

# \*\*\* NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING \*\*\*

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

---

**LOCATIONS:**

Old Assembly Chambers of the Capitol Building 101 South Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701	Grant Sawyer Building 555 E. Washington Avenue Suite 5100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
--	--

If you cannot attend the meeting, you can listen to it live over the internet. The address for the website is <http://admin.nv.gov>. Click on the link "Livestream Meetings: Old Assembly Chambers, Nevada Capitol Building" – Listen or View.

**DATE AND TIME:** November 14, 2018, 1:00 p.m.

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. 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 Chair.

### MINUTES

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Diflo, Chairman  
Senator Moises Denis  
Director Patrick Gates  
Sherri McGee  
Craig Betts  
Joseph Marcella  
Krupa Srinivas

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

**Chairman Diflo:** I'd like to call the November 14, 2018 ITAB Meeting to order. I'm going to ask Leslie to take a roll call.

**Leslie Olson:** Senator Denis?

**Senator Denis:** Okay, here we go. Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Assemblyman Hambrick.

**Speaker:** Assemblyman Hambrick, actually, his wife called but he just had surgery, so he's still in recovery, so he won't be here today.

**Leslie Olson:** Chairman Diflo?

**Chairman Diflo:** Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Director Cates?

**Director Cates:** Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Director Whitley? Director Malfabon? Ms. McGee?

**Sherri McGee:** Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Mr. Betts?

**Craig Betts:** Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Mr. Marcella?

**Joseph Marcella:** Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Ms. Srinivas?

**Krupa Srinivas:** Here.

**Leslie Olson:** Chairman, we have a quorum.

**Chairman Diflo:** Great, thank you Leslie.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS (*for discussion only*) – No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments may be limited to 3 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. The Chair may, at its discretion, hold this agenda item open in order to receive public comments under other agenda items.

**Chairman Diflo:** That will take us to Agenda Item Number 2, which are Public Comments. So, I want to start here in the North. Are there any public comments here in Carson? Seeing none. I will ask if there's any public comments in the South.

**Speaker:** None down here, Chairman Diflo.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thanks. We will keep this item open until we get down to Agenda Item No. 11.

3. COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR (*for discussion only*) – Chair, Paul Diflo.

**Chairman Diflo:** That will take us to Comments by the Chair, Agenda Item 3. You'll notice we have a small agenda today so it's possible we might be giving all of you back some time this afternoon.

If you recall from the August meeting, based on the wording of the agenda, we were unable to take action in the form of voting to endorse or not endorse the findings of the NCJIS Modernization efforts. We're going to be revisiting that today when we get to Agenda Item No. 6. We'll be asking Mindy to summarize the findings and clarify the scope for all of us because that project, as you heard last time, evolved into a slightly larger effort. And, if we're going to vote to endorse, we really need to understand the specifics. So, I encourage all of you to get any questions clarified that you may have.

On a different topic today, I've been asked by the UNR IT Advisory Board, of which both myself and Mr. Betts are Members, to share a little bit about their internship program. UNR currently has 35 students in their IS Masters Program. At some point during their program, they require a semester long internship at a local business or at a state or county agency. The students should be given a specific task to accomplish as part of a larger project or be given a problem or a challenge to solve by the end of the semester. This task needs to be measurable for the purposes of evaluating their success.

I say this, likely the earliest start window is going to be the Spring Semester in January 2019, or even the Fall semester of the same year. If any of you would like more information about the program, I would encourage you to contact either myself or Mr. Betts about it.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (*for discussion and possible action*) – Chair, Paul Diflo. Discussion and decision to approve minutes of the meeting on August 23, 2018.

**Chairman Diflo:** That will take us down to Agenda Item 4, Approval of the Minutes. So, I would ask—if I could get a motion to approve?

**Sherri McGee:** I do have one change, Sherri McGee for the record.

**Chairman Diflo:** Okay.

**Sherri McGee:** It's on Page 8. It's the second reference from the bottom under my name and it's the word "right", should be "ride". So, if they could change that.

**Chairman Diflo:** Okay. Leslie, can you make that change? Thank you.

**Sherri McGee:** That's all I had. Thank you.

**Chairman Diflo:** All right. And, still looking for a motion to approve.

**Sherri McGee:** With that change, I motion to approve.

**Chairman Diflo:** And, can I ask for a second?

**Senator Denis:** Second.

**Chairman Diflo:** So approved. With that, I would like to invite Eric Pennington up to review the—I'm sorry. Correct. All those in favor? [ayes around] All those opposed?

**Speaker:** I'm abstaining because I wasn't at that meeting.

**Chairman Diflo:** Very good. Now it is approved.

5. PROJECT STATUS DASHBOARD (*for discussion only*) – Eric Pennington, Agency IT Services

**Chairman Diflo:** And, I'd like to invite Eric Pennington up, Agency IT Services, to review the Project Status Dashboard.

**Eric Pennington:** Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. For the record, Eric Pennington. I'm the Manager of the PMO for Enterprise IT Services for the Agency IT Services Unit. I will be presenting to you the Project Status Report.

In the last meeting, we went entirely through the report from front to back. This time, I'd like to propose that we approach it from taking a look at the projects that we currently have at-risk and then I'm happy to answer any questions you have on those projects that are proceeding as planned. If that's okay with the Board.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yeah, that sounds like a good idea.

**Eric Pennington:** Okay. If you'll turn to Page 6. This project is DPS CCH Modernization. This project has been in the works for quite some time. We made a partial delivery of that in May of 2018. There's still some work to be done. Right now, we've got critical—the issue we've got with that project is the allocation of resources. We've got a number of critical prioritized projects for DPS and their Compliance Unit. As we are estimating out the other prioritized projects, we'll try and figure out how to get resources on that. We are shooting, right now, we are shooting for a June 30<sup>th</sup> completion date on the rest of the work for this project. Any questions or concerns? Okay.

On Page 7, this is the Restructured OTIS Modernization Project. This project is currently on hold. We were unable to successfully complete the project within the budget and the timeframe that we had. We are, right now, taking steps to turn over every stone and we're writing an RFI to understand what vendors or products are out in that space. This is going to be going—this is going to be presented during the Legislative Session so we have an understanding of what that cost is going to be and that effort is going to be if the decision is made to go out for cost of products or a consultant who has already built something of that nature. We've also prepared our own estimate of what it would take to finish this project if we're given the opportunity to restart it.

**Chairman Diflo:** For the record, Paul Diflo. Eric, could you articulate the risk of not doing this?

**Eric Pennington:** For the record, Eric Pennington. Yeah, there's actually a lot of risk. There's always an issue of that crashing and this system is used to track and monitor and supervise offenders who have been through our criminal justice system. The risk is really to the public's safety, as well as officer safety. So, we're talking about people who are charged with criminal cases. They go on probation and even criminal offenders coming out of the Department of Corrections, being monitored through this system. So, not going through and completing this project is—it puts the State at some risk.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you, Eric.

**Director Cates:** Mr. Chairman, if I could just add a little commentary to that, because I was involved in that. We went to IFC a few weeks ago to inform them that we were calling a halt to the project. The project—the scope of the project, the coding has been essentially complete. Really, it's down to testing, UAT and data conversion, which is quite a bigger beast than I think people realized in the beginning. We were looking at, I believe the number was \$1.5 million in additional funds. I think it was another 12-months, if I remember the timeline to completion. So, it was very close.

The problem I think we ran into was really a credibility problem. When this project was originally scoped, several years ago, it was scoped as a \$1.7 million project. They have continued to come back and ask for more money and more time. But to keep it in perspective, the consultant with DPS estimated that this project using a COTS solution without customization would be a \$10 million project. EITS, way back when, before any of our tenure, proposed that it could be done for \$1.7 million. I just don't think that number was ever credible. If we had gotten the \$1.5 million and that really was it, we would be looking at a \$5.3 million project; which I don't think is a bad deal for a custom system that meets all of their needs.

I really think, in discussion with the Governor's Office, there's just a lot of frustration. There's a lot of frustration at IFC, that here we were again with a new timeline and more money. So, we decided to table it and bring it back to the next Legislature to make a decision and we are looking at other solutions. COTS solutions, consultants, whatever that may be. I believe, based on what we know right now, that the correct answer is going to be to finish the project that we've already started. We want to make sure we do our due diligence and let the Legislature weigh into that. There is a risk, the longer we wait. So, we're really hoping we can get that moving in the next session.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you. Sherri, do you have a question?

**Sherri McGee:** So, I was looking—you know, you have this project, the CCH Modernization project and then there's 14 active projects with DPS and 16 initiatives on the table. So, I was just wondering, you know, in looking at these projects, you're saying you're having a resource issue. So, I'm kind of curious how all those other projects are going? If anything can be rolled up? Is there things that can be consolidated as you're looking for another vendor that might be able to address some of these other projects and maybe ease you guys up a little bit?

**Eric Pennington:** We are. We've been working with DPS to prioritize their projects. So, when we look at 16 initiatives, we probably need to go through and revise that number. Some of those are going to be rolled up into the MTG Study and Modernization they're looking at. So, that reduces that number, but yes, the projects—we are strapped for resources. So, we have MSA Staff—we have five MSA programmers on staff along with our regular Dev Ops Staff.

So, just keeping up with the maintenance as well as the projects has been a challenge. What we did do is ask DPS, mostly the Compliance Division to really prioritize what they wanted to get done by the end of this fiscal year just to kind of line up with those resources that may get pulled off and put back on to the other project. So, right now we've got the AB 579, the CCH Modernization and some end of life servers that we're going to be replacing.

**Sherri McGee:** Okay, thank you.

**Chairman Diflo:** Any other questions on that? Okay. Go ahead, Eric.

**Eric Pennington:** Thank you. If you'll turn to Page 10. This is a Server Group Project. It's called VX Rail. This project—they have the primary site was installed in February 2018. The secondary site has been installed. Right now, we're waiting for the installation of a power module at the Switch facility. It's a custom built, so it could take a little bit of time, and it may impact the completion on this project, understanding that this report was written at the end of October. It's been a couple of weeks. I haven't had an opportunity to contact that Manager and find out if they've made any progress.

**Sherri McGee:** So, I have a question on that one too. I was curious, being Switch and with all the other entities out there, why we have to have a custom power solution? Is there an issue there, something that we're doing that's causing that customization?

**Eric Pennington:** That's a good question. I just don't have an answer for you right this minute but I can find out for you.

**Sherri McGee:** Okay, I'd appreciate that. Thank you.

**Eric Pennington:** Sure, okay. And then on to Page 11, again, it's another Server Group Project. The Comvault Replacement. There was a delay in some equipment delivery and is causing the project to slip. It was—we were expecting to get completed by mid-November, so that would put us right at the completion date, but again, I haven't been able to contact that manager and find out if they've made that progress. It's something that we're watching because the schedule has slipped.

On Page 13, this is a project from our Network Group. It's called the Bigger Pipes Core Infrastructure. We're expecting now that the project will be completed by the end of this month, November 30<sup>th</sup>. Right now, they're waiting for delivery of long-reach fiber optic transceivers. So, all of the other work has been done. Just waiting for this equipment

now.

Any questions? And, that's it for the projects that we considered at-risk, or needing immediate action. Do you have any questions about any of the other projects that are in the green status?

**Senator Denis:** This is Senator Denis.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yes sir.

**Senator Denis:** Thanks. So, I just—on that last one, the Bigger Pipes Core Infrastructure, where it says on the challenges, the complexity it said, has an impact on enterprise stability. What does that mean? How much of an impact? I mean, what's the real impact of that?

**Eric Pennington:** That's a good question. Again, I'm going to fall back on, I would have to really lean on somebody from the Network Group to answer that question. I can certainly do that. It is core network infrastructure. This runs between Reno and Las Vegas. So, you know, failure in the network itself like that. Maybe should invite somebody else to talk about that, thank you.

**Chairman Diflo:** It looks like we have Dave coming from the Network Team.

**Eric Pennington:** Thanks, Dave.

**Dave Haws:** Good afternoon. For the record, Dave Haws, Administrator for EITS. When we talk about the stability of this particular project, keep in mind that we're hooking up a network, an existing network and we're also putting these pipes in place. So, what we want to avoid is having any kind of downtime as a result of those pipes not working properly. So, when you read through there, where it says that we do proper due diligence, we want to make sure that we test these pipes out. Make sure they're functioning properly, so that the network continues to operate as expected. That's what we want to avoid is any kind of instability in our wide-area network.

**Senator Denis:** So, this is Senator Denis. So does that mean you'll be able to test it all before you switch it over?

**Dave Haws:** Yeah, in fact, they are testing it now. That's part of what we're doing, as we speak.

**Senator Denis:** So then, the only impact then is if, after you've tested it, it's working fine, you switch it over and something—you missed something, right? I mean, that's the only real issue that would cause a stability issue.

**Dave Haws:** Correct. Dave Haws for the record. And again, you know, that's the kind of thing that we're trying to avoid, so we're trying to do all the type of testing that we

need to, to ensure that it's functioning properly before we switch it over. You know, something like this, you know, there's a lot of traffic that goes through this network. You know, it's conceivable that something would occur that disrupts it, but we're prepared to look at those kinds of things and rectify things as quickly as possible. For sure, we want to test it as thoroughly as we possibly can to avoid any significant interruptions, if any at all.

**Senator Denis:** So, is Plan B, if it doesn't work, you can just switch it back?

**Dave Haws:** Dave Haws for the record. That's correct, the plan is to switch it back. So, it's, as I understand it and they're not here to correct me if I'm wrong, but it's already—the pipeline is in place, so we're testing it out. So, we're already operating in a production mode, with the current pipeline. Now we're testing out this new infrastructure. So, we have the ability to kind of—to flip back and forth if we need to. So, I anticipate that if there are problems, that we would be able to switch back.

**Senator Denis:** And in that production test that you're doing, are you actually running data—I mean, are you actually running traffic through there at equivalent capacities?

**Dave Haws:** Dave Haws for the record. Sorry, Senator, I don't know for sure exactly that test plan, but I can certainly find that out for you.

**Senator Denis:** Okay. I'm just—you know, I know we always try to make stuff work right, but I'm just worried about that particular pipe because that's what connects the North to the South, right?

**Dave Haws:** Correct, it's our main pipeline throughout the State and we do want it to work properly.

**Senator Denis:** And, we don't have—currently, have a secondary pipeline that connects us, right?

**Dave Haws:** Dave Haws for the record. There are some—I'm not sure of the question. We do have some redundancy that occurs within the network that's built into it, so I'm not sure of your question.

**Senator Denis:** Yeah, I'm just thinking of that. Because I know for the longest time, we've only had the Reno to Las Vegas, but I know that we've been working to connect other parts of Nevada, to have a second way to do that. I just didn't know if that was in place yet.

**Dave Haws:** Yeah and of course this particular project will in fact provide a lot of that additional redundancy that you're describing. This connects us up through Switch, which we'll be able to take advantage of the network there. And so, there's some crosslinking, if you will, between our primary nodes to make it more resilient and less



susceptible to downtime.

**Senator Denis:** Okay, thank you.

**Director Cates:** Mr. Chairman?

**Chairman Diflo:** Yes sir.

**Director Cates:** If I could just add on to the—to Administrator Haws' comments and I'm really speaking at the edge of my knowledge here but based on my hanging out with the Network Group, I do know there is redundancy currently and it routes out of state. I believe there is a route that runs through Utah and if I'm not mistaken, maybe California as well, but the bandwidth isn't big enough to handle the North/South connection in terms of disaster recovery back up. This Switch connection will then be our big backbone which is much bigger than our current capacity. As I understand it, we'll still have all that redundancy with a big four-lane highway going right to Las Vegas.

I would also add that I think we have some extremely talented network people, network engineers working for us and they've done incredible work for a long time around the State. We have had a very stable network for a long time. I think the wording in this report reflects their caution and their diligence. You know, they're a small group and they're working with Switch who I think probably has the best network engineers in the world working for them. They're not going to turn it on until they're assured it's going to be stable and not cause any failures for the State.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you Director Cates. For the record, Paul Diflo. Director Cates, you mentioned that the current infrastructure, there's an inability to do disaster recovery. That means, network disaster recovery. There's a manual disaster recovery though, right?

**Director Cates:** For the record, yes, there is disaster recovery across different systems, but an online backup between Vegas and Reno, this is what this is—part of what this is facilitating. There's not enough bandwidth to do that currently.

**Chairman Diflo:** Perfect, thank you.

**Dave Haws:** Dave Haws for the record. I would add, if you're asking if our applications and our systems and our databases are backed up, yes. We are doing that.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yeah. I was really looking at the comment, where the current network infrastructure not prepared to support cloud computing solutions and not be able to support disaster recovery on SilverNet. I'm thinking that there's probably a manual way to do a disaster recovery for SilverNet, even if it's not over the network.

**Dave Haws:** Yeah, Dave Haws for the record. That is correct. Part of our problem is just the pipeline being big enough to send data down to Las Vegas, for

example, to allow our disaster recovery to be real-time in some cases. That's why we're wanting to put the larger pipe in, so that we can have that kind of redundancy that's in our site that's in a Switch cell.

**Chairman Diflo:** Makes perfect sense, thank you Dave.

**Director Cates:** Mr. Chairman? If I could just add one other comment. If you look at Las Vegas, we have two data centers down there. One is a back-up for the other disaster recovery but having that in the same city is not exactly the ideal configuration. So, it's not that we don't have backup to be able to do it, geographically dispersed like that is what we're trying to get to.

**Chairman Diflo:** Very good. Eric, anything else?

**Eric Pennington:** I think I've covered everything, unless you have questions about some of the other projects.

**Chairman Diflo:** Any questions from the Board for these gentlemen?

**Director Cates:** I have a comment.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yes sir.

**Director Cates:** I want to thank staff for the report. I just want to point out to the Members that this is a report of just Agency IT Services Projects and that is a small subset of all the projects that are going on around the state. You hear about the things that Admin is doing, that EITS is doing, in terms of infrastructure and you hear about DPS because those are the ones they directly serve on projects. That in no way encompasses the projects that the State is doing across agencies. I think something that this body ought to consider is that, you know, we have the TIN Process and that goes through the IT Strategic Planning Committee and I think if this committee is going to get updates on projects that we might want to, in the future, invite other agencies to give similar updates. Especially for things that have big dollar TINS. Because you know, you're just looking at this, when there's all this out there actually going on. I think the Committee can provide insight and feedback to all the State Agencies and not just Agency IT Services.

**Chairman Diflo:** That's a good point, Director. I think we should talk about that when we put together the next Agenda.

**Senator Denis:** Mr. Chair? This is Senator Denis. I would just want to echo that I agree, I think that—I agree. There's so many other big projects out there and I think this group is a good one to take a look at those. Because when we see this stuff, like at IFC or during the Legislature, we don't have that much expertise in the Legislature on IT things. So, having a group like this to look at that kind of thing, I think it would be very helpful to look at the bigger picture.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you for your comments. Gentlemen, thank you.

6. DISCUSSION OF AND POSSIBLE ENDORSEMENT OR OTHER ACTION ON MTG'S NCJIS MODERNIZATION PRELIMINARY FINDINGS (*for discussion and possible action*)

**Chairman Diflo:** That will take us down to Agenda Item 6, I'd like to invite Mindy McKay up to present.

**Mindy McKay:** Good afternoon, Chair Diflo, Members of the Board. Mindy McKay, Nevada Department of Public Safety, Records, Communications and Compliance Division and I am the Records Bureau Chief, here on behalf of Julie Butler, Division Administrator who unfortunately was unable to be here today.

Just lead me in which direction you'd like me to go. I understand that she had provided a presentation to you back in August. There was a slide presentation that was provided as part of that. I did provide you all with a list of bullet points, as to what was requested specific to the importance and necessity of moving forward, the risks of doing nothing and the method for selection of a replacement solution.

So, I don't know if you want me to just give a really brief refresher of what NCJIS Modernization is and then I can go into the bullet points in the document.

**Chairman Diflo:** If you would, Mindy, that would be helpful.

**Mindy McKay:** Okay. So, in the presentation that Julie gave, there was a Slide #8 that talked about the next steps. We had a 2012 study conducted by MTG Consultants. Unfortunately, that study recommendation was not followed at that time, so we brought them back in to do a refresh of their study, to help us kind of get back on track, guide us where we really need to be in order to make this successful and make it more timely.

So, with that refresh and I do have a copy, if anybody would like it, I can provide it, of the Executive Summary, so you don't have to read the 400-page document of the Refresh Study, but they do provide an Executive Summary, so I'm happy to provide that to you. It outlines, again, where they would recommend that we go with modernization of our Nevada Criminal Justice Information System.

It pretty much is the same as the 2012 study. Replacing our switch. The thing about this though now is the eminency of our small tiny little vendor, population one, sometimes he hires some help here and there. He has expressed his interest in retiring. Now, when we talked to him, that was a year ago and so a year ago, it was in two to five years. Now it's in one to four years. It could be one year, it could be four years. It could be a little bit longer, hopefully, because the refresh study is suggesting that we replace everything within seven years, beginning with the switch, which is the vendor, Norsoft Consulting, who provides the switch for us at this time. He's the gentleman who's wishing to retire.

Replacement of the switch, replacement of our CCH, which is our Computerized Criminal

History System. She had talked to you about, maybe you've heard that we did already kind of modernize our CCH and they were extensive and it provides a lot of functionality that we need and we need it now. There are products out there, across the nation, that provide a full on CCH that we can just bring in the vendor, plug it in and it gives us everything we need without having to have a part one and a part two. So, we are looking at including a new, new CCH along with the modernization items.

We also, along with the switch, we have hot files. Those are information files that are used by our criminal justice agencies, not only statewide, but nationwide to access information regarding such things as active wants and warrants, whether someone is currently on parole or probation, they're dangerous offenders, whether they're a registered sex offender. It also allows them to look up driver's licenses, registration information, protection order information—domestic violence protection order information, I should clarify. Those hot files are used to access information to assist the officers on the street, what they need to know when they're coming in contact with the subject.

We also need to, as part of that, the vendor, not only does he provide the switch, but he also provides some civil applications for us. So, we have our civil applicant program that he provides through his system for fingerprint submissions for such things as employment, licensing, adoptions, things that are civil related, but use criminal information to make determinations. He provides that, so that needs to be replaced as well.

He also provides our accounting system. So, we do charge for the civil applicant. We also charge for our Brady Firearms Background Check System, which he also provides the Brady Firearms Background Check System, so we need to modernize that as well, get away from him from that.

We also have what we call a Civil Name Check Program and it is what it says it is. It's a name check based background check for civil purposes, for employment. He also provides that which is embedded in his switch as well.

And, along with that—so, we need to modernize and hopefully go out to a COTS solution for cloud purposes and the newest and greatest. I'm not techie, you're going to learn that real quick. The latest and greatest and the best business practices out there to make sure we stay current and we stay in compliance and we have the support and security that we need to protect this information.

We also would like to have a portal which is brand-new, we don't have something like that right now. So, we'd like to attach that to all of these as well. So, we have a lot of different things that we need to modernize and decouple from this spaghetti bowl of Norsoft products because the gentleman would like to retire, as would I.

So, we need to modernize this, get it in compliance, get it supported, get it decoupled. So, with that, with regard to the list that was provided to you with the bullet points on it,

the questions that were asked for me to provide for you today, importance and necessity of moving forward, I just want to in the forefront bring to the attention of the fact that this is public and officer safety. I'm going to say that a lot. This is public and officer safety. You are the public. Your loved ones are the public. The State is the public. The people who visit this State is the public. So, we need to make sure that the system is available at all times with all information for those criminal justice agencies out there that need this in order to make sure that we have safe and livable communities.

So, we're making sure that we're in compliance and in line with the Governor's goals. We're making sure that these criminal justice agencies, again, not only in our state but again, nationwide, have access to these systems to keep us all safe. We need to make sure that these systems are available in order for us, my division internally to use it for those civil applications. All of our customers who use it, as well for the Civil Name Check Program and of course, making sure that the firearms dealers out there have access to us and we have access to the system so they can sell their guns.

So, making sure that everyone has access, that they—that these systems are supported by, hopefully a vendor that's larger than a one-man band. Making sure that it is updated, supported, it's not vulnerable to security threats. That it's not overly complex. If you would like a copy of what I've offered up earlier, along with that copy is going to be this lovely diagram of what our current system looks like and it's a mess. It's very complex. It doesn't need to be that way.

So, in the study that MTG refreshed for us, they gave us a much prettier picture of what it should look like, which is not such a mess. It's still very complex, but it's not tightly interwoven. So, we want to make sure that we make it more user friendly, easier to take care of and ensure that it's not at an imminent risk of failure.

The risks of doing nothing, we could have major unplanned long-term outages with potential tragic consequences, loss of life. Again, this is public and officer safety. Inability to comply with FBI and current state requirements. We have a lot of requirements that come down from the FBI because we are the CJIS Systems Agency for the State of Nevada as a liaison to the FBI for access to their systems and the system is the switch in order to pass that information through those pipelines, to make sure that the agencies in Nevada have access to FBI information as well.

It's not just FBI information but there's a system called NLETS, that allows us direct access to states without having to go through the FBI's system. We can go direct to the state through the NLETS Highway. So, the agencies also have access to other states and also to Canada and Mexico. They are able to get similar criminal justice information system through NLETS to the other states.

And then, Session is coming and we never know what's going to come down every Legislative Session. Making sure that we are—that our systems are capable and ready to modify or add-on to any mandates that come down, not only from Legislative Session for the State, but also from the FBI as well.

And, there was a question about the method for selection of a replacement solution. So, we are requesting MTG's assistance with drafting the Requests for Proposals for all of these different systems. So, we are going to be working very closely with them very soon to gather the requirements for that, for the scope of work, making sure that we give them everything that we need in order to have those RFPs very detailed and ready to hit the streets, hopefully in July.

Again, that's going to be looking for an off the shelf and cloud based solutions. Your buzz words are co-location, cloud and consolidation. We want to go with that.

The estimated cost, and I do want to point out, this is a little bit higher than what the slide presentation originally was presented to you back in August. The slide presentation that Julie presented was \$54 million but we added a program or project management office and staff to go with that hopefully, so that did increase the cost about \$58 million. Again, it's going to be over the course of seven years in order to replace all of this.

The funding source is to be determined. We have been in talks with the various budget people to try to put our heads together and try to figure out where we're going to get \$58 million from over the course of the next seven years. We do have some reserves. Obviously, it's not enough. So, we are going to do everything we can to find the money that we need in order to replace these systems as soon as we can. So, any suggestions you might have we are welcome to that.

I hope that was everything that you would like me to present to you today. I'm available for questions.

**Chairman Diflo:** For the record, Paul Diflo. Mindy, I think it's important for the Board to understand the importance of this project. So, we just saw—Eric went over all the projects, all the DPS projects. Where would you rank this one?

**Mindy McKay:** Number 1.

**Chairman Diflo:** I had a feeling you were going to say that. Second thing, in the private sector, unplanned projects come up quite a bit and if it's not funded, a lot of times the business unit has to look to other projects they have going on and maybe pause those in order to put the investment toward the priority project. Is that something that DPS would be willing to do?

**Mindy McKay:** Mindy McKay for the record. So, with respect to all of our projects that we have and we have approximately 30 plus TINs out there. Most of those, the majority probably 99% of them, they're mandates. We can't really put them on pause. So again, there is going to be that resource constraint. We do try to prioritize where we can. We do try to say no, where we can, but very often, we don't have the ability to do that. It's something coming down that we have no control over, that's a mandate that we have to comply with. Those things that we do have control over, we do try to either find a different way, bring in different resources, put them on hold if we can, find—you know,

maybe manual work arounds for the time being. We have been doing that and we will continue to do that. Does that answer your question?

**Chairman Diflo:** Yes, thank you. I just have one other question and then I'd like the rest of the Board to ask their questions. We're obviously in a vulnerable situation with this one-man vendor. Is there anything—do you know if there's anything in the contract that says, you have to give us X number of years warning and support, before end of life—this software? Have the lawyers looked into that?

**Mindy McKay:** Mindy McKay for the record. Not to my knowledge. I don't know exactly what the contract with him says so I'm happy to go back and look at that and I can provide an answer to you with respect to that question.

**Chairman Diflo:** Okay, thank you.

**Sherri McGee:** For the record, Sherri McGee.

**Chairman Diflo:** Sherri.

**Sherri McGee:** A one-man shop, I mean, the contract is probably the least of the concern. I mean, anything can happen day-to-day and so, it's a huge concern, for sure.

**Chairman Diflo:** What other questions do we have for Mindy?

**Senator Denis:** This is Senator Denis.

**Chairman Diflo:** Senator?

**Senator Denis:** So, I just want to follow along in that. My concern wasn't so much the contract. I mean, the guy gets sick and you know, is unable then what do we do? Do we have like a back-up for that? I mean, is there—I'm sure that the—I mean, he's the expert on it because he's been working on it for years but is there any way to have some kind of a—because in the documentation that we got, I mean, under the risks of doing nothing it says, potential tragic consequences, loss of life. It also says that this particular vendor is doing several of the systems. I don't know if that relates to any of the systems that he's doing, relate to possible potential tragic consequences. If that's the case, do we—I mean, is there a back-up? I mean, if he has a heart attack today and dies, I mean, we do we do?

**Suzie Block:** This is Suzie Block, Agency IT Services Chief, for the record. I'd like to answer that. So, we have a team of engineers that actually support the Justice Link application. So, we have three full time members of our staff that are very familiar with the configurations and have looked under the hood at some of the source code. So, to say that it's just one person, yes Scott Norberg who is Norsoft is the primary member, but my team has supported this system for probably the last 20 years. So, there is some institutional knowledge, but as the technology gets more and more aged, it becomes a

support issue. I'm not sure if that answered your question or not.

**Senator Denis:** Well, yeah, that sounds like—yeah, that sounds like a back-up to me. As long as they know, at least something of how it's working that they can get in there, you know what I mean, you know, they would be able to eventually figure stuff out, it sounds like, if they've been doing this for 20 years and doing the back-up to it.

**Suzie Block:** Yes. To answer your question, so for the record, Suzie Block. We are 24/7 support of J-Link, so we are their first responders if there are issues. So, it normally comes through the helpdesk if there is an issue and my team normally responds if the helpdesk can't respond to it. So, they're very, very familiar with the application but again, as we need to modernize this effort, a one-man shop is not going to be able to keep up-to-date with all of that.

**Senator Denis:** Yeah. Thank you. I mean, that makes me feel better that at least I know, it's not just the one-man shop but that we also have some back-up to that. So, thank you.

**Mindy McKay:** This is Mindy McKay for the record. I do want to add to that. Thank you Suzie. So, that question was asked during Julie Butler's presentation and Mr. Haws had come up and spoke to that, with respect to what Suzie said. I just want to point out as well that, Mr. Norberg has not documented anything that would be helpful or useful, if anything at all, actually and he does not use industry best standard practices. And again, what he has built is in his head, the way he built it and it is completely reliant on him. It's a big spaghetti bowl of, you pull one string, it's connected to another, that's connected to another and you don't know where that's going to lead. To try to reverse engineer this would be very difficult.

While the current EITS staff does have some support activities that they provide for the Justice Link System, they don't have all of it, my understanding. And what he has locked up in his head, again, is probably his own language that we may not understand and so, to have to reverse engineer that and really deeply get under the hood and try to figure out, what is the foundation of this system, I believe would be very difficult and time consuming and in the interim of the EITS staff trying to do that, who knows what catastrophic failures could happen. If Mr. Norberg is not around to help solve those catastrophic failures, we're dead in the water, blind on the street.

**Senator Denis:** Okay. So, now you're making me not feel good about it.

**Mindy McKay:** Sorry. It's the truth, it's reality.

**Senator Denis:** Yeah and that's my concern, obviously. I mean, it sounds like we've got kind of a partial thing but not really because we have one person that knows everything and everybody else has little pieces of it. So, I guess we just have to cross our fingers that nothing happens between now and when we're able to put something in place? That's what it sounds like.



**Mindy McKay:** Yeah. Yeah, you know, we're trying to do everything we possibly can, which is why we're in front of you today. Why we've been in front of you. We're happy to come back, we're happy to go to other committees and bodies of people to get what we need when we need it to get this done and taken care of so we can all sleep better at night and know that not only, you know, that we and our loved ones are protected, but the officers and everyone who visits the state is protected as well. So, we need the funding and we need this now. We cannot wait any longer. It may be too late, I hope it's not, but yeah, anything else that I can provide, anything else to anyone else that you can think of, we're happy to do that.

**Senator Denis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you. Sherri?

**Sherri McGee:** For the record, Sherri McGee. So, I'm looking at your 37 TINs or whatever, that—from the last meeting that we had, is there—are there public safety suites out there that we could roll up and maybe knock off half this list all at once as we do this project? Or, a chance of that?

**Mindy McKay:** Mindy McKay, for the record. I'd have to go back and refresh myself on all of those, I don't have them all memorized. Going off of what Eric Pennington said earlier, I'm sure that some of those probably wrap up into the NCJIS Modernization effort and but I'd have to go back and take a look at those to see—I mean, we have really sat down, multiple times and we do it every so often to sit down, review everything that we have on the table, what can we do? How can we do it better? Who can do it for us? What resources can we bring in? But, I'm happy to do that again and get back to you on that.

**Sherri McGee:** For the record, Sherri McGee. I just want to make sure that you're looking at that when you're looking at other vendors and maybe at least throwing the other systems out there or enhancements that you're looking at, so it gives a vendor an opportunity to say something, especially if you might not have done the research or don't know if those things exist. You know, having the internal conversation is good, you know, but to make sure that you're getting that information out to the vendor community is key too because you might find the vendor out there that can consolidate a lot of this stuff into one project. So, thank you.

**Chairman Diflo:** For the record, Paul Diflo, that's a very good point, Sherri. Michael, correct me if I'm wrong, is this the one that you said you've already engaged Gartner to talk about the options of what different vendors are out there? Maybe that's something we could do.

**Mindy McKay:** Mindy McKay, for the record. So, MTG Management Consultants that we have contracted with to do the refresh, this is their area of expertise and we have asked them to—as they're working through this with us, that they can look for vendors that can do multiple items in one big shot. So, there are a few of them out there,

nationwide that provide such systems to other states where they provide a switch and a CCH and perhaps a hot files system, portals. Yes, they do—there are some vendor agencies out there that provide multiple items in one package.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you, Mindy. Are there any other questions? I think you both have presented the urgency of this very well. This is, I think where the Board, can add some value by endorsing this project. So, I mentioned earlier that this is the agenda item that we want to ask—I guess I'm asking for a motion to take a vote. This is the type of vote that we would do, Leslie, just like a roll call. We'll do an individual yea or nay, on this. So, I'd like to ask for a motion.

**Director Cates:** I'll make a motion to support this project.

**Chairman Diflo:** I think I need a—

**Director Cates:** Is that the motion we want?

**Chairman Diflo:** I need a motion to take a vote for the Board to endorse.

**Director Cates:** To endorse, okay. So, we want a motion for the Board to endorse the NCJIS Modernization Project, as presented by the Agency.

**Chairman Diflo:** Let me check with Jeff—

**Director Cates:** How's that?

**Chairman Diflo:** Should we have a motion to take a vote to endorse as opposed to—

**Director Cates:** No, you make a motion and then you vote on it.

**Speaker:** I think one motion would suffice to take the vote to endorse or not.

**Chairman Diflo:** Okay. Let me ask for that motion to endorse then.

**Director Cates:** Okay. I'll make a motion to endorse the NCJIS Modernization Project as presented by staff.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you Director, I'd like to ask for a second.

**Sherri McGee:** Sherri McGee for the record, I'll second.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you Sherri. And now I'd like to ask Leslie to—

**Director Cates:** Discussion? Discussion on the motion?

**Chairman Diflo:** Oh I'm sorry, yes. Open it up for discussion.

**Director Cates:** I just wanted to make a statement that I have read the consultant's report, at least the Executive Summary and I did get a presentation, along with GFO on the plan. I think it's solid. I think it calls for COTS solutions. I think they're trying to create an office of—a Project Management Office to manage this because it's really big. I think that's best practice. That's what we've done with the Smart 21 Project that you'll hear about later. You know, once upon a time, back after that report—original report was done in 2012, decisions were made to try to in-house, do all this stuff in-house and that—I don't think that's a strategy that we endorse today and I think the direction they're trying to go is—aligns well with the broader vision the state has for IT projects and how we're trying to approach them.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yeah, I would concur with that. Any other comments, any other discussion? Okay. Now, I'll ask Leslie to take a vote.

**Leslie Olson:** Senator Denis?

**Senator Denis:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Chairman Diflo?

**Chairman Diflo:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Director Cates?

**Director Cates:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Ms. McGee?

**Sherri McGee:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Mr. Betts?

**Craig Betts:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Mr. Marcella?

**Joseph Marcella:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Ms. Srinivas?

**Krupa Srinivas:** Yes.

**Leslie Olson:** Chairman, we have seven ayes, zero nays.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you, motion is carried then. All right. We can excuse you, thank you both.

**Mindy McKay:** Thank you very much.

7. ADA FOLLOW UP (*for discussion only*) – Suzie Block, Chief IT Manager, Agency IT Services

**Chairman Diflo:** Now I'd like to invite Suzie to stay and she can give us our ADA follow-up.

**Suzie Block:** Good afternoon ITAB Members. Again, for the record, Suzie Block. I am the Agency IT Services Chief. I work for EITS. Boy, Linda did probably an amazing job giving you an update, probably more than you ever want to know on ADA and all of the wonderful work that's going on within the team. So, she basically gave me three pages of wonderful efforts since the last meeting, so I'm going to try and do it some justice.

Basically, all of the information is—we have an ADA website. I don't know if you've had an opportunity to look at that. All of the notes are included, as well as, a breakdown from each ITAB meeting of the report. So, I would encourage you, if you haven't seen it, that is available on the website, under ADA.NV.GOV.

Just real high level, we have an additional three websites that have been made compliant, so that totals 15 websites, out of 118 remaining. Let's see, 13 websites are partially remediated, which means to give you kind of a ballpark, 4,958 were remediated PDFs, which leaves a remaining 70,651. I believe at the last meeting, if we were just going to use existing staff what that effort looked like, I think we said it was like 100 years of manhours. So, just to kind of put that into perspective, as we move forward through this, we're looking at options of outreach with other agencies to have them crowdsource the effort. So, those are some of the things that we're doing today.

We hired our intern. Great news. He is now a full time position. We were able to get him as a trainee, so that's kind of exciting, showing that the interns that we're bringing in through EITS we're able to kind of help them with a career path. So, we're going to be recruiting for that position, we're currently going to be recruiting for that replacement position. His name is Robert Schrader and he was an intern for over 11 months. He's remediated over 1,600 documents. He's become our resident expert, so we're proud of the work he's done.

We've trained, since the last time Linda presented, Department of Human Services, all Divisions. Department of Human Resources on the job specs. The Division of Nevada Highway Patrol and we have their new ADA website, so very proud of the team on that. The Division of Purchasing. And, the team also created remediation guides and wrote the documentation, test documents and webinars.

One of the things we were asked to do by folks that were on the Contact Management System was to create some reports to kind of help them identify documents that could be

deleted. So, the team basically created several reports, I won't go through all the reports, but the three top reports were documents that were sorted in highest, based on descending order. So, it listed every document within the website, whether it be a PDF, Word, YouTube. Sorts report in descending order by number of pages and gave them a grand total. So, they knew kind of what the scope of the project was. Then basically, what this will do is it will help users see at a glance any unwanted documents. So, really what we're trying to get ahead of is, not trying to boil the ocean but say, you know, give them kind of a composition of a site map on their website. Report 2 was sorted by date sequence, so they could identify documents that are older than two years and potentially delete them. Then Report 3 was a Google analytics report that tracked number of clicks on each document. So, basically a usability document, you know, based on who was accessing the documents.

Other efforts. Linda and the team met with the Adaptive Technology folks, consumer group and Thomas Kearns at TMCC. They discussed our plans to add a wheelchair icon on each document. We started that as of September 20<sup>th</sup>. Basically, what that does is, when clicked, it prompts a message so a user can add their name and address. Then what happens with that is the request will get emailed to the web team and they can move forward to remediate it. If it's something that we're not able to do, we do some outreach and try to get it to the Agency who owns that document.

Then, she put together a report, Linda did, and again, it's on the website. Basically, it's since the last meeting, we started this September 20<sup>th</sup> to present, how many documents were asked to be remediated and we had a total of 20. So, 11 were remediated by EITS. Six were forwarded to ADA Coordinators to remediate. Then we have three out there we're still waiting for acknowledgement on. To give you kind of an idea of what's happening out there.

Working with our new tool, Seamless Docs, you may be familiar with the Webform Initiative that was passed, I want to say in 2013. Very proud of the team. We're working with a vendor on compliance of the entire platform, but since the last update, the web builder is ADA compliant. So, that's one of the tools that we're using for the form building.

Of our pilot projects that we've currently got underway, Deferred Comp, revisions are currently being reviewed, as of 11/08/18, with the Administrator. So, it will be finalizing the Deferred Comp workflow. ASD has compliant forms and we've worked with that group to—our Accounting Administrative Services Division to help them—we've trained a couple of their team members to utilize the tool. So, basically what we're doing is, we've learned it and now we're teaching fellow team members to utilize the tool within their group.

We've got the Governor's Office, forms for the new Governor completed, awaiting to be reviewed by the Governor's personnel. And, let's see here. Of those, Application for Appoint to Position of Trust, the Intern Application, Invite the Governor, Request a Proclamation and Proclamation Guidelines have all been completed. We've worked with

Smart 21 staff on some of their form initiatives and that's under way. Human Resources, we trained one of their business process analysts to do all of the job class specs, so those will be coming. DPS on their flashing amber lights permit was completed. What we're waiting on right now is the integration with E-Pay, so we're working with the Treasurer's Office and the vendor to make that happen.

Right now, they're currently testing the Docs Tool, we've got Purchasing is another pilot that we've made eight of their heavily used forms ADA compliant. So, I would just like to say, I'm very proud of the team for their efforts on that.

Moving forward, Site Improve is the tool. We had a very minimal license. I'm happy to report that my budget was able to actually purchase a statewide license, to begin January 1<sup>st</sup>. Basically, what this will allow is the website owners to monitor and remediate their entire website. That's going to be really huge for us to be able to provide that level of reporting back to the state. We do have a budget initiative in 2021 to continue funding that, so that is an enhancement from my budget, so I hope you will help us support that as that goes through the Legislative process.

Basically, the licenses will cover websites out of the State CMS, so initially, we were looking internally, but after discussing with our Director Cates and Michael Dietrich, you know, we wanted to be able to cover the state as a whole. So, that's what we're doing.

Let's see, just to give you a real quick update on that project. November 28<sup>th</sup>, we were scheduled to start the outreach and get it ready for the implementation for other users. Then, licenses will be released gradually, so Site Improve and users have time to understand the tool. So, there will be training, there will be governance and onboarding, kind of through the web team, but there will be more to come on that. And, we're going to be leveraging folks that we've been meeting with and roundtables, through the PIOs, those are some of the outreach who we've talked to about Site Improve.

Let's see, here's a plug for Linda, she put a nice little bullet. This is an exceptional benefit to our customers and our CMS and outside of our CMS so that we can give them the tools to make them responsible for their own websites. So, that, I would like to say, in support of the road to unity, this is another one of those enterprise tools that can benefit the state that we've made an investment initially on.

So, just real quickly, meetings and outreach. Richard Whitley, Director of DHHS is continuing to move his Division's website towards ADA compliance. We've had several meetings. We've actually trained many of their Divisions and we were able to participate in a steering committee with them, to help train them on document remediation. So, really appreciate the Director's support on working with us. They were kind of our pilot for collaboration, but that has been going very well. I don't know if Val Hoffman is in the crowd but thank you Val for supporting us. She's been kind of our go-to person on that.

We're going to continue to communicate with our CMS Users and extend outreach. We continue to update the ADA website on you know, the collaborations that we have and

events that we're holding, also soliciting input from the user community. I mean, we continue to want to learn.

We met with Thomas Kearns and the AT Consumers, I think I said that earlier, but also gave them an update on what we're doing around this and they were very pleased to see that we kind of were being very proactive.

That brings me to kind of the last closing point. The National Federation of the Blind. We had received an email from Terry Rupp on September 12<sup>th</sup>, basically saying she was going to be sending a draft compliance agreement. That compliance agreement was sent yesterday and I know our leadership will be reviewing that, so there will be more to come on that compliance agreement and what the National Federation of the Blind is asking the State of Nevada to do to support ADA initiatives within the state.

That is pretty much what I had, so I'll open it up to any questions you may have.

**Chairman Diflo:** For the record, this is Paul Diflo. Thank you for a very comprehensive presentation, Suzie, that was good. This tool that you purchased, do you have any idea what the rate of remediation improvement is going to be, percentage wise?

**Suzie Block:** Great question. For the record, Suzie Block. Again, I can just base it on what we've done today. Robert, as you heard the stats we used with that tool—the fact that within nine months, kind of as a brand new person was able to remediate over 1,600, just himself, is huge. Some of these were very complex documents, so I think if you teach a person to fish and depending on what kind of a resource you get, we could really get ahead of this. So, we're really looking to collaborate the outreach and help folks. I think we've got an excellent strategy, with the training, the tools, Linda's leadership has been amazing, but the web team is really in support of this. Again, I want to thank Val Hoffman. I want to publicly say that for the outreach and helping us get into DHHS to help them with their websites.

**Chairman Diflo:** Great, thank you Suzie. Any questions? All right, nice job.

**Suzie Block:** Thank you.

8. SMART 21 Update (*for discussion only*) – Brett Harvey, Office of Project Management

**Chairman Diflo:** I would like to go down to Agenda Item No. 8 and invite Brett Harvey, Office Project Management to give us an update on Smart 21.

**Director Cates:** For the record, Patrick Cates, I thought Brett and I would talk to you about this jointly. Brett Harvey is the Project Manager for Smart 21.

**Brett Harvey:** For the record, Brett Harvey.

**Director Cates:** He has been with the State for quite some time. He was with EITS before he came on to the Smart 21 Project and he brings a lot of experience and expertise to this very big project. So, Brett prepared an overview that I think addressed some of the questions that were brought up at the last meeting. I apologize, I was not able to make that meeting. I had a conflict. I also sit on the Public Works Board and we were in two-day, all-day meetings to consider Agency's Public Works requests. So, I apologize, I wasn't here to talk about this project. Michael Dietrich did a good job of trying to fill in the gaps, but he hasn't been as close to this project as I have. I'm one of the Executive Committee Members for Smart 21. I've actually been associated with it, probably longer than Brett has.

**Brett Harvey:** Yeah.

**Director Cates:** But you've been very immersed in it though, for quite some time, more than I have. So, just very briefly, I'll give you a little bit of overview that's in the report. So, Smart 21 is the State's ERP System replacement. It includes financial administration, human resources management, which includes payroll. That would be replacing the Core Advantage System that we have today, that's 18-19 years old, going on 20 years. That system was put in place with heavy customization and it was out of support the day it was launched.

The State has been using a lot of different systems, which gets to integration platform, as part of this project. Have been using a variety of different systems from spreadsheets to databases to different types of applications to bolt on top of the ERP System to handle mostly their financial transactions. So, we've got a lot of diversity among agencies, in terms of what systems they're using for data analytics, reporting, those kinds of things because of the limitations of the existing Advantage system.

We use, just for instance, we use NEATS for a lot of the HR processes, including payroll timesheets. It doesn't run payroll, but it collects the timesheets. So, we have this custom system that's been bolted on to provide features that we didn't get out of the core system.

The project really has been a long time coming. Just very briefly, this goes all the way back to, I believe it was 2014. So, this would've been the 2013 Session when they authorized funding for the Hackett Group to do a study that showed the State's HR/Financial processes were very outdated, very person intensive and not very efficient. Then we came back in the 2015 Session and we got \$1 million to start the exploration process and start approaching an RFP. We came back in the 2017 Session, got \$5 million to set up the project office and to develop the RFP and get the project started.

Which is kind of where we're at today. If I just skip to the procurement schedule. So, the RFP is on the street. It's on the State's website. Really, what we are trying to do with the timeline is have—really be ready to do final negotiations, best and final offers between March and mid-April. So, our plan is to bring to the Legislature, once we have picked a vendor and have their proposal and have the Legislature approve the funding for the next biennium for that. So, I know there were questions and concerns about the costs of the



project and we will have those costs for the Legislature to approve in that timeframe.

I can say, you know, the estimates that we're using right now, to put in the budget are \$25 million a year. There's a lot of unknowns with this project and it's hard to compare to other projects. I know the Smart 21 Group has done a lot of work in trying to look at other states and what their experience is. They've talked to UNR. These seem like reasonable estimates but we're in a little bit of—there's not a lot of states that have done a SaaS solution for ERPs. It's fairly new. There are some states that have done pieces of it. There are states that are on the same path that we are, to going towards a project and they're all looking at SaaS Solutions. Local governments have done it, private sector has done it, but a big state hasn't done anything quite like this. The one thing that I know that we heard from vendors when we brought them in for demos last year was really a sense that with a SaaS solution, your implementation costs could be lower than an on prem solution but then you have, you know, subscription fees that you have to pay going forward and based on those conversations back then, those subscription fees are probably going to run \$2-\$5 million a year, ongoing just to maintain access to the software.

So, is \$50 million it? No, I don't think \$50 million is it. \$50 million is our best guess at this point in time, of what we'll need in the next biennium.

Just to talk briefly about the schedule. So, the implementation timeline. I do want to just make clear that there are several pieces to this. There's a couple of big phases. We want to implement this project in phases. I believe at the last meeting, Michael had responded to a question that the project would be completed at the end of the next biennium, that's not—that's not correct. He erred in that statement. The plan would be to roll out Phase 1, January 2021, which is the HR functionality, except for payroll. Then we would roll out payroll by January 2022 and then the financial system, full financial system by July of 2023.

I can tell you this is our best guess at what this timeline would look like. In the RFP, we have laid that out but we have asked vendors to propose their own timeline. I can tell you, as one of three people on the Executive Committee, I didn't like this timeline. I didn't feel it was aggressive enough. I felt it was taking too long. However, I also know that particularly in the financial system, there's so much diversity in the way people are doing processes, it could possibly take that long before we had every agency rolled out. So, we really kind of punted to the vendor to help guide us through that process. I'm very anxious to get any of these pieces going, sooner rather than later. I don't want to draw the project out any longer than we have to, but this is a really big lift.

What else, gosh there were a couple of other points I wanted to make.

**Brett Harvey:** For the record, this is Brett Harvey. We're going to allow the— whoever gets the contract award to come back to us and propose an implementation schedule, but for fairness in the RFP process, we have to keep it, you know, the rule's the same for everyone. So, we're going to have each vendor propose based on our

implementation schedule that we put forward. So, just wanted to clear that up.

**Director Cates:** The other thing I wanted to mention, the interfaces. Now, we're hopeful that this project is going to replace a lot of those systems. I think we've identified over 100 interfaces, currently.

**Brett Harvey:** Yeah, 125 plus.

**Director Cates:** Yeah. We're hoping a lot of those will go away, but a lot won't. You know, we do have other pieces that could be considered part of the ERP that are either in progress now or will be deferred later. For instance, procurement. So, in a separate TIN, we have Nevada ePro. That was approved last Session before last. That system is in the process of being implemented, in fact, pieces of it are implemented today. In fact, the RFP for Smart 21 is in Nevada ePro and available online. That's one of the bigger interfaces that we are going to have to integrate, because the procurement piece obviously works very closely with financial.

Grants, is another system that originally was within scope and we removed that from scope from the RFP. We had a separate project for a Grants Management System and what we saw with the vendors is that with the ERP vendors is that they handle the financial piece of grants fairly well, but they don't handle the grant administration or have those kind of functionalities. That was meant to go forward like Nevada ePro, it was appealed. The award was appealed. That has gone through a hearing process and I believe it's going to the Court. So, we can't proceed with that until we get some resolution with that project, but that will be another project that would be working in tandem with the Smart 21 project that would integrate, as well as all those other systems that that Agency is using.

One other point that I wanted to make, in the RFP and when we had a bidder's conference, Brett talked to them about this. We have very strong language in the RFP. Because this will be out for bid during a Legislative Session, we are very concerned about bidders lobbying the Legislature, because we're going to be coming to them and asking them to approve funding. So, we've put very strong language in the RFP that tells the bidders, if they lobby the Legislature about this project at all, they will be disqualified. That's something we want to make sure all the legislatures know when we go forward. I think the vendors understand that but we're just—it puts us in a little bit of an uncomfortable position to have this be going through a bid process that's confidential by law and would be concerned that the people making the final decisions for funding, that they might be out lobbying them for one vendor versus another, that would be improper.

**Brett Harvey:** For the record, Brett Harvey. All of the documents related to this RFP are on Nevada ePro. All the schedules, the appendices, it's all public information out there if you guys—if the Board is interested in looking at any of the—like, the requirements, financial requirements, or technical requirements are all posted on Nevada ePro.

**Chairman Diflo:** For the record, Paul Diflo. What vendors got the RFP? The usual ERP players?

**Brett Harvey:** Well, we have a sign-in sheet from the bidder's conference. Again, which is posted on Nevada ePro. We're going to be using a system integrator to bring in vendors of their choice. There could be specific vendors, but typically we're going to be using a system integrator, so they'll reach out to vendors themselves, to bring them in.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you. Sherri?

**Sherri McGee:** This is Sherri McGee for the record. What was the thought process about going with an integrator, can you explain that a little more?

**Brett Harvey:** Well, because there's—we're doing a finance and HR system and we want interoperability and things like that. We may use one vendor for finance and one vendor for HR and not consolidate that with one vendor. So, that was sort of the thinking behind that. Director Cates may have some more thoughts on that.

**Director Cates:** I would just add to that that, we worked with Gerger Consulting to help formulate the RFP and stand up our project office. In Gartner Research, they really talk a lot about—they have papers on the post-modern ERP and it's really kind of a best of breed that the expectation is, you're going to have separate systems to do things well and integrate them together. That seems to be the path forward. I mean, there's some software sellers that do their own integration, but what most of the states seem to be doing is having an integrator. Some states have—for instance, I believe it was Nebraska—where they actually went out, picked the integrator and then had the integrator, after they were selected, pick what software they were going to use. Other states have picked software and then gotten an integrator. We're going to ask integrators to propose whatever they think is best. It's possible an integrator could propose solutions with multiple software products.

**Chairman Diflo:** Any other questions for Director Cates or Brett Harvey? All right.

**Sherri McGee:** I have a comment, not a question.

**Chairman Diflo:** Okay.

**Sherri McGee:** So, I just wanted to talk about the ongoing costs with a cloud-based type implementation and this project is going to be huge for the State of Nevada and there's going to be a lot of cost savings around processes. So, I don't know if you've collected any of that information to articulate that to the Legislature, but I think that might help. You know, when you start talking about those ongoing costs and the efficiencies that you're going to get from replacing the system.

**Director Cates:** For the record, Patrick Cates. I think that's a great point. I have talked about the number of FTEs that we have dedicated today to fiscal and HR

processes. I've used the number of 800 FTEs, that's based on job classifications, people that are in the fiscal series, people that are in the HR series. I don't know if that's an exact number, but it's a pretty good number, a pretty good estimate. I think there is tremendous opportunity to have efficiencies in this project and in fact, the way it is structured, one of the key positions in the office is the change management person. We've already done quite a bit of work on that and we'll continue to do a lot of work to get people to think about more efficient ways to do the processing with the new system. That's the whole reason we're doing it.

I'm a little cautious about putting a dollar amount of savings on the table. Especially when you're talking FTE because you know, the message I think that we have given to people who are likely to be impacted by this, who have been fearful is that there's a lot of work for the state that's not being done. This system is going to take a while to rollout. And frankly, just at the rate that we have attrition and people turning over in jobs, I don't think this is going to be a big job killer, but people's roles will change a lot. We're going to automate a lot of things and it will make us more efficient.

I think the other thing that is worth comparing is that although you have subscription fees, you're also getting constant updates and you also have to consider the cost of a more traditional system where you would have to pay for all those upgrades and go through processes to upgrade your system and that has costs as well.

**Chairman Diflo:** Seeing no other questions, thank you gentlemen.

9. Chief Enterprise Architect 90 Day Update (*for discussion only*) – David Axtell, Chief Enterprise Architect, Enterprise IT Services

**Chairman Diflo:** I would like to invite David Axtell up. We're all very excited to get the 90-day update from the Chief Enterprise Architect.

**David Axtell:** For the record, David Axtell, Chief Enterprise Architect. Good afternoon Chairman and Members of the Board. It's my privilege to present an update of my first three months as the State's Chief Enterprise Architect. My excitement and optimism have—serving the State of Nevada has really only increased since my introduction here in August, when very shortly after I'd started, I think it had only been a few days, the team under the State Office of the CIO has produced an exceptional strategy document which, in addition to becoming a beacon of core IT for the state as a whole, will guide my Enterprise Architecture efforts moving forward.

The purpose of establishing the statewide enterprise architecture is to benefit the constituency both directly and indirectly. Among the goals I've accumulated over the last 90 days are to evaluate and define unified technology solutions that are more cost effective through good of the state contracts. This is in response to GFO Audit Report 17-04, Page 10—they've identified that as something that was lacking—to establish policies and standards for IT procurement, another GFO Audit Report, 18-08, Page 16. Again, this was something that I think will help induce contracts that encompass a more complete definition of what the needs are, so that hopefully we'll get a better set of contracts out

there from procurement.

Identify and socialize technology needs where these solutions will benefit multiple state entities. That involves listening and identifying needs from various agencies, commissions and boards; that they have and in many cases, in just the brief time that I've been involved with reaching out, I've discovered needs that many agencies have, but they're looking at their own silo and they're own specific needs. It's somewhat limited in their solution, but when looking at a 90,000 or zoomed out look, we can see common needs that can be used across the state. I believe very firmly, it's likely we can come up with a solution that can satisfy everyone's individual needs, while providing perhaps a single solution overall that the state can benefit from.

Bringing new technology solutions to the State that better engage our constituents and address their web and mobile adoption. The state clearly has people who are wanting to move forward very fast and it's not always possible with budget cycles and everything to accommodate the speed that a Silicon Valley might handle that increase, but I think we should certainly try and keep that on the radar so that we'll have a bar that we can shoot for.

Collaborate with agencies, boards and commissions to create a more unified communication solution with the State. This is something that again, I discovered people are clamoring for something other than just an analog dial tone phone to pick up. Email is great, but there are a lot of communication solutions that will tie multiple approaches together. So, this is another goal that we're—I'm looking at.

Evolving towards a single source of trust, for state information. This will reduce errors in the constituent and in the business and agency data. I think frequently we see situations, Secretary of State comes to mind, that you log in to do business, you get shunted to a different site. You follow a link. You have to log-in to yet another log-in and create credentials so that you can get tax information. Then you go to another site so that you can pay your unemployment. So, you move around to a number of places and this creates several sets of truth which are not the same. Yet, it's the same individual or the same business entity adding this data. I think this is again, a higher level goal, high bar. It certainly is not going to be accomplished immediately, but it's something we need to look at so we can move towards that in our solutions.

Finally, reaching out to state entities and capturing technology wins. One of the things I've discovered was that there are lots of wins. People tend to talk a lot about some failures and some black eyes, but there are a lot of wins and they don't get enough—they don't get enough press, in my mind, internally. Not the bad press. And also, I think lessons learned is something that we shouldn't be afraid of. When we see something that doesn't go the way we want or it goes sideways, it's very typical that we don't learn from history. I think history can really tell us from a technological standpoint, just a little step different can make a big difference in the outcome. So, I think capturing those lessons and sharing those for the benefit of all IT initiatives is something that's important.

So far to date, I've taken a lot of tactical steps. Again, it's been a short period, but these tactical steps are on the road—the road to unity, the road to creating an effective statewide enterprise architecture. They include creating a State Technology Needs Register. It's easy to hear these needs that people have but it's critical to capture them so that when I hear them again and again, I can kind of put a check mark and say, this is getting a bit more heavily weighted. These are common needs that are across different agencies. So, that will help with my communications with—in collaboration with other agencies and entities to capture those needs.

I've coordinated with the Secretary of State's Office, identifying several technology needs that they have, that they would love to see be part of a solution. Some of the needs have actually been put up as bills and did not pass, but I think that it's a mistake just to let it die. I think at least, especially when the needs are shared amongst agencies. It needs to continue to be put forth and be put forth as a state solution that many can share in.

I've partnered closely with State Purchasing to help identify some common solutions. We have some challenges sometimes where we have many solutions that are capable of being procured through State Purchasing when we don't need dozens of desktop computers for instance. So, narrowing that down makes the purchasing procurement more powerful and it also makes it similar in terms of maintenance and management and updating and tracking of those things.

I've leveraged most recently the State Purchasing Roundtable that was held up at Switch. Actually, it was yesterday. There was another meeting we had several weeks ago, perhaps it was a month ago, that kind of kicked that off. It was a much more limited meeting. This meeting yesterday involved many more entities in the state and I hope we get to continue to benefit from that, not just our own traditional agencies or close to the chest, but other local and county facilities or groups could also benefit from this. Again, I think that just increases our leverage and increases the—decreases the cost of producing and procuring solutions.

I've recently become a SME on the TIN review process. That—while this is after the big push, everybody else did all of the hard work before I came on, it's given me a visibility into the types of technology and solutions people are requesting and it is invaluable because I can see—you can see how people think about their solutions when they put these—the TIN information together. So, it's a fabulous dragnet for understanding what's happening across the State, as they—as people do update their TINs or produce new ones.

On the other end of the spectrum of recently integrated with the CETS system, the Contract Entry and Tracking System. As we know, EITS does a review and approval of technology contracts over certain value and this is another vector for accumulating information on technological solutions. Now, unlike the TIN process, which starts at the beginning of the contract, the CET System is at the end. So, there's really very little opportunity to make a change in a direction somebody is proposing because the contract is right there ready to be executed. However, it's still another avenue, it's another vector

to get information that might not be available in a TIN. So, this is—I view this as invaluable for pulling information in for enterprise architecture strategy for the State.

I've recently joined the Smart 21 Team as a SME for their—for their evaluation team and I'm really looking forward to working on that. There's a lot of expertise in the program and it looks like it's really humming along quite well, so I'm sure the Enterprise Architecture Team will be able to look—learn, not only from what the solutions are and how they're being chosen, but the OPM in a bigger way, looking at project management and possibly program management for a broader use across all state technology needs.

In addition, and lastly for those more recent accomplishments or activities, I've joined the STAR Evaluation Committee Team as a solution evaluator. Again, the DMV project is a substantial technology effort and so again, I'm looking forward to pulling in more information from that team to use in a broader sense, after the official evaluation is completed and then I can use some of that information more broadly for agencies, in the benefit of how their program worked and their project has been working.

The initial items that I have on the high-level items that I have on the needs register at the moment that are kind of on the top of my radar are cloud solutions. Naturally, this is a core part of the road to unity. So, we're looking at—I'm looking at all of the different aspects, not just solutions, but the other elements within a cloud. What are the security requirements? Bob is obviously, you know, spearheading that, but these are all part of an architecture that needs to be put together so that when an individual or an agency is looking for a solution, they have all the questions laid out in front of them and they know what they need to ask for. FedRAMP or HIPAA or FIS or any of other security requirements. So, that's a cloud solutions portion.

I'm looking at, as a recent addition, descriptions of complex purchasing relationships. This is generally between technology and their attendant support services. A lot of times they're two separate items. They're split for purchasing purposes. It's—there's a tight relationship between the amount of certification, knowledge that has to go into supporting these technological services. So, it sometimes limits the type of solution that can be approached when somebody needs to find a network solution, for instance. You need to take into account much—many more things than just the specific technology of, that network switch, the bandwidth, how it gets managed, etc. There is the—all of the people that have to support it over time that needs to be taken into account. So, I'm looking at describing those complex relationships and that will, I think, make Purchasing's ability to identify when there's flexibility and when there's less flexibility, a little easier and hopefully come up with solutions that will be better for individual needs.

Unified communications is on my needs register. This, as I said before, I alluded to not just dial tone, but its digital voice, computer-based voice and video, text, SMS and audio/video conferencing. So, that whole gamut now is all part of a unified communications solutions. So, I believe we're looking at a trial, a real baby mini-trial to see what's happening and I'm hoping we can get some good baseline for where to move forward in a cost effective manner, but still gets us into the 20<sup>th</sup>, if not the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Single sign-on solution. Again, I was alluding to the disparate nature of single source of truth for data. Single sign-on is so critical and while we may have it for some, our loose federation of agencies and entities promote, really a very separate siloed set of IT services in the backend. So, I think looking at the single sign-on that will work across agencies, by either through federation or through integrating at a higher level will be helpful because I think we can achieve a single sign-on and yet provide the power for individual agencies to still control and kind of be the masters of their own domain, so to speak. Yet, we will still have a single sign-on and possibly with integrating into a single source of truth be able to really move forward reducing errors, making things faster and giving us a much more modern and safe aspect. The security aspect of this, I think isn't touched on enough. But the single sign-on and the single source of truth is really key. It's very challenging to identify whether you have three different actors who are using your services, or it's just one actor with three different identities. I think these are subtle, but security based issues that we can alleviate by a single source of truth and single sign-ons.

Lastly, on the needs register, I have Statewide Geographic Information Systems. Again, this is something that was initially brought to my attention by the Secretary of State but many, many agencies have needs for a GIS System and some have—some use multiple systems. I've heard of one recently that uses three different systems. While that may simply be because of an evolution of needs of different layers, I think if we take a more holistic look at this, I think we can come up with a solution that we would be able to add layers into a GIS System for individual agency's needs, without having to go with a whole new system. So, the incremental ability to add functionality would be a lot simpler and more direct than bringing on yet another GIS and having to integrate with another API, etc.

So, that's—that's my list—my short list of high-level needs that I've identified. I know this will grow and I also know full well that these will not be knocked off in weeks or months, but I'm hoping many of these we can get some quick wins and we can get some collaboration amongst and across agencies that will make it easier to get big wins and hopefully bring those win dates into a shorter period because everybody will be sailing in the same direction, the same heading and wanting pretty much the same thing as opposed to just going off into disparate directions.

So, I'm looking forward to having more updates for you next time, in February or—I shouldn't be presumptuous. Whenever the next ITAB Meeting meets, but if you have any questions, I'd be happy to address them. Thank you.

**Chairman Diflo:** For the record, this is Paul Diflo. It's a good analysis for 90-days. I think your needs, your EA needs are spot on. Let me ask you this. I think the single sign-on example is perfect. I mean, I have wrestled with that in every company I've been with. Do you have plans to publish a set of EA principles that can help agencies at least stop digging the hole so that you can avoid the multiple credentials, as one example?

**David Axtell:** David Axtell, for the record. Yes, we do. Chairman, I am intending, I haven't done it, I wanted to do it by now but as you might imagine, the firehose—actually,



I thought would shrink but it just keeps getting bigger. Our desire is to very shortly create an Enterprise Architecture Working Group. I don't call it a Governance Board because I think it's too immature at this point to presume anything like that. I think at this point where we are learning and gathering data, I think a working group is very critical to engage with all agencies. We have already a nub of a SharePoint site that we will be using to disseminate information so that people can see what we're doing. They can look at the needs register. They can look at what projects we have on our visible radar. At this point, I'm not there yet. We still have more work to do and honestly, I would love to say that it would be ready to go and up and running by the next one, but that's my goal—that's my bar, but at this point, it's kind of a stretch goal. I'm trying to capture and put together a structure where I can at least have good visibility on all these technologies. So, I think it may be a little more than another 90 days, but that's absolutely a goal of ours. Communication is absolutely key in sharing this—what we're learning with everyone else.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yeah, that sounds right. Thank you.

**David Axtell:** Good, thank you.

**Chairman Diflo:** Any other questions or discussions that people have for David?

**Sherri McGee:** For the record, Sherri McGee. I just want to thank you for your efforts so far. It's going to really make a huge difference for the State of Nevada to have an enterprise architecture and some guidance going forward because over the years, all the agencies have just been, you know, struggling and just picking whatever they can or the cheapest thing or whatever and that's what's got us to this place today. It's just going to make a huge improvement for the State as a whole. So, thank you and welcome aboard again.

**David Axtell:** Thank you very much. David Axtell for the record. I would just like to say one more thing. The Office of the CIO and Michael Dietrich has done a great job in putting strategies together which I alluded to in my opening. I think this is part of the key of being able to have a successful enterprise architecture for the State. Key to that is, not an edict based organization or governance, but listening to all the agencies and what their solutions are. I think when we continue to work that way, we will—we will get great feedback from people because everyone likes to say how they've done so well in this area, or that area. I think it's key for us to be able to take these solutions and wins, that every other agency has, big or small and be able to share that. I'm looking forward to that, but I think this is a statewide, agency-wide effort. So, thank you very much.

**Chairman Diflo:** Thank you David.

**David Axtell:** Thank you.

## 10. BOARD DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS *(for discussion only)*.

**Chairman Diflo:** That will take us down to Agenda Item 10. We always like to ask Members of the Board if there's any specific agenda items that you'd like to see for the next meeting or the meeting after that. We'll open it up for any suggestions.

**Sherri McGee:** For the record, Sherri McGee. I think i would like to have further update from the Office of the CIO. I know in our last meeting, there was discussion about a website being stood up. I don't know if that's stood up yet, or what kind of information is going on there or activities coming out of that office. So, I think it would be good to have an update from the CIO.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yeah, that's a good point. Michael tried to escape this meeting, so he delegated everybody else. I'll make a note of that.

**Director Cates:** For the record, Patrick Cates, just back to my comments earlier in the meeting. I think we should think about adding something for other agency's projects, to get an update. I'm not quite sure, we'll put our heads together with the Office of the CIO and maybe you, Mr. Chairman, on how best to approach that. It'd be an awfully long meeting if we asked every agency to update us in one meeting. So, maybe we'd want to pick and choose. Maybe we can look at some of the TINs and TIRs that we have and maybe pick an agency or something to come to the next meeting.

**Chairman Diflo:** Yeah, I think that's a great idea. Anyone else? Okay.

## 11. PUBLIC COMMENTS *(for discussion only)*

**Chairman Diflo:** That will take us down to Agenda Item 11, Public Comments. And, I'll start in the North, are there any public comments? Seeing none. I will ask down in Las Vegas, are there any public comments.

**Speaker:** None here, Mr. Chair.

**Chairman Diflo:** All right, very good.

## 12. ADJOURNMENT *(for possible action)*

**Chairman Diflo:** All right, very good. So, 2:55, I mentioned earlier that we might be able to give you back some time. It looks like we've been successful with that. I think I was told the last meeting, I don't need to ask for a motion to adjourn, that we can just say, adjourned. So, thank you everybody.

---

*Notice of this meeting was posted before 9:00 a.m. three working days prior to the meeting pursuant to NRS 241.020, in the following locations:*

- Capitol Building, 101 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701
- Legislative Building, 401 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701
- Blasdel Building, 209 E. Musser St., Carson City, NV 89701
- Carson City Court Clerk Office, 885 E. Musser, Carson City, NV 89701
- Washoe County Courthouse, Second Judicial District Court, 75 Court Street, Reno, NV 89501
- Nevada State Library and Archives, 100 Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701
- Grant Sawyer Building, 555 E. Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89101
- And the following web locations:
  - [http://it.nv.gov/Governance/dtls/ITAB/Information Technology Advisory Board \(ITAB\)/](http://it.nv.gov/Governance/dtls/ITAB/Information%20Technology%20Advisory%20Board%20(ITAB)/)
  - <http://www.notice.nv.gov>

The appearance of the phrase “for possible action” immediately following an agenda item denotes items on which the Board may take action.

The Information Technology Advisory Board may: take agenda items out of order; combine two or more agenda items for consideration; remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Supporting materials for this meeting will be available to the public at the meeting locations at the time of the meeting. Members of the public may request supporting materials from Leslie Olson at (775) 684-5849 or email a request to [lolson@admin.nv.gov](mailto:lolson@admin.nv.gov).

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled. If special arrangements for the meeting are required, please notify Leslie Olson in advance at (775) 684-5849 or you may email your request to [lolson@admin.nv.gov](mailto:lolson@admin.nv.gov).