



**DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL**  
**209 East Musser Street, Room 101**  
**Carson City, Nevada 89701-4204**  
**(775) 684-0150**  
**<http://dop.nv.gov>**

**MEMO PERD #04/08**  
**January 9, 2008**

**TO:** Personnel Commission Members  
Department Directors  
Division Administrators  
Agency Personnel Liaisons  
Agency Personnel Representatives  
Employee Representatives  
Media Representatives

**FROM:** Todd Rich, Director *T.R.R.*  
Department of Personnel

**SUBJECT:** PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

---

Attached are the minutes from the December 14, 2007, Personnel Commission meeting. These minutes have not been approved and are subject to revision at the next meeting of the Personnel Commission on March 21, 2008.

TR:vk

Attachment

**PERSONNEL COMMISSION  
DECEMBER 14, 2007 MEETING MINUTES**

*\*Indicates agenda items that were voted on by the Personnel Commission.*

**MEMO PERD #04/08  
January 9, 2008**

I. Call To Order - 9:00 a.m.

Chairperson Enus called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on December 14, 2007, in Las Vegas at the Grant Sawyer Building, Room 4401, 555 E. Washington Avenue, and via video conferencing to Carson City at the Legislative Building, Room 4100, 401 S. Carson Street.

*Present in Las Vegas:* Chairperson Claudette Enus and Commissioner David Sánchez.

*Present in Carson City:* Commissioners David Read, Karen Massey and Katherine Fox; Director Todd Rich from the Department of Personnel; Katie Armstrong, Deputy Attorney General, Attorney General's Office; Peter Long, Division Administrator Compensation and Classification, Department of Personnel and Shelley Blotter, Division Administrator Employee and Management Services, Department of Personnel.

II. \*Adoption of Agenda

**Commissioner Fox's motion to adopt the agenda was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

III. \*Minutes of Previous Meeting

**Commissioner Read's motion to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2007 meeting with a correction on page 18 of 31 to read "The motion failed by a 3 to 2 vote" was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez. The corrected minutes were unanimously approved.** Commissioner Enus noted that this meeting was taking place in accordance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

IV. \*Approval of Proposed Regulation Changes to Nevada Administrative Code, Chapter 284.

Shelley Blotter recommended taking the regulations with similar changes grouped together. She presented section 1, NAC 284.370. She explained this section pertains to written exams. The proposed change would require a candidate to take a revised or newly created exam as a screening tool for placement on any new eligible list.

There were no questions from the Commissioners or the public.

**Commissioner Read's motion to approve the amendments to NAC 284.370 was seconded by Commissioner Fox. The motion unanimously carried.**

The next 3 sections, NAC 284.4375, NAC 284.444 and NAC 284.448, were considered together. Ms. Blotter stated that the proposed amendments to these sections bring the State's regulations into compliance with the federal USERRA.

There being no questions or discussion, **Commissioner Fox's motion to approve the amendments to NAC 284.4375, NAC 284.444 and NAC 284.448 was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

The next group was sections 5, 8, 10 and 11, NAC 284.554, NAC 284.653, NAC 284.718 and NAC 284.726. Ms. Blotter stated that these regulation changes had to do with the employee assistance program. The changes clarify that an employee may use an employee assistance program other than the one offered by the State of Nevada.

There being no questions or discussion, **Commissioner Massey's motion to approve the amendments to NAC 284.554, NAC 284.653, NAC 284.718 and NAC 284.726 was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

Ms. Blotter presented the proposed change to section 6, NAC 284.576 and stated it would remove a subsection that was added in 2005. Ms. Blotter explained that the Department of Personnel felt that the regulation change that occurred in 2005 went beyond statutory intent. Catastrophic leave is based on one employee gifting leave to another employee and this added section went beyond that requiring a department to grant leave without pay when there were not catastrophic leave donations. The Department was asking for it to be removed.

Dennis Mallory, ASFME Local 4041, indicated that numerous members were concerned about this change. The argument is that there is an even burden on the employer whether or not the employee was receiving leave with out pay or catastrophic leave with pay. James Spark, ASFME local 4041 and an employee of the Nevada Division of Forestry, felt the change is not appropriate. He stated that there are other avenues that agencies should take such as temporary appointments, provisional appointments and intermittent appointments. Ben Atteberry, President of the Sierra Range Chapter of ASFME local 4041 in Carson City, stated it was unethical and inhumane to suggest that an employee be terminated after suffering a catastrophe. He was concerned that an employer will terminate unfavorable employees due to their health status. Ken Corzine, Senior Correctional Officer from NDOC representing nurses working at facilities providing mental health services, felt that this is causing a popularity contest and retirement benefits don't cover it all. He also stated that it would cost 20 to 25 thousand dollars to train someone to replace him if he was let go. Kevin Ranft, Corrections Chapter President for the North, also disagreed with the proposed changes. His concern was that Welfare and unemployment costs would go up if this goes through. Joe Vanacore, Employee Representative for ASFME Local 4041 in Carson City, failed to see the impact of the financial burden to the employer. He stated it would cost additional funds to the State due to Welfare costs and unemployment. He felt management shows favoritism by determining which employees receive

**MEMO PERD #04/08**

**January 9, 2008**

Page 3 of 12

donations. Chairperson Enus questioned Mr. Vanacore in regards to donations, stating that it was her understanding that the donations for catastrophic leave come from other employees and she failed to see how management could show favoritism. Mr. Vanacore replied that management may put out a memo for a particular employee asking for donations. He felt that there is favoritism in management not asking for donations or posting notifications for those that aren't popular with the administration. Ms. Blotter responded that there is a Committee on Catastrophic Leave established in statute by the Legislature. The Committee hears employee appeals of management decisions regarding catastrophic leave. She also stated that as for the posting or solicitation of donations, some employees feel it is a sensitive subject regarding medical conditions and prefer their health problem not be publicized.

Commissioner Fox asked Ms. Blotter to walk through the process of FMLA and catastrophic leave. Ms. Blotter replied with the process and the benefits of FMLA and catastrophic leave. Commissioner Sánchez asked Ms. Blotter could employees file for FMLA without filing for catastrophic leave? Ms. Blotter replied yes. Commissioner Sánchez asked under the States policy are they required to use vacation and sick time under FMLA? Ms. Blotter replied yes they are. Commissioner Sánchez asked which one would go first? Ms. Blotter replied that it would depend on the situation; you would have to qualify for the leave types used and she provided examples.

Gary Wolff, Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association representative, stated he had concerns regarding the legislative intent issue. Chairperson Enus asked Mr. Wolff if it was true that employees have FMLA and they can receive donations from employees for catastrophic leave for up to 6 months, even with the modifications proposed? Mr. Wolff said she was mostly correct; it just creates another roadblock. Mr. Wolff stated that he had represented an employee at the Committee and brought up an instance when an appeal was denied. Ms. Blotter addressed his concern by stating that she sits on the Committee on Catastrophic Leave and assured the Commission that the Committee has fairly handled all employee appeals. She went on to say that there are other protections including early medical retirement and long-term disability benefits.

Phil Brittenham, Personnel Officer for the Department of Motor Vehicles, stated that the paragraph that the Department of Personnel was asking to be removed has only been in place for approximately 2 years. He went on to say that NAC 284.611 already provides that an employee with a physical or emotional disability could be separated from their department. He also stated a department may still grant leave without pay even if this regulation passes. He supported the recommendation.

Ron Cuzze, President of the Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association, stated they will object to this regulation change when heard by the Legislative Commission. Jeanine Lake, ASFME local 4041 in Las Vegas, was concerned with the healing process for an employee not knowing if there is enough donations coming in and fearful that they might be terminated. She was also concerned that agencies have made little to no effort in obtaining donations and felt it is morally wrong. Theresa Russell, an employee of UNLV, explained situations for both sides of

this regulation change. She also stated that morale is low when a temporary employee is brought in to cover the position and they make more money than a regular State employee.

Alys Dobel, Personnel Officer for Nevada Department of Corrections, state Department of Corrections was in support of the change. Kareen Masters, Deputy Director of Administrative Services for the Department of Health and Human Services, said she was in support of the change.

Commissioner Sánchez felt it is a very generous program to the employees. He asked Ms. Blotter what impact it will have on the State if this was passed today? Ms. Blotter replied that it is a donation from one employee to another. From a leave standpoint it has no impact, but from a productivity standpoint it is a loss. She also stated that hiring temporary employees isn't always possible especially for correctional officers and other classes requiring specialized knowledge and skills. The fiscal impact is that the State is in a hiring freeze and there aren't extra employees to get the job done. Alys Dobel responded to Commissioner Sánchez's concern about fiscal impact. The Department of Corrections has to pay officers overtime to cover another position.

Lisa Dehart, a member of AFSME in the Northern office, stated she opposed the changes. Jeanine Lake stated that NDOC has an ongoing problem with turnover and opposed the change to the regulation. Joe Vanacore stated that he agreed that it is a productivity issue but it only affects a handful of people and opposes the change.

Ms. Blotter's final comments were that FMLA, sick leave, short-term and long-term disability, and medical retirement benefits provide sufficient benefits.

**Commissioner Fox's motion to approve the changes to NAC 284.576 was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

Chairperson Enus made a final statement regarding NAC 284.576. She stated that there are extensive benefits available to State employees and this is not an anti-employee vote. It is a balanced vote to allow management to operate at a responsible level.

Ms. Blotter stated that section 7, includes two amendments to NAC 284.589. The amendment to subsection (5a) pertained to the employee assistance program and was consistent with sections previously approved. The proposed amendment to subsection (3c) was submitted by NSLEOA and it was regarding the grievance process. She requested the Commission approve (5a) and deny (3c). She explained that the amendment to (3c) provides up to 4 hours of leave to prepare appeal packets for an EMC hearing and was concerned that it may not be administered the same across departments. Additionally when there are multiple grievants on the same grievance, four hours would be excessive for all parties to take at once. Ron Cuzze stated that only one person would need the 4 hours to prepare, not all the parties involved.

Chairperson Enus asked the Commissioners to consider (3c) first and then they would vote on (5a).

Gary Wolff stated 4 hours is not unreasonable. Phil Brittenham opposed the time allotted for the grievance process. He stated that employees are granted 8 hours to prepare for Specificity of Charges hearings, which are charges against the employee. He felt that the Incident Tracking System that will be implemented in January to track all grievances will cut back on paperwork.

Commissioner Massey wanted clarification that only employees file grievances. Ms. Blotter responded yes. Gale Anderson, Deputy Director for Business and Industry, stated their Department is in support of the Department of Personnel in denying NAC 284.589 (3c).

Ron Cuzze stated he thought there was a misunderstanding of what the time was needed for and that it would be used for making the 12 binder copies and preparing witnesses for EMC.

Marilyn Yezek, Human Resources Manager for Nevada Department Of Transportation, stated she agrees with the Department of Personnel and the statements made by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Kimberly King, Personnel Officer for the Department of Public Safety, stated they support the denial of this regulation change. She also stated that it would be difficult to determine who would get the 4 hours. Alys Dobel, NDOC Personnel Officer, supported the Department of Personnel and requested the Commission deny this change.

Kevin Ranft, AFSME local 4041, proclaimed that employees have little rights and is in favor of the change.

Dan Stockwell, Director of Department of Information Technology, voiced his concern with this change and stated he supported the Department of Personnel and denying this request. Rick Gimlin, Deputy Director for Nevada Department of Agriculture, stated that Agriculture did not submit a budget request for either the employer or the employee preparation time and did not support the addition of this section.

Tom Donaldson, attorney for the NDPSA and Nevada Corrections Association, stated that they were in favor of the change and did not think 4 hours was excessive.

Commissioner Massey was concerned that the language was problematic. Commissioner Fox agreed with Commissioner Massey. Ron Cuzze again stated it is permissive and only for the final packet for EMC. Chairperson Enus agreed with the Commissioner's that the language Mr. Cuzze was representing was not the language being presented even though it might be the intent. She also stated that employees in the public sector are treated very well in terms of their rights.

Chairperson Enus called for a motion for subsection (3c) of NAC 284.589. **Commissioner Read's motion to deny the amendment to subsection (3c) of NAC 284.589 was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously carried.**

Chairperson Enus called for a motion for subsection (5a) of NAC 284.589. **Commissioner Massey's motion to approve the amendment to subsection (5a) of NAC 284.589 was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

Director Rich asked if they could go out of order to hear Section IXA and B of the agenda.

IX. \*Discussion and Possible Action of the Individual Classification Appeals

A. *Communications System Specialist II (4)- William Hance, Mark Pate, Bill Hendrix and Joseph Christensen  
Department of Transportation*

Peter Long, Department of Personnel's Division Administrator of Compensation & Classification, stated that these appeals were heard at the last Commission meeting, and on the suggestion of the chair, the three directors had gotten together and discussed these positions. Director Rich explained that he had met with Director Stockwell and Director Martinovich and they had reached an agreement. Susan Martinovich, Director of Nevada Department of Transportation reiterated what Director Rich had stated about working closely with the Department of Personnel and that they come to a fair recommendation for the employees. Dan Stockwell, Director of Department of Information Technology (DoIT), also stated that he was in full agreement with the other two directors on the upgrades of the individuals into this class series. He went on to state the he is not in support of the two individuals that were asking to go to the higher grade. Ken Adams, Deputy Chief Communications for DoIT, explained the communications structure of DoIT. He stated the main reason the two individuals do not qualify for a higher level is because DoIT's System Specialists oversee several agencies and the two from the Department of Transportation only oversee one agency; there is a difference between enterprise and agency responsibility. Commissioner Fox asked Mr. Adams if he has had a dialogue with the Department of Personnel in regards to the enterprise vs. agency responsibility? His response was yes, with supporting documentation. Commissioner Read asked about overtime and Adams responded with there is no overtime allowed. Director Stockwell responded that there is a unique situation in regards to enterprise responsibility, and overtime is limited due to funding granted by the Legislature.

Commissioner Massey asked Mr. Long to clarify the terms of the agreement. Mr. Long explained the process of this particular appeal.

B. *Communications Systems Supervisors (2)- Kenneth Wiley and Donald Hilton  
Department of Transportation*

Ken Wiley, Nevada Department of Transportation from Elko, stated he used to work for DoIT and is concerned about the turnover at DoIT and 25% of his time is working with this agency. They lose key people and don't pay overtime. He said System Specialist's weren't required to have supervisory experience in the past. He said they have a problem filling these types of positions, especially in Las Vegas. Chairperson Enus asked Mr. Wiley to please be relevant to his appeal only. He stated that he has demonstrated through the NPD-19 process that the duties he performs encompass a larger area than just the district he works in and the duties should be at IT Professional IV level. He asked that he be approved for an IT Professional IV and Mr.

Hance to be a IT Professional III. Mr. Hance stated that he respects the Commission's decision and appreciates the consideration for the upgrade.

Mr. Long said he provided to the Commissioners organizational charts of the DoIT positions that were being discussed. He stated that Mr. Wiley had less subordinates at lower levels than the other positions. Chairperson Enus asked Mr. Long if these two positions have received a 2-grade increase? This was the compromise reached by DoIT and Dept. of Personnel? Mr. Long answered yes that all six incumbents received a 2-grade increase.

Commissioner Fox thanked the directors for coming together and encouraged them to continue to work with one another. Commissioner Sánchez requested clarification on the grade increase and asked Mr. Long what exactly the two appellants were asking for? Mr. Long explained that all incumbents in the class have received a 2-grade increase and Mr. Wiley and Mr. Hance are requesting a 4-grade increase.

**There being no further questions or discussion on Items IXA and B, Commissioner Sanchez's motion to deny the appeal for Mr. Wiley and Mr. Hance was seconded by Commissioner Read. The motion to deny the appeal unanimously carried.**

Katie Armstrong, Deputy Attorney General, clarified for the Chairperson that no vote was needed regarding the other appeals as those appellants had in effect withdrawn their appeals when they accepted the classification agreed upon by the directors.

Commissioner Read voiced a concern that Mr. Wiley mentioned that DoIT was not attracting new personnel. He asked Department of Personnel to take a closer look at that and would like more information.

Mr. Wiley asked the Department of Personnel to provide information in the future to see if this can be addressed through a compensation study and the results given to the Legislature.

IV. \*Approval of Proposed Regulation Changes to Nevada Administrative Code, Chapter 284.

Ms. Blotter presented section 9, NAC 284.682, of the regulations and requested that the Commission deny this proposal by the N.S.L.E.O.A. She said the amendment would require departments to file a copy of a grievance resolution agreement with the EMC even though the grievance has not reached the EMC level in the process. She stated that this is a clerical function and she felt it would be an administrative burden for the agencies and the Department of Personnel which would have to store the documents.

Mr. Cuzze explained that the amendment in subsection 1 was necessary because it would allow an employee to jump over their immediate supervisor at the first step if the grievance was against that supervisor. The other amendment would provide a place to store written agreements as a way to memorialize the agreement. His concern was that once a director leaves their position the agreement could be broken. He stated that with the agreement filed at the EMC



then there is a record of it. Mr. Cuzze stated its purpose was not to set precedence for other cases but it could be used that way if it was the exact same issue in the exact same division.

Alys Dobel, Personnel Officer II for the Department of Corrections, asked the Commissioners not to pass this change to the regulation. Corrections feel it was redundant. Marilyn Yezek from the Department of Transportation stated they agree with the Department of Personnel and feel that it should not be passed. Karen Masters from DHHS, had concerns with this change and there are places on the current form that can memorialize this process already. She also was concerned about subsection 1 in regards to an employee skipping over a level in the grievance procedure. And she opposed both changes.

Ms. Blotter clarified that Mr. Cuzze's interpretation of the amendment to subsection 1 was incorrect and didn't have the effect he presented. She also answered Commissioner Sánchez's question regarding the burden this places on Department of Personnel that supplies clerical support to the EMC. She also stated that the EMC has no statutory or regulatory authority over these agreements. She explained that these agreements should not be used as precedence for the EMC, since such a document would not include an explanation of the facts leading to an agreement. Mr. Cuzze stated that he specifically said that it would not set any precedence, the EMC rules on an individual basis and this should lessen the burden on the EMC and the D.O.P. Commissioner Massey asked to clarify the intent. Why can't the employee retain a copy of the agreement? Mr. Cuzze explained that the employer goes back on their word. The EMC can use the agreement to make a ruling if a grievance comes to it regarding the agreement being broken, then the EMC can use both documents to make a decision without going to a hearing. Chairperson Enus agreed with Commissioner Massey that the Employee Representative or employee should keep a record or copy of the agreement. Mr. Cuzze stated again that they are not asking that this set any precedence; the EMC already does that. Commissioner Massey understands that Mr. Cuzze would want to have the agreement in case it is broken but felt it should not be filed with the EMC. Kimberly King, Personnel Officer for the Nevada Department of Public Safety, stated that they do have a mechanism in place for agreements made before it gets to the EMC. EMC is a public arena and not all employees want their grievances or resolutions made public prior to getting to that level. Filing all the agreements with EMC would make them public.

Mr. Cuzze stated that the agreements need to be put on record somehow. He was concerned that the process needed to be memorialized. Ms. Blotter commented that documentation of any agreement are a part of the current process; there is a formal grievance process and the employee does not have to suspend any of their rights if they feel like there isn't a solid agreement in place and they can proceed to the EMC.

Kimberly King stated that the Department of Public Safety does resolve their grievances in writing. If there is formal resolution, it can be made in writing and made available to all parties.

There being no comments or questions, **Commissioner Massey's motion to deny changes to NAC 284.682 (both sections) was seconded by Commissioner Read and it was unanimously carried.**

V. *\*Approval of Class Specifications*

A. *Teaching Parent and Treatment Home Supervisor/Provider series*

Mr. Long explained that this class was presented at the last Personnel Commission meeting. There were concerns that came up during the meeting, and at the Commissioner's suggestion, management and incumbents had gotten together and all parties are now satisfied with the class specifications as written. He also stated that the incumbent, for which there had been concerns on whether he would be affected by the class specification changes, would not be negatively impacted; his transcripts had been reviewed and he does qualify.

Commissioner Fox stated she is satisfied with the resolution.

There being are no comments or questions, **Commissioner Fox's motion to approve Item V was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

B. *Correctional Assistant*

Mr. Long explained this was a class that is being reestablished by the Department of Corrections.

There being no further questions or discussion, **Commissioner Read's motion to approve Item V-B, the Correctional Assistant class, was seconded by Commissioner Fox and unanimously carried.**

VI. *\*Approval for Pre-Employment Screening for Controlled Substances*

*Department of Corrections, Correctional Assistant*

Renee Travis, Personnel Analyst for the Department of Personnel, stated that NRS 284.4066 provides for pre-employment screening for controlled substances for applicants whose position affect public safety. Department of Corrections is asking this position be added to the list requiring pre-screening.

There being no further questions or discussion, **Commissioner Massey's motion to approve Item VI was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously carried.**

VII. *\*Approval of Occupational Group Study Revised Class Specifications*

*Previously Proposed-Fiscal Management & Staff Services occupational group*

A. Subgroup: Public Information

*Public Information Officer series*

B. Administrative & Budget Analysis subgroup

*Management Analyst Series*

C. Revenue Collections & Management subgroup

*Tax Program Supervisor series*

D. Obsolete Class to be Abolished

*7.171- Real Estate Administrative Specialist*

Chairperson Enus stated that this item was presented at the last Commission meeting and they were unable to vote on it. She asked if there was anyone who needed an overview?

There being no questions or discussion, **Commissioner Fox's motion to approve Item VII was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

VIII. \*Approval of Occupational Group Study Revised Class Specifications- *Newly Proposed Fiscal Management & Staff Services occupational group*

A. Business Management subgroup

*Administrative Services Officer series*

B. Actuarial/Research/Grants Analysis subgroup

*Grants & Projects Analyst series*

Mary Day stated that there were minor changes made to the Administrative Services Officer series to make distinctions between the levels and also to assist in classifying the positions. Additionally, benchmark examples of representative positions were added at each level.

**Commissioner Sanchez's motion to approve both subgroups was seconded by Commissioner Read and unanimously carried.**

IX. \*Discussion and possible action on Individual Classification Appeals

C. Daniel Berger, Telecommunications Coordinator II

*Department of Transportation*

Daniel Berger requested to be moved to the IT Manager series. He stated that he works with three different sites and the IT series is more appropriate for what he does. Commissioner Sánchez asked Mr. Berger if he supervised any staff. Mr. Berger replied yes he does, one employee in Las Vegas.

Mr. Long reviewed the NPD-19 of past to present duties for Mr. Berger's position and explained through a Power Point presentation that there has been no significant change. Mr. Long also stated at that at the time the study was conducted, Mr. Berger did not supervise anyone. Commissioner Fox wanted clarification from Mr. Berger that he is supervising a Telecommunications Coordinator II, someone of the same class as himself. Mr. Rich indicated that when the Directors met regarding the other positions, supervision by Mr. Berger's position was not brought up and he should not be supervising someone at the same level. Mr. Long indicated that Mr. Berger could receive a 5% salary adjustment for supervising. Commissioner Massey recommended that we table this for more information. Chairperson Enus asked Mr. Berger to clarify his meaning of supervising. Mr. Berger responded that the person he

supervises answers to him directly, performs functions that he sees fit, and Mr. Berger has the authority to hire, fire and discipline that particular employee. Chairperson Enus agreed with Commissioner Massey to ask to table it. Commissioner Read asked that it be postponed. Director Rich asked that we consider Mr. Long's perspective. Mr. Long stated that the only change is that Mr. Berger is supervising; it would be appropriate to give a 5% increase for supervising, not change the class. Mr. Berger stated he wanted a decision today so he could move on. Mr. Long said he could suggest moving it to a IT Professional III which allows supervision and a 1-grade increase, but the 5% increase for supervising is actually more money than going up one grade. Mr. Berger agreed to the IT Professional 3. Commissioner Massey asked to amend her motion to approve Daniel Berger to be upgraded to the IT Professional III class and asked that the approval of the appeal to the IT Professional III be contingent on Mr. Berger providing documentation of his supervision responsibilities and that the effective date of the appeal be only back to the date when formal supervision was assigned.

**Commissioner Massey's motion to approved a reclassification of Daniel Berger to the IT Professional III based on proof of supervising the Telecommunications Coordinator II in Southern Nevada with the effective date of the reclassification to be when formal supervision was assigned to his position was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez. Commissioner Read opposed the motion. The motion carried by a 4 to 1 vote.**

Chairperson Enus asked the Department of Personnel to update the Commission on this situation at an upcoming Commission meeting.

X. Uncontested Classification Action Report

*Posting #02-08 and 03-08*

Chairperson Enus read into record the uncontested classifications.

XI. Special Reports

No Special Reports.

Director Rich wanted to clarify that Commissioner Read asked the Department of Personnel to come back in the future and comment on the recruitment of IT professionals. He asked if he wanted that at the next meeting. Commissioner Read stated that in the near future not necessarily at the next meeting.

XII. Comments by the General Public-action may not be taken on the matters considered during this period until specifically included on the agenda as an action item.

No comments from the North or the South.

XIII. Announce Date for Next Meeting

**MEMO PERD #04/08**

**January 9, 2008**

Page 12 of 12

Director Rich indicated he felt it be beneficial for all of the Commissioners to meet in one location. He wanted to thank all the Commissioners for their time and devotion to the Personnel Commission. Commissioner Fox raised the concern of having the Commissioners in one location with all the attendees there are in Carson City and also wanted to be fiscally prudent during the time of budget cuts. Commissioner Read felt that it is convenient not having to travel or being able to choose where to attend. Commissioner Sanchez stated he doesn't like snow. Commissioner Massey indicated that on an occasional basis it would be beneficial to all be in the same location at least once a year. Chairperson Enus would support traveling at least once or twice per year, and as for the budget, she would defer to Todd Rich. Director Rich stated that the travel moneys are built into our budget. Commissioner Fox again raised a concern about the audience members having to travel. Director Rich indicated that his staff could present from either Carson City or Las Vegas and a video link would still be available for presentations. Chairperson Enus stated that starting with the first meeting in calendar year 2008 the Commission would alternate between the North and the South. She asked that the Department of Personnel develop a proposal for Commission meeting sites, taking into consideration the weather at the two locations. This was unanimously agreed upon.

**Commissioner Massey's motion to move the next Commission meeting from March 14<sup>th</sup> to March 21<sup>st</sup> was seconded by Commissioner Fox and unanimously carried.**

XIV. \*Adjournment

**Commissioner Read's motion to adjourn was seconded by Commissioner Fox and the meeting came to adjournment at 12:41 pm.**