

AARON D. FORD  
*Attorney General*

CRAIG A. NEWBY  
*First Assistant Attorney General*

CHRISTINE JONES BRADY  
*Second Assistant Attorney General*



STATE OF NEVADA  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

February 5, 2026

TERESA  
BENITEZ-THOMPSON  
*Chief of Staff*

LESLIE NINO PIRO  
*General Counsel*

HEIDI PARRY STERN  
*Solicitor General*

Via U.S. Mail

Gina Greisen  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Re: Open Meeting Law Complaint, OAG File No. 13897-548  
Clark County Board of Commissioners**

Dear Ms. Greisen,

The Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”) has reviewed your complaint (“Complaint”) alleging violations of the Open Meeting Law (“OML”) by the Clark County Board of Commissioners (“Board”) regarding their June 17, 2025, meeting.

The OAG has statutory enforcement powers under the OML and the authority to investigate and prosecute violations of the OML. NRS 241.037; NRS 241.039; NRS 241.040. The OAG’s investigation included a review of the Complaint, the Response on behalf of the Board and the agenda, minutes and video recording for the Board’s June 17, 2025, meeting. After investigating the Complaint, the OAG determines that the Board did not violate the OML as alleged in the Complaint.

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

The Board held a public meeting on June 17, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., at the Clark County Government Center, Commission Chambers, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, 6th Floor, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106, with simultaneous livestream via YouTube and the Board’s website. The meeting was broadcast live on Clark County Television (CCTV) in the Las Vegas area on Cox Channels 4/1004 and CenturyLink Channels

4/1004; in Laughlin on Suddenlink Channel 14; in Boulder City on Channel 4; and in Moapa Valley on Digital Channel 50.3. The agenda was properly posted in compliance with OML and included clear instructions for accessing the meeting and submitting public comment. As required under NRS 241.020, public comment was scheduled at the beginning of the meeting and prior to adjournment.

The complaint alleges that on June 17, 2025, the Board failed to provide an opportunity for public comment before voting on agenda Item 17. Pursuant to NRS 241.021(1)(a), the Board provided two separate public comment periods, one at the beginning of the meeting and a second prior to adjournment. The June 17, 2025, agenda described these public comment periods, and the procedure was followed.

Approximately 17 minutes into the meeting, the Chair opened the first public comment period. During this time, a member of the public, Mr. Rojas, requested that items 15 and 16 be pulled from the agenda and asked about the appropriate timing for comment. The District Attorney's Office advised that public comment on agenda items not designated as public hearings should be provided during the initial public comment period, rather than when each item was individually heard.

When the consent agenda was considered, the Board voted to remove items 15, 16, and 17 for separate consideration. Agenda Item 17 was therefore addressed independently and not as part of the consent agenda. Consistent with the Board's established procedures, an opportunity for public comment was provided during the public comment period at the beginning of the meeting, prior to any action being taken on Item 17. Ms. Greisen, therefore, had an opportunity to comment on agenda Item 17 before the Board acted, but she did not do so.

## LEGAL ANALYSIS

### **A. There Was No OML Violation Because Public Comment Opportunities Were Meaningful and Accessible**

The OML does not require that any member of the public actually speak, only that a meaningful opportunity to comment is provided. (*McKay v. Board of Supervisors*, 102 Nev. 644, 651, 730 P.2d 438 (1986)). Here, the Board's agenda clearly included a designated public comment period at the start, and a second comment period at the conclusion. These steps ensured that the public's participation rights were fully protected.

**B. There Was No OML Violation Because Public Comment Was Provided Before Action Was Taken**

No violation of OML occurred because the Board provided the public with a meaningful opportunity to comment on Item 17 before any deliberation or vote. At the outset of the meeting, the Board opened a public comment period during which Item 17 was discussed, thereby satisfying NRS 241.021(1)(a). The Board allowed public comment before discussion and action on Item 17 and again provided a second public comment period at the conclusion of the meeting.

Nevada courts have emphasized that the OML's primary purpose is to ensure meaningful public participation, not to create technical procedural pitfalls. In *Sandoval v. Board of Regents*, 119 Nev. 148, 156–57, 67 P.3d 902 (2003), the Nevada Supreme Court held that OML compliance is satisfied when the public has a realistic opportunity to observe, participate in, and understand the decision-making process. Because Ms. Greisen had the opportunity to comment before Board action but chose not to do so, the statutory requirements were satisfied.

**CONCLUSION**

Upon review of your Complaint and available evidence, the OAG has determined that no violation of the OML has occurred. The OAG will close the file regarding this matter.

Sincerely,  
AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General

By: /s/ Stephanie Itkin-Goodman  
STEPHANIE ITKIN-GOODMAN  
Deputy Attorney General

cc: Lisa V. Logsdon, Esq., counsel to Clark County Board of Commissioners