

# CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

## MINUTES

Thursday – July 25, 2013 – 5:30 p.m.

Reno City Hall – Room 709

One East First Street, Reno, Nevada

### MEMBERS

Jeannie Atkinson, Chair  
Bertha Mullins, Vice Chair  
Tray Abney  
Maureen Cole  
Milven Hooper  
Paul Lane  
Jenny Martinez  
Ric Bailey, Chief Examiner

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Atkinson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. A quorum was established.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tray Abney, Jeannie Atkinson, Maureen Cole, Milven Hooper, Paul Lane, Jenny Martinez and Bertha Mullins.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** None.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Ric Bailey – Chief Examiner; Brad Drum – IAFF 731; Jo Ann Malugani – Civil Service Technician; Cadence Matijevich – Assistant City Manager; Susan Rothe – Deputy City Attorney and Renée Runģis – Director of Human Resources.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – This item is for either public comment on any action item or for general public comment and is limited to no more than **three (3) minutes** for each commentator.

None.

#### 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (For Possible Action)

*It was moved by Vice Chair Mullins, seconded by Commissioner Abney, to approve the July 25, 2013 agenda as written. The motion carried unanimously.*

4. **LIAISON REPORT** (*Item for announcements and informational items only. No deliberation or action will be taken on this item.*)

None.

5. **MINUTES** – *Approval of the June 27, 2013 regular meeting minutes. (For Possible Action)*

*It was moved by Commissioner Hooper, seconded by Commissioner Cole, to approve the June 27, 2013 minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.*

**6. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Request to approve employee confirmations. (For Possible Action)
- B. Request to approve eligible list for Police Sergeant. (For Possible Action)
- C. Request to approve eligible list extension for Secretary. (For Possible Action)
- D. Request to be placed on the re-employment list for Recreation Supervisor (12 month position) from Robert Forse. (For Possible Action)

***It was moved by Vice Chair Mullins, seconded by Commissioner Lane, to approve Consent Agenda Items A, B, C and D as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.***

**7. REGULAR AGENDA**

*7-A. Discussion and possible direction to the Chief Examiner regarding request from the City Manager to temporarily reopen the re-employment application period for Firefighters. (For Possible Action)*

Chair Atkinson: We have a request from the City to re-open the time period for IAFF Firefighters to apply for re-employment. IAFF members relied on a letter they received. Subsequent to that it was determined that the letter was sent in error and so in light of the fact that the individuals did rely on an official communication from the City, the City is requesting that we provide an opportunity for that to be rectified. What we are looking for is:

1) That these individuals would have an opportunity to put in an application, by either walking in or electronically, for a period of 15 days from July 26, 2013 and ending at 5:00 p.m. on August 9, 2013. That would allow the Chief Examiner under our rules to put them on the re-employment list.

There are a couple of considerations. The only way the department could reach them is once the reinstatement (layoff) list has been exhausted. There are a couple of names on that. There is some activity underway for that list.

Chief Examiner: The individuals can also turn down the opportunity.

Chair Atkinson: Yes, this is not mandatory, but it is an option with the understanding that the reinstatement list first has to be exhausted (they come first in order) and then the re-employment list would be used to fill any vacancies that then might occur.

2) The department in coordination with IAFF will be sending out notifications (not CSC).

Deputy City Attorney Susan Rothe: I see it as a three part motion, you would also provide authority to Chief Examiner Ric Bailey to forward that re-employment list to the Reno Fire Department on the first business day (August 12) after the closing on August 9.

Assistant City Manager Cadence Matijevich: I would like to thank Mr. Bailey for the staff report and the Commission for your consideration and ask that you look favorably upon this and thank you for your consideration.

***It was moved by Commissioner Abney, seconded by Commissioner Lane, to approve Item 7.A. as discussed.***

Deputy City Attorney Susan Rothe: Just for clarification that includes the three items mentioned by the Chair and me, correct?

Commissioner Abney: Yes.

***The motion carried unanimously.***

*7-B. Performance evaluation of the Chief Examiner to review accomplishments, discussion of future operational goals and collaboration efforts. (For Possible Action)*

Chair Atkinson: This is for review of the past year. What Ric has accomplished and any feedback that we have with regards to processes, procedures and methods. Anything that we would like to see changed or continued. In addition what we want to do is look at future goals so that we can give Ric marching orders going into this fiscal year. Typically an evaluation is done as a form of also setting the stage for pay raises. Unfortunately, because of the state of finances in the City, pay raises aren't available. In this instance it is just as feedback for Ric so that he understands what our desires are with respect to his performance.

He and Jo Ann together do the work that three people and an intermittent have done historically. From my perspective prior staffing was well justified just given the nature of work that we do. This is not an off the shelf operation. We don't go to the internet and pull down a test that somebody has written in Georgia. We create our tests by working with incumbents and subject matter experts so that what we are testing are actually demonstrable needs for that job. Something that is essential to someone's success within that job. So that when the test is applied and the people come through that test, we can say those individuals actually possess the critical and essential knowledge, skills and abilities. That takes a significant amount of work. There has been a substantial reduction in the number of recruitments that we do simply because there are hiring freezes that extend Citywide, but what remains are the more complex/critical jobs. Because the only ones that make their way through that hiring freeze are the ones that you can actually say are essential to continued operations in the City. When we are recruiting and testing for positions of that nature, what you actually see is increased complexity in the nature of the testing device that has to be used. You see increased risk and liability exposure because there is greater scrutiny. So while workload on one hand may have gone down in pure numbers what you have got, I believe, is performing work of a higher criticality and the outcome has a greater impact on the City. Also, in this last year (and before), what we have seen is a lot of involvement or increase in the administrative demand that is placed on Ric. There have been a number of issues that are of critical concern to the very essence of what this Commission does – what its mission is and those are not easy issues. They are fairly complex; there are multiple layers of involvement from labor contracts to state law to case law to legislative intent. In most of those instances we haven't had a lot of time to respond. We typically get notice at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour. Ric then is put on mission to really ferret out what it is we are dealing with – to look at what works or doesn't work about it, what unintended consequences are and then to get more than a single supervisor up to speed. To get us, as a Commission, up to speed so that we can collectively take action that is appropriate. From my perspective, I really believe that the operations side of the CSC functions very effectively. I

think it does an extraordinary job in meeting demands while at the same time understanding that there is an essential mission that can't be set aside or overstepped in the process or in the hurry to try to get other things done. I attribute our success in that respect to Ric. I'm thankful that Ric is here to represent our interests. I appreciate what you do and the depth of the work that you do in order to get us where we need to go. And, Jo Ann, I think you are an essential part of all of this. Even though it is not your review, I don't want you left out of this because I think you are an essential part of the efficient way that this organization actually operates.

I also think (and this is not as concrete as how the work is performed) the type of lists that we deliver, the methods we use and the fact that we rely on best practices. I think Ric has an extraordinary ability to deal with "unorthodox" requests. There are at times requests to do things that just don't fit the model, don't work in the concept of merit and fitness, and don't work under the concept of competition. There is a lot of pressure that comes in to try to get Ric to bend in a way that simply produces an outcome – the method be damned. He has an extraordinary ability to work with those kinds of demands. That is very political on one hand and I think that takes strength of character to do that.

Commissioner Martinez: He has an uncanny ability to be neutral.

Chair Atkinson: Part of that is evident because at our last meeting we specifically asked the City if they had comments that they felt needed to be weighed as part of our evaluation of Ric's performance to bring those forward and we have nothing. From my perspective, I think it is fair to conclude that there is no criticism because typically in an organizational environment what floats to the top are the things that are broken; the things that need to be fixed. The absence of feedback on that part has to have value.

I would invite each of you to share with Ric your perspective on his performance and how we have done over the past year.

Commissioner Cole: These have been very difficult times the past few years and created very difficult situations. I think you have established yourself as an honest broker and that situation is really a credit to many things about you – integrity, character, all of those things. I absolutely agree if there were issues, we would be talking about them today. To have walked that tightrope successfully all this time I think is an expert thing to have accomplished. I'm very grateful to have you as the Chief Examiner.

Commissioner Martinez: Not too long ago we had a number of people that did not know the function of the CSC and wanted to completely change what the CSC is all about. I really appreciated you being there - being a leader; being sort of a non partisan in a political arena. I was in awe when we had all the police and fire here.

Vice Chair Mullins: This has not always been a smooth road as to where we are today. From the structure of the City, from the City Manager and Ric's reporting. We have gone through some changes and over the last year or two the relationship with the liaison, Pierre, who was really faithful to attending the CSC meetings, asking if we had any issues or anything to take back. I think that liaison person has been very important to us and allowed Ric to speak things in reference to the liaison directly to the City Manager and he has done that freely. I agree in reference to integrity he has walked the tightrope for several years even when it was very

uncomfortable. In reference to the Commissioner's goal, our goal and purpose has always been for the employee. The other thing I would like to say about Ric is that he is accessible. He has been able to keep abreast on what is going on and I would like to commend him on that.

Commissioner Hooper: My comments today for Jo Ann and Ric are I agree with the aforementioned comments by the other Commissioners. One of the key elements is that we all receive written, electronic or verbal communication by telephone when necessary. That communication is always there and that is commendable.

Vice Chair Mullins: I am glad that Jeannie and Milven mentioned Jo Ann because I've been here when we had more staff. I just really commend them with all that they do with the shortness of staff in their department and the professionalism with which they do it.

Commissioner Abney: I haven't been here long, but I agree with everything that has been said especially accessibility. Late this afternoon I shot Ric an email to clarify something and he got right back to me with a very clear, concise and succinct answer. In my day job, I am in the political arena and I know how that difficult can be. I also have worked with people in the City under prior administrations and know that it has been a big change in this building as City Managers have come and gone. Even from the outside, I know how difficult it can be to work that process because you have to be political and practical and smart and figure out how to maneuver. It is obvious to me that Ric has done that and of course, Jo Ann has been wonderful as well. For my short time, it has been a great experience and Ric has been awesome to work with.

Commissioner Lane: Same thing: short time, short exposure. Accessibility, communication and availability have been tremendous. Of course, coming in as new, you want to ask questions and try to get background and he has been so patient about not short circuiting and going directly to the top. He took the time to go through the different steps and the different issues that we have encountered thus far and I appreciate that. It helps me get a better understanding and make better decisions hopefully. The communication is wonderful. The written stuff that comes across and just being able to talk to you on the phone and walk in the office is just heaven.

Chair Atkinson: I certainly second that. He responds to my calls.

In preparation for this meeting, Ric and I identified issues that we think are important for the Commission. I would like to lay out for the Commission some of those things.

1. To find a good resolution to this temporary employee issue. Just as a side, we did have an opportunity to talk with Andrew about it and explain to him essentially the same things we explained to Mr. Chisel and he promised to look into that. We are waiting for them to come back to us in August. This is really a critical issue and we need to find a way to get it resolved and keep it resolved as we move forward.
2. We have some non-compliance appointments in the Reno Police Department in the Victim Services Unit that are there either because the class specifications were adopted and approved by this Commission and testing was initiated and then did not produce a result that was desirable or because the jobs changed. In any event it has stalled at the

- department level. It is kind of like the temporary appointment issue, it is a non-compliance appointment issue so it is something we need to square away.
3. There are some civil service rules that we may want to look at and as we get further into this fiscal year (I think around March.) we may want to look at the layoff rule particularly as it relates to reinstatement. One of the issues that has come up is how many times can somebody on the reinstatement list say, “No” to a job offer before they actually get taken off the list. We are using general language at the moment (which is three times), but that is something as a Commission we may want to revisit and take a look at whether or not that is practical.
  4. We may want to look at the rule for use of temporary employees. How that process works. Whether we need to massage that in some way or whether we feel it is written adequately for needs.
  5. Ric is anxious also to expand use of the electronic online requisition system. Right now portions of it are still hand carried.

Chief Examiner Bailey: The Police Department is the pilot study. We are just now working out some of the issues. Once, Jo Ann & I are confident and the Police Department is confident with the process then I want to expand it to some other departments, including the temporary requisitions particularly for Parks & Rec so they can keep up with the temporary and seasonal individuals. That will give us a hands-on record as well.

Chair Atkinson: That builds a greater efficiency into the process itself. It removes that delay that happens with hand carrying.

6. There is also an upcoming issue, or an issue that we may see more and more, and that is how do you deal with hiring decisions for positions in which funding is uncertain. Historically, positions are funded with the anticipation that they will be funded in an ongoing fashion absent elimination of a program or something of that nature. We are going to see more and more instances where people are hired for a specific term. Our rules don't really wrap themselves around that kind of hiring decision. That would be a review of what our intent would be. How do we stay with our mission and how do we write or craft a rule that addresses that issue.
7. A very important issue for us is to work with the City to avoid and eliminate conflicts between Charter and Civil Service Rules and other contracts and agreements. If we can get ahead of those issues and find a way to improve the brainstorming that is necessary to figure out where those lines and limits should be, we might avoid some of the things that we have seen in the past year.
8. Communication within the City – going back and forth. Set up regular meetings and insure that there is some discussion happening so that we get a heads up about things that are pending, but we are also involved in some of that decision making process to the extent that it affects or involves Civil Service functions. Right now there is some breakdown that happens and as a consequence things are not as efficient and sometimes very, very awkward.

Those are some of the ideas that Ric and I generated. Are there others that we should be working on?

Vice Chair Mullins: I think those are good.

Chair Atkinson: One question that I have of the Commission, and I didn't want to answer this for Ric. How heavily do you want him to lean into some of these issues? How hard do we push and where as a Commission will we stand solidly behind our staff in terms of sending them out on the battle ground?

Commissioner Cole: Because it has been such a long standing issue the resolution of the temporary employment situation really seems to be an "A" priority to me. There are so many things that will be better once this is resolved. It will be a fairer system, a more transparent system and I think we all benefit from that. That is something that the Commission should consider; really planning to support Ric in whatever needs to be done to fix that. I think as we have heard before there is some perceived efficiency for the way it is, but we know it is in conflict with the rules. We can certainly look at those rules because we are not trying to create inefficiency, but we are trying to require of the City Managers and Department Managers compliance with rules as they are written.

Commissioner Lane: It's like the basis for the decisions tonight; so much of it was done in consideration of equity. Equity versus expediency, I'd like to make sure that is pervasive throughout the City in all its operations and dealings with all of the employees and managers and everybody. Equity has got to be a keystone value.

Chair Atkinson: It's important that we send a clear message to Ric from the Commission how far you lean into some of these issues. I did mention one issue which is non-compliance appointments in the Police Department. At what point does that completely defeat what it is we stand to serve. I think the non-compliant appointments also rises to the same level as does the temporary. There are systems and methods to solve these. The reasons for not doing that aren't good. It is driven by non job related, non efficiency factors. My concern overall is that the system itself not be defeated by that.

Commissioner Cole: I would agree with that. If we are committed to the most equitable outcomes that we can achieve then turning a blind eye to inequitable situations does not serve our purpose. It does have a corrosive effect on employees who can see the same thing and wonder why.

Chair Atkinson: Ric, do you have any questions that you would like to ask the Commission.

Chief Examiner Bailey: I think that was the main one that I wanted to address which is how much diplomacy versus how much assertiveness. That is always going to be a balancing act depending on the Department Head and the issue itself. The question as a Commission that you would have is to what degree do we want to enforce the rule or the spirit of the rule with a particular Department Head on a particular subject. How far do we basically say, "No more, this is it" versus let's negotiate a little at a time like we have done with the temps. There is a point to where I have heard some Commission members say the rule is the rule and this is what we are going to do. I don't want to be in a position of being so diplomatic and complacent with a Department Head that they just run amuck. At the same time, we don't have a verbal war going on with any one right now and I certainly don't want one. There is that balancing act and one remedy may be to put the item on the agenda and we will talk about it in public.

Commissioner Hooper: With that comment, certainly we always want to represent you 100%. As far as this rule is concerned, there should be a consensus although that is an individual decision making thing. The rule should not be broken and I think that I have stood on that.

Chief Examiner Bailey: That has been very clear and that is why I want to make sure.

Commissioner Hooper: Right, I don't believe the rule should be broken at any point and any Department Manager that comes forward requesting us to continue to break the rule is unacceptable. As Maureen mentioned, it is corrosive; it is unequal and it sends the wrong message to the citizens and the employees of the City when rules are broken by an organization that was put in place to make sure the rules (until they are changed or altered) should be advised. Be as strong as you need to be and certainly communicate with the Commission. This is for the good of everybody. It is good for the citizens, good for the leadership in the City, good for the employees and, of course, equity is one of the key things that the Commission should be concerned about at all times.

Commissioner Martinez: It is also in the rules that a Department Head can come to request the change of an approval, extension, reinstatement – to come forward because whatever is in the best interest of the employee or that department at that time or even for the City.

Commissioner Hooper: Well, my comment there is that it doesn't matter whether they come forward or not. If they are breaking a rule, the rule should not be broken and even though they come forward which gives me some concern why a person would come forward that has knowledge (which they do now) that the rule should not be broken. You are right, they do have the right to come to any group and ask for changes. I think as a Commission we should not allow any mixed messages by approving something and not approving something else – equal treatment throughout the City.

Commissioner Martinez: When it comes to something that has not been put on an agenda and brought to a meeting and there is a question to Ric, then Ric outside of the agenda or meeting would say this is what the bylaws say. This is what the CSC says and then go from there.

Commissioner Abney: It seems to me you have to navigate these things. You have had Department Heads come here in good faith that did not know about the temporary rule for example. Especially one in particular sat here, learned about it and came here the very next meeting and said here is the deal: I just learned about this – we need to extend these people. Rules are important, but you can be a slave to the rules to the detriment of the people of the City. Ultimately while we are here to provide fairness and equity to the employees, we also want to make sure that we have fairness and equity for the citizens and taxpayers for the City of Reno. People are treated differently all the time in the rules of the court and the rules of government. There needs to be some leeway. If you have a Department Head that is flagrant about it and blatantly ignoring you and not doing what they are supposed to be doing that is another issue. It is incumbent upon them to come to us and say we think this rule needs to be changed. I think that is important, too, that we are always open to changing rules, adding or getting rid of them or whatever we need to do. I'm a "live by the rules" guy, but you also need some common sense and humanity in the process as well. I don't know if that is a mixed message to you, Ric, or not. I would argue that depending on the issue and the person that you are dealing with you have been able to figure out diplomacy versus something else. One

situation, frankly, may call for a different kind of response on how “far you lean into it.” That may not be helpful to you. I don’t want to sit here and say go full bore and anybody that is breaking the rules, we are going to bring it up in a meeting. Sometimes you can take care of these things without coming to a CSC meeting. If everything is fair and equitable and we were by the rules all the time 100% then every one of these Department Heads would be brought up here in a public meeting and flogged and talked about and told what needs to happen. Or, you have rules there and you say this is what’s going on, let’s figure this out.

Commissioner Cole: I wonder if it might be a good opportunity for the Chair and Chief Examiner to perhaps have a meeting with the City Manager and share our priorities with him. Invite him or the Assistants or Department Heads to take a look at the rules if they haven’t for a while or if they are having particular difficulty and to bring those concerns forward so that we can examine those and see if there is some room to adjust that rule so that it works better for employees and for the City. Our intent is that once the rules are established that we would expect compliance with them.

Commissioner Hooper: To our knowledge at this time all Department Heads are aware of the rule. This is business; there is no room for emotion. This is a City and when services are depleted to the citizens, hopefully the City would react by doing the appropriate things to get the services to them within the policies and rules. I don’t think it is feasible to give someone something and not give someone else something, even though Tray is correct. There are unfair things. We have all lived through it. It is unacceptable. The Department Manager came right back when they were supposed to know what the rules were and insisted to ask us again to break the rules. That is unacceptable.

Vice Chair Mullins: This is an evaluation of Ric and honest feedback from the Commissioners. In listening to Jeannie and what she has outlined as what they perceive moving forward. I think we all realize the transition at the top in reference to leadership that the City has gone through. From my perspective, this is good and I think it is good for us to extend an invitation to the people that are not here. Some people in the past, the problems are there, but in reference to the Civil Service Charter, it is our goal to work towards making it work. Some people, quite frankly, are not in knowledge of the rules and they should be. I think this would be a great opportunity for an education. We are in support of Ric. I think there is a point – Ric reports to the CSC. He doesn’t report to the City Manager. That is a different structure. We also have an obligation to the City and it is not Ric, it is this Commission to bring that to them. That’s why I feel it is very important to have a liaison and I think we could come up with a plan. I think there really is a need for education starting with the City. We have new City Council members. We are in a great opportunity to do some education here so that when they hear the information coming back from the City or the Assistant Manager, they would have some knowledge of this. There was a time that we used to have workshops on a particular subject. We should look at that moving forward. This is a good opportunity for us to start at ground zero. We are assuming a lot of things. We all know that government doesn’t work for the people all the time.

Chair Atkinson: What I heard, just to summarize so that Ric leaves with a single voice on some things, is that with respect to non-compliance or illegal temporary appointments what we are looking at is a couple of things. The rules are adopted and are to be followed (that is a general premise) and this Commission will hold departments accountable to following those rules. When there are extraordinary circumstances that require extensions and reconsideration, the

departments are invited to come forward and to present that so we can work with them on those types of issues. To get over the problem of “I didn’t know the rule was there” that type of fallback position is to plan and design a process where we can begin to educate departments about some of the key cornerstones of the Civil Service rules and requirements for them. That we would like Ric to operate in a position where departments are advised that their actions are not in compliance and to give them information with respect on how to bring it into compliance, to set deadlines for compliance action and in the absence of that then to advise the departments that the issue needs to come back to the Commission. The Commission would then have a hearing on it in public and for the Department Heads to provide additional information at that time, and they should be prepared to do so. That actually brings the final decision back here, but at the same time empowers Ric to push into those areas where things aren’t working the way they need to be working.

Vice Chair Mullins: I understand in reference to the Department Head, but I think the information has to come from the top. I’m looking at going above the Department Head because the Department Head is to enforce. It is their responsibility to carry it out. Until we educate the upper layer is where I can see starting this. I think it has to start there and then the middle level of administration.

Chair Atkinson: You want to focus higher?

Vice Chair Mullins: I think we need to do some education here and have it so there isn’t a cop out which it has been with the Department Heads because the people up here don’t know what is going on. As the CSC we haven’t communicated that to the people at top. There was a time when the City Manager came to the CSC meeting. The City Manager was here in addition to the City Council liaison. So, the City Manager is given the responsibility from the Council to see that the City is operating. I am saying that we don’t have that representation. We all know that there is a void here with the communication getting back to where it needs to be. We had a representative here tonight.

Chair Atkinson: Typically, their attendance is subject specific. Part of that I believe is driven by scarcity of time.

Vice Chair Mullins: What I am saying is there is certainly a void missing with communication with the people at the top and the people that are supervising departments.

Commissioner Lane: I really like to solve problems at the lowest levels wherever possible. I really like leadership to take the lead at the highest levels wherever possible. A bilateral approach is a good way to get into compliance. The educational feedback and exchange at the top and buy in and have the ability to have the Department Managers be aware now. To allow things to exist in perpetuity because we have not come to a final whatever is not a good thing. Things need to be working positively towards a good resolution at all times. Those Department Managers should be able to make things under their control better at this point. I’d love to have the bifurcated approach.

Commissioner Abney: Ric, how many Department Heads are there?

Chief Examiner Bailey: I think there are nine that we serve.

Commissioner Abney: Maybe a workshop, if it's possible, with all nine at the same time or take chunks of them and sit down and have a back and forth dialogue. I really see your role and our role, at least as a first approach, as a hand – as an arm around the shoulder. Let me help you come into compliance; let me help you learn about the rules. Eventually our role may be you haven't come into compliance and we told you six months ago to do it. Then it is a different kind of role, but I don't see our first approach or role as slapping people down, you broke the rules, you are out, we are going to have a hearing. Maybe there is a couple of workshops or meetings where we have Department Heads in here (and they know enough ahead of time) so they can be somewhat prepared to talk about issues that they have had and we can educate them on what is expected. Maybe through that process we can find out if there any changes that need to be made. I don't know if we can have a meeting with all nine. Maybe that is too many people all at once.

Commissioner Cole: Maybe if we can get 20 minutes or a half hour of a Department Managers' meeting at some point to initiate that process and go over part of it. Maybe do that on repeated agendas. There are a number of ways that we could structure opportunities for them to ask questions and hear about the rules and how the Commission works.

Vice Chair Mullins: Those are all good suggestions, but in terms of the dialogue, how do we move on from here.

Chair Atkinson: Here is my suggestion. If it is to the Commission's pleasure let me sit down with Ric and kind of fashion this out and look at the different suggestions that came up and then come back to the Commission with a plan that we think can work and here's how this plan would run out.

Vice Chair Mullins: Could you put potential dates in there?

Chair Atkinson: Yes. We can try it and revisit it if it doesn't work. What I am getting primarily from the Commission is that there also needs to be an emphasis on educating Department Managers, starting with the City Manager down. Improving communications through the Council liaison and City Manager so that they fall in line in terms of insuring compliance and also stand in support of what we are trying to achieve together with some of the other issues. Let us see what we can put together and bring it back and have the Commission take the last look at it and then we will get it started.

Vice Chair Mullins: We used to have for the workshops around the lunch hour in order to get the group that we wanted. That was when the City had a few pennies and they served us lunch.

Chair Atkinson: Thank you everyone for participating in the discussion. It is very valuable for Ric and from my perspective as Chair to have a sense of where this Commission wants to go.

Chief Examiner Bailey: Thank you, it is a privilege serving the Commission. I hope I never let you down. Jo Ann is a diamond in platinum.

Chair Atkinson: We do appreciate what you do. The minutes are extraordinary.

**8. IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

As discussed.

**9. SET NEXT MEETING DATE (For Possible Action)**

The next regular meeting of the Civil Service Commission is Thursday, August 22, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.

**10. PUBLIC COMMENT** – This is for general public comment limited to items that do not appear on the agenda and is limited to no more than **three (3) minutes** for each commentator. Pursuant to NRS 241.020, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item until the matter has been specifically included on an agenda.

**11. ADJOURNMENT (For Possible Action)**

Chair Atkinson adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeannie Atkinson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date