AMENDMENT FOUR TO THE CONTRACT
BETWEEN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, AND
MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C.,
FOR CONSULTING SERVICES FOR A BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING
ASSESSMENT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE EFFECTIVE
DECEMBER 5, 2006

This Amendment Four, dated February 17, 2009, amends the Contract for Consulting Services for the Department of Social Service.

WHEREAS, MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C. is currently providing consulting services in accordance with Contract effective December 5, 2006; and

WHEREAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C. previously agreed to modify the Contract via Amendment 1 on December 18, 2007;

WHEREAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C. previously agreed to modify the Contract via Amendment 2 on May 20, 2008;

WHEREAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C. previously agreed to modify the Contract via Amendment 3 on October 7, 2008;

WHEREAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C. mutually agree to modify the Contract via Amendment 4;

THEREFORE, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA and MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C. agree to amend the Contract as follows:

- Add Scope Of Work (SOW) A-2 dated February 17, 2009 to the Contract

- Modify Exhibit B, Project Cost, by replacing the value $617,740.00 with $866,908.00 in the second paragraph on Page 1 of 29, in Section V, paragraph 1, on Page 4 of 25, and in Exhibit B, Page 20 of 29 in the Contract. The hourly rate and the prices are described in the attached Scope of Work Exhibit A-2.

- Add the following option phrase: The effort under Scope Of Work A-2 is divided into two Fiscal Years. Fiscal Year 2009, for $249,168.00, and Fiscal Year 2010, for $264,920.00. Fiscal Year 2010 is an OPTION for OWNER. This OPTION will only be exercised if the effort under Fiscal Year 2009 is successful and the funding is authorized in Fiscal Year 2010. If exercised, the total value of the contract will be increased to $1,131,828.00.

Except as expressly amended in this Amendment Four, the terms and conditions of the original Contract and Amendments 1, 2 and 3 shall remain in full force and effect.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Amendment Four to be executed the day and year first above written.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID ROGER
District Attorney

By: _____________________________ 4/3/09
   ELIZABETH A. VIBERT
   Deputy District Attorney

OWNER:

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

By: _____________________________ Date
   GEORGE STEVENS
   Chief Financial Officer

MTG MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, L.L.C.,

By: _____________________________ 1/29/09
   NEEL CHAKRABORTI
   Senior Manager

Attachment: Exhibit A-2 Scope Of Work
Exhibit A-2, Scope Of Work

The following is a brief description of modifications to our current scope of work and a breakdown of hours and associated costs in the effort.

1. Additions to Scope of Work

In addition to MTG’s current responsibilities related to the implementation of BPR recommendations at all Social Service offices, the need to develop training materials, design and implement re-engineered processes, tools and forms in ACES, create standard operating procedures in the re-engineered environment, deliver training and provide BPR assistance during the ACES pilot and transition will ensure that workers have the understanding necessary to execute re-engineered processes and that re-engineered processes which are being done manually today will carry over to ACES and deliver on the promise of the BPR in a more automated environment. The additional proposed activities are described below:

Development of Case Management (CM) and Case Coordination (CC) Training Materials

Case management and case coordination are critical aspects of the redesigned business model which are being implemented with the BPR because these activities are geared toward reducing the number and duration of clients on the county’s eligibility rolls. MTG will meet with subject matter experts from the CRC pilot site and others as necessary to develop materials that will allow staff at CCSS to be trained in these important areas.

Design Assistance with BPR Tools in ACES

MTG will work closely with ACES subject matter experts and design team members to ensure that all BPR processes, tools and forms are being incorporated into ACES in the most cost-effective, efficient manner while meeting the needs of business users. Proactive attempts to ensure that the ACES team is kept aware of the latest changes in CCSS operations have already been somewhat successful in this area, but more direct involvement in the design of ACES will ensure that design trade-offs and other decisions are made within a broader context that includes an understanding of the BPR and departmental priorities. In addition, we will factor cost considerations and potential impact to the schedule into design decisions so that the review cycle, when necessary, will be considerably shortened. In addition to avoiding problems that have previously been encountered with miscommunication, our input has the potential to save the county significant resources (staffing and rework time) during design, development and testing.

Redesign of Specialty Units

While the implementation of the BPR has been successful with “online” CCSS units, there are a number of decision points that have not been determined with respect to the specialty units, and these units are not functioning as an integral part of the BPR. To truly deliver on the promise of the BPR, we need to examine the process by which referrals are being made to specialty units, the
disposition of these referrals, the use of the case management tools by specialty units, potential opportunities for consolidation and efficiency as well as a more holistic analysis of how staffing resources are being allocated across the department, including specialty units. As part of this work, we will make BPR recommendations, ensure that any impact to ACES is considered and mitigated, and then assist in the implementation, measurement and monitoring of these recommendations.

**Development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)**

Currently, no standard operating procedures exist for the department and this makes it very difficult to train new employees on either existing policies and procedures or those that have been impacted by the BPR. We propose to develop the documentation for procedures related to client-facing activities such as client intakes and interviews as well as provide a template that can be used by the department to document all other procedures. As part of our development process, MTG will review and revise these standard operating procedures with the BPR Roll-out Committee (ROC) and present these to the CCSS Management Team.

**Preparation and Delivery of Training**

A plan for training which identified staff gaps in skills and understanding was initiated while the BPR pilot was underway and refined during the course of the department-wide rollout of the BPR to all "online" units. Example areas include field worker safety, effective resource referral, customer service and interview training, and are important because they address the department’s concerns over liability, need for increased worker productivity and improved client service, and are important considerations in the transition to a new business model. The plan was also developed with an understanding of resource constraints and known barriers to implementation, execution and sustainability. As such, CCSS has provided trainings to staff which have no out-of-pocket cost to the department, but there are gaps in the delivery of training or areas where training is only valuable if customized to CCSS processes which MTG will work with County staff to help fill.

**BPR Assistance during ACES Pilot and Department-Wide Transition**

The BPR will conclude with the new business model being implemented across all "online" units in the agency by the end of April 2009. However, the implementation of automated tools such as ACES as part of the BPR may not be piloted until March 2010 and not fully completed until April 2010. In order to ensure that the objectives of the BPR are achieved in the automated environment, it will be necessary to implement changes to organizational processes as the department transitions to ACES, monitor the impact of the transition, and make adjustments to processes during this time.

**2. Level of Effort and Costs**

The work outlined above is in addition to the existing scope of work which will conclude in February 2009. We estimate the additional level of effort required for MTG to complete the work outlined in this proposal to be 2872 hours through April 2010, which is equivalent to approximately 1.25 FTE over that timeframe. The blended hourly rate, $179/hr, is inclusive of all project-related expenses,
resulting in a total cost of $514,088 over a 14 and half month period. The following is an anticipated breakdown of hours and costs by activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Current FY Cost</th>
<th>Next FY Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Estimated End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPR Extension</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$89,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$89,500</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of CM and CC Training Materials</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$23,628</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,628</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Assistance with BPR tools in ACES</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>$78,760</td>
<td>$21,480</td>
<td>$100,240</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of Specialty Units</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$57,280</td>
<td>$28,640</td>
<td>$85,920</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of SOPs</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$85,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,920</td>
<td>Oct 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and Delivery of Training</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$71,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,600</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPR Assistance during ACES Pilot and Transition</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,280</td>
<td>$57,280</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2872</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249,168</strong></td>
<td><strong>$264,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>$514,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>April 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>