



State of Nevada  
**MERIT AWARD BOARD**



“Good Government, Great Employees”

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

**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*



**MERIT AWARD BOARD**  
**OCTOBER 23, 2024 – 9:00 AM**

**Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records 100**  
**North Stewart Street, Room 110**  
**Carson City, NV 89701 and**

**Eureka Building**  
**7251 Amigo Street, Room 120 Las**  
**Vegas, NV 89101**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Merit Award Board**

**Members Present:**

Shayne Powell, Governor’s Finance Office, CHAIR  
Tracey Cook, Representative, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 4041  
Carrie Hughes, DHRM  
Brian Miller, Representative, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 4041

**Members Absent:**

None

**AGENDA**

**1. Call to Order, Roll Call**

Chair Shayne Powell called the meeting to order. All members were present in order to conduct the business of the Board.

Chair Powell noted that there is still an open spot on the Committee from the Governor's Office.

## **2. Public Comment:**

There was no public comment.

## **3. Review and Possible Adoption of Language Access Plan to Address Barriers to Individuals with Limited English Proficiency (NRS 232.0081)**

Chair Powell informed the Board that everyone was provided a copy of the Language Access Plan (LAP). The Chair explained that he has seen many of these in his role at the Governor's Finance Office because the Governor's Finance Office is paying for any costs incurred with them, and that many have been rejected, The ones that are frequently rejected are the ones that offer a 5-percent salary increase to an employee. It's difficult to put an employee on call to be able to take one of these calls and can be burdensome to ensure that the person remains qualified to provide language access due to the necessary training and certifications. As such, the Chair suggested following NRS very closely.

Carrie Hughes indicated that because DHRM has already done one for the Division itself as well as for two other public bodies, they are not being submitted. Ms. Hughes further indicated that the base plan was submitted for public comment on the website for 30 days, and that all public body plans, including this one for the MAB, are based upon that. Ms. Hughes informed the Board that should the plan be approved by the Board, it will be posted on DHRM's site for access. Ms. Hughes presented some key points about the plan, beginning with the fact that the plan is based on NRS 232.0081 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, which require that state agencies that receive public monies have an obligation to provide meaningful, timely, access for persons with limited English proficiency to the programs and services those agencies and entities provide. Ms. Hughes explained that the LAP identified procedures for providing individuals with limited English proficiency access to the services of the MAB, and mirrors the LAP that was developed by DHRM. In addition, Ms. Hughes indicated that the plan identifies as the points of contact staff members of DHRM who are points of contact both for the Division's LAP as well as those of other public bodies, including the Human Resources Commission and the Employee and Management Committee. Ms. Hughes explained that the plan outlines the fact that the Board would bear the cost of these services when a need presents, and that the coordinators, Kimberly Smith and Millie Thomas, would be the points of contact. Ms. Hughes next discussed the two resources identified in the plan: the state bilingual contact list that includes 142 employees with various language proficiencies, and the statewide contract that makes many vendors available for translation and sign language interpretation.

Chair Powell noted that for the MAB, cost should not be of any consideration as the money will come from special appropriations to fund this. The Chair indicated that he has not seen any of the assistive technology but presumes that it exists if needed.

Carrie Hughes noted that the Board can contact the office of the CIO to ask for assistance, should it be needed, or the Board can potentially purchase the equipment.

Chair Powell indicated that as such, the only challenge would be if the Board does not find out soon enough that someone needs that accommodation.

Carrie Hughes pointed out that on the Board's agenda, contact information is provided with a request for reasonable notice of five working days for accommodations.

A motion was made by Chair Powell and seconded by Carrie Hughes to adopt the Language Access Plan. Motion carried.

#### 4. Employee Suggestions

##### A. Jesse Haines

Chair Powell explained that Jesse Haines suggested cost savings by removing uniform allowances for those personnel that are not regularly in uniform. The Chair indicated that this suggestion was denied because while the personnel themselves aren't regularly in uniform, that doesn't mean they are not ever in uniform. The Chair further noted that most uniformed officers are members of a CBA and in those CBAs, every one of them has a stipend for uniform allowance. As such, the Chair indicated that it would essentially be a breach of contract to axe the uniform allowances.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

##### B. Lyell Collins

Chair Powell informed the Board that Lyell Collins's suggestion was to improve pay and benefits to improve retention. The Chair explained that this had been addressed by the COLA and retention bonuses given out by the state this year. Chair Powell further noted that DPBH, in their response, explained that they had been given authority to accelerate steps when this was submitted years ago to retain and recruit difficult-to-hire positions. As such, the Chair indicated his belief that the combination of those two things would denote fairness in denying this request.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

##### C. Desiree Drakely

Chair Powell indicated that Desiree Drakely introduced a suggestion to reduce paper waste by requiring online transactions. The Chair explained that the DMV contends that NRS 483 establishes DMV policies. In addition, the Chair indicated that the DMV does offer a majority of transactions online and is working on a new CRM to streamline operations further, into which the concept of reducing paper waste is baked inherently.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

##### D. Yo Lee

The Chair informed the Board that Yo Lee from DPBH suggested a review of the red flag laws. However, the Chair indicated that there is some information missing from the submission and as such, introduced a motion to table this agenda item until the additional information is provided. The Chair discussed a lawsuit that was settled a few years back for about \$800,000, and noted that the impetus of this suggestion was to avoid having this sort of litigation. The Chair further noted that this is tricky in the sense that there are not necessarily any savings to be had by building systems not

getting sued.

Carrie Hughes questioned if the Chair is looking for more information on red flag laws or for further elaboration from the agency.

Chair Powell noted that the suggestion form was left blank.

Tracey Cook questioned the inclusion of a set protocol for the state and Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (SNAMS) so as to avoid blame for a mass shooter.

Carrie Hughes concurred that she too does not see the correlation. Ms. Hughes questioned if the Board should look to the agency or to the employee for more clarification.

Chair Powell noted that the issue appears to be that the PDF is cut off or truncated.

Carrie Hughes indicated that she will go back and look to see if there is a complete version of the PDF available and if not, she will contact the agency to request one.

A motion was made and seconded to table Agenda Item 4D. Motion carried.

#### E. Ryan Regan

Chair Powell explained that Ryan Regan, Office of Analytics, suggested the implementation of a department-level rainy day funds. The Chair noted that the state already maintains a statewide rainy-day fund, and that this suggestion is to delegate the fund to the department levels. Chair Powell explained that the language in NRS 353 is such that this power is delegated to the level at which it currently is and as such, the Office of Analytics has denied the suggestion. The Chair further explained that agencies that collect fees can put excess funds into reserves so not everything reverts to the general funds--these are simply called by a name other than rainy-day fund.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### F. Austin Krehbiel

The Chair explained that Austin Krehbiel's suggestion is to require DWSS to print documents front and back. The Chair indicated that DWSS has denied the suggestion. Chair Powell explained that while DWSS acknowledges that duplex printing would save paper, the agency contends that having to buy duplex scanners and potentially PDF software would actually cost more money than it would save to print two pages rather than one.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### G. Andrea Brown

Chair Powell explained that Andrea Brown suggested offering shuttle service to state employees and noted that there were no cost savings provided, no savings, and no sort of financials into how this would reduce any expenditures to the state or improve efficiencies. The Chair indicated that logic would dictate that offering shuttle service to 20,000 people would be a tremendous cost to the state.

Tracey Cook indicated that California has a similar system in place.

Chair Powell further noted that if DWSS was to provide this service, then each state department should also be provided this service for equity purposes.

Brian Miller discussed the difficulty of implementing this plan for rural areas where no buses run and the potential for this being a tremendous cost.

Carrie Hughes noted that the employee did discuss charging a monthly fee so that this would not be entirely state-funded. Ms. Hughes asked Ms. Cook for more elaboration on the program in place in California.

Tracey Cook indicated that in Orange County, that has shuttle services, travelers meet at a central location to get on the shuttle. Ms. Cook further indicated that users of the shuttle service do pay a monthly fee out of their checks for this service.

Carrie Hughes discussed the overhead that staffing and insurance for this type of an endeavor, noting that even with a monthly fee paid by the users, this would still be cost prohibitive.

Chair Powell indicated that something like this could certainly come up again down the road several years as parking and driving becomes more congested in places like Las Vegas. As such, the Chair noted that he will do some research to see what sort of administrative burden is required on the MAB to track a suggestion that's denied right now but may be put into place in the future.

Carrie Hughes discussed how one of the recent things the state has done is purchase a very large campus of office buildings and moving whatever offices can be to that location as there is a tremendous amount of parking on that campus complex.

Tracey Cook discussed that regardless of this, the possibility of shuttle services in the future still exists as people may want to have a shuttle service to take them to their locations.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### H. Karla Scott

Chair Powell next discussed Karla Scott's suggestion to mandate employees to volunteer at least four hours per year. The Chair indicated that the Division of Insurance denied the suggestion, noting that if you are told to volunteer by your employer, this is no longer considered volunteering and as such, is a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Carrie Hughes added that for the state to pay an employee to volunteer this is state funds being used for an arguably unauthorized reason.

Chair Powell discussed the possibility of this opening the door to working out of class, which can cause all sorts of complications.

Carrie Hughes added the problem of the exempt employees who are salaried, whose hours could not be docked for volunteering and as such, again causes an FLSA problem. In addition, Ms. Hughes discussed the possibility of the state paying for something here that the taxpayers did not approve.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

I. Brandon Bishop

Chair Powell discussed Brandon Bishop's suggestions to realize cost savings by adopting the EPEAT Standard when purchasing computers and for all state employees to turn off their computers at night. The Chair indicated that Mr. Bishop did take the time to calculate the wattage approximately by all the computers being left on at the end of the night. The Chair informed the Board that the statewide contract through NASPO (phonetic) does comply with the EPEAT gold standard. In addition, the Chair indicated that State employees cannot turn off computers at night as that is when all program and security updates occur and that the cost to do these updates during the workday would actually be more expensive in terms of labor wasted.

Brian Miller commended Mr. Bishop for the work he put into researching this suggestion but concurred that turning off computers at night could potentially lead to disaster should these devices not receive security updates.

The Chair also commended Mr. Bishop for providing analysis along with the suggestion.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

J. Juliann Koch

The Chair informed the Board that Juliann Koch, DWSS, suggested copy paper savings and noted that DWSS denied this suggestion based on the grounds that these are for TANF and SNAP benefits, which are federally funded, and in order to receive those funds, the state has to be compliant with the electronic signatures in the Global and National Commerce Act, aka eSign.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

K. Ken Kitto

Chair Powell informed the Board the Ken Kitto from DPBH suggested digitizing the surveys. The Chair explained that DPBH denied this request as they had already implemented a similar program in 2013, which yielded mixed results. The Chair further noted that the surveys are currently offered both online and on paper, and there are accessibility considerations that have already needed to be addressed by the agency.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

L. Griffin Burke-Ruhl

Chair Powell indicated that Griffin Burke-Ruhl suggested bilingual applications for DWSS, which was denied by DWSS as work on the statewide Language Access Plan is underway and the centers for Medicare/Medicaid services has also implemented something similar and has been overhauling

this process since 2014, well before the suggestion of Mr. Burke-Ruhl.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### M. Yehonathan Rubinstein

Chair Powell discussed Yehonathan Rubinstein's suggestion of a nationwide benefit inquiry database from DWSS. The Chair explained that this was denied by DWSS for two reasons: Nevada has no authority over the other 49 states and territories to ensure compliance; and authorized personnel within the agency already have access to a federal database to obtain this information when needed.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### N. Chenyce Webb

Chair Powell discussed the suggestion from Chenyce Webb to enhance the onboarding experience and reassign PCNs (Position Control Numbers) and then find ways to speed up the process for employee access to the various systems. The Chair noted that in reviewing the packet, he did not see any process or plan that would speed up access. As such, the Chair indicated that he concurs with NDOC's decision to deny this request.

Carrie Hughes indicated that DOC did indicate that they are unable to simply swap empty PCNs as there are many other departments that need to provide approval, making this a much more difficult process than it looks.

Brian Miller added the possibility of also needing to go through the union if the PCNs are in a certified unit.

A motion was made and seconded to reject this suggestion. Motion carried.

#### O. Sandra Atkinson

Chair Powell informed the Board that Sandra Atkinson, DHHS, suggested a reduction to reduce a number of unused ERSI, health analytics software licenses. The Chair indicated that DHHS denied Sandra's suggestion based on the fact that per NRS 285.050 (2a), this suggestion had already been considered and rejected, and that managing the licenses is already a part of Ms. Atkinson's daily duties.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### P. Dawn Ashford

The Chair informed the Board that Dawn Ashford suggested improvement of the document

archiving process. The Chair indicated that the agency contends that the agency and the state already has a record disposition schedule and furthermore, that DWSS has even more controls in place and as such, there is no authority to change the records disposition schedule.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

Q. Dawn Ashford

Chair Powell informed the Board of Dawn Ashford's suggestion to change the font in AMPS case management software to red on the case summaries so as to alert the case managers that case summaries need to be reviewed before submission. The Chair indicated that DWSS has denied this suggestion because the work performance standards for the case managers clearly state that the case summary needs to be reviewed as part of the employee's responsibilities. In addition, the Chair noted that the case summary is the first document in the generated packet so it would be difficult to miss.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

R. Jacob Clodfelter

Chair Powell discussed Jacob Clodfelter's suggestion to make some changes within the Advantage HR system, regarding nurse shift differentials so as to reduce the amount of time it takes to process payroll every two weeks. The Chair indicated that this one is different in that NDVS did not issue an opinion regarding this request, but by way of DHRM noted that the state of Nevada is not entertaining enhancements to its old system as a new system will be rolled out shortly, followed by an additional phase for HR functions. The Chair further noted that there were some steps in the packet that outlined what Mr. Clodfelter wanted to achieve although not quite in the way he wanted to do it.

Brian Miller noted that typically departments comply with what's written within the CBA in regards to the shift differential. Mr. Miller explained that if an employee finds that this is not the case, they can follow the process to submit through DHRM and if denied, submit a formal grievance using the CBC, so there are already ways of implementing what Mr. Clodfelter is suggesting.

Chair Powell noted his hope that in terms of workflow to get the issue resolved, that it would start at the unit's payroll clerk first. The Chair applauded the state for attempting to make employees whole when these types of errors are spotted.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

S. Samantha D'Ambrosio

Chair Powell discussed Samantha D'Ambrosio's suggestions for the Homeless to Housing Program improvements but noted that there is no cost savings and no means to pay for these improvements other than via grants, which can be a clerical burden. As such, the Chair indicated that there is actually cost involved rather than saved. The Chair reminded the Board that for approval by MAB, the suggestion needs to increase productivity, improve service, prevent waste, prevent accidents, eliminate duplication, or reduce costs.

Carrie Hughes noted her confusion as one of the questions to which the agency responded is that this



suggestion is currently under active consideration and marked as a yes. Ms. Hughes indicated that the Homeless to Housing Unit indicated it began work on a grand proposal at the end of July 2023, and Ms. D'Ambrosio's suggestion was submitted on August 4, 2023.

Tracey Cook requested proof that the grant proposal was already in the works as of July of 2023 given that the suggestion was made in very early August. Ms. Cook further questioned the age group that this suggestion would affect.

Carrie Hughes questioned what could be considered proof.

Tracey Cook noted that the date they received the grant paperwork would suffice and indicated that just because they said they were working on it in July of 2023 does not mean that is accurate.

Brian Miller suggested requesting the info about what agency received the grant request.

Carrie Hughes reminded the Board that it takes several months to finish grant paperwork and as such, they might be able to produce proof of submission, but not necessarily proof of when the process began, which is what the Board is looking to determine.

Tracey Cook noted that there must be some kind of dated paperwork because it says the end of July 2023 and the suggester's submission was in the beginning of August 2023.

Chair Powell indicated his belief that the Board would end up getting the SF424, the grant application, which would be dated several months later and would ultimately not resolve the question on the table. The applications are not date stamped and typically will be dated months after the initial work began on the grant suggested. The Chair thus noted the importance of trusting that the responses from agencies are in compliance with statute and that they are not being untruthful in their responses and as such, breaking the law. The Chair further indicated that if Ms. D'Ambrosio did receive an award, it would not be out of the budget of the Division and as such, they have no financial motivation to be untruthful.

Brian Miller suggested requesting a copy of the grant submission, noting that if the submission date is reasonable, then the Board should take the Division at its word.

Chair Powell suggested for future cases that may have some ambiguity that the Board request specific dates for clarity.

Tracey Cook suggested that proof of an email showing gathering of people preparing for a grant would also suffice to serve as a paper trail.

Carrie Hughes noted her disagreement with the potential estimated savings or benefit claimed by Ms. D'Ambrosio. There's no indication of another program that this would offset. There probably wouldn't be an award to go out. Although we could ask for that documentation, it probably would not change anything.

Brian Miller noted that twice on Page 3 of 5, the Division requested that Ms. D'Ambrosio address the fiscal considerations, indicating that if that is one of the main criteria specific to the Board, this might not even fall within the genre of consideration.

Tracey Cook confirmed that the way it is written out is to incorporate as many wraparound services as possible with in-house resources, and concurred with Ms. Hughes' position on the lack of

potential estimated savings or benefits.

Chair Powell added that the cover letter asks for a million dollars.

Brian Miller noted his hope that the grant does go through because it is a good idea for the Division.

Chair Powell indicated his belief that this was a well-thought out plan.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### T. Femmi Rhose McGuire

Chair Powell discussed Femmi Rhose McGuire's suggestion to increase the state's usage of Teams by giving everyone their own telephone number and integrating it into Teams. The Chair discussed integration of a transcription option that exists within Teams that sends an MP3 after someone calls him.. The Chair questioned whether it was Ms. McGuire's suggestion that was implemented and whether the state followed suit or whether a plan was already in place.

Brian Miller questioned the need for a phone, noting that with his experience with Teams, all he has needed is his email.

Chair Powell noted that this person's suggestion is to eliminate the landline entirely and pay for phone service through Microsoft. The Chair indicated that the agency's reply was that this would actually be more expensive than the current means of maintaining phones. Chair Powell added that ADSD (Aging Disabled Services Division) indicated that this has been in the works since COVID started and people began working remotely, which is actually years before this suggestion.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### U. Femmi Rhose McGuire

Chair Powell discussed Femmi Rhose McGuire's suggestion to convert the faxing process to E-Fax. The Chair indicated that the reason ADSD Denied this one is because they already have the E-Fax software available and as such, the suggestion is not novel. The Chair further indicated that getting a provider to comply is a challenge because they cannot be forced to send documents via E-Fax. The Chair opined that this is likely due to rules around the funding received from Medicare. The Chair further noted that the rebuttal from the agency does say that they are willing to train Ms. McGuire on how to use the E-Fax software if she believes it will make her job easier.

Carrie Hughes pointed that the rebuttal notes that the Division has determined that it already has the capability but that this does not mean that it is actually actively being done. Ms. Hughes indicated that she is reading their response as this is something the agency can do and will switch over to doing, but questioned if the switch was a result of this suggestion from Ms. McGuire.

Chair Powell agreed, noting that this doesn't quite mean that the idea has already been implemented unless they have some other system in place that achieves the same results. The Chair questioned the possibility of tabling this suggestion with a request for more information.

Carrie Hughes concurred with tabling the agenda item and requesting clarification. Ms. Hughes added

that the employee did not give much information regarding estimated savings or benefit, noting that for the Board to award this, should it be merited, there would be some basis needed to calculate.

The Chair suggested requesting more information. Although it might not be a cost saving idea it might save time or improve efficiency which may also be worthy of an award due to man hours saved. We can start with the person who responded to this request, Dena Schmidt, specifically asking for a description of the pre-existing capabilities so the Board can make an informed decision based on data rather than on the memo included.

A motion was made and seconded to table Agenda Item 4U. Motion carried.

#### V. Robert Ritua

Chair Powell discussed Robert Ritua's suggestion to convert the Grant Sawyer Building into residential condos. The Chair noted that NDVS denied this decision, along with some input from the State Public Works Division (SPWD) because between the two groups who have explored overhauling this building, the determination was that costs have come in at \$120 million to start. In addition, the Chair noted that the state has been in talks with Clark County to actually sell that property.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### W. Jesse Olson

Chair Powell discussed Jesse Olson's suggestion from NDOT to design, film, edit, and update Nevada testing method videos for field sampling to online videos rather than field training. The Chair noted that NDOT contends that in addition to the field training, the agency has also been creating videos since 2013 and in 2023 paid the Office of the Chief Information Officer to convert these static videos into some more interactive training materials. The Chair indicated that this points to a timing issue, noting that the date of the suggestion was on 10/26, and that 22 days later, NDOT purchased video editing software. The Chair further indicated that the letter from the director notes that while the idea was good, it had already begun implementation in 2013 and the reason for the license purchase was to revise the materials, not to create them.

Carrie Hughes added that the suggester noted that this idea would save money by reducing errors, but that NDOT refuted this by commenting on the fact that they didn't find any records of direct payment for errors in testing.

Chair Powell noted that Mr. Olson's suggestion says that there have been errors that have caused the Department to pay contractors thousands of dollars of additional pay each year

Carrie Hughes indicated that the use of the words direct payments makes her wonder why that needed to be qualified.

Chair Powell discussed the need for more information regarding the language about the direct payments for the testers as well as the timeline of the 10/26 suggestion versus the purchase of the license on 11/16.

A motion was made and seconded to table the suggestion to get more information. Motion carried.

#### X. Adrienne Boren

Chair Powell discussed Adrienne Boren's suggestion to improve the state's interview process via virtualization and digitization. The Chair explained that currently job applicants for the state are emailed a significant amount of paperwork. The Chair indicated that DWSS has denied this suggestion on the basis of two things: there is a statewide ERP system being implemented and as such, this would be a duplication of efforts; and DHHS has a Board or Committee called the EP Projects. They have one EP project numbered 10146 which is a system to streamline some of the interviewing processes like filling out some of the forms online. Chair Powell noted that both of these preclude the date of submission.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the suggestion. Motion carried.

#### Y. Markus McEntee

Chair Powell discussed Markus McEntee's suggestion to eliminate the purchase of physical business cards and replace them with virtual ones. The Chair indicated that Public Works contends that business cards are not built into the budget and are an incidental expenditure of about \$26 per box, are optional, and are not issued to all employees, thus rendering the cost savings negligible. The Chair discussed the option of e-business cards on cell phones, but noted that a state employee cannot be required to use this option on a personal device but instead would need to be issued a state-owned phone, which would actually increase costs.

Carrie Hughes opined that this suggestion needs to be denied because even if phones are not provided and employees use personal devices for business reasons, this could open them up to potential legal issues.

Chair Powell concurred and added that employees that use their personal mobile devices for business purposes need to sign a personal mobile device agreement, noting that the agreement includes the ability for the state to wipe the phone in the event of a security breach, as well as to access the content if needed for legal reasons. As such, the Chair indicated that aside from the realizable cost savings of \$26 per box, there could be other costs incurred that this could make this a very expensive option in the future.

A motion was made and seconded to reject this suggestion. Motion carried.

#### Z. Corina Suttle

Chair Powell discussed Corina Suttle's suggestion to improve the process of tracking violations, noting that there are some provisions that need to be followed by those receiving assistance.

Brian Miller added that violations within the county plays a role in this as well.

Chair Powell indicated his uncertainty if this suggestion is geared towards representatives or the

people applying for benefits.

Carrie Hughes indicated that the Agency pointed out that based on federal rules, they would need to capture Personally Identifiable Information (PII) of those that are not actually applying, and that this would create an additional security risk.

Chair Powell noted uncertainty as to how the AREP (Authorized Representative) is involved, questioning whether this was a member in the household or someone on the state's side, and concurred with the collection of PII of these reps being problematic. The Chair further noted that the Agency indicated that this program is 100 percent federally funded, which could create funding problems should changes be made.

A motion was made and seconded to reject this suggestion. Motion carried.

## **5. Discussion of date of upcoming meetings**

Carrie Hughes indicated that the next meeting is planned for November 14, and questioned if the Board could be available in the afternoon as due to labor negotiations, the scheduled meeting room for the morning was no longer available. Ms. Hughes next questioned whether or not the Board would like to schedule a meeting for December or prefer to schedule one in January.

Multiple Board members questioned whether or not the Board was caught up or was still behind.

Chair Powell suggested adding ten more items to the November meeting so as to take December off.

Carrie Hughes discussed the lack of an analyst handling the administrative support for the Board and as such, was unable to provide a list of how many items would be on the potential December agenda, and how long the Board comments on these items could take. Ms. Hughes noted anticipation of having this position filled in November, but indicated that with this position empty, she was not able to keep up on her own. Ms. Hughes noted that there is an agenda in place for the November meeting but that she would not be able to go through additional items that might be slated for a later meeting in time to add them to the November agenda. Ms. Hughes did note the likelihood of the Board being close to caught up following a January meeting.

The Board opted to break through December and to reconvene in January, with a meeting date to be discussed at the November meeting.

The next meeting was scheduled for November 14, 2024 at 1:30 p.m. at 515 East Musser Street in Carson City for the north, and 7251 Amigo Street, Room 120 in Las Vegas for the south, and virtual for those unable to attend in person.

## **6. Board Comments**

Brian Miller discussed the inclusion of a letter with Agenda Item 4V that appeared to be out of place, noting his belief that it belonged with a different submission from Kevin Myers (phonetic) from UNR. Mr. Miller indicated that he does know Mr. Myers personally and thus knew that he did have an idea that was submitted, then later resubmitted, and could ask regarding this submission.

Carrie Hughes indicated that she would check on this to keep it going through official channels.

Chair Powell concurred that this should move through official channels due to response times required per NRS.

Brian Miller noted that NSHE had not replied to his submission initially within the required 30 days, which was the reason for Mr. Myers' resubmission.

Carrie Hughes indicated that if Mr. Myers did need to submit a third time, the process would be to submit to the Board rather than the agency directly because it would not become part of this program unless it was submitted to the Board.

**7. Public Comment:**

There was no public comment.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.