



State of Nevada
MERIT AWARD BOARD



“Good Government, Great Employees”

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

Brian Sandoval
Governor

MERIT AWARD BOARD
December 12, 2017 – 9:30 AM

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

And

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

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

MINUTES OF MEETING
(pending Board approval)

Merit Award Board

Members

Present:

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

I. CALL TO ORDER –

Chairperson Rosa Mendez called the meeting to order. Guests present included, Nova Murray, Deputy Administrator for the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Lisa Swearingen, Chief of State Collections and Disbursement Unit in Welfare, Bill Strom, Chief Investigator for Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Amber Law, Treasurer’s Office, and Dennis Stoddard from the Treasurer’s Office.

II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 2017– FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

Chairperson Mendez asked if there were to be any changes to be made to the August 30, 2017 minutes. Rachel Baker: noted the following changes, Robert Shaw should be removed from the list of Board Members, Jennifer Frischmann's last name was spelled incorrectly on Page 1, acronyms need to be spelled out the first time used. Ms. Baker also noted that the format appeared to be different and needs to be changed to remain consistent with past minutes.

MOTION: Moved for approval of adoption of minutes for August 30, 2017 Meeting.
BY: Harry Schiffman
SECOND: Rosa Mendez
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion

III. EMPLOYEE SUGGESTIONS — FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

- A. Christopher Scaffidi**
- B. Landrin Long**
- C. Desiree Drakeley**
- D. Susannah Lawson (update only)**
- E. Haaland McIntire (update only)**
- F. Brandi Johnson (update only)**
- G. Erich Drakeley (update only)**
- H. Cassandra Shelton (update only)**

A. Christopher Scaffidi

Chairperson Mendez: Started with the first suggestion on the Agenda, Christopher Scaffidi. She stated that the suggestion was related to improving the way Cost Allocation was tracked by updating the Excel Spreadsheet used in the system. The Agency was rejecting this suggestion because the process that Mr. Scaffidi described fell into an area of his responsibility. The Agency anticipated that what was described in the suggestion would significantly change or become obsolete upon implementation of the new tracking system methodologies. In addition, the Agency was currently contracted with a vendor who was in the process of reviewing and updating its cost allocation

plan, processes and methodologies which included this particular portion of the suggestion. **Nova Murray:** Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, reiterated that this was part of Mr. Scaffidi's responsibilities and that no other employees would benefit from this suggestion. **Harry Schiffman:** asked if Mr. Scaffidi was present. **Rachel Baker:** confirmed Mr. Scaffidi was not present.

MOTION: Reject suggestion based on Agency response.
BY: Harry Schiffman
SECOND: Melanie Young
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

B. Landrin Long

Chairperson Mendez: Introduced Mr. Landrin Long's suggestion. She stated the suggestion related to the Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS) current hiring process. The suggestion recommended streamlining the Request to Fill (RTF) process by allowing the team manager or the hiring manager to approve the RTF and interview the potential candidates while still maintaining the final approval by the Administrator. The initial Agency response stated that the Division of Human Resource (DHRM) does not determine the RTF procedure; the process was left to the discretion of each Agency. The Director of the Department of Administration believed that each division under his purview be allowed to determine which RTF procedure best fit their business needs. Additionally, any savings with this request would be difficult to quantify. Therefore, the agency would not be implementing the suggestion.

MOTION: Reject suggestion due to the Agency not implementing the suggestion.
BY: Melanie Young
SECOND: Harry Schiffman
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

C. Desiree Drakeley

Chairperson Mendez: Introduced the suggestion from Desiree Drakeley with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). She stated that the suggestion focused on improvements to registration and title transactions, specifically concerning the sales tax template on registration of out-of-state vehicle purchases. The Department had evaluated the recommendation and decided six separate reasons for rejection of the suggestion. The first reason, due to updated statutes the sales tax laws are increasingly complicated and would have to be reviewed by other agencies. Also, the DMV does not have access to the information of the private parties. In addition, the DMV is not equipped or staffed to track and monitor all of the changes of the department. Implementing the suggestion would require technicians to have substantial

sales tax training to properly apply tax law to the transaction. Currently the DMV had no such training. Further, the interpretation of law which could actually cause conflict for DMV staff when trying to assist customers with this type of transaction. Finally, answering the tax questions might also cause conflict with customers and the Department of Taxation. For the previously addressed reasons, the Agency recommended not implementing the suggestion. **Harry Schiffman:** questioned whether the suggestion was a good and valid suggestion and the Agency just found it would be too difficult or expensive to implement. **Rosa Mendez:** noted that if the Agency were required to provide training, there would be a cost associated with that training whether through a vendor or internally. In addition, there are also concerns with staff having to interpret regulation or law. **Melanie Young:** stated that the Agency provided a thorough response, and that they currently have a process in place to do this where they would have somebody who has been trained behind the scenes to make adjustments to the transaction if necessary.

MOTION: Reject suggestion due to the Agency not implementing the suggestion.
BY: Melanie Young
SECOND: Harry Schiffman
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

D. Susannah Lawson (update only)

Chairperson Mendez: Moved to the next suggestion, Susannah Lawson, with Nevada Office of Veterans' Services (NOVS). Suggestion is related to optimizing the utilization of employees during fire drills and emergency responses in the Department of Veteran's Services. The Agency response stated that at the time of suggestion, the facility fire drill/disaster policy was in effect as required by the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services, but did not stipulate who on staff were to be the responders. It was noted that the suggestion would increase productivity, improve service, and prevent accidents. A follow-up meeting and a summary of that meeting was shared on March 28, 2016, however, it was not formally transmitted or given to the Board. It was determined that a follow-up review, and if appropriate, the policy, would be revised and be sent to the policy review committee for approval. Deputy Director Simons felt that, at the time, the employee's suggestion had merit and needed to be addressed and be reviewed. It was noted that the facility did not complete that revision based on Ms. Lawson's suggestion. On October 9, 2017, the Nevada State Veterans Home Fire and Safety Policy and Procedures Manual was revised and as a requirement to the Code of Federal Regulations, CFR4390, the Agency actually stipulated that that change has taken place within the federal inspection process for skilled Nursing Facilities and have people dedicated with additional responsibilities. The new policy was included in the response and delineates the actual changes to CFR and everything that's related to it. Furthermore, the Agency added that

it does not feel that this suggestion rises to the criteria level of NRS 285.060, 2 (b)(2) related to actual cost savings/cost avoidance.

MOTION: Reject the suggestion based on the Agency's response and Board limitations.
BY: Harry Schiffman
SECOND: Melanie Young
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

E. Haaland McIntire (update only)

Chairperson Mendez: Moved on to Haaland McIntire' suggestion. She reminded the Board that the suggestion related to eliminating the need for paper for direct deposit. The Treasurer's Office had approved the suggestion and estimated the cost savings at \$11,784. The Board agreed to wait for the agency to confirm estimated savings with actual implementation, and a complete system upgrade had to be implemented for that to occur. Therefore, the Treasurer's Office referred the Board to the Controller's Office, which is responsible for this suggestion and implementation of that upgrade. The Agency was currently making the necessary upgrades to their Bottom Line Server. Chairperson Mendez indicated that Mr. James Starbuck did inform her that while in the process of completing upgrades, the Agency did run into some issues with software, which they were currently working with a vendor to make sure the issues were repaired. She stated that the upgrades should be functional by the end of January 2018 with more current figures to follow thereafter. **Harry Schiffman:** noted that it was just a question of what the final numbers would be. **Melanie Young:** stated that with the total savings not being known until the end of the fiscal year, June 30th, the suggestion was likely be tabled.

MOTION: Table suggestion until confirmation of total savings.
BY: Harry Schiffman
SECOND: Melanie Young
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

F. Brandi Johnson (update only)

Chairperson Mendez: Moved on to Brandi Johnson' suggestion and stated it was in regards to reducing state General Fund expenditures for Child and Welfare cases by billing Medicaid for targeted case management (TCM) services currently provided by Child Welfare workers. There were two formal responses submitted to the Board, dated 7/16 and 10/16 and both had rejected the suggestion. The first formal response rejected the suggestion because the process of the suggestion was recognized as part of Ms. Johnson's existing duties. The Agency also did not recognize financial gain. She indicated the follow-up response dated 10/16 indicated that Ms. Johnson's suggestion was not being implemented due to other revenue maximization efforts already being conducted by the Agency. At the previous meeting, the Board was

unclear on the responses and asked for clarification. Ms. Deborah Harris, along with Ms. Priscilla Colegrove, provided the Board with the information sought in an email dated September 26, 2017. In that, the Agency explained that the cost saving measures at DCFS implemented were related to Title IV for foster care and adoption funding rather than Title XIX. And that TCM can only be claimed with the youth placement was not Title IV eligible. Ms. Colegrove explained that she felt the programs were involved in the reimbursement for Child Welfare, Title IV for the foster care, and then Title XIX. Ms. Colegrove added there was a random moment time study required by Title IV submitted eight years prior. Chairperson Mendez asked how that would exempt the suggestion to which Ms. Colegrove noted the system allowed the tracking of both titles and she stated that the random moment time study was already in the process of being updated and that it did not allow additional Title IV-E allowances for case management. Ms. Colegrove indicated that those programs were not able to reimburse for the one item which is TCM. Finally, the response stated, the effort to change the random moment time study resulted in equivalent savings of with less effort by staff who would have to be doing additional activities for the suggestion. **Melanie Young:** noted the Agency was now explaining that they have looked at it and they can maximize the funding by using the IV-E Funding that they are eligible for, and did not further impact the Agency.

MOTION: Reject the suggestion based on the Agency not implementing the targeted case management for non-IV-E eligible clients.
BY: Melanie Young
SECOND: Harry Schiffman
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

G. Erich Drakeley (update only)

Chairperson Mendez: Moved to the suggestion of Erich Drakeley. She stated that the suggestion was related to installing a \$10.00 late fee on expired licenses after 30 days. This suggestion warranted multiple responses from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The suggestion was approved; however, the Agency was waiting to see how much was confirmed in the savings. The Agency was not able to allocate the necessary resources to complete upgrades this fiscal year, and had an estimated implementation date of March 2018. The estimated savings is \$55,818. The amount included the initial \$74,818 minus the \$19,000 cost that the Agency would incur to implement the suggestion.

MOTION: Suggestion be tabled.
BY: Harry Schiffman
SECOND: Melanie Young
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

H. Cassandra Shelton (update only)

Chairperson Mendez: Moved on to the suggestion of Cassandra Shelton with the Treasurer's Office, Cash Management Division. Ms. Shelton's suggestion regarded improving the Bank Statement Procedure process by creating a better tool, and/or form, for agencies to claim their ACH-Wires. The Agency supported the suggestion and implemented it on July 1, 2017. The Agency estimated a savings of \$3,712.81 in hard costs, paper, ink, etcetera; and \$14,898 in soft costs, full-time employee hours in overtime, comp time, or additional time to perform the task. She noted the Board had been updated with figures from the pilot program and there had been a slight decrease in the hard costs from \$3,712.81 to \$3,438.43. The soft savings remained the same. **Amber Law:** with the Treasurer's Office noted that the pilot program was running smoothly and the Agency was already seeing a savings in staff time. The Agency had started Phase II of the pilot. The agency's IT was working on the database and working with various state agencies in order to streamline the process even more. **Melanie Young:** inquired if the suggestion related to the duties performed by the Accounting Assistant III. **Amber Law:** responded that Ms. Shelton was an Accounting Assistant III when she made the suggestion, but most of the duties affected the Account Technician I and the Account Technician II. Although the employee was doing the duties currently, she was not performing them at the time the suggestion was submitted. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked if the Agency was still overwhelming in support the suggestion. **Amber Law:** answered, yes, and they were proceeding with the pilot program. **Chairperson Mendez:** asked Melanie Young to which savings, hard cost or soft cost, would be addressed as part of the award. **Melanie Young:** responded that the Board needed to address the definition of "realized savings" and whether that included both hard savings and soft savings.

MOTION: Table the suggestion pending the Agency's cost-savings, anticipated to be after June 30th, 2018, and the Board determining a definition for 'realized savings'.
BY: Melanie Young
SECOND: Harry Schiffman
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

IV. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Board Correspondence

1. Employee Suggestion Form
2. Agency Review Form

1. Chairperson Mendez pointed out the Employee Suggestion form had been provided to the Board members and was now fillable.

MOTION: To approve the revised Suggestion Form.
BY: Chairperson Mendez

SECOND: Harry Schiffman
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

2. Chairperson Mendez moved to the Agency Review Form. She stated the members had been provided the forms for their review which was now fillable.

MOTION: To approve the revised Agency Review Form.
BY: Chairperson Mendez
SECOND: Harry Schiffman
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

B. Meeting Date

Chairperson Mendez asked for a preference for the next Board Meeting in March. The 15th and 29th of the month were tentatively picked, to be determined based on Member's schedules. **Harry Schiffman:** asked if the meeting would take place in the morning or afternoon. **Rachel Baker:** answered, typically meetings are at 9:30 PM or 1:30 PM. **Harry Schiffman:** expressed a preference for morning meetings.

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

Chairperson Mendez: Asked if there was any public comment and there were none.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved that the Merit Award Board meeting be adjourned.
BY: Harry Schiffman
SECOND: Melanie Young
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.