



STATE OF NEVADA PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date and Time: February 26, 2026, 1:30 PM
Hybrid Meeting (In-Person and Zoom)

Physical Location: City Hall
401 California Avenue
Boulder City, Nevada 89005

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 PM. Attendance was taken.

In-Person Members Present:

- Ben Lipman
- Colleen McCarty
- Brittany Walker
- Leslie Nino Piro
- Mitch Fox

Virtual Members Present:

- Matt Christian
- Josh Hicks
- Matt Morris
- Vince Guthreau
- Kalie Work

A quorum was established.

2. Public Comment (First Period)

One in-person public comment was received.

- **David Charns**, investigative reporter, spoke regarding inconsistencies in access to arrest reports and public records among Nevada agencies and jurisdictions. He urged the task force to pursue greater consistency, transparency, and timely access.

One written public comment was received from Jeff Church and is attached to these minutes.

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Pursuant to AB 128, the Chair must be selected from the transparency advocates; the Vice Chair from the government representatives.

Members first introduced themselves and briefly summarized their backgrounds and appointment categories.

Nomination and Election of Chair:

- Colleen McCarty was nominated.
- No other nominations.
- Motion passed unanimously.

Nomination and Election of Vice Chair:

- Vince Guthreau was nominated.
- Motion passed unanimously.

4. Task Force Webpage Hosted by the Office of the Attorney General

Leslie Nino Piro explained the proposal to create a simple webpage to:

- List task force members
- Indicate each member's appointment category (transparency or government)
- Post agendas and meeting materials
- Provide public transparency and ensure Open Meeting Law compliance

Additional discussion included:

- The Legislative Counsel Bureau is unable to host the website due to statutory limitations.
- The AG's Office is providing administrative support to enable posting and compliance, although not statutorily required.
- The webpage would not include member biographies.
- A disclaimer will clarify that the AG's Office is not providing legal counsel to the task force.

Discussion of Public Comment Submission:

- Discussion raised the question of where email comments should be directed.
- Suggestion: route public comment to the Chair and Vice Chair.
- Matter to be added to a future agenda.

5. Items for Next Meeting Agenda

Discussion identified topics for inclusion on the next agenda:

- Process for submitting agenda items
- Identifying subject-matter presenters or outside contributors

- Potential decision-making structure (e.g., clarifying how recommendations are approved)
- Development of task force bylaws
- Site for hosting public comment submissions

Clarifications noted:

- Open Meeting Law requires subcommittees to meet publicly.
- The statute requires that official action be taken by a simple majority of members present; changing this standard may conflict with statute.
- Members can meet informally in groups less than a quorum.

After discussion, the motion to include the above agenda topics (excluding meeting location and bylaws) was approved unanimously.

6. Public Comment (Second Period)

No in-person public comment received.

Virtual public comment was not available due to resource limitations.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 PM.

Public Document Task Force: Public Comment, 2-26-2026

I just saw this so am responding on very short notice. I was just forwarded this but believe today's meeting is in violation of NRS 241 as detailed in other correspondence.

Now that I have endeared myself to you, should any openings come up, I would be interested in serving on the task force.

Again on short notice but NRS 239 and subsequent court cases have gutted and rendered useless the Public Document Law. Agencies routinely ignore the law with no repercussions.

For example ,I filed under NRS 239 vs the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Case No. CV23-02245. It cost me about \$4,000 out of my own pocket and I won but it took **eight ++ months** and two judges and essentially WCSD continues to ignore the intent of the law. By then the issue was essentially moot. The cost to the taxpayer was likely over \$100,000 for one minor case. They were represented by the previously prestigious (and expensive) law firm of McDonald Carano.

I'm open to ideas but I think clearly that NRS 241 and NRS 239 are siblings and should be handled the same. Persons should be able to file a complaint with the A.G. and the A.G. should be duty bound to address it promptly (currently that doesn't happen) an perhaps there might be a mediation step thrown in to save time and money. Sanctions in addition to attorney fees might be warranted where it does go to court (if you can find a judge in Washoe County).

Complainants should be indemnified. If not the A.G. then who: a contract with the ACLU or a legal services firm, etc?

I so much commend Bob Conrad of ThisIsReno, Attorney Luke Busby and the ACLU Nevada for challenging some of these. The ACLU just caught the State (DMV) so called 'pants down". Bob Conrad has taken them on but these take months or years and in many cases the court's rulings are bizarre at best.

No one is looking out for the public's interest. Likewise it is not in the government-agency interest to have expensive protracted litigation. I have not had time to look and see good models from other states.

Sincerely,

Jeff Church
RenoTaxRevolt.com
775 544-RENO (7366)
RenoTaxRevolt@Sbcglobal.net