

**STATE OF NEVADA  
HUMAN RESOURCES  
COMMISSION**

Held at the Legislative Building, 401 S. Carson Street, Room 3137, Carson City; and via video conference in Las Vegas at the Legislative Hearing Rooms Building, 7120 Amigo Street, Room 6.

-----  
**MEETING MINUTES  
March 20, 2026  
(Subject to Commission Approval)**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

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

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Ms. Bachera Washington, Administrator, DHRM  
Ms. Michelle Garton, Deputy Administrator, DHRM  
Ms. Keish Harris, Deputy Administrator, DHRM  
Mr. Dakota Peterson, Deputy Attorney General

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

**Chairperson Olson** called the meeting to order and called roll. There were no announcements from members.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Chairperson Olson**, asked for public comments.

**Jill Atkinson, Chief Human Resource Manager, Office of the Attorney General**, stated she was formally advising the Commission that the Office of the Attorney General has objections to the AG Criminal Investigator Series and the AG Deputy Chief Investigator classification on today's agenda. She indicated on February 17, 2026, a ten-page memorandum was submitted to Deputy Administrator Harris, outlining concerns with the public posting for those classifications. She respectfully requested the Commission to remove these currently uncontested agenda items and consider the AG;s objections to appropriately reflect any future recommendations brought forward by the Commission.

**Sean Gallagher, Nevada Peace Officer Administration**, stated he was representing the Deputy Chief Investigators bargaining unit. Mr. Gallagher stated that while the Nevada Peace Officer Association (NPOA) strongly supports the effort to consolidate and streamline job duties, they are concerned there might be some unintentional things with the classification language. He explained there are indicators that the state has a desire to make the Deputy Chief Investigator an unclassified position, of which the (NPOA) doesn't have any standing, in that regard, but does represent employees in that department. He stated that unclassifying the Deputy Chief Investigator position would be "absurd." He further explained it would be a detriment and a massive disservice to the citizens of Nevada.

Mr. Gallagher elaborated that Deputy Chief Investigators are subject matter experts that head up the investigation division inside the Office of the Attorney General, which is an elected position. Individuals who occupy these positions have critical, institutional knowledge base that hold the Office together and serve at the pleasure of the Attorney General. He indicated that, if the state invests resources to train individuals for knowledge and training, they wait key individuals available, when their career path leads them there. If the position were to become unclassified, there will be no interest from current state employees to fill the vacancies. He further stated there is no indication to unclassify the Chief Investigator Position.

Mr. Gallagher then spoke about the attachments for the Criminal Investigator Series, which shows that the criminal investigator can either be a category I, II, or III peace officer. He indicated that a category III peace officer would be automatically disqualified, as they do not have the training to be a criminal investigator. He indicated that, to his knowledge, there is no state agency that utilizes category III criminal investigators and that he is there representing category II investigators and some category Is.

There were no further public comments.

### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

#### A. December 19, 2025

**Chairperson Olson**, asked for questions or comments on the December 19, 2025 minutes. There were no questions or comments from members.

MOTION: Moved to approve the December 19, 2025 meeting minutes.  
BY: Commissioner McCann  
SECOND: Commissioner Santiago  
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioner Asherian abstaining.

### IV. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF INDIVIDUAL CLASSIFICATION APPEAL

**Marie** (inaudible), **Nevada Taxicab Authority**, started by voicing her appeal to the decision to reclassify her and her entire staff from Public Safety Dispatcher Series to Call Taping Series. She listed the numerous and extensive duties that the Taxicab Authority does and what she does in her roll, as well as what her staff do in their rolls. She stated that if these positions are re-classified, insurance costs will go up \$300-\$400 a month, and pay will go down \$600-\$700 a month, while still performing the same duties as before. She gave a brief history of where the funding does and does not come from for the Taxicab Authority, who participated in the original classification studies for the Call Taker Series, and what funding is obtained from the technology fees. She also indicated that if these positions are reclassified, there will be little to no interest when positions are posted, giving an example of a recent posting for an inter-departmental position that had once garnered 25 individuals, and with the most recent posting, garnered one individual. No other qualified applicants were interested. Because of this, they are currently working short staff and ten-hour shifts.

**Heather Dapice** started by explaining that on August 8, 2025, an HR-19 was submitted to determine if current duties and responsibilities of positions within the communication center of the Taxicab Authority were consistent with the Public Safety Dispatcher Series and were warranted for reclassification to a more appropriate series. She cited NAC 284.130, Investigations of classifications, and NAC 284.126, Subsection 8. She stated that Administrator Todd Park, for the appellant's position, submitted an HR-19 on August 13, 2025. A comprehensive review of associated duties within the communication center was conducted. It was determined that the duties and responsibilities of positions were more closely aligned with the Communications Call Taker Series.

She continued by stating that a revision to the Series was made to include a supervisory level, with an initial determination letter reference in Exhibit 4, and job specifications for Communications Call Taker and Public Safety Dispatcher in

Exhibits 12 and 13, respectively. Ms. Dapice stated the appellant's appeal to the DHRM administrator, dated September 17, is Exhibit 3, and her appeal to the Commission, dated December 19, 2025, is Exhibit 1. In both, the appellant indicates the reclassification misrepresents the scope and complexity of her duties. However, the duties of the appellant are consistent with the Communication Call Taker Series. Ms. Dapice then explained, in great detail, the duties of the appellant's position, explaining that appellant believes that reclassification strips the position that was a public safety roll, and fails to acknowledge that Taxicab Authority dispatchers engage in continuous, operational oversight and decision making.

Ms. Dapice continued by stating the Taxicab Authority receives emergency and non-emergency calls for taxi cabs and their respective compliance enforcement investigations, and that while the Taxicab Authority may monitor and direct real-time compliance enforcement operations, this monitoring is not consistent with or comparable in scope to other communication centers. Additionally, Taxicab Authority dispatchers utilize a fully-integrated, computer aided dispatch system that allows for cross-jurisdictional, statewide monitoring, tracking, and control of unrestricted law enforcement functions. She stated the public safety dispatchers, through the integrated dispatch system, are secondary public safety answering points, commonly known as 911.

She explained that in departments like the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Wildlife, public safety dispatchers routinely support, monitor, and track state law enforcement personnel, investigative units, the Nevada AG's Office, and numerous other State of Nevada and federal law enforcement activities. This level of operational involvement is not evident in the Taxicab Authority's current practices. In addition, public safety dispatchers have broader authority in the use of these systems, whereas the Taxicab Authority are limited to taxi-related (inaudible).

Ms. Dapice then moved to the pay related topic cited by the appellant. She stated that, while the reclassification does result in a grade change, the reclassification allows for a retained grade of pay, pursuant to NAC 284.90. Briefly, this states that an employee's base rate of pay remains unaffected for two years after the effective date of the downward reclassification. At the end of the two-year period, the employee's base rate of pay will then be frozen until it falls within the range of the grade to which they were reclassified, or for a maximum of two years.

She then explained that the appellant stated the Taxicab Authority has category I peace officers, and that the use of defined restrictions is irrelevant to the duties and her staff perform. Ms. Dapice indicated that, while the Taxicab Authority has employed category I peace officers, NRS 289.470 devised positions at the Taxicab Authority as category II peace officers. These officers are restricted through NRS 289.340, which states that the Taxicab field investigators are peace officers, for the specific purpose of enforcing provisions of Chapter 706 of NRS, and as such, the compliance enforcement investigators are limited in their authority, regardless of the category they were hired at.

Ms. Dapice then stated the appellant also wrote in her appeal that the creation of the Call Taker Series was merely created because of funding, and that retention and morale will be effected, because of the reclassification. Ms. Dapice stated the Communications Call Taker Series was established in November 2024, from a request to establish a series of positions that did not have the full breadth and scope of responsibility of public safety dispatchers, while still performing similar duties. She indicated the appellant's request for review did not occur until August 2025, so funding was not a determination in creating the job Series. The original class specification allowed for the senior communication call taker to be either a lead worker or a supervisor, and as such, the Series was amended to include job specifications to supervision only, and that the addition of a supervisory level occur in August 2025, because of this review.

Ms. Dapice stated that it was unfortunate that a downward reclassification is the result of this study, indicating that it is an extremely rare occurrence and a determination not taken lightly and without sympathy for those affected. Understanding and empathy is given to those affected, but reclassification of positions must be done, based upon a similarity of duties and responsibilities. She indicated that the positions of the Taxicab Authority do not compare in the scope of duties and responsibilities to positions allocated as a public safety dispatcher within the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Wildlife.

Ms. Dapice then spoke on the appellant's statement on December 17, 2025, of a board approved, \$0.25 increase to the technology fund. This was specifically to support the new pay grades for the public safety dispatcher, with funding secured to properly classify and compensate dispatchers at the correct levels. Ms. Dapice stated that, while legislators, committees,

officers, and boards may allocate funding for this position, they just approve the funding. It is the responsibility of DHRM to classify positions. She stated that it is the determination of DHRM that the appellant's position more closely aligned to the Supervisor Communication Call Taker Series. Additionally, this position supervises a staff of communication call takers that did not appeal the reclassification determination. She indicated that, while this appeal could create inequities, both within the Taxicab Authority and with positions classified as communications call takers within the Department of Public Safety, DHRM respectfully requests that the commissioner polls for reclassification determination and deny the appellant's appeal.

(Unidentified) asked for verification of their understanding of the situation, stating the reclassification is not based solely on the technology that is used or the type of issues taken in, but rather, upon the complexity of interaction with other departments or coordination with other law enforcement agencies, which takes place on a different scale.

**Heather Dapice** confirmed that this statement was correct.

**Rick McCann** asked if the decisions reached by DHRM apply to all statewide dispatchers and call takers or just to the Taxicab Authority.

**Heather Dapice** stated that the only agencies affected are ones that currently use positions such as public safety dispatchers, which are the Department of Public Safety, Wildlife, and at this time, Taxicab Authority, indicating those were the positions that were done in comparison.

**Rick McCann** then asked if they were looking at the statewide process that uses the system.

**Heather Dapice** confirmed that this statement was correct.

**Rick McCann** then asked how many people occupy the Taxicab Authority call taker or dispatcher positions, currently.

**Heather Dapice** stated there is one supervisory communications call taker at Taxicab Authority. She also believed there were three or four communication call takers at the Department of Public Safety. She estimated a total of 13 communication call takers.

**Rick McCann** then asked the appellant to confirm those numbers. The appellant's response was (inaudible), but Commissioner McCann responded in such a way that it seemed like the appellant agreed with those numbers. But again, the appellant's response to Commissioner McCann's question was (inaudible).

**Christine Santiago** then asked Heather Dapice what had started this process and why. Ms. Dapice stated that Deputy Administrator Keisha Harris should answer that question. Ms. Harris stated this process was started from a review of the Dispatch Series. Commissioner Santiago then inquired if this was for the entire state. Ms. Harris indicated that this was correct.

**Chairperson Olson** did not hear any other questions or comments, and subsequently called for a motion.

MOTION: Moved to deny individual classification appeal.  
BY: Commissioner McCann  
SECOND: Commissioner Hurley  
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

## **V. REPORT OF UNCONTESTED CLASSIFICATION CHANGES NOT REQUIRING HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION APPROVAL PER NRS 284.160**

**Chairperson Olson** introduced agenda item V. He subsequently asked for any questions or comments. There were none.

## VI. DISCUSSION OF DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS

**Deputy Administrator Michelle Graton** indicated tentative dates of June 26, September 18, and September 25, with the preference in September of the 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Chair Olson** asked for any questions or comments. There were none.

## VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

**Chairperson Olson** called for Commission comments. There were no commission comments.

## IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Chairperson Olson** asked for public comment.

**Michael Baltz, Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation Human Resource Manager**, stated he had a problem with a posting in agenda item V, specifically posting 09-26, Management Analyst Series. He stated Dieter is over 90% federally funded, with specific programs allocated for funding and cannot be easily moved around. He indicated that with the job reclassification for their budget managers, they are unaware of any way to declassify these positions or how to do it. He stated the Management Analyst Series is their budget managers.

**Sean Bowen, Acting Chief of Investigations, Attorney General's Office**, indicated his agreement and concurrence with the previous statements of Jill Atkinson, Chief Human Resource Officer, and the representative of the union. He asked the Commission to look closely at the objection that was raised by the AG's Office. He conveyed that, while they support combining the positions into one classification, there are some unique aspects of the positions that would cause problems for the agency. He elaborated that when the post draft was submitted, there were comments asked for, of which he indicated they spent considerable time doing this. When the post was placed on the record, he stated there were no changes that they had recommended, all of which he indicated were for good reason.

Mr. Bowen continued by stating that, once it was announced on today's agenda, they issued an opposition to it, agency-wide, addressing the same, exact issues. He indicated they are critical and important to the agency, and the reason he is in an acting position now. He indicated he was offered the position, but because it is unclassified, it is a revolving door with each changing administration, which he is not interested in. He has been with the agency for almost 25 years and appreciates the fact that individuals can come into the agency, grow their career, and establish knowledge of all the laws that are enforced there. He stated the AG's office is interested in working with DHRM to combined classifications, but at the same time, there are critical issues they want to see addressed in this classification.

Mr. Bowen ended by stating the AG Criminal Investigator classification was drafted more recent than any other one that is out right now, being updated within the last ten years, after originally being drafted with DHRM's help. If they want to use that as a guide, and just remove the AG-specific language, that would work wonderfully.

There were no further public comments.

## X. ADJOURNMENT

**Chairperson Olson** adjourned the meeting.