

CRAIG A. NEWBY
First Assistant Attorney General

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

LESLIE NINO PIRO
General Counsel

CHRISTINE JONES BRADY
Assistant Attorney General



HEIDI PARRY STERN
Solicitor General

STATE OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

May 1, 2026

Via U.S Mail and Email

Timothy L. Ross



**Re: Open Meeting Law Complaint, OAG File No. 13897-565
Clark County Department of Aviation**

Dear Mr. Ross:

The Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”) is in receipt of your complaint (“Complaint”) alleging violations of the Open Meeting Law, NRS Chapter 241, (“OML”) by the Clark County Department of Aviation (“CCDOA”) regarding a closed meeting held on August 20, 2025.

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 of the Complaint included a review of the Complaint and supplemental materials, the Response on behalf of the CCDOA, and other information regarding the CCDOA’s creation and organization. The OAG concludes that the CCDOA is not a public body as defined under the OML and therefore was not required to comply with the OML for the meeting at issue.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Clark County Department of Aviation's organization is established in Clark County Code of Ordinances Chapter 20.02. The Director of the Department of Aviation and its employees are tasked with administration, operation, planning and development of the airports and related facilities. Clark County, Nevada, Code § 20.02.020-30 (2013).

On or around July 30, 2025, the CCDOA posted a Tenant Bulletin with a meeting notice for a tenant meeting on Wednesday, August 20, 2025, at 5:30pm (the "Tenant Meeting"). The notice specified it applied to "North Las Vegas Airport and Perkins Field tenants with a contractual relationship, including enclosed hangars, shade hangars, open tie-downs, DOA-approved subleases, or DOA-approved businesses."

On August 20, 2025, prior to the start of the meeting, an employee of the CCDOA stated that the meeting was a private meeting and instructed a news team to leave the room. The meeting commenced as an informational session for tenants where they were told their leases would not be renewed.

Complainant filed the instant complaint alleging that the CCDOA violated the OML by closing the meeting to the public and to the press.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The threshold question in the instant matter is whether the CCDOA is a "public body" as defined in the OML and thus required to comply with its provisions. The OML includes the following definition of a public body:

Any administrative, advisory, executive or legislative body of the State or a local government consisting of at least two persons which expends or disburses or is supported in whole or in part by tax revenue or which advises or makes recommendations to any entity which expends or disburses or is supported in whole or in part by tax revenue, including, but not limited to, any board, commission, committee, subcommittee or other subsidiary thereof and includes a library foundation as defined in NRS 379.0056 and an educational foundation as defined in subsection 3 of NRS 388.750, if the administrative, advisory, executive or legislative body is created by:

- (1) The Constitution of this State;
- (2) Any statute of this State;
- (3) A city charter and any city ordinance which has been filed or recorded as required by the applicable law;

- (4) The Nevada Administrative Code;
- (5) A resolution or other formal designation by such a body created by a statute of this State or an ordinance of a local government;
- (6) An executive order issued by the Governor; or
- (7) A resolution or an action by the governing body of a political subdivision of this State;

NRS 241.015(5)(a).

The CCDOA is part of Clark County government, but the OAG does not possess evidence of any “body consisting of at least two persons” within CCDOA or overseeing CCDOA that collectively has the power to make decisions or make recommendations to a body that does. The evidence indicates that the Tenant Meeting involved one or more employees of the CCDOA conveying information to contractual tenants of the CCDOA and receiving input. The existence of employees of a government department or agency that assist in carrying out its functions do not alone make a body under the OML. As such, the OAG finds that the CCDOA is not a “public body” as defined in NRS 241.015(5) and thus the Tenant Meeting was not required to comply with the OML.

CONCLUSION

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

Sincerely,

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By: /s/ Rosalie Bordelove
Chief Deputy Attorney General

cc: John P. Witucki, Esq., Counsel to Respondent