

POST

*** NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING ***

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

LOCATIONS:

Legislative Counsel Bureau	Grant Sawyer Building
401 S. Carson Street	555 E. Washington Avenue
Room 2134	Room 4412
Carson City, Nevada 89701	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

If you cannot attend the meeting, you can listen to it live over the internet. The address for the legislative websites is <http://www.leg.state.nv.us>. Click on the link "Live Meetings"- Listen or View.

DATE AND TIME: March 26, 2012, 1:00 p.m.

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. **Action will be taken on items preceded by an asterisk (*)**. Items on the agenda may be taken out of the order presented, items may be combined for consideration by the public body; and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time at the discretion of the Chairperson.

AGENDA

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

David Gustafson: My name is David Gustafson. I am the State Chief Information Officer, also Division Administrator of Enterprise IT Services in the Department of Administration. Going by the Agenda here, I will go ahead, is there any public comment in Carson City? Laura and Joe, is there any public comment in the south?

Joe Marcella: None here.

David Gustafson: Thank you. Lenora, would you mind calling roll for us to ensure we have a quorum?

2. ROLL CALL

Lenora Mueller: Assemblyman Bobzien?

David Bobzien: Here.

Lenora Mueller: Mr. Breslow?

Bruce Breslow: Here.

Lenora Mueller: Mr. Casazza?

Cory Casazza: Here.

Lenora Mueller: Senator Dennis? Mrs. Fucci?

Laura Fucci: Present.

Lenora Mueller: David Gustafson?

David Gustafson: Present.

Lenora Mueller: Mr. Marcella?

Joe Marcella: Present.

Lenora Mueller: Attorney General Masto?

Carrie Parker: Deputy Attorney Carrie Parker.

Lenora Mueller: Thank you. Mr. Menicucci?

Jeff Menicucci: Here.

Lenora Mueller: Mr. Mohlenkamp? Mr. Willden?

Mike Willden: Present, Carson City.

Lenora Mueller: And Mr. Farrell?

Kevin Farrell: Present.

Lenora Mueller: Thank you.

Male: Do we have a quorum?

Lenora Mueller: Yes, that constitutes a quorum.

David Gustafson: Thank you. At this time, I'd like to go ahead and pull Agenda items out of order here. Let's go ahead and start with the presentation on ethic review and open meeting law and then I'll give CIO introductory remarks. Thank you.

3. MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS

David Gustafson: So for the record, my name is David Gustafson. I am the State Chief Information Officer. I've been with the state for about three years now. I come from the private sector. I am a certified project manager, which is where I earned most of my stripes in IT. I have a degree in management information systems from UNLV. At the time when I graduated, I could program in nine different languages and now that's certainly not the case, but at one point I could. I came to the state because I was looking to make a difference recognizing the fact that government is complex, it is big, it is cumbersome. It's like turning the Titanic. But I figured now would be a good time considering the economy, considering the events that we face to actually make a real change. And so I came to the state. I was appointed Deputy CIO under the previous administration, under Gibbons' administration. When my boss at the time retired out, then I was appointed acting Director and CIO from Governor Gibbons and then appointed the acting Director and CIO from Governor Sandoval and then in August of 2011 appointed Chief Information Officer for the state by Governor Sandoval. So that's who I am. I am here if anybody has any questions. I'll go into introductory remarks after we introduce all members. I am not a member of the Board. I am just convening the Board because it is so important to do so, and I'll talk a little bit more about that later, but I am not a member of the Board, but I'll be here to answer any questions. Jeff, do you want to go?

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Thank you. For the record, Jeff Mohlenkamp, and I serve as Director of the Department of Administration. I've been in this capacity for it seems like a long time but it's only been eight months. I also serve as the Budget Director for the state. And Dave and I work closely together. We're in the same department together. And I am also excited about this opportunity. I think this has been a long time in coming and I look forward to what this group can do.

Cory Casazza: Cory Casazza with Washoe County and I've worked for the County for about 28 years in the IT Department, graduate of UNR and Nevada native and Reno native. And I've been the CIO of the county for almost six years now.

Carrie Parker: Hi, I'm Carrie Parker, Deputy Attorney General. I was asked to attend on behalf of the Attorney General. I don't know if that's a permanent request or just for today, so...

Male: Depends on how you do.

Carrie Parker: Yeah. I started at the Attorney General's office in January. Before that I was in private practice as an attorney. And before that I was a high school social studies teacher.

Mike Willden: I'm Mike Willden. I'm the Director of Health and Human Services. Been the Director 11 years and been in the department 38 years, so I've been around a long time in human services. I think we're the biggest user of state IT services. We pay most of David's bills. We run the largest system, I think, the NOMADS systems, and we have about I think around 5,500 users hooked up, maybe even a little more than that, all the staff and we also have several of the district attorneys' offices linked into our system and county child protective services agencies, so pleasure to be here and look forward to doing the work.

Kevin Farrell: My name is Kevin Farrell and I am with AAA Insurance, the Auto Club as you all know. My job is senior business consultant. My background from a technology standpoint has been in business process management and content management. And prior to AAA, they were a client of mine. I had my own consulting firm for about 15 years and have been building systems for large clients in the business process management area for that period of time. Moved to Reno about four years ago, almost five, from the Bay area, and when I was down there, served on the Alameda Healthcare District Board running an acute care hospital, so I have a little bit of public experience doing that. Glad to be on this committee.

David Bobzien: I'm David Bobzien. I'm representing Assembly District 24 up in Reno. I've represented that district since 2006 and my own background is in technology. I was campus webmaster at the University of Nevada at Reno for just shy of seven years as part of their information technology shop, and since then have worked for private web design agencies, had my own consulting firm for a while and now currently, as part of my work for a nonprofit, their digital director, so I do a lot of web design and social media type things and pay close attention if you are unlucky enough to have to sit through IFC meetings. If there is ever a technology issue, it's either myself or Senator Dennis that tend to lead the way on the questioning even if it's something that we have no idea what we are talking about when it relates to, say, radio frequency bands. No idea, but if it is a tech issue, we're usually the ones that are there to take up the charge. So happy to be here and a lot of great things that both the legislative branch and the executive branch do in this state when it comes to technology and also certainly the local governments, so it's always an interesting thing to see how we can do things better together.

Jeff Menicucci: Jeff Menicucci, Deputy Attorney General. I am sitting in today as counsel for the Board, not a member. I am also assigned as the deputy advising the Enterprise Information Technology Services Division.

Bruce Breslow: Hi, my name is Bruce Breslow. I am the Director for the Department of Motor Vehicles. I have been there for about 15 months now. I think we're the second largest user of IT services in the State of Nevada, dwarfed by Mike Willden, I would say. But we recognize the future of our department is in IT and is in technological changes to serve the customer and in much better ways than we've done it over the years, so technology is really -- this is the Department of Motor Vehicles with some fingers going out to technicians. The rest of it is the brain and IT. Before that, I was fortunate enough to be the -- I don't even know what my title was, but I ran the agency for nuclear projects for the State of Nevada. Prior to that, Governor Guinn had appointed me to what was then called the TSA and I ran the Employee Management Committee as well. I was Chairman of that. And prior to that, I was the mayor of Sparks. I had the good pleasure of doing that through the 1990s. Prior to that, I was a TV sportscaster and that's what my degree is in, so a pleasure working with you all.

David Gustafson: Thank you. Can we go to the south now?

Laura Fucci: Hi. My name is Laura Fucci. I am the CIO for Clark County, been there about five years. Prior to that, I was the VP of Technology for City Center and the Chief Technology Officer for MGM Mirage for about 11 years. And prior to that, I was at CH2M Hill doing

environmental engineering work in their IT area, so I came to government to do public service work and am happy to have made the move. Joe?

Joe Marcella: For the record, Joe Marcella, CIO for the City of Las Vegas. I am originally out of the private sector somewhat like Laura. I was the former CIO for Norwest Bank, now Wells Fargo. Most of my career has been spent in the private sector. Government was new to me about 15 years ago, so now a better running government, I would imagine. Been in every technical position there is or there has been over the last 40 something years that I've been doing this. My degree is in biochemistry, so I'm absolutely qualified. Thank you.

David Gustafson: Thank you. I was just thinking about the diverse backgrounds that we have here on the Board. So let's move into Item Agenda No. 4 then, CIO Introductory Remarks.

4. CIO INTRODUCTORY REMARKS -David Gustafson, CIO, Enterprise IT Services Division

David Gustafson: For the record, David Gustafson. I'm so excited because this has been long in the making. And the last we could check, it was seven years since the last Board met. This has been a statute since 1993 and serves an important role, I believe, in the government because it brings in public, private, executive branch, legislative branch members to sort of guide and advise on enterprise information technology. IT is the business enabler, but we are not the business, which is why I believe that such a diverse panel, everybody from the budget director to former newscasters, is what really brings a lot of diversity to the Board so you can make solid recommendations. And it has just been a long time in the making, I can assure you. I want to thank Lenora Mueller, my assistant. She has spent a lot of time working on this where there were times when we weren't sure if we were actually get the Board to meet or not because of bureaucracy, I will say, and the process by which you have to do things in government is cumbersome at best.

Before I begin, I want to talk a little bit about the purpose of the Board. I want to talk a little bit about SB82 and some things like that, some general areas about the division. I say in my notes here that I'm available for debriefings. I mean, the state is a member of the National Association of State CIOs, which I represent the state when I'm traveling around to these conferences. They meet every six months. This May we're going to meet in Baltimore. And then I think later on this year we're also meeting in Denver. I am happy to come back and debrief the Board on things that are happening from NASCIO on a national level. Sometimes those bring relevance, sometimes they don't, but I'd be happy to do that. Tomorrow, for example, we have an IT symposium down in the south, down in Vegas, that I'll be attending which is a lot of IT people getting together down in the south. I'll see my friends, Joe and Laura, tomorrow. I'd be happy to come back and debrief on any of the symposiums that I attend. I'm available if the Board would like to bring a presentation on the state of IT in the executive branch. Those kinds of things. I'm available just at the request of the Board. Just let me know if you'd like me to do that.

You have two documents in the packet, and I emailed Joe and Laura earlier. One of them is the NRS, which I'll talk about in just a second. And the other is a presentation that I actually had in

one of the cabinet meetings. This was back when we were a department, because you'll see references to DOIT. This was when we were the Department of Information Technology. And it has all kinds of miscellaneous information about our division that a lot of people don't know and it's -- what we did was I played this in the background at one of the cabinet meetings and I just called it, did you know that we have Snow Cats and things like that and that we support 114 microwave sites and things like that. The mainframe that Mr. Willden was referring to has 5,500 people at any point in time connected to it to run core infrastructure systems for the state. So there's all kinds of miscellaneous stuff in here. I'd encourage you just to thumb through it. We do a lot of things that you may not think we do.

So with that, I'll move into the NRS. I just want to read the purpose here because there's some things I'm going to read, NRS 242.124, the Information Technology Advisory Board, the duties and the powers because, number one, when it says the Board shall, which means you will, and then number two says the Board may, which means you don't have to, essentially. But the Board shall advise the Division concerning issues related to information technology including, without limitation, the development, acquisition, consolidation and integration of and policies, planning and standards for information technology. B, periodically review the Division's statewide strategic plans and standards manual for information technology. C, review the Division's proposed budget before its submission to the budget office of the Department of Administration. I'd like to pause for a moment on that one. We are now part of the Department of Administration and the Department of Administration is dealing with our budget, so I'm not sure how that's actually going to work, but that may be actually some language that we need to clean up going into next session.

And then we get to number two, the Board may. These are things you don't have to do if you don't want to. With the consent of the Division, recommend goals and objectives for the Division including periods and deadlines in which to achieve these goals and objectives. B, upon request by a using agency, review issues and policies concerning information technology to resolve disputes with the Division. And C, review the plans for information technology of using agencies. That's sort of the NRS. That's what it says in the law. That was 124. There's 122, which has the Board members, the creation of the Board. There's 123, which is the compensation part of it, and you should all have those. Laura and Joe, I sent you guys that list as well. So you might want to familiarize yourself with the actual statute of what the Board is required to do.

Moving on to that, I want to go into the impact of Senate Bill 82 from last session. First and foremost, I want to thank the Attorney General's office. SB82 was a bill from the Attorney General's office that actually changed the composition of the Board and promoted collaboration between state, county and city governments. We changed the composition a little bit of the Board. That's why I mean it's been a long time making since even before last session we were actually already looking at ways to change the Board. We had a few members on here that didn't seem to be really relevant and we added a few others, so now that we actually have city, county CIOs and we also have private and public membership from executive branch and legislative branch, so we think this is a good cross-section membership so we can get a lot of good ideas that come forward from this.

SB82 also allows for collective purchasing power and increased collaboration resulting in lower costs, standardization and improved security across governmental boundaries. SB82 also increases the security incident reporting and accountability by now mandating security incidents are reported to the Office of Information Security within the Division of Enterprise IT Services, so I thank the AG for that.

Let me talk a little bit about the actual Division of Enterprise IT Services. We call it the EITS. EITS, we operate as an internal service fund, meaning we do not take any general fund authority directly. All of our revenue is generated through services that are provided to agencies or to our customers, so we have no general fund authority. Thank you, Mr. Willden, for that. He keeps the lights on over at the data center.

I want to talk a little bit about the mission. I'm just pulling some of this from my last budget presentation, actually at the last session. Our mission statement is to provide a cost-effective enterprise -- technology solutions. We are not in everybody's business. We are not in the business of building roads or bridges or anything like that. We are in the IT business. And we are required by law to do it as cost-effectively as possible. I'll just read you our strategic priorities. Create agile secure service delivery, deliver cost-effective and innovative enterprise products and services, foster collaborative enterprise information technology solutions and recruit, develop and retain the best information technology workforce. I don't believe I know we have the most capable IT workforce in the state government, and I want to thank them all for that because without them, I'm nothing.

Something I started earlier about information technology, we support business. We are a business enabler. We own nothing. Everything we do is for a business unit. There isn't a server built, there isn't a person employed, there isn't a programmer hired that isn't for some purpose of a business function, so it's fitting that such a cross-representative Board like this should set that direction and at least help guide us to where the business needs to be, and IT should enable that vision.

I want to talk a little bit about the budget here and then I'm going to get into some of the things that we're actually doing more so in the Division. Our budget is about 30 million annually out of what we estimate is about a \$200 million IT spent. We can't quantify that, but that's an estimate. It is about \$200 million annually, or about \$30 million. And our total personnel, we are about 126, 130, if you will, out of about 615 total executive branch agencies. If anybody has any questions, just feel free to stop me.

I want to talk a little bit about what we are doing in each one of our divisions, if you will, at a high level just so that we can sort of talk about some things here. I know this is probably going to be a lot for everybody here, so if you have questions at any time, just let me know. If you need special briefings, I am certainly able to do that as well, but just in a broad sense. We are always looking for ways to improve and adapt to the changing world of information technology. We had looked to do so by leveraging cloud technologies, consolidations to (inaudible) of scale, collaborations with other governmental entities and to leverage private and public partnerships. We do that by strategic outsourcing. We have, for example, our disaster recovery data center is not a state owned building. It is a private, for profit organization that we collocate with.

Now, I want to talk briefly about some of the security things we are working on. Probably a month ago now we kicked off a 14-month assessment and training exercise that was a Homeland Security grant given to Texas. Laura, I'm trying to remember. Was it San...

Laura Tucci: San Antonio.

David Gustafson: San Antonio? San Antonio. Okay. San Antonio and they are using that money for a 14-month assessment and training exercise for the Center of Infrastructure Assurance and Security. What that particular event will do, the exercise, is allow us to understand the relationships that we already have between each other already, all the governmental entities as well as public and private as to how would we respond to a major cyber event. And I don't want to speak too much on cyber events unless you guys want me to. But if you had a cyber attack that crippled the water supply or the power grid, what would happen? How would we respond? How would we collaborate? Do we even know who to call? That's a great question, so that's sort of what this event -- we kicked this off about a month ago. There's a whole series of events that are lined up with training exercises. In fact, even Wednesday, starting Wednesday is when we have another major kickoff and actually some training exercises going on, so this is a 14-month exercise that includes public and private. That's one of them.

We have applied for and received Homeland Security grants for cyber and others. We are working on an NSTIC. I spoke to you about the CIAS. NSTIC is an identity management grant. We're working on cyber centers where we can build, grow and maintain cyber excellence at the State of Nevada. Actually, that will be for private and public cyber centers. We are increasing our security monitoring through continuous monitoring of key infrastructures. And we get a lot of alerts now since we implemented the program through a grant which will send off alarms when people, for example, dial in from their home and they have a virus, let's say, and then it will show up as alarm that we can mitigate the virus through the VPN network, things like that. Lastly, about security, I just want to say that at the last Homeland Security meeting, the governor voted cyber as his number one priority and has supported many initiatives with letters of support, so this is very important for us. We are really excited. I could talk for hours on cyber. I don't think you guys want me to, but we could, if you want to do that.

Moving on to communications, we have a few things here that I want to talk about. This would be our microwave team, our network team and our telephone group. We have a telecomm audit contract that was approved by Board of Examiners which is a no cost to the state, but there is a recovery fee. What happens is where they go in and they audit major telephone systems looking for voice mails on fax lines and abandoned phone lines and all that kind of good stuff and then as part of the documented savings, and the state reimburses them for that savings. That's actually ongoing now. In fact, out of the Department of Administration, there's going to be a all agency memo, I use the word instruct very loosely here, advising them to take advantage of that. There also was approved in the last legislative session a telecommunications consolidation study to the tune of \$160,000 that has already been approved. It was RFP and was awarded. This is going to go and look at all the various telephone systems throughout the state and figure ways to move forward in a more consolidated model.

Our Silver Net, our wide area network, connects to all 17 counties. I'm just going to pull some miscellaneous things out of here just to give you an idea how big it is. All 17 counties connect to Silver Net. The microwave group supports over 114 microwave sites. We have propane trucks, we have Snow Cats, all of our trucks are the big heavy-duty ones, and those guys are supporting public safety, first responders including health, ambulance, fire, those kinds of things, 24 by 7, 365. They have been known to use helicopters from National Guard or renting them to get on top of mountaintops that are inaccessible even by the Snow Cats so they can restore public service communications. In this group, we support over 10,000 telephones. That includes the voice mail and all the hard wire, so there is a lot of telephones there as well.

Moving on to the computing environment, this is more of the data center guys, we manage the state's tier three data center. It is not our data center. We just happen to manage it at the moment. This is where the state's only mainframe is which Mr. Willden was speaking to earlier where 5,500 or 6,000 people at any point in time are connected and relying on its availability. It maintains over three nine's availability, 99.9% available up time, and serves a lot of the major critical infrastructure systems that you see ranging from DMV to (inaudible) unemployment system to all the welfare programs in NOMADS. We have built and support the state cloud using virtualization technology. We have our state email system that has over 10,500 users at any point in time. It is always up and available. We are looking to do something there potentially next session with cloud technology and/or some sort of outsourcing now that it has become more of a commodity in the marketplace, so it looks like these kinds of things that we should be looking at, so that's one way in which we want to look at cloud technology. And specifically in computing, we have a 24 by 7 operation staff supporting all the critical infrastructures. They are there 24 by 7, 365 days a year, holidays, you name it, snow, they're there maintaining the state data center, so the state data center always has somebody there to manage it.

Couple things here about application development. We have a new look and feel of NV.gov. Last session, we had -- actually, before the session, we had been able to use some grant money to secure Ektron, the content management system which is a platform by which we use to deploy the new NV.gov. There's also a new IT.NV.gov and also a new budget.NV.gov. And we're working in the Department of Administration DOA.NV.gov I think is what it is, so we're rolling out all these new websites with a new look and feel. If you've seen the old ones, you can certainly understand why we'd want a new look and feel on them. But it's all built on this Ektron, this content management system, and our web team is just fantastic. They've done a great job with that. Also, they support financial systems. Many of us here know this is as Advantage payroll and timekeeping systems. And also on the application development, we provide over 21,000 hours of programming support to our customers annually, so they have a lot of things that they do including 21,000 hours of programming.

Then, lastly I just want to talk about business development. Last session, we were able to move a couple of resources into at the time we called them a business analysis group. And basically what these folks do is their job is to maintain the customer interface to IT. If any of you know IT people, some of them should not be interfacing with any business people whatsoever, and so how we've tried to solve that is by creating intermediaries, if you will, people who can...

Male: Translators.

David Gustafson: ...who can translate IT and business, and it's been a great success. Dave Miller is leading that up with his team and their job is to interface with the businesses, gather requirements, understand what they're saying, instead of just coming to the IT people with a solution, come with a problem so that then we can appropriately tailor the IT solution to meet the business requirements.

And lastly, I just want to talk about TIRs. By statute, all technology information systems having an estimated development cost of over \$50,000 are to be reviewed, documented and planned accordingly, and this is what many in state government know as the Technology Investment Request, the TIR process. There's a whole committee and a whole process set up around that, but there is process by which major initiatives actually go underway called the TIR process. And with that, I will stop talking and answer any questions. And if there aren't any, then I'll hand the baton to Mr. Mohlenkamp over here with Agenda Item No. 6. But before I do that, does anyone have any questions?

Mike Willden: You know me, David. So is now the time -- I am a little confused whether you want to talk about things now that might be kind of where we're going and what we're going to do as a Board or is that Item 7?

David Gustafson: Mr. Willden, the Board is going in any direction you want it to go in.

Mike Willden: So maybe I should wait until we get a Chair done, but I'm sort of thinking at some point in time today it's like...

David Gustafson: Sure.

Mike Willden: ...what are we going to tackle and...

David Gustafson: Sure. I agree. I did not want to set the Agenda. I mean, I'm not even a -- I'm not even a nonvoting member of the Board. I just wanted to kick it off and then certainly you guys can do that. You get set your own Agendas and do that.

Mike Willden: Well, then I'll hold my comments until a Chair is elected.

David Gustafson: Okay. Anymore questions? Okay. I'll go ahead then and hand it off to Mr. Mohlenkamp.

5. PRESENTATION ON ETHIC REVIEW AND OPEN MEETING LAW -Attorney General's Office

George Taylor: Good afternoon, members of this committee. I'm George Taylor. I'm the Open Meeting Law Deputy for the State of Nevada. It's a pleasure to be here. I appreciate the invitation to come and speak and the good news is, I have something to say, but it's going to be real short. I understand many of you understand the open meeting law have been members of

public bodies or you service public bodies. So I will take things out of order and there are some issues that I was thinking about that are characteristic of a body like this. You've got 11 members and it's important to know about how you function. And most large public bodies like this are going to function through committees and subcommittees. I want to talk about that. I want to talk about the quorum, why it's important to know what your quorum is. I want to talk about communications among each other, what constitutes a serial communication, what constitutes constructive quorum. Those are all synonyms for the same thing. It's basically communication electronically done by fax and those kinds of things, telephones, social media. I want to talk a little bit about minutes and the Agenda, about what constitutes your record of your meeting, and then I encourage questions. I mean, I have very short issues here. I don't want to belabor this. You've got other things to do.

To move on, now, I understand this is the first meeting of this Board, it's newly constituted, and it's an appointed Board, so that's important. There's a difference between elected Boards and appointed Boards as far as voting goes. As long as you've got a quorum, you can take action to the extent that you need to do something internally. I know this is an Advisory Board. I've looked at the statute creating this Board. So let me just get started. I'm going to basically say that in 2011 there were a lot of changes to the open meeting law, many that don't affect Advisory Boards such as this. However, they were extensive changes to the extent that something would apply here. I'm going to mention it, but Attorney General Mastos' bill was AB59 and there were seven major changes to the open meeting law there. There was -- I'm just going to read the seven changes very quickly.

Quasi judicial meetings became subject to the open meeting law. Number two, public bodies now that are found by my office to have violated the open meeting law have to post the opinion issued by my office on their next Agenda for discussion, or at least to notify the public that there's been a violation. And number three, the legislature gave the Attorney General investigative subpoena authority. Number four, the definition of public body was clarified in a scope expanded to include commissions, blue ribbon commissions appointed by the Governor, for example. Important Agenda notice requirements have been made mandatory. For example, looking at your Agenda, you've got the correct language here, which is like boilerplate. Items on the Agenda may be taken out of order. Items may be combined and items may be pulled or removed from the Agenda at any time at the discretion of the chairperson. Those are the kinds of issues that are notice requirements that were made mandatory by the law. And significantly, the legislature gave the Attorney General the power to seek a monetary penalty from a member of a public body up to \$500. So those are the basic seven issues that were done -- were changed by the legislature in AB59.

And then AB257 was a bill that was sponsored in the legislature by members of the House and Senate. That changed the law with regard to public comment. The floor for public comment in the past had been one period of public comment per meeting. Now, there are multiple periods required, so the floor is at least two periods of public comment, or the legislature gave public bodies a choice, and either or, although they can be combined, but the other alternative is usually for elected bodies. Elected bodies typically allow public comment on every action item before they take action. Advisory bodies typically don't do that. But those are the two basic choices

given to public bodies. So consider that as we go forward. At the end of this or even at any time during this little presentation, please, if you have a question, stop me and we'll talk about it.

Nevada is a quorum state and that's important for your purposes, for any advisory body or elected body. The Nevada Supreme Court has been careful to follow the legislative direction in this area, so Nevada is a quorum state. It is in NRS 241.015, requires a quorum to be present to hold a meeting. So in the past when the Supreme Court has looked at this, it has determined that meetings with less than a quorum or meetings among members of a body, whether in here or at the grocery store or outside or on the telephone, do not implicate the open meeting law. So the legislative intent as construed by the Court is to allow the discussion of public business as long as a quorum is not involved. It is not like that in every other state, and I've looked at some other statutory schemes in other states and I think Nevada is somewhere in the middle. We are neither very, very strict, nor are we very, very lax. Now, moving from quorum to how does this play out. I mean, are you allowed to call somebody or talk to them anytime? The answer is yes, you certainly are, but you need to keep track of who is on this daisy chain, who is on the chain, who has talked to whom, and at the conclusion of your discussion with one or two members of your Board, everyone should understand that if one member calls or faxes or telephones or uses social media to contact another one, you're adding another member to the original group. And as long as you stay less than six, as long as this daisy chain is less than six, you're probably all right. Many times someone will send an email and the temptation is to hit reply all. That's something that you've got to think about carefully before you do.

What the Nevada open meeting law prohibits is deliberation and action in a meeting, so let me pull out my trusty definition. Action is defined in the statute .015. It includes actually voting and, of course, includes making a promise or commitment, so that's pretty easy. I mean, when you're discussing public business with other members of this Board, keep that in mind and deliberations, and this is a little harder. It's not been defined in the statute, but the Nevada Supreme Court has defined it as when a body examines ways or reflects upon the reasons for or against the choice. It also means collective acquisition or the exchange of facts preliminary to decision. It seems like the metaphors and the euphemisms can go on and on there, but basically the idea is if there is a discussion regarding issues preliminary to a decision, then it's probably deliberation.

So now, committees, we'll move on to that, and I think this is probably the most important thing I will say to you. It's really important for all the other advisory bodies and elected bodies about committees. It's a confusing area for everyone, and I admit that the statute is not that clear about it, but the legislature did determine that the open meeting law includes any committee, subcommittee or any subsidiary thereof. Well, that phrase, subsidiary thereof, has not been construed. We'll just use a dictionary definition of it, which means, in our view, is that as long as two members of a public body have been tasked to do something, the open meeting law may apply to them. And here's how we'll make that distinction, and this is coming out in our new manual, which will be published in April. To the extent that a group is appointed by a public body, as long as there is two members of this group appointed to do something, a task, and they are given the task of making decisions or recommendations to the parent body, then the group is governed by the open meeting law.

All right. Moving on, there is a sub part to this. But if a subcommittee recommendation to a parent body is -- well, if a subcommittee recommendation to a parent body is more than mere fact finding, because the subcommittee has to choose or accept options or decide to accept certain facts while rejecting others, or if it has to make any type of choice in order to create a recommendation, then it's participated in the decision-making process and is subject to the open meeting law. So, I guess I got ahead of myself a little bit there. What I meant to say is a lot of times, public bodies create fact-finding committees. They want to go out and bring something back to the parent body. But even fact-finding committees can be part of the decision-making process if they have to weigh which facts are choices to make with regard to what to bring back to the parent body. So I hope that helps a little bit about what you have to do. And as an example, there are, in rural counties, a lot of advisory bodies of weed control body. Almost every rural county has a weed control board. Now, if that weed control board sent two members out and they drew a square meter around a ditch somewhere, so they drew a square meter in the ditch and they counted every weed in there, that's true fact finding. There is no choice to be made. They probably had a list of all the noxious weeds that the Department of Agriculture publishes. Well, that's true fact finding. On the other hand, if a public body goes and does some research and there are multiple leads, there are multiple sources to look at and they have to choose or decide which are relevant to the task given them, perhaps they are making a decision or a choice and they are part of the decision-making process.

In five years of doing this, this is the most intractable problem that I've had is the calls from people to ask whether what they're doing is, in fact, committee or subcommittee and are we subject to the open meeting law. My typical answer, first thing, is, well, if you have to ask, you probably are and it's the safe thing to do, but I hope that having shared this little bit of information with you, you have an idea of when you do form committees and subcommittees, and I'll bet that's going to be your major task is to get information back and bring things back to the Board to discuss, so this probably is going to be pretty important for you. And then lastly, minutes and agendas. The law says that the agendas have to be published three working days before the meeting, before 9:00 a.m. and there are some mandatory requirements, which you have met on this Agenda, that's just fine. The other thing, there are minutes. Verbatim minutes are not required. The law only requires that the minutes reflect who was present, how the members voted, what the vote was if it's not unanimous, something so that the public can determine how the voting went and who voted for what, and the topic of each -- or the substance of each topic discussed, and that's at the bare minimum. There is a sample form for minutes in the back of the Attorney General's manual, which is published on our website. It is sample form number three, and that will give you an idea of what sample minutes should look like. Now, those are the most important things that I had to talk with you about. Is there anything else that you would like to ask or another topic that we could talk about?

Mike Willden: George, Mike Willden for the record. When I was looking at the ethics review part of this, I was just thinking every year at least public officers and some other boards that I'm appointed to, I have to file the financial statement with the Secretary of State. So does this appointment -- does the financial filing apply to this appointment because I'll need to amend mind? I haven't -- I don't know when I was appointed, but not since I filed last. So a financial filing is required with this job -- this appointment?

George Taylor: Mr. Willden, I think -- can I let Mr. Menicucci do this? You know, ethics is -- the Ethics Commission is separate from the Attorney General's office, so it's not in my area. And I think Mr. Menicucci has inquired of Ms. Jenkins, who is the Executive Director, about this very issue.

Jeff Menicucci: Thank you, George. Yes, it is a separate issue and, first of all, I would commend to the members of the Board the chapter on ethics, which is NRS Chapter 281A. That chapter requires some filings and disclosures, but I don't believe they apply to the Board for this reason. It is keyed upon whether the Board member is a public officer, and a public officer is defined in that chapter which is somebody who involves the exercise of a public power of trust or duty and further define that the actions taken in an official capacity must involve a substantial and material exercise of administrative discretion in the formulation of public policy. And under the statutes which created this Board, it's pretty clear that it is advisory only and will not be setting, by itself, public policy, it can only recommend. And therefore, it is my opinion that you don't have to file the acknowledgement of familiarity with the statutory ethical laws and you don't have to file the financial disclosure merely because you're on this Board. There may be other posts that you have that require such a filing, but I don't think this Board is something that would trigger that. And on the financial disclosure there is another reason that I don't think any of you all will be going over the \$6,000 threshold for compensation because I think this Board is only going to meet about four times a year. Anyway, that's my opinion. Just being a member of this Board should not require the financial disclosure or the filing with the state that you're familiar with the state statutory ethics laws. Those are still great ideas as far as conducting business, though, in terms of transparency and conflicts of interest and so forth.

George Taylor: Any questions? I want to thank you for the opportunity. I enjoyed meeting you. And if you have any questions, ask Jeff. Either Jeff.

David Gustafson: Thank you, George. And now, if I may -- actually, Lenora, for the record, would you not that Jeff Mohlenkamp is present. Okay. Thank you. I was thinking about going into CIO introductory remark, but since we have many of you here, I think maybe we should go into member introductions. I'll start that off and then we can perhaps just -- maybe we should go to Las Vegas, Laura and Joe, after this and then back up here to Carson.

***6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – ELECT BOARD CHAIR
-Jeff Mohlenkamp, Director, Department of Administration**

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Thank you, David. Once again, Jeff Mohlenkamp for the record. So on Agenda Item No. 6, we are looking to elect a Chairman of this group. I don't see anything in here that allows for a Vice Chair, but I'm thinking it might make sense to have that in the event that the Chairman is not available so we could have a meeting that would continue forward. I guess what I'll ask is some comment from the group as to whether they think that's appropriate or not.

Kevin Farrell: This is Kevin Farrell. I think that's a pretty good idea. It will inevitably be necessary at some point.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Any other comment on that matter? Okay. Well, I think I saw some heads nod, so with that understanding, I think what we will do is look to try and establish both a Chairman and a Vice Chair. And at this point what I would be doing is asking if there are individual members who would like to put their names forward at this point for either or both of those two positions.

Laura Fucci: Actually, this is Laura Fucci, for the record. I'd like to nominate Joe Marcella as Chair for the committee...

Male: Second.

Laura Fucci: ...based on his years of experience both in private and public sector. Thank you.

Male: Officially second that.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Okay. So we have a first and a second for that nomination. Before we settle on that individual, are there any other nominations? And, Mr. Marcella, are you willing to take on this distinguished task?

Joe Marcella: I think I can man up to that.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: All right. Then what I would do is look for -- we have a motion, we have a second. I would look for a vote on Mr. Marcella as the Chairman of our committee. All those in favor, say aye.

Group: Aye.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Any opposed? And the motion passes. So we have a new Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I will let you take over for the potential nomination of a Vice Chair.

Joe Marcella: For Vice Chair, I will take nominations from the Board.

Male: I would like to nominate Mr. Breslow for the Vice Chairmanship for the Board.

Joe Marcella: You don't have to second that.

Mike Willden: I'll second it. This is Mike Willden. If you don't second it, you might have to put your own name in nomination, so...

Bruce Breslow: Anybody else, speak up, might wanna jump right in there. I'd be honored.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Mr. Chairman, I think we have a motion and a second.

Joe Marcella: Thank you. Let's take a vote.

Group: Aye.

7. BOARD MEMBERS' COMMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENTS

Joe Marcella: Okay. Well, I thank you. The last Agenda item then is the Board members' comments and, I'm sorry, Board member comments and public comments. Are there any comments from the Board?

Mike Willden: Is this, I guess, where I jump in? Mr. Chair, this is Mike Willden. And so everybody knows me, I'm a pretty vocal guy and like to kind of know where we're trying to go and I guess I'm not exactly sure, because I've sat on various IT boards in the past. They all have different acronyms and I never knew what the roles of the different boards were. So on this one, I guess I had kind of four suggestions that I'm personally concerned about that I would like this Board to spend some time on and maybe it's inappropriate and maybe not. But, you know, one of the things that we as state agencies deal a lot with is, and these are in no order of priority, but what should be centralized and what should be decentralized. And as Jeff knows, we get round and round on this thing. We've done a bunch of studies, you know, should the help desk be centralized, should the help desk not be centralized, should desktop support be centralized or not centralized, should -- you know, we've got all these IT functions and we've done, at least in my lifetime, in 11 years as the director I've done 3 studies and nothing really ever happens. After we do three studies, we move in inches or in millimeters, not in, you know, feet or miles and so I would really like to have some time with all the professionals here about what should be done in that area, because we spend a lot of time budgeting for things and prepping up and then we don't do it and so I would like to spend time on that.

The second issue is -- and these are not criticisms or anything, these are my worries. I've talked with David before. In my organization, our world changes with healthcare reform 2014. Huge capacity issues I'm worried about. I know people are looking at it, in theory we are looking at that, but, you know, when you start talking about Medicaid, which is our biggest healthcare program, 325,000 Nevadans on that to happen to go to 500,000 Nevadans and all the other caseload growth and, you know, just is the capacity there, you know, and will all the lines work and the mainframe big enough. And I just would want to make sure that we are involved in that stuff because life changes 2014 in my business big time. You know, with a 20% uninsured rate in this state and then everybody in theory will become insured, it just puts huge pressure on the state's system and to the county CIOs. I would think that you're maybe getting some of that from your healthcare folks, your social services folks, so what's going to be happening in that world. So I would like to spend some time there.

The other thing that is bugging me is what I call every vendor who wants to sell something to the state and they get passed around from agency to agency to agency to sell their hardware and I would like to see a more consistent, uniform process. I don't want to name any names. We've got a bunch of them running around and I can never figure out -- you know, I mean, obviously because we're the biggest agency, we get a lot of them sent our way. Well, I'll go, that's not really me, that's DMV ought to be the first guinea pig.

Male: I refer them to you.

Mike Willden: Or somebody else, you know, and so I really would like to see us work on a process that -- I mean, there are a lot of cool tools out there and great things, but I don't know how we evaluate them. We need to have a more objective way of evaluating the benefit to the state rather than just send them to the biggest user or potential biggest user and we sit there and struggle through the evaluation process and go, yeah, it'd be kind of nice, but we can't afford to do it now or we, you know, we need more information or we need partnerships or we need whatever. So I'd like a better evaluation tool.

And then on my pet peeve list, then I'll shut up, are a lot of the minor things, you mentioned Ektron and email and some of those systems. I think there's a lot of things we could work on for some better uniformity and consistency, same look and feel of government that we keep saying we want but we never get. Dot gov versus dot coms, you know, the Ektron platform. I don't know where we're going sometimes and I think we're going nobody can have anything but a dot gov and then I read we got dot coms and we've got dot orgs and we've got all kinds of dot things going on, and so I really don't know where we're at. Again, I'm looking for what's the consistency, what's the plan. Again, if there's bleeding edge or leading edge, I'd like to be on it, but sometimes I think we've been prohibited from going there and then we're going there, and so I really would like to have some more discussion. Again, I don't know if this is this group that's supposed to be doing that or some other group that's supposed to be doing that, so I would need some guidance or direction from the agency.

Bruce Breslow: Mr. Chairman, I echo what Mr. Willden said. We have the same concerns. And I know in the long years many of you have worked with state government, city government, county government. You centralize, then you decentralize, and then you centralize and you decentralize because somebody thinks it's a better idea each time, but there's certainly some economies of scale that could be met through centralization of IT. I still can't believe we're not all on the same state email system within the state. Individual agencies have things. But what really has held it back is the fear and loss of the individual identities, the specialists and the expertise and the rapid response back to each department and agency that you get now if you have your own. We have about half as many IT folks as David does working for us. So I think if the state agencies were to look at it again and were assured that they would still have the priority, that they would still be able to rank the projects and priority, they could still really have some level of expertise within -- even if they were working for David instead of working for the agency, that would be a big way to move forward on this sort of thing.

My other major concern is we have the new Windows coming out which is touch screen technology and a lot of businesses go to that way before governments could even consider something like that. We have, you know, Windows 97 still running on probably half the state computers out there. We have all sorts of different products. We have HTML5 now where you can write a project that works on various platforms. We have all sorts of things, but nobody's doing it all at the same time. So for our department, we have something called PowerBuilder still which David promised me he could find some experts in because I couldn't find them. And he looked all over the world and he told me this afternoon there aren't any left. So we have, like, four levels of different type of things. So new programs we're writing and cutting edge, C++, C# Bubble, but we still have the old stuff. So how do we migrate forward in all our different departments, cities, counties, agencies to systems because they're going to -- by the time we do it

and probably pay some consulting firm to do it, it's all going to be old. So how do we have a rapid response that allows us to grow, to not be left behind and not have systems fail because there's nobody left on earth that can operate some of them, but at the same time create some centralization.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Mr. Chairman, if I might?

Joe Marcella: Please.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: This is Jeff Mohlenkamp again. First of all, I want to stress that I think that there's a lot of topics here that we could really get into and I think that Mike and Bruce have highlighted some of the major ones that we need to look at. My perception of where we are is a bit of the Winchester House type thing. I think for real good intentions, we have built on and built on to the state to deal with emerging issues that we have been faced with and sometimes with very tight timeframes, so we've had to adjust rapidly to things that we need to deal with. And as we've done it, we've created some, you know, closets to nowhere and stairs that don't end up anywhere and we've managed to create that. Those of you who haven't been to the Winchester House, it's a conglomeration of rooms that were just built onto a house and many of them in such a hurry that it wasn't fully architected the way anybody would really want to do it. So I think we have that.

And our challenge in the state, and I'm not sure if the counties and cities have the same types of challenges, I'm guessing that they might have some of them, is to deal with an old system that is built in a fragmented and maybe not as well thought out plan as we would have liked, and then trying to move that forward to where we need to go. And so I think some strategic planning in this group I think could really help because there are those people from all walks of life here but who understand -- maybe have confronted those or are in the middle of confronting those.

The other thing I think that it's really helpful, valuable and I'd like to see us advance is that there's collaboration potential here. We have representatives from our largest counties and from cities and also with the private sector. And I think trying to understand that the opportunities that might exist for us, that this committee can play a role and maybe help advance some collaboration. So those are some of my thoughts in addition to what's been mentioned.

Joe Marcella: Thank you. Any other comments from the Board? Well, I'd like to make -- Laura?

Laura Fucci: I just have a few things. Some of the things that have been mentioned have been around standards, I would say. I think Mr. Willden's comments were around that area and strategic planning. One of the purposes of the Board as outlined by the statute is that we review the standards or the strategic plan that the Division already has in place, so if we can ask David to bring that back to us so we can kind of see that their strategic plan is, that might be a good starting point. Another thing that was mentioned was kind of, you know, how do we keep up with technology. We have PowerBuilder. You're not the only one. We have assembly language, mainframe assembly language, which is another skill set that is hard to recruit for. You know, if there's some kind of document where we can understand the application lifecycle,

that might help us get a better understanding of where the state is with growing and maintaining their application technology. So that's a thought or an idea.

Joe Marcella: David, continuing on that thought, there is -- it's obvious that part of the reason for an Advisory Board is that there are known issues, and obviously we have a list of six that I have that are high level and that obviously we can drill down into. Truth is, is that many of these have been identified because there are issues in the individual divisions within the state. And I would suspect that some of your strategic or your business plan is built around those issues because they've been identified. Tagging onto what Laura said is, is there the opportunity to get that kind of information so the Board has a starting place to align where the issues are and who has them and start to not only discover but focus on where the bigger issues might be and what divisions within the state would benefit most and by the Board's focus and prioritization.

David Gustafson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can certainly do that as best as I can. Some of these issues that we've been discussing here have largely come from a decentralized IT environment in which many of the silos have kind of done, for a lack of words, kind of their own thing. And so when you look at -- because of that, you get a lot of these kinds of problems. I can certainly bring to you what we have in the way of a strategic plan and standards and those kinds of things. I think when it gets down to specific applications for each division or each department, and in this case many of them are departments, we can certainly reach out to those IT individuals and see what we can find out for them.

I think echoing Mr. Breslow, Mr. Willden's comments there that there needs to be a -- and Laura, I suppose, as well, an application lifecycle. Programs only last so long. This is the world of IT. It's ever changing and you constantly need to be investing in it. And the state has gone through some, I would say, tumultuous times as of lately. And in doing so, we've kind of cut a lot of the funding where a lot of those would have been looking into new systems or renovating or updating legacy systems. But in the grand scheme of things, coming back to the original question, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to reach out to many of these agencies and see what we can find out about application lifecycle.

Joe Marcella: Thank you, David. Now, my point would be is that understanding the limitations as well as the trouble points in each individual division, we could start to resolve or look at alternative processes that benefit the whole, more or less looking at the state more as a -- from an enterprise perspective, because I did hear in several of the comments that collaboration, inner relationships within those agencies are part and parcel of where the problems lie, and then preserving those things that are particular or vertical to those organizations is paramount as well. Any additional comments from the Board?

Male: Just one last comment, Mr. Chairman. I'd be interested in any additional information on where you manage and prioritize demand through the entire process I think is what you called it. That would be -- and I think that would be at the leading edge of the application cycle as well.

Joe Marcella: I would believe some governance that wraps around the prioritization of these projects based on a set of parameters developed by the Board would be beneficial.

David Gustafson: Mr. Chairman, for the record, David Gustafson. I would be happy to bring that process as well as experts on that process for further questions, if you'd like.

Joe Marcella: Thank you, David. Any additional comments from the Board? This is a public meeting. I'm opening it up for public comment. Hearing none, seeing none.

Bruce Breslow: Mr. Chairman?

Joe Marcella: Yes.

Bruce Breslow: Just before we close the meeting, perhaps we might want to look at when we might want to meet again and what items we should have on the Agenda so that we can at least start planning for that while we develop the infrastructure and the plans that David may provide. I'm not sure what everybody's schedule is, but I know the legislature starts on X day and anything once that starts is pretty much a block for most state agencies, so I would think that we should meet before the legislative session starts and have an Agenda. I'm a little bit confused on the way they presented the open meeting law with the changes because getting consent on meeting dates and Agenda items, which normally had nothing to do with the open meeting law, may now apply, so I'm curious how that might work.

Male: Mr. Chairman, I would just advise that the statute tells us to meet every three months at least as a minimum.

Joe Marcella: Yes, on a quarterly basis. Laura Fucci?

Laura Fucci: So that would make our next meeting towards the end of June? I don't have a calendar with me, but...

Mike Willden: Mr. Chair, Mike Willden up north. The state agency people know this, I guess. If this Board intends to influence anything before the agency budgets are submitted, you have to meet no later than July because agency budgets are due in September. And so if you want to try to influence anything, we would have to have time as agencies to react to anything. And then from there if you want to influence what the governor submits to the legislature, you need to meet again before November-ish or you won't be able to influence what Jeff and the governor do, so those are kind of the influence timeframes.

Jeff Mohlenkamp: Yeah, this is Jeff Mohlenkamp. I would suggest if this Board is ultimately going to make recommendations that might impact where we go in the next budget that you will need at least a couple meetings between now and the end of July, because I think the next meeting we'll still be trying to get our mind around some of the issues, some of the concerns that we're faced with, and then probably there will be need for yet another meeting to actually try and come to grips with what this Board might want to recommend. So I would say if we're really going to try and impact something between now and, you know, that impacts the next budget, probably two meetings between now and the end of July would be necessary.

Bruce Breslow: So perhaps one in early May and one in June, something like that?

Joe Marcella: Yes, I was looking at May 14th -- or May 7th and May 14th and I think 14th would be preferred. And I was also looking at, just to keep it consistent between the timeframes, June 11th and that would give us some time to respond for whatever gets decided on in June.

George Taylor: Mr. Chairman, are we doing a calendar check then now?

Joe Marcella: Yes, we are.

George Taylor: May 14th I'll be out of town. I'm available May 7th. June 11th works great for me.

Bruce Breslow: And this is Bruce Breslow. May 7th and June 11th work for me, also.

Joe Marcella: Anyone else?

Jeff Mohlenkamp: This is Jeff Mohlenkamp. Both dates are available for me.

Cory Casazza: Cory Casazza and both dates work for me also.

Joe Marcella: So should we move it to the 7th of May?

Male: That works fine.

David Gustafson: Mr. Chairman?

Joe Marcella: Yes?

David Gustafson: For the record, David Gustafson. While I am not a member of the Board, that is the week that I'll be gone to the national NASCIO conference in Baltimore, so if you require my attendance, I would prefer you make it a different week.

Joe Marcella: Okay. And the 14th I would actually think that we'd want you to do some sort of a briefing on that NASCIO conference.

David Gustafson: Okay.

Joe Marcella: So the 14th and the 11th? Okay. Confirmed. Should we project out to the next three-month meeting or we'll decide that on June 11?

Bruce Breslow: Mr. Chairman, I'd recommend -- we can't make a motion because we don't have anything on here to taken action on anymore, but if our kind support staff -- are you the kind support staff?

Lenora Mueller: If Mr. Chairman would like me to be, I'd be happy to do that.

Bruce Breslow: Would you send out an email requesting meetings for those two days, and then maybe once we get together again on the 14th, we can agendaize something that talks about future meetings so that we can take action?

Lenora Mueller: Another piece of the puzzle was also room availability. We'll have to check into that.

Male: We have a lot of rooms. They're empty right now.

Male: Well, we have rooms (inaudible).

Bruce Breslow: We can do teleconferences from our various divisions as well.

Joe Marcella: I think it was the availability of this room that was a concern and the room up north.

Bruce Breslow: Since we book these things out in advance, could we perhaps pick an either morning or afternoon so we can at least start booking the rest of the day?

Joe Marcella: I would imagine the one o'clock timeframe works fine for southern Nevada. And northern Nevada?

Male: That's fine. Yeah, one o'clock, that should be fine on those days.

Joe Marcella: Thank you. It was also recommended that we start to at least assemble the Agenda for the May 14th meeting. Recommendations from the Board?

Jeff Mohlenkamp: This is Jeff Mohlenkamp once again. I think Mike laid out some of the key considerations that I think we should look at, and then down south I think there were some lifecycle analysis discussions as well, so I think some of the capacity concerns, some of the divisional issues that, Mr. Chairman, you identified some of the uniformity consistencies. I think those would be some items that make sense for us to discuss, basically establishing at the next meeting for the Board members what the current state of affairs is so we know kind of where we are before we decide where we want to go.

Joe Marcella: Any other comments? I would tend to agree. I think with the information that I've requested from David Gustafson and putting these Agenda items into the next meeting, to cover them at the highest level and then drill down into those things that are important and then do some prioritization, and it would be a help if I had Mr. Gustafson's governance that sort of manages that.

David Gustafson: Okay.

Joe Marcella: Any other comments from the Board? We will need some administrative assistance to post Agendas and minutes.

David Gustafson: Mr. Chairman?

Joe Marcella: Is anyone volunteering? Yes?

David Gustafson: For the record, David Gustafson. We'd be happy to provide that support for you.

Joe Marcella: Thank you. All right. Any other comments from the Board? Again, this is a public meeting, open for public comment.

***7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – ADJOURNMENT**

Joe Marcella: Seeing none, hearing none, I'd like to adjourn the meeting.

Male: Mr. Chairman, I vote for adjournment, please.

Female: I second that.

Joe Marcella: Thank you, everyone. We'll see you on the 14th and you'll have some information prior to that date. Thank you very much.

Male: Thank you.

Notice of this meeting was posted in the following locations:

Blasdel Building, 209 E. Musser St., Carson City, NV 89701

Legislative Building, 401 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701

Nevada State Library and Archives, 100 Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701

Notice of this meeting was emailed for posting to the following location:

Capitol Police, Grant Sawyer Office Building, 555 E. Washington Ave, Las Vegas, NV 89101

Hadi Sadjadi: hsadjadi@dps.state.nv.us

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and would like to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are required, please notify the Enterprise IT Services Division at least one working day before the meeting at (775) 684-5849 or you can fax your request to (775) 687-9097.