

# MINUTES

## MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

September 13, 2011

The Board of Examiners met on Tuesday, September 13, 2011, in the Annex on the second floor of the Capitol Building, 101 N. Carson St., Carson City, Nevada, at 10:00 a.m. Present were:

### **Members:**

Governor Brian Sandoval  
Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto  
Secretary of State Ross Miller  
Clerk Jeff Mohlenkamp

### **Others Present:**

Dave Prather, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Roger Miles, Office of the Attorney General  
Charles Duarte, Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing and Policy  
Christi Smith, Department of Public Safety, Highway Patrol  
Tammy Trio, Department of Public Safety, Highway Patrol  
Richard Wiggins, Department of Public Safety, Highway Patrol  
Nancy Bowman, Office of the Attorney General  
Jim Lawrence, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, State Lands  
Mechelle Merrill, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Richard Barthlet, University of Nevada, Reno  
Sue Smith, Department of Health and Human Services, Welfare and Supportive Services  
Stacey Woodbury, Gaming Control Board  
Emily Nunez, Office of Energy  
Bill Chisel, Department of Taxation  
Jennifer Bauer, Department of Public Safety  
Deborah L. Reed, Department of Corrections  
Greg Cox, Department of Corrections  
Linda Parvin, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Grant Nielson, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Daphne Deleon, Department of Administration, Library and Archives  
Jo Malay, Department of Health and Human Services, Health  
Julie Butler, Department of Public Safety, Records Bureau  
Kendall Howard, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Christine Goetz, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Barbara Legier, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Phil Weyrick, Department of Health and Human Services, Health  
David Olsen, Department of Transportation  
Jamie Vacek, Department of Transportation

Liz O'Brien, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Colleen Murphy, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Rachel Richards, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Mel Rosenberg, Department of Health and Human Services, Health Care Financing and Policy  
Joe Pollock, Department of Health and Human Services, Health  
Sharyn Peal, Department of Education  
Laura Smolyansky, Department of Information Technology  
Dawn Rosenburg, Department of Corrections  
David Gustafson, Department of Information Technology  
Romaine Gilliland, Department of Health and Human Services, Welfare and Supportive Services  
Judith Lyman, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Michael Fischer, Department of Cultural Affairs  
Katie Armstrong, Office of the Attorney General  
Harold Cook, Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services  
Mark Costa, Department of Cultural Affairs  
Clark Leslie, Office of the Attorney General  
Dennis Gallagher, Office of the Attorney General  
Mike Torvinen, Department of Health and Human Services  
Mike Willden, Department of Health and Human Services  
Patrick Cates, Department of Wildlife  
Tamara Nash, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Marsha Sabori, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Kim Morigeau, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Brenda Ford, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation  
Greg Weyland, Department of Education  
Tom Macdiarmid, Department of Education  
Kim Perondi, Department of Administration, Purchasing

**PRESS**

Sean Whaley

# 1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

## Comments:

**Governor:** The first item on the agenda is public comment. Is there any member of the public here in Carson City that would like to provide public comment on any matter in the agenda? Seeing none, is there any member of the public in Las Vegas who would like provide public comment on any matter on the agenda. Seeing none, we'll move onto Agenda Item No. 2.

## \*2. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 15, 2011 BOARD OF EXAMINERS’ MEETING MINUTES

**Clerk’s Recommendation:** I recommend approval.

<b>Motion By:</b>	<b>Seconded By:</b>	<b>Vote:</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Governor:** I am going to remove that item from the agenda, that is For Possible Action - Approval of the August 15, 2011 Board of Examiners' Meeting Minutes. Mr. Mohlenkamp, it's my understanding those minutes aren't ready for review yet.

**Clerk:** Governor, thank you. Yes. We will have this and the minutes from today's meeting on the next agenda.

## \*3. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – STATE ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL REVISIONS

The State Administrative Manual (SAM) is being submitted to the Board of Examiners’ for approval of additions and/or revisions in the following Chapters: **2900 – Tort Claims**

**Clerk’s Recommendation:** I recommend approval.

<b>Motion By: Attorney General</b>	<b>Seconded By: Secretary of State</b>	<b>Vote: 3-0</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Governor:** Move onto Agenda Item No. 3, State Administrative Manual Revisions. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. This modification to the State Administrative Manual provides for an increase in the tort claim payment threshold for the Attorney General's office from 75,000 to 100,000. This is in line with revisions to enter as 41.035 which becomes effective on October 1.

**Governor:** Madam Attorney General, did you have any comment on this item?

**Attorney General:** No. Other than the changes are pursuant to some statutory changes that the legislature made. So other than that, if you're taking motions, I move for approval.

**Governor:** There's a motion by the Attorney General to approve Agenda Item No. 3. Is there a second?

**Secretary of State:** Second.

**Governor:** Second by the Secretary of State. Are there any questions or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes unanimously.

**\*4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – APPROVAL TO RENEW BUILDING LEASE**

**A. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources – State Lands**

Pursuant to NRS 322.065, the Nevada Division of State Lands is requesting approval for renewal of a 5-year lease for occupancy of a state-owned building in Winnemucca by JOIN, Inc., a non-profit organization.

**Clerk's Recommendation: I recommend approval.**

**Motion By: Attorney General                      Seconded By: Secretary of State                      Vote: 3-0**

---

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Agenda Item No. 4, Approval to Renew Building Lease. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. You have one lease in front of you. That is Division of State Lands is leasing a facility, billing to JOIN, Inc., which is Job Opportunities in Nevada. This is an ongoing lease that has been in existence since the mid-'90s, and we would recommend approval.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Mohlenkamp. I do have one question with regard to it. It is a below-market lease rate, but there's a good reason for that, correct?

**Clerk:** Yes, Governor. This is actually an old BOM facility, and it's outside the commercial zone in Winnemucca. It is below market, but it is also for a non-profit that provides valuable services to the community, and there are very few instances of these in our state.

**Governor:** There is a statutory provision for this type of rate as well, that being NRS 322.065.

**Clerk:** That's exactly correct.

**Governor:** Any other Board members have questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 4? The Chair will accept a motion for approval.

**Attorney General:** I'll move for approval.

**Secretary of State:** Second it.

**Governor:** There is a motion by the Attorney General for approval of Agenda Item No. 4, second by the Secretary of State. Is there any discussion or questions on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes unanimously.

**\*5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – STATE VEHICLE PURCHASE**

**Pursuant to NRS 334.010**, no automobile may be purchased by any department, office, bureau, officer or employee of the State without prior written consent of the State Board of Examiners.

<b>AGENCY NAME</b>	<b># OF VEHICLES</b>	<b>NOT TO EXCEED:</b>
Department of Corrections – Administration	7	\$222,446
Department of Wildlife – Law Enforcement	5	\$119,516
<b>Total:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>\$341,962</b>

**Clerk’s Recommendation: I recommend approval.**

**Motion By: Attorney General                      Seconded By: Secretary of State                      Vote: 3-0**

---

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Agenda Item No. 5, State Vehicle Purchase. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. Before you, you have two separate vehicle purchases, one for the Department of Corrections for seven vehicles. This is in line with their budget appropriations, part of that. Then you have the Department of Wildlife, their Law Enforcement division, five vehicles. And this is being paid for with additional grant funds and reserve funds that are available. These vehicles being replaced in Wildlife are 140,000 miles plus. They're used on off roads out in the boonies, and these are needed by the department to ensure safety of their staff.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Mohlenkamp. That was my observation is that that's a large number of vehicles, but they are high mileage, and given the remote places these vehicles go, the last thing we'd want is one of our folks to be caught in the middle of nowhere with a broken vehicle. Any other questions from Board members? The Chair will accept a motion for approval.

**Attorney General:** Move for approval.

**Secretary of State:** Second it.

**Governor:** We have a motion for approval for Agenda Item No. 5, State Vehicle Purchase by Department of Corrections as well as Department of Wildlife, second by the Secretary of State. Is there any discussion or questions on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes unanimously.

**\*6. LEASES**

Three statewide leases were submitted to the Board for review and approval.

**Clerk's Recommendation: I recommend approval.**

**Motion By: Attorney General                      Seconded By: Secretary of State                      Vote: 3-0**

---

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Agenda Item No. 6, Leases. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. Would you like to take these all three at once or separate them?

**Governor:** All three, please.

**Clerk:** Okay. You have three separate leases on the Agenda. One is for the lessee is the Board of Massage Therapy. The second is Department of Business and Industry and Nevada Department Transportation Authority. And then you also have Health and Human Services Rural Services Section. And all three of these leases are in line with market rates and we have no problems with these leases.

**Governor:** In fact, Mr. Mohlenkamp, Lease No. 2 provides for a \$1,000 per month savings over the prior lease rate. Any other questions from Board members on Agenda Item No. 6? Seeing none, the Chair will accept a motion for approval.

**Attorney General:** Sure. I'll move for approval of Agenda Item No. 6.

**Secretary of State:** Second.

**Governor:** There's a motion by the Attorney General for approval of Agenda Item No. 6, a second by the Secretary of State. Are there any questions or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes.

**\*7.      CONTRACTS**

One hundred and six independent contracts were submitted to the Board for review and approval.

**Clerk's Recommendation: I recommend approval.**

**Motion By: Attorney General                      Seconded By: Secretary of State                      Vote: 3-0**

---

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Agenda Item No. 7. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. On the Agenda are 106 separate contracts for consideration by the Board.

**Governor:** I do have some hold outs. Contract 35, Contracts 45 to 50, Contract 51, which will include questions on some other related contracts, but I'll just hold out 51, Contract 68, 76 and 77, 85 and 100. Do any of the other Board members have any contracts they'd like to hold?

**Attorney General:** No, Governor. You identified the ones I had questions about.

**Governor:** So is there somebody from the Department of Education with regard to Contract 35?

**Tom MacDiarmid:** For the record, I'm Tom MacDiarmid with the Nevada Department of Education, Office of Assessments, Program Accountability and Curriculum, representing Contract No. 35.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. McDermott. My question is with regard to the soundness of the contract. It is only this, I have heard from some of the schools about their concern about how early the test is administered, and they would like to perhaps -- was there any ability for that test to be administered later so that students have more time to prepare for it?

**Tom MacDiarmid:** Yes. We have adjusted our window for the alternate assessment to be later. I believe it's February 1 through March 15, or maybe that's April 30. We've adjusted to align with the CRT testing, that's been adjusted by 45 days.

**Governor:** So the time has been extended by 45 days than it was before?

**Tom MacDiarmid:** The testing window for the CRT testing, the Criteria and Reference Test, in grades 3 through 8, has been moved 45 days. And this is the alternate assessment that aligns with that assessment, so we've also adjusted this window to be later in the school year.

**Governor:** Does that include the high school proficiency?

**Tom MacDiarmid:** No. The high school proficiency, the testing windows for that test have been set, the windows haven't been changed this year.

**Governor:** Is that any concern to you with regard to high school proficiency? Is there any ability to make that a longer window?

**Tom MacDiarmid:** Right now the window for the high school proficiency exam is -- we administer that test four times a year, November, March, May and July, and each of those windows, except for the May test, is a week long.

**Governor:** That's all I have. Any other questions from Board members for Mr. MacDiarmid? Thank you, sir. We move onto 45 to 50. Mr. Willden, I saw that you were present.

**Mike Willden:** Good morning, Governor. For the record, I'm Mike Willden. I serve as the Director of Health and Human Services. The contracts in question are contracts that the health division has with our community health nursing programs. With me at the table today is Mr. Weyrick, who can answer any detailed questions. But just a couple of things that I think that maybe the line of questioning, I've talked with you Governor that there are a number of contracts that we are negotiating with the counties, that the legislature approved where we're assessing the counties to provide certain services. This is part of that process. We probably will be bringing somewhere up to 120 to 150 contracts to the Board over the next couple Board meetings where we are negotiating these assessments that the counties have to pay for various human services. The Community Health Nursing contracts, the counties have been in partnership with that for a significant number of years. Mr. Wyrick can answer that in detail. What's new with these

contracts this year is there's new language in here pursuant to Senate Bill 471, passed in the legislature that the counties, in addition to our relationship with Community Health Nursing, also have a fiscal obligation for tuberculosis screening and testing and sexually transmitted disease screening and testing. So the contracts going forward have the traditional Community Health Nursing relationship, and we've also incorporated into the contracts going forward the county's responsibility for TB and STD. The contracts before you are the initial wave that we have got signed. At the next Board of Examiners' meeting we will be bringing additional contracts on Community Health Nursing. Also we'll be bringing contracts dealing with the Medicaid, what we call the County Match program. We'll be bringing in consumer health protection from the Health Division, and the county's and assessments to pay for some of the consumer health protection. We will be bringing in contracts on rural mental health services to mentally retarded children. We'll be bringing contracts for youth parole assessments and rural child protective services. All of those contracts are in various stages of negotiation. These are the first wave of contracts being signed by the counties.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Willden. You've anticipated my question is that in the meantime the state is providing those services?

**Mike Willden:** Absolutely. We are providing those services using our general fund dollars that we had appropriated by the legislature. It will be a concern if we don't get all these contracts negotiated by mid-year that our general funds will be depleted and we'll have problems by mid-year. I set a goal that we would have all the contracts negotiated by the end of September. And again, I have a spreadsheet I can provide to the Board. I apologize to Secretary of State Miller, I didn't get one to his office. If you look at the spreadsheet, the yellow on the spreadsheet is where we've been successful in negotiating the contracts with the counties and/or we've received payments from the counties. I've got to get this whole spreadsheet turning yellow, and you can see I have about a third of it yellow and two-thirds of it not yellow. Everyday new contracts are coming in, new negotiations are resolved. I would expect within the next two weeks that we'll have most of this being successful negotiations. The only thing I would report to the Board that I can tell you has been communicated to my office that will definitely be a problem is Carson City on the spreadsheet and the assessments for rural child protective services and the assessment for youth parole. They're about two-thirds of the way down on the spreadsheet. Carson City has sent me a letter that indicates that they will not pay those assessments based on their interpretation of the statute. I am working with the Attorney General's office and the legislative legal counsel to provide additional legal guidance to Carson City hoping to convince them to pay the assessments and not have to have a legal battle of some sort. So that's the only county that has indicated that they don't intend to pay the assessments.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Willden. What is delaying entering into these contracts? Is it the reasonableness of the charge? I mean, when you say you're negotiating, what are the issues that are being negotiated?

**Mike Willden:** Governor, members of the Board, there are several things that maybe I could just kind of briefly identify some of those. With regards to the largest one which is the Medicaid county match, which is the first line, it was some issues over length of the contract and some billing mechanisms and some new issues there dealing with that we're not only billing them for institutional services, people that are in a nursing facility, but also people who are in our waiver programs. So we've had some back and forth with staff. We got to attend 10 or 11 Board of



County Commissioner meetings, and there's been a high level of discussion. So I think all of those contracts are in the final stages of being negotiated. With regard to world developmental services, which is the third, fourth and fifth lines on the spreadsheet, that's just a whole new paradigm for the counties. There wasn't even a law passed to shift that responsibility to the counties. That's basically a determination that there was a law on the books that the State of Nevada has not enforced for 20 years. And we are now enforcing the law making the counties participate and pay, so we're going through the process of their choices with them as to whether they want to pay for the current level of services that the state provides, negotiate a new level of services or not contract with the state and take over providing the services themselves. And so, again, those negotiations are sort of slow going. Again, we are providing these services until those negotiations are done. With regard to the others on the list, there's a law on the books, NRS I think it's 353, and I want to be specific, NRS 353.203 that was passed in a 2009 session that said if the state or the counties intend to transfer a service that is currently provided by either the state or the county to the other party, that there needs to be one-year planning process. That was passed in 2009. The counties are interpreting that law as applying to these assessments that we are providing. We see a legal difference, at least in my discussions with lawyers, counsel, is that we are not transferring the program to the counties, we are assessing them for a service that is currently being provided, and so that's a legal distinction at least a couple of counties have raised. They believe we can't assess them under the law NRS 353.203. Others have opined that this is not a transfer of the service or the program; this is the charging of an assessment or a fee. And so we're working through that. I hope Carson City will change their mind and we'll all be on board and everybody will pay their assessments soon. If not, we'll be probably coming to the Board or through the unfortunate remedies that we have to say somebody needs to help us enforce receiving this money, or we will not have about \$44 million worth of revenue built into the HHS budget for these services on this spreadsheet.

**Governor:** Thank you. And finally as part of that negotiation, you will be able to recover the expenditures you're making now until the time within which a contract is entered into?

**Mike Willden:** That's my belief. Obviously, we will be bringing you contracts that have the retroactive beginning dates, and we know that's not ideal, but with the legislature passing the laws and us doing those negotiations and just the process to get the County Commissioner to sign the contracts and for us to get them to the Board, you will see all these contracts having retroactive start dates.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Willden. Do any other Board members have questions for Mr. Willden?

**Attorney General:** Governor, I do. Mr. Willden, on the second page there is eliminate spending to community juvenile justice programs. How did that come about? Was that just the State made a determination that we're no longer gonna fund programs and transfer the services to the local governments? And if that's the case, is it a one-year period where there has to be some working arrangements made before the actual transfer occurs, pursuant to the law that you just cited?

**Mike Willden:** Thank you for the question. Page two of this spreadsheet, there's a number of programs that we're just eliminating funding to the counties on. How these all came about was in balancing the budget and closing the budget. During the 2001 session, there were a number of

programs that were in Governor's recommendation or the final legislative approved budget that there simply was not general funds available to support. In this case that you highlighted, the community juvenile justice block grants, we had traditionally had about \$1.4 million a year, and we distribute those dollars to the various judicial districts for programs to keep youth, if you will, out of the deep end of the correctional system and in community programs. There simply was a finding there was not enough general fund available to support all these kinds of programs, so that \$1.4 million was eliminated out of our budget. We've notified all the judicial districts that they will no longer get these grants, and you can see by county what the grant amount would be. So we communicated to the local juvenile justice organizations that that grant money will not be available for at least FY12 and FY13, and we'll have to revisit that in the FY13 legislature if there would be funds available. I can report to the Board that in our meetings with the Boards of County Commissioners at least one judge representing White Pine and Lincoln Counties came to the board and said we don't like this, but we have another way of funding these programs and we intend to fund them. And it was basically out of some judicial fee that they currently collect. I don't understand the details of that, but Judge Papez indicated that he was sorry to see this happen, but he was going to step up in his judicial district and make sure these programs stayed funded using court assessments that were already in place, and they must have some sort of reserve available, and that he was going to fund the programs from that source. I would assume other judicial districts will go through some sort of assessment process like that also.

**Attorney General:** Thank you.

**Governor:** Any further questions? Thank you, Mr. Willden. Mr. Willden, are you on the next 51 and 52 with regard to SNAP?

**Mike Willden:** I can be. Governor, coming to the table is Romaine Gilliland from the Welfare Division and Sue Smith. It would probably be best if Mr. Gilliland address the questions.

**Governor:** Good morning, sir. Good morning, ma'am. My questions, I guess I'm looking for a little bit more mechanically how this works. We're sending a million dollars of federal money I understand to the university system to help educate individuals with regard to making healthy food choices. I'm just wondering how the process works and when the money gets there and how that outreach works and the mechanics of it all.

**Romaine Gilliland:** Thank you, Governor. Thank you for the question. And again for the record, Romaine Gilliland, Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. Again, both contract 51 and 52 are prepared in conjunction with FNS, and that's the Federal Nutrition Services. It's a federally-sponsored program under CFR 272.2. And what it provides, it provides the states the options to provide education services, which is really designed to educate SNAP participants in healthy food choices to various communities or various organizations throughout the state. And what we do is we provide a plan to FNS which is prepared by, for example, UNR and UNR cooperative extension in the south. Those plans are then submitted to FNS for their approval. Typically, that approval is received late in September for the period beginning October 1 through September 31 of, for example, federal fiscal year 2012. These contracts are on the Board of Examiners' agenda today so that we can avoid retroactive contracts. And they're prepared with budgets that have been submitted to FNS based on plans provided by UNR and UNR cooperative extension, and our anticipation of the approval to be received in the next few weeks.

**Governor:** Good. And I get all part of it and I'm not questioning the value of it all. It's just you said they supply a plan. And I'm just curious how does that education, how does that get to the participants?

**Romaine Gilliland:** Thank you very much for the question. Again, more specifically to that, there's a combination of both classroom setting as well as social media. And we've been working with UNR for the last several years and have had a great deal of success in reaching people through an educational environment. And through all the various educational programs, we've touched about 20,000 SNAP participants at an average cost of about \$60 per participant in bringing the educational opportunities to them.

**Governor:** So for UNR, is that UNR -- well, because a million dollars sounds like that's a lot of money. And so they were able to educate 20,000 participants?

**Romaine Gilliland:** Thank you, Governor. The 20,000 is through all of the educational programs. So UNR is the largest participant. And, again, UNR cooperative extension provides this education throughout the state including many of the rural counties.

**Governor:** Are there benchmarks for them? Do you follow up and audit in a sense how they're doing with that money?

**Romaine Gilliland:** Thank you, Governor, for the question. Yes. In fact, we have a member on our staff who continually works with them to ensure that they're meeting specific performance measures, and FNS also sends out their representatives to audit these programs as well. So we really have a mutual audit function coordinated between both the state and the federal government.

**Governor:** And I don't mean to sound like I'm picking on the University, because there are several contracts here, so all my questions are (inaudible) to all of the folks that are going to be providing these services. But as I went through this, it's a lot of money, and I know that money can't be put in a different bucket for food, but I just want to ensure that it's all being spent very well and that there is that audit function in the performance measures.

**Romaine Gilliland:** Thank you, Governor. If I could, on the SNAP benefits themselves, the SNAP benefits are provided through a separate funding screening through the federal government, and there's complete separation of the funds so that we're assured that every single participant that presents themselves for eligibility does in fact have the SNAP benefits that they're entitled to. And, yes, we do monitor the program and we do look at the number of dollars that are spent per individual to ensure that we're hopefully accomplishing a use of the SNAP benefits towards healthy food choices.

**Governor:** And there are other contracts, one with the food bank, one with Boys and Girls Club for the community partner interviewer's demonstration project. I think translated that means you use those organizations to get people signed up for SNAP.

**Romaine Gilliland:** Again, thank you, Governor, for the question. Yes, those are outreach contracts. And historically the State of Nevada has had a relatively low participation rate in the

SNAP program with our citizens. So the outreach is a program that allows us to attempt to, through these organizations, reach additional individuals. They accept it on behalf of the division and perform interviews on approximately 5,000 applications last years. And of those 5,000 applications, which we again do the final review and what we might call push the final button of eligibility, 91 percent of those applications were accepted as eligible applications. This both facilitates the individual in obtaining timely SNAP benefits as well as relieves the burden upon our district offices. So those 5,000 individuals did not have to, for example, come into our district offices for eligibility.

**Governor:** And help me understand this, because you made that statement that we have a low participation rate, perhaps the lowest in the country, which is stunning to me given that we are struggling. We lead the country in unemployment. We have our challenges with foreclosures and bankruptcies. Logically there's a disconnect there and I'm trying to understand why we have that challenge.

**Romaine Gilliland:** Historically we do have a low participation rate. The last participation rate that was published by FNS was in 2008 when there was a 51 percent participation rate. If you go back and look at the SNAP participants back in 2008, we had about 150,000 people participating. Today we have about 370,000 participating. We estimate our participation rate to be in the low 70 percent today. And we expect it to be something over 400,000 by the end of the biennium. I will also tell you that for the last several measurement periods, the State of Nevada has been in the top five as far as SNAP participation growth amongst all the states in the country. So in 2008 we did have the lowest participation. I'm hoping that we see a significant improvement in that.

**Governor:** I hope you didn't take my comment as being critical. I just was trying to understand where we're coming from.

**Romaine Gilliland:** Governor, thank you for that. Actually, I consider your comment to be very positive because this is an area that we struggle to be sure that the opportunity is there for those citizens who are eligible.

**Governor:** Thank you very much. Any other questions from Board members? Thank you, sir. Next item is Contract No. 68.

**Harold Cook:** Good morning, Governor, members of the Board. I'm Harold Cook, the administrator for Mental Health Developmental Services. Contract Item No. 68 is a temporary medical services contract for rural mental health for physicians, psychiatrists, advanced-practice nurses and registered nurses.

**Governor:** And, Mr. Cook, my question really wasn't with regard to this contract. As you know, at the internal audits meeting, there was an internal audit that was performed, and there were some issues with regard to physician attendance in Southern Nevada and I saw this as an opportunity to get an update from you on how that situation is going.

**Harold Cook:** Thank you, Governor. Yes. The issues at Southern Nevada Adult Mental Services are being addressed. We have two processes in place right now. We have an RFP on the street for internal medicine doctors. And some of the more egregious problems that we had in the audit were from the internal medicine doctors. We anticipate having responses by next

month, October 1, and hope to have a vendor selected by the 1st of January of 2012. That will then privatize all of our internal medicine services for Rawson-Neal Hospital and should resolve at least some of those problems. With respect to the other avenue that we're taking, we have begun to require all physicians, and this may sound childish, but we've begun to require them to sign in and sign out. I have the sign-in sheets and sign-out sheets here. We started that earlier this month to try to track better their attendance and their devotion to the job.

**Governor:** No. I thank you for that, Mr. Cook. I saw this again as an opportunity to see -- for you just to tell how conditions have improved with regard to their attendance. And how is that signing in and signing out working?

**Harold Cook:** They are complying with the requirement to sign in and sign out. A brief review of the data that we have would indicate that they are still not consistently working an eight-hour day, or a ten-hour day as required by their schedule, but that is being addressed by management at Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health.

**Governor:** So will these new RFPs cure that situation with regard to getting paid for the hours you actually work only?

**Harold Cook:** That is the intent of the RFP is to get a medical management company which we can hold responsible for the services delivered. If they don't deliver the services, we don't pay them. So it will resolve the issue specifically with internal medicine. The larger issue with the psychiatry staff will remain.

**Governor:** When you say will remain that you still have that issue of people billing for hours that are not working?

**Harold Cook:** We will have the issue of people being paid for hours that they are not working. That is correct.

**Governor:** And you're trying to fix that as well?

**Harold Cook:** We are working on that as well. Yes, sir.

**Governor:** And in what way are we trying to correct that?

**Harold Cook:** The initial effort is the sign-in sheet where physicians, when they walk into the building, they have to sign in and sign out. And the reason for that, Governor, is that the key card method of tracking their time has certain flaws in it that does make it somewhat inaccurate. So our solution to that right now is to have the docs sign in and sign out. The management reviews those sign-in and sign-out sheets and when necessary, they bring it to the attention of the physician that their time on duty is not sufficient according to the contractual obligation. I will have to tell you that the psychiatrists have indicated in writing that they do not believe that they are required to be on duty for 40 hours a week, that their productivity is better measured by other factors such as length of stay in the hospital, recidivism rates, medical records compliance and other issues that reflect on the effective operation of the hospital. And quite truthfully, those measures are improved, but they are adamant that their positions should not be required to be there on duty eight hours a day routinely.

**Governor:** We can probably visit about this later. I respectfully disagree.

**Harold Cook:** I do too. Yes, sir.

**Governor:** I'll just leave it at that, because I'm very concerned about that. Not just from a fiscal standpoint, but from a patient standpoint that, I'll use this word again, logically to me, the more often that a physician is there treating his or her patients that -- and it just doesn't make sense to me that somebody should be paid for when they're not there when the contract provides that they're there 40 hours a week.

**Harold Cook:** Yes, sir.

**Governor:** So I'll leave it at that. Any other Board members have any questions for Mr. Cook? Again, I'm not being critical of you. I appreciate the fact that you are taking this issue on.

**Harold Cook:** This is a longstanding issue, Governor, and we will continue to work on it.

**Governor:** All right. Thank you very much. Contract Item 76 and 77, Department of Corrections. Mr. Cox, are you there?

**Greg Cox:** Yes, Governor, Greg Cox, Director of Department of Corrections. Down there Debbie Reed, Deputy Director of Support Services is up in northern Carson with you. I'll be glad to talk about 76. Basically it's health care services that we provide to our inmates through a preferred provider organization, PPO, through a third-party administrator. I can get in the financial details and Debbie can provide or I can provide you some more information about what this has done to the department's state. Basically what they do is they negotiate contracted rates through our medical providers and these are kind of the network rates. These discounted rates show a savings for us in the north Carson City area and our northern facilities of 1.7 million, which is substantial. And I really want to congratulate my staff and the work that they've done to make that happen. And that's 76 and that's with Hometown Healthcare Providers. We also have a similar contract, it's 77, in the south with Multiplan. And even though the initial cost permit was a little higher, we believe we'll have \$600,000 in additional savings as a result of that due to more competitive marketplace here in Las Vegas. Our total payments to medical providers in 2011 were \$14,138,000. Without the PPO discount, our payments would have been \$32,754,000. So we saw a savings by using the PPO, preferred provider organization, of \$18,615,000. To date, savings in FY12 are \$2,441,000. We'd like to answer any questions you might have, Governor.

**Governor:** Mr. Cox, thank you. The reason I asked for you to make this presentation is that sometimes you look at this cold booklet that includes all these different contracts and there's a very good story to be told here in terms of patient care as well as the amount of money that the state has saved. So I really just wanted to give you all at the Department of Corrections an opportunity to talk about the fact of how much savings that you have provided, but at the same time maintain the high level of medical care for the inmates. Are there any other questions from Board members? Thank you very much.

**Greg Cox:** Thank you, Governor.

**Governor:** Next is Contract No. 85, Department of Public Safety. Good morning.

**Richard Wiggins:** Good morning. Richard Wiggins, Department of Public Safety.

**Governor:** My question here is I wasn't aware of the Badge on Board program. And when I read this, there's just a brief description. We have this Badge on Board program that's been implemented. This contract is with the University to measure how that program did.

**Richard Wiggins:** That's correct.

**Governor:** So would you just provide a brief description of what the Badge on Board program is and then just the analysis of passenger behavior around large trucks? I'm just kind of curious.

**Richard Wiggins:** Yeah, it's a good program actually. We put troopers in the cab of a semi-truck and when -- well, let me back up. Federal research shows that 56 percent of accidents with large trucks are caused by passenger cars. And in 70 percent of those cases it's the passenger in the car who's (inaudible). So we recognize that passenger cars are a major issue with truck safety, so we put a trooper in the cab of a truck to observe unsafe moving violations around the trucks. And then they radio back to a trooper on the ground who tracks down the violator and issues a citation. And part of the program also is a media public education program. We do billboards, radio, other means to try to help folks understand the no zone and safe driving around large trucks. As part of the grant requirements we have to do an evaluation so they can see whether or not this is actually a beneficial program.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Wiggins. All I was looking for is more of an explanation because, again, there's a good story to be told here. I know as a member of this Chair that at Board of Transportation there is a goal of zero fatalities in the state, and this is another important piece of reaching that goal.

**Richard Wiggins:** Absolutely.

**Governor:** Are there any other questions from Board members? Thank you, sir.

**Richard Wiggins:** Thank you.

**Governor:** Next is Contract 100 (inaudible).

**Female:** We have staff down in Las Vegas to speak to this contract. We have Lynda Parven who is our Deputy Administrator for the Employment Security Division, as well as Cornelius Eason who is part of the Workforce Connections, Southern Nevada Workforce (inaudible).

**Lynda Parven:** Good morning. I'm Lynda Parven. I serve as the Deputy Administrator for the Employment Security Division. This contract is for the Local Workforce Investment Board of Southern Nevada called Workforce Connections to hire three staff to provide layoff aversion strategies to businesses in Southern Nevada.

**Governor:** I know everyone is working very hard to keep people employed, so I just wanted an explanation of what layoff aversion services are and what those three individuals will be doing.

**Cornelius Eason:** Governor, for the record, Cornelius Eason, Director of Regional Strategies for Workforce Connections. Essentially this team of three will act as business consultants, and so they'll interact with businesses through various outreach efforts to understand when a business is experiencing some problems and anticipating either a reduction in sales or increase in expenses that would cause them to lose profitability and ultimately layoff people. So they essentially are business consultants. Their job will be, when they determine that a business is experiencing negative results, to assemble resources and/or subject matter experts from organizations like SCORE or SBA or UNLV, a small business resource center, and try to address those problems and avoid the layoff of people.

**John Ball:** And then, Governor, if I might, this is John Ball, Director of Workforce Connections. This is a model that's been very successful around the country. The Department of Labor and the Employment Training Administration are promoting it aggressively around the country over the last year or two as the economy has continued to bump along near what we hope is the bottom. And it essentially -- the return on investments that this model has gained around the country by getting inside of businesses at the point where they start having trouble and bringing all the assets, both public and private sector assets, that are available into that company to either reduce the layoff or potentially reduce a plant closure or a company closing down, and get workers trained to a higher level of performance and particularly in new markets and new products has been very successful.

**Governor:** And if I'm a small business owner, how is this triggered? How do I know to get a hold of you? Because this sounds like a great service and we do have a lot of struggling businesses. How do they become aware that this resource is available?

**John Ball:** I think a large part, Governor, will be using our traditional contact methods. We work very aggressively with all the chambers of commerce, business associations across Southern Nevada, the Nevada Development Authority and others. We have had over the last several years a rapid response network in place that many employers are familiar with. And so I think that we will have, using all those assets and an aggressive social media outreach strategy, we'll have a large opportunity to contact businesses across Southern Nevada. I think the other piece that will be important are these three positions will be key to the business community in using a variety of intelligent sources that will give them an early indication that a particular company might be able to use some assistance. So everything from Dunn & Bradstreet and Moody's listings to the kind of personal contacts that we maintain with literally hundreds of employers and business agencies across Southern Nevada is the network we will use.

**Governor:** How many businesses have you assisted this year, do you have any idea?

**John Ball:** I think if you take a look at both the state one-stop system and the direct employment training program that we use in Southern Nevada, I think already in this program year, we started July 1, it'd probably be in the range of 300 to 400 businesses.

**Governor:** That's great news, congratulations.



**John Ball:** Thank you.

**Governor:** Any other questions from Board members? Thank you very much. I have no further questions with regard to any of the Contracts 1 through 106. If Board members have no questions regarding any other contracts, the Chair will accept a motion for approval.

**Attorney General:** I'll move for approval of Contracts 1 through 106.

**Secretary of State:** Second.

**Governor:** We have a motion by the Attorney General for approval of Contracts 1 through 106 under Agenda Item No. 7, a second by the Secretary of State. Any questions or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes.

**\*8. MASTER SERVICE AGREEMENTS**

Eight master service agreements were submitted to the Board for review and approval.

**Clerk's Recommendation: I recommend approval.**

**Motion By: Attorney General                      Seconded By: Secretary of State                      Vote: 3-0**

---

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Next agenda item, Agenda Item No. 8, Master Service Agreements. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. Before you are eight separate Master Service Agreements that all have been taken through the standard process with purchasing to come before you for consideration.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Mohlenkamp. Mr. Cox, I see that you're still at the table. I was going to ask you about MSA's 4 and 5, with regard to the kiosks at the Department of Corrections.

**Greg Cox:** Yes, Governor. Greg Cox, for the record, Director of Department of Corrections. The Master Service Agreements between the first one, No. 4 basically allows us to put the kiosk in our units, which the inmates can go and order their store, what we call commissary store, from our store without having to go over there. It also gives us an ability to look at from an operational standpoint what they're buying. It reduces their movement outside the units which provides us, quite frankly, for more safe environment because they're not outside their units. Overall we are looking at how we can provide that one-on-one service more effectively and more efficiently. It's something with this Master Service Agreement that western states such as Wyoming, Hawaii and Arizona, we're actually the lead state. And some eastern board states like Virginia and several others are also involved in this process. We hope to leverage our buying power among the states to be able to provide, quite frankly, more revenue for us in the department as a result of that.

**Governor:** Mr. Cox, do those kiosks do more than that though? I mean, does it allow for the inmates to file their grievances, or if they're seeking medical attention that they can do that now electronically which makes things more efficient?

**Greg Cox:** Thanks for the question, Governor. Yes, it does. It's gonna give them the ability to communicate using that kiosk for any grievance purposes or what we call medical requests that are made through our medical service. They can go right there. We can pull that information right at our fingertips, not only determine the amount but whether we're providing a service on a unit in particular or whether we're having issues with grievances, quite frankly, I know that the attorney general's office deals with those issues, and we'll be able to pull that information. I think for a short term being able to provide a quicker response not only to the inmate population, which with our staff working on the unit, it will enable them to better deal with that population because they won't be frustrated that we're not getting back to them as quick as they'd like us too.

**Governor:** And finally, how are these kiosks being paid for, Mr. Cox?

**Greg Cox:** Governor, thanks for the question again. These kiosks are not going to be paid by any taxpayers from our state. They'll be paid through with a contract by going to the vendors that's providing the services..

**Governor:** And how do they make their money?

**Greg Cox:** Good question, Governor. They make their money through the sale of the store items and then, quite frankly, the profit that they make from that pays for the backbone in those type of systems.

**Governor:** I have no further questions. Any other Board members have questions? Thank you very much. If none of the Board members have any questions with regard to Agenda Item No. 8, Master Service Agreements 1 through 8, the Chair will accept a motion for approval.

**Attorney General:** I'll move for approval of Agenda Item No. 8, Contracts 1 through 8.

**Secretary of State:** Second.

**Governor:** We have a motion by the Attorney General for approval of Agenda Item No. 8, Master Service Agreements 1 through 8, a second by the Secretary of State. Is there any questions or discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes unanimously.

## **9. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **A. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources – Division of State Lands**

Pursuant to NRS Chapters 111, Statutes of the Nevada, 1989 at page 263, the Division of State Lands is required to provide the Board of Examiners quarterly reports regarding lands or interests in lands transferred, sold, exchanged or leased under the Tahoe Basin Act program. Also,

pursuant to Chapter 355, Statutes of Nevada, 1993, at page 1153 the agency is to report quarterly on the status of real property or interests in real property transferred under the Lake Tahoe Mitigation Program. This submittal reports on program activities for the fiscal quarter ending June 30, 2011 (reference NRS 321.5954).

- **1989 Tahoe Basin Act**

The agency reports that there were no transfers of lands or interests in lands during the quarter.

There were no acquisitions of lands or interest in lands during this quarter.

- **Lake Tahoe Mitigation Program**

The agency reports that there was one land coverage sales transaction under this program for the quarter. That transaction involved the sale of 2,616 square feet of Class 4 restored land coverage in the South Stateline hydrologic zone and generated \$48,396 in proceeds. The agency also reports that there was one acquisition of interest in land under the Lake Tahoe Mitigation Program during the fourth quarter of FY11. The Nevada Land Bank purchased 164,613 square feet of sensitive land coverage from the Incline Lake Corporation at a cost of \$800,000. No state funds were used in this transaction.

**Comments:**

**B. Department of Transportation – Administration**

A dispute existed as to the responsibility for payment of construction costs arising from a developer agreement entered into between the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and Syncon Homes. NDOT requested additional payment of \$400,000 and Syncon has offered \$100,000 in full and final payment of NDOT's demand for payment. No litigation has been filed relative to this dispute. The Agreement provides that payment is to be directed to NDOT by the last day of August.

**Comments:**

**C. Letters from Clark County and Washoe County demanding repayment of taxes deposited in the State General Fund pursuant to AB 595 passed by the 2007 Legislature and AB 543 passed by the 2009 Legislature**

On July 5, 2011, the Clark County District Attorney's office submitted a letter to the members of the Board of Examiners demanding repayment of funds in the amount of \$102,533,033. The claim for refund cites the Nevada Supreme Court decision in Clean Water Coalition vs. the M. Resort, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. No 24 and claims that the diversion of funds from Clark County to the State pursuant to AB 543 passed, which became effective July 1, 2009 is unconstitutional.

On July 6, 2011, the Washoe County Commission submitted a letter to the Nevada State Controller demanding repayment of funds in the amount of \$21,497,617. The claim for refund cites the Nevada Supreme Court decision in Clean Water Coalition vs. the M. Resort, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. No 24 and claims that the diversion of funds from Washoe County to the State General

Fund and the State Highway Fund is unconstitutional. The Washoe County demand letter cites both AB 543 passed by the 2009 Legislature and AB 595 passed by the 2007 Legislature. The Washoe County demand letter states that the County will withhold payment of any such revenues the County has not yet paid.

**Comments:**

**Governor:** We move onto Agenda Item No. 9, Information Items. Mr. Mohlenkamp.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. On the agenda, the informational items are three separate items. The first is Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of State Lands. They're reporting no transfers of lands in the last quarter. There is the Lake Tahoe mitigation program and they have made a report of no state funds used in the transaction that is recorded. And then there's a third and final under the Department of Transportation Administration under Agenda Item No. A -- I'm sorry, that's Item A. Do you want to take these together or you want to separate them?

**Governor:** Let's take them separate.

**Clerk:** Agenda Item A actually is before you if you'd like a report from anything further from the agencies.

**Governor:** The documents I have in here are self-explanatory with regard to Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the Tahoe Basin Act and Tahoe Mitigation Program. Do any other Board members have any questions with regard to that agenda item? So then we'll move on onto Agenda Item 9 B.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. 9 B is a agenda item for a settlement that has been negotiated between the Nevada Department of Transportation and Syncon Homes, and this is a settlement where the state is receiving \$100,000. Is someone from the department if you need any?

**Governor:** I see Mr. Gallagher here. Hello, Mr. Miles. Did you want to provide any brief description of what it's about?

**Mr. Miles:** This settlement arises from a dispute between Syncon Homes and the Department of Transportation. There arose controversy as to who might be responsible for costs arising from change orders. NDOT made a demand for \$400,000 for payments of costs. Syncon responded with an offer of \$100,000 and indicated that they may be going into bankruptcy. And we believe that the acceptance of the \$100,000 was in the public interest and, in fact, that amount has been tendered.

**Governor:** I appreciate the memo. It's very thorough. I mean, essentially you have the authority to enter into this agreement, but I appreciate the courtesy of keeping the Board aware of the settlement that was made in this case. I think that was a good result given the financial status of the other party. Madam Attorney General, I don't know if you had any questions, maybe not.

**Attorney General:** No, I don't. Just a comment because I know -- I'm assuming this particular agenda item will also be brought before NDOT as well so that that Board will have the

information like we have it. And the only other question I throw out there is because this really would never be an item that this Board would make a decision on or take an action on, whether we want this type of information before us or we just want to strictly limit it to those court litigation action items, that means we really take action on, and that's something I would throw out there.

**Mr. Miles:** Thank you, Madam Attorney General. And that's certainly before the Board for discussion as to whether these types of informational items you'd like to have come before you or whether you would like those items essentially not to be appearing on the agenda.

**Governor:** I guess my only comment would be, as long as it's being reviewed by one or the other, I'm comfortable that it has been reviewed by the Department of Transportation which is probably where it belongs given that those are the folks in the Attorney General's office that are handling it. I don't believe that these DOT-type items, as long as they're on the agenda for the Transportation Board, need to be on this Board of Examiners' agenda. Do you agree, Madam Attorney General?

**Attorney General:** Yes. Obviously this is not an action item for us, but I agree with your comments, Governor.

**Governor:** Do you have any comments, Mr. Secretary?

**Secretary of State:** No, Governor.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Miles.

**Mr. Miles:** Thank you, Governor.

**Governor:** We move onto Agenda Item 9 C.

**Clerk:** Thank you, Governor. Before the Board as an informational item are two separate letters that were received. There was a letter from Clark County that was received on July 5, 2011 to the Board of Examiners for consideration of demanding a repayment of funds in the amount of \$102,533,033. Similarly, on July 6, 2011, the Washoe County Commission submitted a letter to the Nevada State Controller who in turn submitted it to the Clerk and the Board, myself, demanding repayment of funds in the amount of \$21,497,617. They both have cited the Clean Water Coalition Supreme Court case as the reasoning for their demand.

**Governor:** Thank you, Mr. Mohlenkamp. And I have taken the opportunity to review each of the demand letters that were sent by Washoe County as well as Clark County. And as you say, these arise out of their interpretation of the Clean Water Coalition v. The M. Resort. This has to do with a prior budget cycle and prior budgets in seeking refunds of monies from prior budgets that were approved in the past and were not as connected with the 2011 legislature or legislative budget that was approved. I have had an opportunity to meet with a representative or attorney at the Attorney General's office. As a result of that meeting, I have instructed or asked the Attorney General to seek a meeting with both Clark County and Washoe County to essentially investigate the nature and the specifics of their claim. I think it's prudent at this point before this matter were to proceed to any kind of litigation to begin a dialogue between the state and the respective

counties. This is obviously a very complex legal matter that includes an interpretation of a very recent Nevada Supreme Court case. Given that these demand letters were sent in the first week of July, we are in the second week of September, as I said, I think it is prudent that a discussion be had. And depending on what the outcome of that is, that information can come back to this board so that it can make an informed decision with regard to the consideration of those requests for a refund from this Board. So I don't know if there are any other Board member comments with regard to this agenda item. Madam Attorney General?

**Attorney General:** Sure. Thank you, Governor. I do agree with the plan of action that you've just suggested. Ultimately it does have to come back to this Board for decision, but it does make sense to open dialogues with the counties beforehand to see what we can work out if anything possible short of coming back to this Board, and most importantly, short of any type of protracted litigation.

**Governor:** I neglected to mention as well that I'm going to be asking Mr. Mohlenkamp to participate in that as well. As I said, I think it is reasonable that the budget director be a part of those negotiations and discussions with the county representatives. Mr. Secretary, did you have any comment with regard to this agenda item?

**Secretary of State:** No, Governor. I have been briefed by the Attorney General's office and will follow your lead.

**Governor:** Any other comments with regard to this agenda item? Hearing none.

## 10. BOARD MEMBERS' COMMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Are there members of the public here in Carson City that would like to provide public comment with regard to any item on the agenda? Is there anyone present in Las Vegas who would like to provide public comment? This Agenda Item also provides for Board member comments. Do any of the Board members have any comments? Any comments, Mr. Secretary?

**Secretary of State:** No, Governor.

**Governor:** Then I'll close public comment.

## \*11. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - ADJOURNMENT

**Motion By: Attorney General                      Seconded By: Secretary of State                      Vote: 3-0**

---

**Comments:**

**Governor:** Final item on the agenda is adjournment. Is there a motion to adjourn?

**Attorney General:** I'll move for adjournment.

**Secretary of State:** Second.

**Governor:** We have a motion by the Attorney General, a second by the Secretary for adjournment. All those in favor of the motion, please say aye. Motion passes unanimously. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is adjourned.

**Respectfully submitted,**

---

JEFF MOHLENKAMP, CLERK

**APPROVED:**

---

GOVERNOR BRIAN SANDOVAL, CHAIRMAN

---

ATTORNEY GENERAL CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO

---

SECRETARY OF STATE ROSS MILLER