

**STATE OF NEVADA
PERSONNEL COMMISSION**

Held at the Nevada State Library and Archives Building, 100 N. Carson Street, Room 110, Carson City; and via video conference in Las Vegas at the Grant Sawyer Building, 555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 1400.

**MEETING MINUTES
June 25, 2021
(Subject to Commission Approval)**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
IN CARSON CITY:**

Ms. Patricia Hurley, Commissioner
Ms. Priscilla Maloney, Commissioner

Ms. Dana Carvin, Alternate Commissioner, non-voting

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
IN LAS VEGAS:**

Ms. Katherine Fox, Chairperson
Mr. Mark Olson, Commissioner
Mr. Andreas Spurlock, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Mr. Frank Richardson, Administrator, Division of Human Resource Management (DHRM)
Ms. Michelle Garton, Deputy Administrator, DHRM
Ms. Beverly Ghan, Deputy Administrator, DHRM
Ms. Denise Woo-Seymour, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, DHRM
Ms. Keisha Harris, Personnel Analyst, DHRM
Ms. Carrie Hughes, Personnel Analyst, DHRM
Ms. Patty Kreymborg, Personnel Analyst, DHRM
Ms. Tori Sundheim, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

STAFF PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Ms. Heather Dapice, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, DHRM

I. CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, ROLL CALL, ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairperson Fox: Called the meeting to order on Friday June 25, 2021, at approximately 9:00 a.m. She welcomed everyone and stated after roll call, she had an announcement.

Chairperson Fox: Announcement; Frank Richardson, who was the Interim Administrator for DHRM has now been named Division Administrator, congratulations.

Frank Richardson: Thank you, these are going to be big shoes to fill, after following Peter. He has been a real fixture in HR here for many, many years. Fortunately, I got to work with him for a few years and we'll keep that culture going. It's going to be a lot of fun and a lot of challenges going forward. Thank you.

Chairperson Fox: Speaking, I think for all the Commissioners, you have one heck of a staff. I have always been in awe of the level of professionalism and expertise from the State of Nevada's HR staff. I know they are going to want you to be successful.

Chairperson Fox: Before moving to public comment, there are no alternate Commissioners in the South, are there any in the North.

Michelle Garton: Yes, Dana Carvin is here.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Fox: Advised that no vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken under NRS 241.020. She asked if there were any public comments; there was none.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING DATED MARCH 19, 2021 – Action Item

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made on the minutes from March 19, 2021. Commissioner Maloney stated she had corrections.

Commissioner Maloney: I do have a minor but clarifying correction on page 7 of your packet. Under agenda item #5, I made a statement pursuant to NRS, case law precedent and regulations on disclosure of potential conflict of interest I needed to disclose so I am reading from that first paragraph. ‘Self-employed, government affairs specialist contractor for AFSCME 4041, Retirees Chapter for the Legislative Session of the interim.’ Further, I said ‘‘I sit in a labor representative seat, so it would be understandable I would be employed in some capacity in a labor function in the State of Nevada.’’ The very next paragraph is where the changes come in. I said ‘‘the retirees’ chapter is a standalone subdivision of the classified part of AFSCME 4041, they have their own constitution and by-laws’’, and here’s where the typo is; the next sentence says ‘‘my consultees’’, and it should say ‘‘ my consultant fees comes from separate’’ and then I want to interject there ‘‘retiree chapter funds’’ not comingled with the funds of AFSCME 4041, and then the rest of my clarifying statement is my work is directed by a separate executive order, and I do not believe my work with the AFSCME Retirees chapter will affect the impartiality of my vote.

Chairperson Fox: So, Commissioner Maloney, could you go ahead and do that as a formal motion so it can be seconded and then discussed by the Commission.

Commissioner Maloney: I would like to make a motion that on page 7 of the minutes from the meeting on March 19, 2021, under agenda item #5, the third paragraph we’re making a correction of a typo; ‘‘my consultant fees’’ should be the start of the second sentence and interjecting from the word ‘‘separate’’, ‘‘retiree chapter funds not comingled with the funds of AFSCME 4041.’’ That is my motion.

Commissioner Olson: Second.

Chairperson Fox: It’s been moved and seconded, any questions, any discussion, any public comment? Seeing and hearing none, I will entertain the item for a vote.

The vote was unanimous.

MOTION: Moved to approve minutes of the March 19, 2021 meeting with corrections noted by Commissioner Maloney.
BY: Commissioner Maloney
SECOND: Commissioner Olson
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

IV. PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES: DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED INCONSISTENT, INCOMPATIBLE, OR IN CONFLICT WITH EMPLOYEE’S DUTIES AND THE PROCESS OF PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE – Action Item

- A. Department of Taxation
- B. Silver State Health Insurance Exchange
- C. State Public Charter School Authority

Denise Woo-Seymour: Good morning Madame Chair and members of the Commission. I am Denise Woo-Seymour, a Supervisory Personnel Analyst for the Division of Human Resource Management, Consultation and Accountability Unit.

In accordance with NAC 284.742, an agency shall identify specific activities considered inconsistent, incompatible or in conflict with employees' duties, and identify the penalties for such activities. These Prohibitions and Penalties are subject to the approval of the Personnel Commission.

The Department of Taxation has updated their Prohibitions and Penalties previously approved by the Personnel Commission and in effect since December 10, 2010. Prior to the submitted revised version, department employees and employee associations were requested to submit comments and suggestions.

Prohibition #I-1 on page 26, contains additional language which was adopted by the Commission this last December. The proposed amended penalty range is consistent with other agencies whose penalty range was approved by the Commission for this prohibition. Otherwise, the items submitted for approval have been reviewed by the Division and are consistent with those already approved by the Commission. Revisions have been tracked with new matter in blue font and deletions as red strikethroughs. Prohibitions that were relocated from a section to a more appropriate section were not noted since language had already been previously approved by the Commission.

Representatives from the Department of Taxation and Agency HR Services are available to answer any questions.

Chairperson Fox: Are there any comments or questions from the Commissioners or the public? There were none.

MOTION: Moved to approve Item IV-A.
BY: Commissioner Olson
SECOND: Commissioner Hurley
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Denise Woo-Seymour: Again, for the record, Denise Woo-Seymour from the Division of Human Resource Management.

The State of Nevada Silver State Health Insurance Exchange (SSHIE) is a new agency, therefore the Prohibitions and Penalties before you for approval are newly created. Input was requested from the department employees and the employee associations. Prohibition #H-7 on page 43, contains additional language which was adopted by the Commission this last December. The proposed amended penalty range is consistent with other agencies whose penalty range was approved by the Commission for this prohibition.

Otherwise, these new Prohibitions and Penalties have been reviewed by the Division and are consistent with those already approved by the Commission.

Representatives from the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange and Agency HR Services are available to answer any questions.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commissioners or the public. There were none.

MOTION: Moved to approve Item IV-B.
BY: Commissioner Maloney
SECOND: Commissioner Hurley
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Denise Woo-Seymour: For the record, Denise Woo-Seymour from the Division of Human Resource Management.

The State Public Charter School Association has updated their Prohibitions and Penalties previously approved by the Personnel Commission and in effect since May 10, 2013. Prior to the submitted revised version, department employees and employee associations were requested to submit comments and suggestions.

Prohibition #L-5 on page 58, contains additional language which was adopted by the Commission this last December. The penalty range is consistent with other agencies whose penalty range was approved by the Commission for this prohibition.

Otherwise, the items submitted for approval have been reviewed by the Division and are consistent with those already approved by the Commission. Revisions have been tracked with new matter in blue font and deletions as red strikethroughs. Prohibitions that were relocated from a section to a more appropriate section were not noted since language had already been previously approved by the Commission.

Representatives from the State Public Charter School Association and Agency HR Services are available to answer any questions.

Chairperson Fox: I do have a question, in some of the documents, it's called and "association" and in some, it's called an "authority". Is it "association" or "authority" or are the terms interchangeable?

Jennifer Bauer: I'm the Director of Finance and Operations for the State Public Charter School Authority. I believe that was an inadvertent error and the statute creates a State Public Charter School "Authority".

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commissioners or the public. There were none.

Chairperson Fox: I'll make the motion here and, in my motion,, I am going to move to correct the record for all the documents to reflect "authority".

MOTION: Moved to approve Item IV-C, the Prohibitions and Penalties for the State Public Charter School Authority to include, in the necessary documents, changing the word "association" to "authority".
BY: Chairperson Fox
SECOND: Commissioner Spurlock
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

V. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF ADDITION OF CLASSES OR POSITIONS FOR PRE-EMPLOYMENT SCREENING FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES– Action Item

A. The Department of Administration, State Public Works Division requests the addition of the following positions to the list approved for pre-employment screening for controlled substances:

1. Classes and positions requested for approval of preemployment screening for controlled substances:

- a. 09.612 Facility Supervisor I, PCN 0119
- 09.609 Facility Supervisor II, PCN 0202

Carrie Hughes: Good morning Madam Chair and Members of the Commission. My name is Carrie Hughes and I am a Personnel Analyst with the Division of Human Resource Management.

The Department of Administration, State Public Works Division is requesting the addition of the requirement of pre-employment screening for controlled substances for the positions listed in agenda item 5(A).

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration requires pre-employment screening for controlled substances of positions that operate commercial motor vehicles and are subject to the requirement of a commercial driver's license. Public Works has indicated that these positions are required to obtain and maintain a commercial driver's license due to driving commercial motor vehicles.

Thank you for your consideration of this item. A representative for Public Works has been requested to be available to answer questions you may have.

Chairperson Fox: Asked if there were any further comments or questions from Commissioners or the public. There were none.

MOTION: Moved to approve Agenda Item VI A item 1a.
BY: Commissioner Olson
SECOND: Chairperson Fox
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

VI. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS SPECIFICATION MAINTENANCE REVIEW OF CLASSES RECOMMENDED FOR REVISIONS AND ABOLISHMENT – Action Item

A. Mechanical & Construction Trade

1. Subgroup: Equipment Operators

- a. 9.212 Driver Warehouse Supervisor/Worker Series

2. Subgroup: Trades & Allied

- a. 9.465 Craft Worker-In-Training Series

Patty Kreymborg: Good morning Madam Chair and members of the Commission. For the record, my name is Patricia Kreymborg, Personnel Analyst with the Division of Human Resource Management, Classification Unit.

As part of the Biennial Class Specification Review Process, I am here to present for your approval, this date, recommended changes to Item 6A,1A, Driver Warehouse Supervisor/Worker Series.

In consultation with Subject Matter Experts from the Nevada Department of Corrections, the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles, the Nevada Department of Agriculture, and Analysts within the Division of Human Resource Management, it was determined that the Series Concept be amended to clarify duties and to update other types of equipment used by these positions. Additional recommendations include the following:

The class concept for Driver Warehouse Supervisor be revised to include additional oversight responsibilities pertaining to orders and/or materials received or disbursed.

Within the class concept for Driver Warehouse Worker Trainee, language to be added to clarify requirements to progress to the next level in the series.

Special requirements within the Minimum Qualifications section should stipulate the condition for possession of a valid commercial driver's license and also that certification to operate a forklift and/or other equipment may be required of both Driver Warehouse Supervisors and Workers.

Within the Minimum Qualifications at the Driver Warehouse Supervisor Level, working knowledge of computer systems to track and manage inventory to be added to the Full Performance Knowledge, Skills and Abilities.

Lastly, it is recommended that minor revisions be made to the Minimum Qualifications at the Driver Warehouse Supervisor, Worker II and Worker I levels to maintain consistency with verbiage, formatting and structure.

Personnel Analyst Keisha Harris will now present Item 6A, 2A on the agenda.

Keisha Harris: Good morning Madam Chair and members of the commission. For the record, my name is Keisha Harris, Personnel Analyst with the Division of Human Resource Management, Classification Unit.

As part of the Biennial Class Specification Maintenance Review Process, I am here to present for your approval this date, Item 6A 2a on the agenda, the Craft Worker-in-Training class specifications.

In consultation with subject matter experts from the Nevada System of Higher Education and analysts within the Division of Human Resource Management, it is recommended that revisions be made to the Series and Class concepts, and the Minimum Qualifications to update occupational language, clarify respective duties, reflect current methods and practices being used, and to maintain consistency with verbiage, formatting, and structure.

Additionally, it is recommended that a change be made to the class title of option D to accurately reflect the craft being performed.

We respectfully request your approval of these class specifications effective today. Thank you. We will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

MOTION: Moved to approve Agenda Item VI A item 1a and item 2a.
BY: Commissioner Maloney
SECOND: Commissioner Hurley
VOTE: The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

VII. 2021 LEGISLATION AFFECTING STATE EMPLOYEES AND DHRM BUDGET– Informational Item

Chairperson Fox: The next item is a non-action item, it's informational only and it is a presentation regarding the 2021 legislation affecting State employees also includes a presentation of the Division's budget.

Michelle Garton: Good morning Madame Chair and members of the Commission, I'm Michelle Garton, Deputy Administrator for DHRM there are handouts available for this presentation in the back as well as on our website. There are a few bills we wanted to highlight on this report. The first one is SB51, and this was one of the big bills DHRM had in session this time. This bill, SB51 results from the task force the Governor put together and they released a report in June of 2019 with the vast majority of the recommendations that are in this bill, almost completely.

Some of the statutory additions to 284 as well as the regulations were recommended by the task force.

First, a great part about this bill is the allowance of statutory authorities for what we now, currently call the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Unit, which has been around for a long time but has not had statutory authority.

It also changes the name of that unit to Sex or Gender-based Harassment and Discrimination Unit, so many of the regulations we'll talk about in the next meeting will be about that name change throughout, that phrase.

This is one I want people to really be aware of. It requires now that once that unit has completed an investigation and submits a report to the appointing authority of an agency, that appointing authority is now required to inform the Division of Human Resource Management of any actions taken as a result of that report. That's a requirement now, we can finally close that loop. On number 5, the section of the bill is allowing if the Administrator ever feels it necessary to release confidential information related to an investigation, it is confidential unless the Administrator determines otherwise. So, for whatever reason it comes about that that is in the best interest any of the affected parties, complainant, witness has 10 days to file an appeal. So we have to notify them the information will be released, they have 10 days to file an appeal that they don't want that information released. That appeal will be to the Personnel Commission. The appeal comes to DHRM to be heard by the Personnel Commission and it is a closed-door meeting as well.

Frank Richardson: I would like to add instances when it comes to confidentiality are pretty rare, we don't get many requests for the documents, typically they come from the party's attorneys and will often arrive with some type of subpoena, so we don't envision this being something that happens all the time.

Chairperson Fox: Thank you for that and speaking for probably every HR representative on the Commission, who I think would agree with me, the concern is that individuals who won't come forward as a witness to the complaint, may hesitate to do so if they believe that there's going to be some way their name and information will be released. I'm concerned about protecting the integrity of confidential investigations like that and I think the Division echoes that concern.

Frank Richardson: It would have a chilling effect on the amount of reporting, and we want to make sure we're out in the community trying to get everybody to report anything that's going on with sexual harassment, discrimination and we don't want to limit that, we want to increase that reporting level. I think it would be a pretty rare circumstance where we would agree to release confidential information.

Chairperson Fox: Thank you.

Frank Richardson: Assembly bill 493 is the employee pay and this year, the bill establishes the maximum allowed salaries for employees in the classified and unclassified service of the State with appropriations for payment of salaries and grants at 1% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) increase on July 1, 2022. The bill also establishes additional increases in salaries for certain employees who are represented by various bargaining units. Some of those employees who are represented by Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA) the salary increase was approved at 3%. I will answer any questions you may have now.

Chairperson Fox: I do have a question. So, if I understand correctly, is the 3% and the 1% increase, are they both effective July 1, 2022.

Frank Richardson: Yes, that is correct, July 1, 2022 there is nothing this year.

Chairperson Fox: And the distinction is, if you are not represented by a bargaining unit, you're 1% and if you are, it's 3%, is that correct?

Frank Richardson: Tori (Sundheim, DAG) is telling me that's not correct.

Tori Sundheim: The distinction just depends on what was in the pay bill, so each bargaining unit got a different amount than what it says in the pay bill so it's not necessarily that some were represented, some that were represented didn't get that amount.

Chairperson Fox: So, the max amount was 3%?

Frank Richardson: The bill specifically says if they have a collective bargaining agreement in place and they negotiated, it turned out this year that all the units that negotiated had a collective bargaining agreement in place and received the 3% COLA. There are others who are represented that don't have a collective bargaining agreement negotiated yet and they did not receive the 3% COLA.

Chairperson Fox: Thank you. Are there questions related to this from the Commissioners? There may be additional Commissioner questions as we go through the bills.

Frank Richardson: The next bill we have is Senate bill 409 which requires DHRM and the Department of Administration to charge an annual fee to the Executive Department for each employee position in the Executive Department that falls within a designated bargaining unit to carry out the duties of the Division, to support the Executive Department and Collective Bargaining negotiations.

Many of you may not know we do have a new Labor Relations Unit (LRU) and that is currently staffed with a Deputy Administrator, a Supervisory Analyst, four Personnel Analyst III's and a Personnel Technician III. Last year we funded this with reserves, this year we have placed a request for an assessment and the bill has passed and been signed so now the Labor Relations Unit will have an assessment team to support their actions and programs.

Michelle Garton: Madame Chair, those are the three bills that the Division wanted to highlight, and we'd be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Commissioner Spurlock: I have a question on, this is kind of a personal issue of mine that I've been following for a long time. SB267, on the workplace diversity, I tracked that legislation, not this legislature but the last one, I didn't really think it would go anywhere. I've spoken at multiple HR conferences on gender pay and how to improve it, but more importantly how to correct it and how to calculate it so you're on the right track to begin with in differentiating between gender pay equity versus gender staffing equity because they are two distinct things.

I have actually talked with and gone to a function of the Women's Resource Center at University Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) who I think is the one mentioned in this paragraph that will actually be doing this study.

I have expressed my concerns to them because what they often do is take national data and just array all the salaries in the country to the best they can gather them and they look at median to median, and then say that females are getting paid 72 to 75 percent what men are. That's looking at all salaries across all levels. But if you look at it just by level, the number shoots up to the high 90's (%).

I'll give you an extremely simple example; let's say you have a casino, but it only has two jobs: executives and housekeepers. Executives are 50 percent men and 50 percent women and they're paid equally. Then you have housekeepers and they're paid equally but 85 percent of them are women. If you pool all of that data together, you will have a horrible gender pay ratio, yet you have paid your executives equally and you have paid your housekeepers equally. This is one of the biggest fallacies in the gender pay environment. That's my soapbox but I have a couple questions.

In following this, I was kind of curious because it's the Secretary of State working with UNLV with what I can assume to be the Women's Resource Center. Does State HR have any role in this whatsoever or in proofing the data or is it funneling through you at the front end, or the backend because I'm very concerned about that, in leaving it solely up to the interpretation of UNLV.

The bill, sometimes this happens, we get into very vague language, so I hear terms like 'equity' and things being thrown out, I'm just curious maybe the more detailed language is in the bill, if anyone has seen it; are they looking at staffing equity like in Nevada, are they looking at pay equity or both?

If anybody has any personal knowledge up there, I would appreciate it, but to Mr. Richardson, I really hope that State HR at some point is involved in this process.

Frank Richardson: Thank you for that and thank you for those questions. Tammy Smith, our Equal Opportunity Employer (EEO) Administrator is following this bill, was assigned to it and has been following it from the beginning. She is here and can speak to her involvement in the process.

Tammy Smith: Good morning, Tammy Smith, EEO Administrator. With this bill, what I was reading was that they're looking at top level, executive positions with the businesses that are licensed with them. It looks like the Department of Taxation is reporting to UNLV at UNLV's request when this bill becomes effective as to the business that are sometimes overlooked out there and they can reach out to these businesses to determine as to what level positions the women and the minorities are in. They can request from us, we do have a job classifications and minority and gender report that shows those positions that is available to them. It is a that high level of positions and it is something that they will be working with when they create those reports.

Frank Richardson: I would like to add, Tammy uses this data to drive our policy and how we adjust to these bills. Tammy will continue to monitor this through the data that we pulled, monthly?

Tammy Smith: It's a quarterly report with a bi-annual report to the federal government, to the EEOC, so they are watching this data. Again, it's something I monitor on a quarterly basis but then I will reach out to the agencies.

Frank Richardson: So in that way, we will be involved in this process.

Commissioner Spurlock: That's my biggest concern, I mean the law is the law so, the Legislature told the Secretary of State go out and collect data so now it has to be collected, I get that part. I think I'm more concerned about how the data is interpreted and again, that might be above all of our pay grades. What it will be is, the data will be collected and then the Legislature will choose to act on it what I'm concerned about in the future is if Nevada law is based on just aggregate data that really wasn't picked apart. The most simplistic example is the Secretary of State through all their surveys through the Women's Resource Center, they collect a million female salaries in Nevada and then collect a million male salaries in Nevada then just array it, low to high and get the median of the females and the median of the males and then compare that and that's completely the wrong way to establish a gender pay ratio. Again, go back to the housekeepers and the executives, the number of people you have a given level of pay will affect your pay ratio. So gender staffing, I believe is completely different than gender pay equity. I'm just concerned we're collecting a lot of data through this process, but I don't think we're going to be collecting good data if it's not interpreted right. As Chairperson Fox just said, we have a ton of bright people at State HR and I admire them too, I'm just concerned they won't be included in this process, it'll be the Secretary of State that doesn't know what they're doing in this area, contacting UNLV who I'm not anymore impressed with them, really because they have these interpretations of the more income data points you have, the better and more legitimate the outcome is with the ratios and it's like garbage in is garbage out, more data points don't make better data to me.

I'm just hoping, Mr. Richardson, it's not like you can forcibly insert yourself or your staff but it's more of a hope or wishful thinking that I hope State HR at some point is really able to weigh in on this and make sure that the information is properly calculated and interpreted.

Frank Richardson: Thank you for that. As Chair Fox said, we do have a great group of people and they're very good at collaborating with other groups. We often find a way to work ourselves into projects so we can be a part of the solution, especially where we have interests, and this is one of those areas where we have to take a look at that and see how we can participate in this process.

Chairperson Fox: The language they're using talks about gender equality in the workplace, and I wonder if they really mean that, or do they mean gender equity? Are they looking at job classifications and appropriate pay of males versus females or are they really looking at gender equality in the workplace which to me is something completely different. To me, when we talk about gender equality, the best example is to take a traditionally male dominated environment, such as firefighting, where females are beginning to be hired in greater numbers in that profession and to me that's kind of gender equality.

And so when I look at this language at a higher level, I wonder are they going to be collecting for an organization's EEO-4 information or is it EEO-4 information and certain data and as Commissioner Spurlock said, are they identifying by the various EEO codes so you have a real sense of what are more traditional male or female dominated professions or classifications so that you can make some inferences about the data based upon the nature of the work code. I wanted to put it on the record that equality to me is something different than equity.

Frank Richardson: I would like to make a suggestion, maybe agendaize this item for our next meeting, go into it a little bit more and maybe have some answers from our side of the table as to how to go forward.

Chairperson Fox: Thank you. I think we're moving on to item #8 unless, Ms. Garton, there are more bills you want to present.

Michelle Garton: No, but we would like to talk about the Legislative budget. Nothing really changed in this biennium, we just eliminated one position that hasn't been filled for probably 3 years, so it doesn't really impact, and we've been able to figure out ways to get that work done. We approved the reclassification for Central Payroll manager, it's a grade 39 and will be reclassified to a grade 40 to a new position to be established. The assessments for SB 409 that Frank Richardson went over just a few moments ago so those are really the only highlights that we have.

Chairperson Fox: Are there questions from the Commissioners?

There were none.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR SEPTEMBER 17, 2021.

Chairperson Fox: I do have a problem with September 17th, I need to be in Chicago that day so I was wondering if we can either do September 10th or September 24th?

Commissioner Spurlock: I believe we talked about September 24th because it was further away from Labor Day. See what the other Commissioners say.

There were no other issues with Commissioner availability for September 24, 2021, the Commission moved the meeting scheduled for September 17, 2021 to September 24, 2021.

IX. COMMISSION COMMENTS

There were none.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Fox: Advised that no vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken under NRS 241.020. There were no public comments.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Fox: Thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:50 am.