

**STATE OF NEVADA
HUMAN RESOURCES
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 Eureka Building, 7251 Amigo Street, Room 120, Las Vegas.

**MEETING MINUTES
December 13, 2024**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Mr. Mark Olson, Chairperson
Ms. Angela Scurry, Commissioner
Mr. Andreas Spurlock, Commissioner
Mr. Rick McCann, Commissioner
Mr. Armen Asherian, Commissioner
Ms. Christine Santiago, Commissioner
Ms. Patricia Hurley, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

Ms. Bachera Washington, Administrator, DHRM
Ms. Michelle Garton, Deputy Administrator, DHRM
Mr. Brian O'Callaghan, DHRM
Ms. Carrie Hughes, DHRM

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

Chairperson Olson: Welcome to the meeting of the Nevada State Human Resources Commission, and let's see, we'll start with a call to order.

Michelle Garton: We are looking for applicants for several of our Boards and Commissions. We need members for the Employee-Management Committee. It's a committee made up of state of Nevada employees and State of Nevada Management employees. We have several vacancies on that one. We currently do not have a quorum for our Committee on Catastrophic Leave. Also made up of employees and management. And then finally, for this Commission, we have several alternate Commissioner positions available for those who are interested, and those are driven by statute. You can find that on the HR Commission page, on our website. And then if anybody's interested, the website to go to is gov.nv.gov and you can click on Boards and Commissions there, and it takes you through the application process.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Olson: Is there any public comment down here, down south? Hearing none, public comment up north?

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

A. September 27, 2024

Chairperson Olson: Are there any questions, comments, changes, corrections on the minutes from our meeting of September 27th? Hearing none, may I have a motion?

The motion passes.

MOTION:	Moved to approve the September 27, 2024 meeting minutes.
BY:	Commissioner McCann
SECOND:	Commissioner Spurlock
VOTE:	The motion passed unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DECISION REGARDING THE PREFERENCE OF THE COMMISSION FOR VIEWING UPDATED CLASS SPECIFICATIONS

Bachera Washington: We have completed the first part of the classification process, which is turning over and reviewing and compressing those 1,800 job titles and levels that the state currently has and compressing them, revising them to somewhere around 500 to 600 classifications. With that being said, I would like to get your thoughts, opinions, and preference on if you would like to see an overall sample of the structure of one or see each and every one of them.

Commissioner McCann: I don't know that I have the need to the condensation of 1,800 down to 500 or 600. I used to represent, I still do from the lobbying standpoint, law enforcement throughout the state. I know there has been an issue regarding a particular category of law enforcement, particularly gaming from state agents being classified. There are certain ones I might have an interest in seeing. Is there a summary of what has been done? Is there some way, in a very summary fashion, we might see that without putting you and your staff through any kind of heartache cause you've already done a yeoman's job.

Bachera Washington: If that is the preference of how we move forward, we can put something together to show the comparison.

Commissioner Scurry: I would like to also see something as you collapse the positions down to ensure that whatever the requirements within those positions are something that is not going to impact anyone's current state in the position that they're in and also moving forward, how does this impact levels of engagement when you present them to someone. I would like to see a sample, not all.

Commissioner McCann: Last time I was concerned that anybody who may have been reclassified might either have lost a job, lost money, and I was assured, and I'm sure that assurance is still there, that has not happened. Nobody's losing their job, nobody taking less money because of this reclassification study, I'm assuming.

Bachera Washington: At this point, nothing has happened. I just want to make sure that's on the record, but it's never the goal and no one will lose a job and it is the goal that no one would lose what they currently are making with this endeavor.

Commissioner Spurlock: But you are going to have some cases where individuals blend up in a salary range that has a lower maximum or top step than they had before. So there's going to be some effect on ranges.

Bachera Washington: I think that's with every class.

Commissioner Spurlock: I would fully trust summary statistics. I'd like to see how many employees have salary ranges that end up being lower than what they had. You weren't re-analyzing appropriate statuses of classifications, were you, as part of the study? I didn't think you were, but I wasn't sure.

Bachera Washington: Yes, we looked at everything when we did the class study. In determining based on the job duties, we also reviewed the FLSA to ensure that we are properly placing those folks amongst the federal guidelines.

Commissioner Spurlock: Out of personal curiosity, I would just like a summary of jobs converted from exempt to non-exempt, or non-exempt to exempt.

Bachera Washington: My team will probably be reaching out to all of you to figure out another Commission meeting for possible January, February so that we'll have that opportunity to do the summaries.

Commissioner Hurley: I feel like the state has done a really good job. I love the condensing of them. I really like the summary idea as well. When you guys go through this, when you guys are condensing these class specifications, you go through a process, right, that involves employees as well to appeal those or do those type of things? Is that going to happen with regard to what's happening now with your updated class specifications or did that already occur?

Bachera Washington: That has not occurred yet. Right now we are still in the very early phase of the classification process. Once we are able to get the approvals necessary to roll out the study, we'll move into the next phase where the employees will have an opportunity to review, ask questions, and deal with the appeal process.

Commissioner Hurley: I will follow Commissioner Spurlock who is the professional in this and the summary will work well.

Commissioner Olson: Thank you, Commissioners, for your comments. I don't have the inclination to go into that almost 2,000 at all but I look forward to reviewing and seeing the changes and perhaps the rationale for some of those.

Bachera Washington: Absolutely we have a game plan. Thank you.

V. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF PROPOSED PERMANENT REGULATION CHANGES TO NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, CHAPTER 284

A. LCB File No. R172-24

Carrie Hughes: I am presenting the amendments to Nevada Administrative Code chapter 284, proposed for permanent adoption, and LCB File Number R172-24. The amendment to NAC 284.5775 clarifies that an employee is not entitled to paid family leave while receiving workers' compensation temporary total disability benefits. Paid family leave provides an employee with 50 percent of their wages, and temporary total disability benefits provides 66 and two-thirds percent of an employee's wages. So if an employee was allowed to utilize both benefits at the same time, they would then receive 116 and two-thirds percent of their normal wages.

The amendment to NAC 284.598 will prevent a seasonal employee from having a break in continuous service if they accept a permanent state position within one year after the end of their previous seasonal appointment. I thank you for your consideration of this proposed language.

Commissioner Spurlock: On the second part of this where we talked about the following or not for a single continuous service and then it talks about Number 3, a seasonal layoff, employees re-employed in a seasonal or permanent position within one year after the end of the previous seasonal appointment. What is the nature of not having the break in service in terms of how that affects their employment status? Are we just talking about the interpretation of this disability leave that was mentioned, or what does it mean there we're not giving 'em a year's worth of service? Are we from an employment standpoint?

Carrie Hughes: I want to step back and say that these regulations are not tied together. They're not intended to be read together. So 598, the current way that this is being interpreted is that they have no break in service if a seasonal employee comes back into a seasonal position within one year. That means that continuous service date doesn't change, their leave progression date doesn't change, their leave that they accrued is not either paid out or lost, and it can have other impacts. This was a request from the Department of Wildlife because they had employees who were looking to transition from seasonal to permanent and they had concerns about doing that because they knew there would be an impact to things such as their leave, their continuous service date.

Commissioner Spurlock: We're not giving them any credit where it costs the state actual money for time not worked, are we? It's just a theoretical bridge of service.

Carrie Hughes: It is a bridge of service. They are allowed to maintain their leave accruals crossing from seasonal period to seasonal period, but if you're asking about such as retirement benefits, whether they would get credit for that, I don't believe that they do get credit for the period where they are not actively employed.

Commissioner Spurlock: When it comes to accruals, you're basically adding up all of the seasons of service, but they're not getting any accrual credit for the time not working between seasons.

Carrie Hughes: Correct, their accruals are held and they can pick them up in the next seasonal period instead of their leave balances disappearing without the benefit.

The motion passes unanimously.

MOTION:	Moved to approve Item 5.
BY:	Commissioner Scurry
SECOND:	Commissioner Hurley
VOTE:	The motion passed unanimously.

VI. REPORT OF UNCONTESTED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES NOT REQUIRING HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION APPROVAL PER NRS 284.160

Commissioner Olson: Do we need a briefing or any information, any questions, anybody see anything that we wish to point out?

VII. DISCUSSION OF DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS

Michele Garton: The Division would like to propose March 28 as the next regularly scheduled meeting, if that works. That gives the Legislative Council Bureau's legal division some time to review temporary regulations we anticipate submitting to them and gives us time to agendaize and post on all requirements. And then as Administrator Washington mentioned, you can expect to hear from us on a January or February additional meeting.

VIII. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chairperson Olson: Any Commission Comments?

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Olson: Is there any public comment here in the south? Seeing none, public comment up north, please?

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Olson: By the power vested in me, the Commission is adjourned. Thank you, everyone, as always.