in the door.
23 So I believe that -- that this budget was prepared two years
24 ago, that the idea itself preempted the suggestion. So I'll
25 accept a motion from the board to concur with action Item

1 9 (N) .

2 MILLER: If they were to implement the part-timers,
3 would they have the opportunity to roll into these current
4 vacancies?

5 HUGHES: I believe that part of what correct --
6 corrections was saying in their response is they are still
7 trying to fill those as full-time. So why would they hire
8 part-time when they're still trying to fill the full-time
9 positions?

10 MILLER: Okay. And then would they -- I would imagine
11 the part -- if they were to implement part-timers, they'd have
12 to be post, what is it for? Certified?

13 POWELL: Was it level -- post level three or, yeah, that
14 -- because one is Highway Patrol, two -- yeah -- so yeah --
15 they do need post certification, but so yeah, getting these
16 positions is -- is quite the endeavor. And we actually have
17 another one from corrections that we'll talk about all the
18 work that goes into getting a correctional officer. So but as
19 it relates granularly to this one, that hiring the part-timers
20 is -- is not as an effective as a tool as that they're trying
21 to complete as actually hiring full-timers. So --

22 MILLER: Got you.

23 POWELL: So I believe it's -- it's fair to accept a
24 motion to concur with the department's decisions to deny this
25 just based on both the timing and to their efforts to actually

1 get more than a part-time in the spot to get full-timers.

2 HUGHES: And I --

3 MILLER: I move a motion to, oh sorry.

4 HUGHES: Oh, I was just gonna also point, they also --
5 they don't spell it out, but this would cause double the
6 hiring of correctional officers. So there are costs involved
7 whenever you hire someone. So if you have part-time people,
8 you're doubling up on those costs.

9 MILLER: Okay.

10 HUGHES: So that -- that's another impact on this
11 suggestion.

12 MILLER: All right.

13 POWELL: Yeah. So aside from the timing, yeah, they're -
14 - they're -- if you hire one person, they go through the same
15 onboarding as it with two people. So they -- you're doubling
16 those costs essentially because -- and a pro certification
17 types to all the HR onboarding and then you have to get used
18 to get them an account. So there's --

19 HUGHES: Both insurance contributions.

20 POWELL: Yeah. All the indirect costs associated with
21 hiring a person are essentially doubled to tell you reach that
22 full-time equivalent. So two PTEs has the indirect cost the
23 same way as hiring one person, so --

24 MILLER: Got you. No cost savings, got you. Brian
25 Miller, motion to concur with agencies motion.

1 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. We have a second?

2 COOK: Tracey Cook, second.

3 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
4 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(N).

5 HUGHES: Aye.

6 POWELL: Aye.

7 COOK: Aye.

8 POWELL: Motion carries. Consider 9(N) complete. Moving
9 on to action item 9(O) from Tanya Keith from the Division of
10 Child and Family Services. This is to replace bottled, excuse
11 me, water fountains in the buildings with bottle fillers. And
12 the agency says this will not be implemented. It is not in the
13 budget, but they see in many of their upcoming leases that a
14 lot of buildings do have these bottle fillers because that's
15 the -- the new norm. So they're not saying that the suggestion
16 from there will cause them to implement it, they just want
17 people to know that as we do rent buildings, it seems to be
18 part of the items offered are bottled water fillers. And I
19 know that my building, which is state-owned, does have a
20 bottled water fillers. So we're heading in that direction. Bu
21 it's according to the agency, they will not implement it
22 directly, but -- and it may not be an awful idea considering
23 that I've seen it, but to be -- to mandate it, I guess is what
24 is not going to be implemented. So I'll accept a motion with
25 the board to concur with DSS decision to not implement action

1 Item 9(O) .

2 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
3 agency in denying the suggestion.

4 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie, do we have a second?

5 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

6 POWELL: All right.

7 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

8 POWELL: Thank you both. Board members, please state
9 your affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item I
10 and 9(O) .

11 HUGHES: Aye.

12 POWELL: Aye. All right. Motion carries, considered 9(O)
13 closed. Action Item 9(P) from Mario Lozano and that is from
14 the Department of Public Safety to modify spike strips. If
15 we're not aware, spike strips are when you are in some type of
16 vehicle pursuit and you throw that big long chain across the
17 highway or the street has a bunch of spikes and it punctures
18 whoever they're pursuing, it punctures their tires. This
19 person's suggestion was to attach like a ball and a string to
20 the end of the spike strip to make it easier to throw. The
21 agency contends that the currently -- the current training
22 program that is already in place is been vetted by both the
23 company that produces these spike strips and the department.
24 And they believe in its current incar -- incarnation that this
25 does maximize officer -- officer safety. So modifying it not

1 to manufacture specification could expose the officer
2 deploying this device to dangers that they haven't considered
3 as well as causing them -- the device to malfunction. So there
4 are no cost savings with this so I can't argue on either
5 person's behalf because I am not an expert in this field so I
6 -- I must just defer with the division's decision to not
7 implement this and I'll accept a motion from the board to
8 concur with that decision.

9 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
10 agency in denying the suggestion.

11 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie, do we have a second?

12 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

13 POWELL: Thank you, board members, please state your
14 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(P).

15 COOK: Aye.

16 HUGHES: Aye.

17 MILLER: Aye.

18 POWELL: All right. Aye. Motion carries. Action Item
19 9(P) complete. Moving on to 9(Q), Sherry McCune, Division of
20 Social Services casework assignment focused to get better
21 familiarized. So the person's suggestion is, I guess these
22 cases at the division of social services are -- are color
23 coded and that's basically to determine what type of case it
24 is. So orange is this type of case and blue is this type of
25 case and so on. And so the -- the the current training program

1 they contend is closely monitored by the supervisors and
2 mentorship is provided. So the problem would be if someone
3 let's say, had three months in and was only assigned to letter
4 or code blue files, then maybe code orange would start to
5 experience a backlog because the person would be pigeonholed
6 into doing blue only based on their -- their time and service.
7 So they've said that if -- if this suggestion like this tenure
8 based, then it could kind of leave you in a situation where
9 you have too many of one case creating a backlog, not enough
10 of others. So they believe there's certain training program
11 with the constant -- with the mentorship by the supervisors is
12 sufficient and they will not be implementing this suggestion.
13 If anybody's more familiar with this -- this, they're free to
14 speak to it, but I will accept a motion to concur with the
15 division's opinion as it relates to action Item 9(Q).

16 MILLER: So they're trying to implement, sign a cross-
17 training program?

18 POWELL: It -- it sounds like to me, like I said, I'm
19 not an expert, but they have, let's say five different types
20 of cases and based on your time as a -- we'll call it a case
21 worker, because I don't think it's like family service
22 specialists. If you have between zero and two years, you only
23 work on blues to get really good at blues and then when you
24 graduate to work on oranges and then that means you can work
25 on blue and oranges. And they're saying right now they have so

1 many new people that if they adopted this program that
2 everybody would be working on blues for two years and then all
3 the oranges, which we'll call level two cases would start to
4 build up. So they don't believe that forcing people to work on
5 just one type of case until they become like the experts of
6 that type of case will be to the benefit of the -- the
7 constituent because a lot of oranges or greens or whatever
8 colors they're using will -- will wait until they get enough
9 like seasoned people.

10 MILLER: Got you. Yeah. And if someone calls out or
11 something, it could go back fast so I get it.

12 POWELL: Yeah. So they -- they say that they're -- they
13 have a process in place that they believe sufficiently meets
14 the needs of all -- all the colors.

15 MILLER: All right. Brian Miller, motion to concur with
16 the denial.

17 POWELL: Thank you. Brian, do we have a second?

18 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I second.

19 POWELL: Thank you both. Thank you. Board members,
20 please state your affirmations or otherwise as it relates to
21 action Item 9(Q).

22 COOK: Aye.

23 MILLER: Aye.

24 POWELL: Aye. Okay, action Item 9(Q) is closed. Moving
25 to action Item 9(R) from Gabriel Ocmeja from the Department of

1 Corrections. This suggestion was to increase salaries and as
2 we all know for the past two biennium, there have been efforts
3 to increase salaries, particularly for uniformed officers.
4 They've already had one, two, or three pay grade increases.
5 Additional to that, there have been three years of salary
6 increases. In addition to that, correctional officers do have
7 recruitment bonuses. And finally, on top of that also
8 retention bonuses. So the department and the state as a whole
9 has been dutifully trying to increase the number of
10 correctional officers we -- we recruit. And so, number one,
11 the suggestion is not how cost savings, might improve service,
12 but that idea was predated as we could tell, because the past
13 two biennium budgets have had salary increases, retention
14 bonuses, and also recruitment bonuses. So I'll accept a motion
15 from the board to concur with the department's decision to
16 deny the suggestion 9(R).

17 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

18 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

19 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes.

20 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

21 POWELL: Thank you both. Board members, please state
22 your affirmations or otherwise as or relates to action Item
23 9(R).

24 MILLER: Aye.

25 HUGHES: Aye.

1 COOK: Aye.

2 POWELL: Aye. Motion carries. Items 9(R) is closed.

3 Moving on to 9(S). That is from James O'Hara from DMV. This is
4 a suggestion to improve the estimate registration tool
5 available online because when you type in your VIN number
6 online, it -- it calculates how much it's going to cost to
7 register your car. It's not an exact figure. And the DMV is
8 not going to implement because they do emphasize that the tool
9 itself is labeled as an estimate and they want it to be an
10 estimate. Because if you add more fields that a customer could
11 enter themselves, they could enter something that makes the
12 number look more favorable and then they get to the DMV and
13 then they say, well the online tool said this, why is there a
14 difference? So the -- they believe that enhancing this tool
15 would leave to more errors and should be left as such as it's
16 just an estimate. And the agency does believe the agent that
17 the estimate is close enough to the actual amount to be
18 expected. So that really honing in on this would cause more
19 trouble and cost.

20 HUGHES: Which item are we on?

21 POWELL: Oh, I'm sorry. I skipped S and went to T so my
22 apologies. That was from Leola Radkey. So we'll just scratch
23 the previous two minutes of comment. We'll go back to 9(S).
24 That's from James O'Hara at the Division of Public and
25 Behavioral Health. And that is a scrutinized discharge

1 process. And this process once James O'Hara contends that when
2 people are discharged from the -- in the particular instance
3 referenced by both the person who responded and the suggestion
4 are the Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada adult mental
5 health facilities, that there is not enough vetting going on
6 in who the -- the patient is discharged to. And so the agency
7 contends that they already have a process for discharging
8 patients to responsible guardians. And anything further would
9 require court intervention because both the person being
10 discharged and the people the guardians have legal rights and
11 for us to intervene on that would require court intervention.
12 So the division says policies are sound enough and they'll not
13 be implementing the procedure. And with that being said, I'll
14 accept a motion from the board to concur with their opinion on
15 this -- this improved discharge process suggestion.

16 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
17 agency and deny the suggestion.

18 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie, do we have a second?

19 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

20 POWELL: Thank you. Board members state your affirmation
21 or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(S).

22 HUGHES: Aye.

23 MILLER: Aye.

24 POWELL: All right. 9(S) is closed. I, excuse me. Action
25 item 9(S) is closed. All right, now we're going to revisit

1 9(T), that's from Leola Radtke at the DMV and this as I
2 previously mentioned was to approve the DMV registration
3 estimate tool. As previously mentioned, the tool is merely an
4 estimate and letting people input things that might fine tune
5 the estimate, may actually lead them into coming up with an
6 incorrect number. And so they go to the DMV and expect this
7 number and it's off would -- which would lead to more problems
8 than merely providing a -- we'll call it a ballpark estimate,
9 but a reasonable number to expect. So the DMV believes that
10 this would actually cause more problems than savings that
11 could be realized and the savings would be basically
12 inconsequential, if any, because there would be a lot of
13 administrative burden in correcting these errors at the time
14 of service. So I'll accept a motion to concur with the DMV's
15 decision to deny action Item 9(T).

16 MILLER: Brian, motion to con -- Brian Miller, a motion
17 to concur.

18 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

19 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second

20 POWELL: Board members please state your affirmations or
21 otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(T).

22 HUGHES: Aye.

23 COOK: Aye.

24 POWELL: Aye. Motion carries. 9(T) is closed. Moving on
25 to 9(U), that's from Dianne Steele at DMV. This is statewide

1 training. This -- this one I think we alluded to just a little
2 bit earlier, is that essentially, there's a lot of training
3 that happens in all our jobs and positions and it's hard to
4 track and it's basically a very difficult thing to manage. And
5 so Dianne suggests overhaul this process and the DMV wanted to
6 note that even prior to our new HR system, CORE.NV, that this
7 was also going to be part of SMART 21, the previous HRM system
8 implementation. That we are going to have a better learning
9 tool, and I forgot the name, it's called --

10 HUGHES: Learn.

11 POWELL: There you go. Learn. So this -- this system
12 should be all encompassing, better tracking, all centralized.
13 And so if you move to agency to agency or position and
14 position, your training can be monitored better. So the agency
15 denies the suggestion as the -- the two enterprise resource
16 planning systems that we have in place or previously we were
17 working on occurred prior to the suggestion from Danielle
18 Steel. So I'll accept a motion from the board to concur with
19 the DMV's decision to deny action Item 9(U).

20 HUGHES: So I have a comment or two on this one.

21 POWELL: Sure.

22 HUGHES: One is that currently statewide training in
23 Nevada eLearn and be set up so that a completion flows through
24 to our NEATS system and from there to our HR data warehouse.
25 So reports can be run.

1 POWELL: Okay.

2 HUGHES: Additionally, the Learn program is currently
3 being set up and we are about to enter UAT testing for the new
4 system, so --

5 POWELL: All right.

6 HUGHES: -- it's not perspective, it's upon us.

7 POWELL: All right, so we have some insider knowledge
8 about this system is coming live soon and it's going to
9 encompass the suggestion in its entirety, or at least the
10 majority to the state's needs. And so I'm okay with accepting
11 a motion for the board to concur with the DMV's decision to
12 deny action Item 9(U).

13 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

14 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

15 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I'll second.

16 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
17 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item 9(U).

18 MILLER: Aye.

19 COOK: Aye.

20 POWELL: Aye. All right. Action Item 9(U) close. Moving
21 on to 9(V). This is from Jan Unger, from the Division of Child
22 and Family Services. This is a suggestion to update cell phone
23 plans. This individual contacted Verizon to see if there were
24 savings to be had by modifying some of the cell phone plans of
25 the state, or not the state, but for this division. And the

1 division responded that the division already has a system in
2 place to monitor the age of their devices and their contracts
3 assigned to the personnel and their agency. And so there is an
4 activity already monitoring this and it suits their needs. So
5 maybe there might be savings to be had, but it's at an ad hoc,
6 one piecemeal. So the division does not want to implement this
7 sort of system to one-by-one update their phone plans. So the
8 division is not going to implement this. So I'll accept a
9 motion for the board to concur with the division's choice to
10 deny action Item 9(V).

11 MILLER: Well, intended but motion to concur with the
12 deny.

13 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. We have a second?

14 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

15 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
16 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item 9(V).

17 MILLER: Aye.

18 COOK: Aye.

19 HUGHES: Aye.

20 POWELL: Aye. Action item 9(V) closed. Action item 9(W)
21 from Esther Veal. This is from division of Social Services
22 eligibility determination. This one has a lot of tech jargon,
23 vernacular that I'm not familiar with, so I will -- I did my
24 best to summarize, make a synopsis. But basically, there are
25 situations where a person seeking assistance is eligible for

1 more than one type of assistance. And the -- the agency
2 contends that they already have a system in place to evaluate
3 any changes in eligibility and that the proposed change could
4 lead to an act -- a lack of oversight as el -- as households
5 become eligible or eligible for more than one program. So the
6 agency did see the suggestion, but is choosing not to
7 implement it contending that they have a system in place that
8 they believe is adequate. And as I said, I'm not an expert on
9 this one, so if anybody wants to speak more intelligently than
10 I did about this one, feel free. But with that being said,
11 I'll accept a motion for the board to concur with the DSS
12 decision to deny.

13 MILLER: Trell, I -- I don't know what --

14 POWELL: Yeah, I'm not or trell and umbrella and a lot
15 of those things. So I guess to the public at large, if anybody
16 else is watching, if plain language helps the folks like me,
17 because I -- I'm not neck deep in DSS casework, so I don't
18 know what a lot of the words mean, but I -- I do have to defer
19 to the opinion of -- of the division in this one because they
20 seem to believe that their system works. And so once again,
21 I'll accept a motion from the board to concur with DSS on this
22 one.

23 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
24 department.

25 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie.

1 HUGHES: And demand the suggestion.

2 POWELL: Do we have a second?

3 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

4 POWELL: Thank you. Board members please state -- state
5 your affirmations so otherwise as it relates to action item
6 9(W) .

7 MILLER: Aye.

8 HUGHES: Aye.

9 POWELL: Aye. All right, 9(W) --

10 COOK: Aye.

11 POWELL: Thank you. 9(W) closed. Moving on to 9(X). This
12 is an -- this is the second from best reveal. So once again
13 we'll follow up on eligibility. If this one is not accepted,
14 then they'll be ineligible to submit anymore for the rest of
15 the year. And also, this is another scanned print. And so the
16 suggestion is basically along the lines that when they receive
17 documents that they have to print them and then scan them in
18 at a later time. And the agency contends that they've already
19 begun implementation of the advanced document storage
20 techniques eight months prior to the submission of the
21 suggestion. And furthermore, on the suggestion, there were no
22 cost savings listed on the suggestion form so it -- it's hard
23 to quantify any sort of potential savings to be realized if
24 you leave it blank or write unknown. So I'll accept a motion
25 to -- for the board to concur with action Item 9(X).

1 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to concur.

2 POWELL: Thank you, Brian. Do we have a second?

3 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I'll second.

4 POWELL: Thank you both Board members, please state your
5 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item 9(X).

6 MILLER: Aye.

7 HUGHES: Aye.

8 POWELL: Aye. 9(X) closed. Just as a friendly reminder,
9 we've already heard 9(Y) at the beginning and now we're moving
10 on to 9(Z) which is from Dawn Ashford. And this is also a scan
11 in print and this is also from the Division of Social
12 Services. So based on the timing, who submitted theirs first?
13 If it was Esther or Don, one of them would be ineligible
14 unless there are provisions in the statute that two people can
15 share a submission, but these appear to have been submitted
16 independently. So I didn't look at the dates of submissions on
17 these, but one of them, if they're functionally similar to
18 each other, one of them would be ineligible, but we will hear
19 it because it -- it has been agendized. So 9(Z) is, as I said,
20 division of Social Services from Dawn Ashford. This is
21 improving scanning and printing processes and the agency
22 replied verbatim same choice of words. The division has become
23 implementation of advantage document storage techniques eight
24 months prior to the submission of the suggestion. So I'll
25 accept a motion for the board to concur with Division of

1 Social Service response to deny action Item 9(Z).

2 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion to concur with the
3 department in denying the suggestion.

4 POWELL: Thank you. Do we have a second?

5 MILLER: Brian Miller, I second.

6 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

7 POWELL: Thank you. Board members, please state your
8 affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action item 9(Z).

9 HUGHES: Aye.

10 COOK: Aye.

11 POWELL: Aye. Motion carries. Action Item 9(Z)
12 completes. Excuse me, I'd like suggestions out of control.
13 Moving on to action Item 10, discussion of budget for
14 marketing. So we have previously talked about trying to get
15 the word out about the program to get some novel ideas and
16 because we like hearing suggestions, like hearing the good
17 ones, and we'd love to give people some money and save the
18 state's money as well. So we have set aside some time to talk
19 about it. I think the budget account right now either has
20 8,000 realized funding available, or 9,000 because 1,000 of it
21 is in a work program for interest recruit throughout the year.
22 So I believe it's actually, yeah, we're -- we're hoping to
23 have collected 9,000, but we have 8,000 on the books as of
24 today. So the statute does state that we do have \$5,000
25 available for not necessarily the word marketing, but for

1 operations of the board. So I don't believe it would be
2 improper to try to get the word out about this program and try
3 to get some interested in, so let's talk about it.

4 HUGHES: So it was put on the agenda as an action item
5 because it would be the -- an action of the board to decide. I
6 mean, unless somebody has any ideas, I mean, staff can look
7 into it further, what would be involved. But the question is
8 first, what would -- what would be researched? What would we
9 be interested in doing?

10 POWELL: I -- I would be interested in somehow
11 communicating statewide to all the employees that there is
12 this program available. I don't want to say we have a lot of
13 frequent flyers, but you know, a lot of our suggestions come
14 from like the same six agencies. And so it seems like some
15 people are more aware than others and then we have a lot of
16 people that submit multiple suggestions. So I don't think a
17 lot of people know about it. So that's one thing I'd like to
18 do. And then the second thing I'd like to do is put some
19 resources into, we have a log that looks like a table of
20 everything that's been previously submitted. So I'd like to
21 overhaul that somehow. And maybe we could do it professionally
22 with some of what we'd like to potentially spend in saying
23 here's kind of, not guide them, but help them screen out some
24 ideas that probably aren't going to make it so.

25 MILLER: In paper.

1 POWELL: At least, yeah. But say it in a nice way.

2 MILLER: Yeah.

3 POWELL: You know, because I don't want to say no, we
4 don't want to hear your -- your ideas on how to save paper,
5 but I do -- we do want to hear your ideas on this or, you
6 know.

7 HUGHES: So DHRM hosts a webpage for the board. So if
8 you have any suggestions about that, more than willing to look
9 at that, like posting that summary of previous suggestions.
10 But when you talk about getting it, well, one thing, I don't
11 know if everyone on the board is aware, especially Tracey and
12 you Brian, but it is required that when a classified employee
13 receives their evaluation, they're required to be told about
14 this program. It's -- it's actually on the form. What -- I
15 can't speak to implementation, but what I will tell you is
16 that tells me however, that which ones are not being told. So
17 that doesn't include our unclassified and our unclassified
18 employees which they're kind of grouped in certain agencies
19 that we never hear from.

20 MILLER: NSHE -- NSHE.

21 HUGHES: NSHE is one of them.

22 POWELL: Gaming Control Board.

23 HUGHES: The Gaming Control, the governor's office has
24 some non-classified and unclassified.

25 MILLER: How many have we got from Secretary of State?

1 We had one today right? From Secretary of State's office.

2 HUGHES: They have quite a bit of classified staff.

3 POWELL: Attorney general's largely unclassified, but
4 that's a good point. And to your point our yearly appraisals
5 don't --

6 MILLER: Yeah, twenty-four years in the state, never --
7 that NSHE never once was --

8 POWELL: Yeah.

9 MILLER: So thank you for letting --

10 HUGHES: Well, somebody tried. They put it, I -- I
11 forget Kelsey, it's either an NRS or in NAC.

12 MILLER: Okay.

13 HUGHES: So and it is something that we're currently
14 revamping the mandatory supervisor classes. And I -- I'm part
15 of that process and that's something that I'll make sure is
16 covered in that training. But I guess what kind of modality
17 are we talking about? Are we talking about getting brochures
18 done? What kind of communication are we talking about?

19 MILLER: Well, I don't know what -- what DHRMs take is
20 on this, but you could potentially put the union to use on
21 this. We have what's going on right now of blitz and if we
22 were to implement that NRS or NAC in what they call chapter
23 meetings to make our stewards aware of that, make our
24 organizers aware of that, that would help get the word out to
25 all the agencies. Because currently that's why all you see

1 these folks coming and going, they're all up from Vegas.
2 They're implementing blitz on different work sites. And that
3 could be included in their -- their wrap, so to speak when
4 they're presenting information. So, and it wouldn't cost us
5 anything other than what they -- they're already paying and
6 dues and things like that. So, and it would take a couple more
7 seconds to actually say, "Hey, did you know that your
8 supervisor should be putting this?" Now I don't want to open
9 the pandora's box to grievances should the supervisors not be
10 implementing because that will weigh me down. But we could --
11 the union could help in this aspect.

12 HUGHES: So even just saying, are you aware of the
13 program?

14 MILLER: Yeah.

15 HUGHES: You know, you could keep it neutral. You don't
16 have to say, your supervisor should be telling you, you could
17 say, are you aware of this program? Let us give you a little
18 bit of information.

19 MILLER: Yeah.

20 HUGHES: So like if we did a blurb and send it to you,
21 Brian and you Tracey, I mean, is that something you could
22 implement?

23 MILLER: Yeah, I'd get it to the organizers and we get
24 it to the stewards. And what do you think, Tracey on this?
25 It's -- it's an ev -- easy lift to help people it out.

1 COOK: You're right, Brian, because like we have our
2 monthly meetings and everything so we can, you know, put it in
3 there that everybody should get a copy that they can actually,
4 you know, we -- we all should have a board with information
5 like this.

6 MILLER: Yeah.

7 COOK: In all our offices, like in our break rooms and
8 stuff like that. We have everything else up there.

9 MILLER: Yeah -- yeah.

10 COOK: But you know, of course important stuff like
11 this is -- is not mentioned. Like I said, I didn't know and
12 I've been here for 15 years, I never knew about this. And so I
13 was able to get on the board asking to get this information.

14 HUGHES: So are we thinking like a poster? I mean a lot
15 of the posters that we have are mandated by statute, either
16 the federal or at the state level. But we certainly could and
17 DHRM promulgates the state's poster advisory and there are
18 optional. So that's also something that DHRM could, if we did
19 a poster or something and basically say, "Hey, this is another
20 thing that you can post."

21 MILLER: But we also have -- so that the way the CBAs
22 work right now is they have the employer provide -- provides
23 the space, we provide the cork board or whatever magnet board.
24 But if it would have to be in line with what y'all are
25 proposing as far as verbiage goes, and then we could pin those

1 up on our union boards as well.

2 HUGHES: Okay.

3 MILLER: And even if it's -- even if they don't agree,
4 even if they agree to the neutral, I don't see anybody -- and
5 what do you think Tracey? I don't see anybody having problems
6 pinning that up on the union boards, like our stewards on site
7 and things like that because it's really important.

8 HUGHES: Right.

9 MILLER: It's a gold nugget of information to put it
10 mildly. It's -- it's a really juicy gold nugget of
11 information.

12 HUGHES: Yeah.

13 MILLER: I was -- I was surprised because 24 years with
14 the state or in particular at NSHE, it doesn't surprise me
15 that NSHE didn't do it, but I mean it sounds like it's
16 happening at other agencies as well.

17 HUGHES: Mm-hm.

18 MILLER: Or not happening.

19 POWELL: What -- I, yeah -- it's like I'm thinking maybe
20 we get something like professionally designed that looks like
21 a pamphlet, but we get a PDF version and then we email that
22 statewide and then we maybe get some print in and give them
23 each to the unions and you know, if we have a professional do
24 this like an advertise, I can make it catchy like, "Hey, want
25 to earn some -- have a great idea, want to earn some extra

1 money?" Try submitting this to the Merit Award Board. And then
2 maybe we could host like two sessions, like one in the north
3 and the south. But we'll also have a video teleconference and
4 people, if their supervisors allow them, can either attend in
5 person or virtually. And then we just go over what the board
6 does, what you can get from it. So what kind of ideas we're
7 looking for and how the process works. And I mean the, you
8 know, that cost -- so -- and -- and travel costs would be the
9 -- the worst thing as terms of expenditure if we sent someone
10 to the south to do it.

11 HUGHES: So yeah. Doing it either in person or as a
12 webinar sort of thing. My unit is experienced in doing
13 webinars. We do this several times a month on a totally
14 different program, the employee assistance program.

15 POWELL: Sure.

16 HUGHES: So I mean, so would we be doing so at this
17 point maybe seeing what it would take to or what would be
18 involved in getting costs, quotes on developing like a
19 pamphlet, a poster.

20 POWELL: Yeah. I think like getting like an RFI to say,
21 you know, we'll let the professionals decide by like, here's
22 our vision is that we want to get the word out on this. So can
23 you print us something nice? Can you give us something that we
24 can also send electronically and then we can give it to the
25 unions. They can hand it out because I know like, not

1 everybody wants a bunch of little paper stuff, but if it
2 doesn't look like, no offense to the state, but we're not
3 graphic designers by trade. If we got something that looked
4 fun that says want make some money, I mean, you know, at least
5 to get people to look at it and it'll say, check out the Merit
6 Award Board or the, you know, Good Government, Great Employees
7 program. And then it'll say in addition to that, we'll also be
8 hosting two meet and greets or whatever. So you can meet some
9 members of the board and learn how the process works that at
10 least get the word out.

11 HUGHES: So we can certainly do some research on that.
12 And you know, if the board is willing to, and it's an action
13 item, you know, if we want to do a motion and take a vote and
14 empower DHRM to -- to look into that and bring it back to the
15 board,

16 POWELL: I'd like to do that. I'd like to at least get,
17 you know, a couple quotes because we don't need, you know, a
18 media blitz per se. But we, you know, spend a couple thousand
19 dollars on some people that do this for a living to turn some
20 heads at it. And then once we get that, we can kind of branch
21 out into, like I said, a webinar or an in-person that we also
22 broadcast at the same time. And it'll -- I mean people might
23 want a reason to get out of work for an hour and they might
24 get something interesting out of it too, so we could --

25 HUGHES: Right.

1 MILLER: Well with submitted, we have a team like that
2 too. Even if we were to get to agreed upon talking points, we
3 could put it in front of our media team and they could come up
4 with something to -- if -- if we're -- if we're waiting on the
5 DHRM and the state to implement something, that might be an
6 avenue of approach too. If we wanted to get the word out
7 sooner than later, but I'd have to get it approved to my
8 people first.

9 HUGHES: Right. And I'd like -- I was thinking something
10 universal because ASME is one of our big unions, but you're
11 not your -- our only one.

12 MILLER: Yeah.

13 HUGHES: So something that could be also given out to
14 like FOP, Fraternal Order Police --

15 MILLER: Yeah, MPU.

16 HUGHES: -- who -- who have our peace officers

17 MILLER: Yeah.

18 HUGHES: So yeah.

19 MILLER: And they'll be -- they'll be pumped. I'll let -
20 - I'll even let FOP know too, like some -- some of their
21 leadership will be excited to hear this as well. I don't -- I
22 can't speak on behalf of FOP.

23 HUGHES: Mm-hm.

24 MILLER: But it'd be interesting to know if the COs are
25 getting this information every year when they're getting their

1 evaluation. It just out of curiosity it's -- because like I
2 said, it's very good information to know this.

3 HUGHES: So it is written on the form. So if they are
4 getting their evaluation, it's there.

5 MILLER: Okay.

6 HUGHES: A reference, so -- okay. So we certainly can do
7 some research. My unit is used to talking to state purchasing
8 and we'll find the best route through there and get quotes and
9 bring that back.

10 MILLER: Okay.

11 POWELL: Yeah, that's good. And if it's more than the
12 money we've got on hand, I can ask for more because this is
13 general fund appropriated so we can -- if it looks like we're
14 actually trying to do something with it, I -- I don't think
15 it's gonna be a lot of heartache to give us a few thousand
16 more dollars especially because we reverted 22,000 last year,
17 so we gave back a bunch and we used very little. So it's --
18 it's not like some, you know, endeavor where we're just trying
19 to shuffle ourselves around the state on taxpayer dime. So I
20 think -- I think that'd be a good idea.

21 HUGHES: So yeah, if the board authorizes it, we can
22 look into making a couple of notes, you know, develop a plan,
23 bring it back to the board.

24 POWELL: Okay. In that case, yeah, I think where would
25 we like to start to put this in small manageable chunks

1 basically maybe before we give something to the union, I guess
2 we want to have something presentable. So do we want to -- I
3 don't know -- I don't know what the best first step is, I
4 guess is what I'm saying or just maybe do the RFI where we
5 don't obligate ourselves to anything and just kind of put the
6 feelers out there.

7 HUGHES: So there might already be an existing contract
8 we can utilize.

9 POWELL: Okay.

10 HUGHES: Without having to go out. We might also be able
11 to do this through a three-quote process.

12 POWELL: Yeah.

13 HUGHES: Like I said, I deal with purchasing a lot. So
14 let me see what we can do but I -- I -- to your point, I think
15 the question is do we want to hold off on giving something to
16 the unions till we have something developed or do we want to
17 just develop some talking points that then the board will
18 approve and hand over and then we're still working on the more
19 formal.

20 POWELL: Yeah, I guess that -- that's kind of the -- the
21 crossing point where I heard, because I -- I would just hate,
22 because I know how the supervisory works. It's like, are you
23 aware of the Marital Award Board? It's not like, hey, check
24 out this when you get your evaluation. We have this really
25 neat program where you could -- they just -- it's basically

1 checking a box.

2 MILLER: Yeah. The sign here stickers.

3 POWELL: Yes.

4 MILLER: Slapped onto the papers.

5 HUGHES: But if we give them like a pamphlet, give it
6 out to the agencies and say, Hey, use this to -- to do this
7 step. Yeah.

8 POWELL: Yeah. It's -- it's hard. So may -- maybe --

9 MILLER: Oh, go ahead. Sorry.

10 POWELL: Maybe the first step is to get something a
11 little snazzy put together so at least it doesn't look so
12 boilerplate that, you know, like a -- a Word document that we
13 convert it to a PDF. It makes no offense to anybody. I'm not
14 saying that's, it's just if it looks run of the mill, people
15 may not pay much attention to it. It's just all I'm worried
16 about.

17 HUGHES: We could, as soon as we get something together,
18 schedule another meeting regardless so that we can move this
19 process along.

20 MILLER: Sure.

21 HUGHES: So not wait for the six months or the seven
22 suggestions. Have a -- have a meeting. We'll agendize what
23 we've got, whatever that is. So we've already got one to go.

24 POWELL: Yeah.

25 HUGHES: If that's what the board wants to do, we

1 certainly can do that. Is as soon as we get something together
2 so we can keep this process moving and not wait six months.

3 POWELL: Yeah, let's -- I like the sound of that.

4 HUGHES: Okay.

5 POWELL: Yeah. So that's good first steps.

6 HUGHES: All right.

7 POWELL: Okay. I like that. I like that we have some
8 marching orders for ourselves here. So anything else you want
9 to talk about regarding the discussion a budget for marketing?
10 I think we've talked about quite a bit. If nobody else has
11 anything to add, I'll accept a motion from board to consider
12 agenda item 10 complete.

13 MILLER: Brian Miller, motion to consider agenda item 10
14 complete.

15 POWELL: Thank you, Brian, do we have a second?

16 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I'll second.

17 COOK: Tracey Cook, I second.

18 POWELL: Thank you both. Board members, please state
19 your affirmations or otherwise as it relates to action Item
20 10.

21 HUGHES: Aye.

22 POWELL: Aye.

23 MILLER: Aye.

24 COOK: Aye.

25 POWELL: All right. Just a reminder that we did complete

1 action item 11 earlier, for the sake of some of our attendees.
2 Actually, I'm number 12, board comments. Does anybody have
3 anything else they wish to add? I think I interjected earlier
4 out of order just because it was present that for future
5 meetings, anything that re -- relates to printing or copying
6 or scanning that we lump together and we'll decide as a whole
7 if they warrant individual attention. If not, we will group
8 them. So that was my only comment to the board and I already
9 brought up the two per year out of order two. So, but like I
10 said, we'll get more information on that. That's the only
11 thing is I want to comment on.

12 HUGHES: So I was thinking that we can take it to both
13 of those items to our legal counsel so that I know that there
14 has been some discussion of consolidation on other public
15 bodies that DHRM provides administrative support to. So I know
16 there -- there might be steps we have to take and certain ways
17 we have to handle it. So if you don't mind, I'd kind of like
18 to take that to legal counsel.

19 POWELL: Sure, yeah. That -- that --

20 HUGHES: Those two points.

21 POWELL: That's fine. I think on our notice it says we
22 can't combine two or more for consideration. So I guess it's
23 just the mechanics of that, just making sure everybody gets
24 their fair shake. But I think we've just kind of beaten the
25 copy and print horse to death.

1 MILLER: Yeah.

2 HUGHES: I -- I -- and I think well, never mind.

3 POWELL: All right. Any other board comments?

4 MILLER: I'm curious to see how NSHE is implementing the
5 -- what we discussed about the -- this committee and -- and
6 pointing it out on Workday because the way they've been doing
7 it as far as like AFSCME goes, they'll present it in Workday
8 on an iPad, send you through a Workday platform and then you
9 send a digital signature. It just has fields to read. So, but
10 back in the days they used to give you a paper and one to
11 sign. So that's -- that's just something to put, it's not
12 anything but it is relevant. It's out of curiosity how are
13 they implementing it with the Workday system as opposed to the
14 needs system.

15 HUGHES: So is that also for the classifieds?

16 MILLER: Yeah.

17 HUGHES: Okay.

18 POWELL: Okay. Any other comments? If not, I'll accept
19 an -- a motion for the board to consider Action item 12
20 complete.

21 HUGHES: I -- motion is complete.

22 POWELL: Do I have second?

23 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

24 POWELL: Please state your affirmation or otherwise.

25 COOK: Aye.

1 HUGHES: Aye.

2 POWELL: Aye. Action item 12 complete. Action item, 13.

3 Public comment, no voter action may be taken upon a matter
4 raised during public comments until the matter itself has been
5 specifically included on an agenda item upon which action may
6 be taken. Comments will be limited to five minutes per person
7 and person's main comment will be asked to begin by stating
8 their names for the record and to spell their last name. I'll
9 accept an action -- motion from the board to consider action
10 Item 13 complete.

11 HUGHES: Carrie Hughes, I motion.

12 POWELL: Thank you, Carrie. Do we have a second?

13 MILLER: Brian Miller, second.

14 POWELL: Please state your affirmations or otherwise.

15 MILLER: Aye.

16 COOK: Aye.

17 HUGHES: Aye.

18 POWELL: Aye. All right. Action item 13, complete.

19 Action number 14, adjournment. Thank you all, everybody for
20 coming. The meeting is adjourned. All right.

21 *** END OF MEETING ***

22

23

24

25