STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Date:	October 19, 2026 (7th meeting)
Time:	9:10 a.m. – approx. 3:34 p.m. (recess approx. 11:11 a.m. – 12:36 p.m.)
Location:	Legislative Counsel Bureau — Carson City and Las Vegas (hybrid), with telephonic/online public comment
Chair:	Josh Hicks
Members Present:	Ben Lipman, Brittany Walker, Colleen McCarty, Kalie Work (Vice Chair), Leslie Nino Piro, Mitch Fox, Matt Morris, Matt Christian, Staci Lindberg, Josh Hicks (Chair) — full attendance; Matt Morris and Staci Lindberg participated online/telephonically

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Hicks called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. in Carson City, with members and the public also participating from Las Vegas and online. All ten members were present (see above); Matt Morris and Staci Lindberg appeared online/telephonically.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT (OPENING)

The following members of the public addressed the Task Force:

- Kathleen Light (Las Vegas, in person) — objected that her September 29 comments were omitted from the posted YouTube video and that the draft minutes incorrectly described her as having appeared telephonically rather than in person, and asked that the minutes not be approved until corrected. She reiterated allegations concerning the Attorney General's Office's handling of her sexual assault complaint against a former Deputy Insurance Commissioner and raised additional personal allegations.
- Philip Al/Aught (Las Vegas, in person) — described what he characterized as a retaliatory traffic stop by LVMPD officers following a misconduct complaint he filed and separately reported a significant reduction in the fee charged for body-camera footage under a recent request (approximately $23, versus a prior cost of approximately $1,200).
- Doug Roberts (Las Vegas, in person) — works in local news production company and described being billed for 17.5 staff hours to review 65 minutes of body-camera footage related to a juvenile incident, and urged limits on chargeable staff-time hours.

DRAFT

- Rebecca Savio (telephonic comment) — raised redaction and medical-privacy concerns regarding a professional licensing board's disciplinary pleading, recommended retaining searchable video over audio-only recordings, and recommended clarifying the distinction between written public comment and official minutes.
- Oscar Williams (telephonic comment) — commended the draft report's substance, suggested consulting federal identity-theft/consumer-protection analogues for personally identifiable information (PII), and described an eight-month delay obtaining election administration and voting survey data from the Secretary of State's office.
- Jeff Church (telephonic comment) — reiterated written-comment support for an ombudsman or review panel with an expedited, appealable process.

3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2026 MINUTES

The draft September 29, 2026 minutes were presented for approval, with a correction to reflect that Ms. Light appeared in person (not telephonically) at that meeting.

> *MOTION: Leslie Nino Piro moved to approve the September 29, 2026 minutes, as corrected to reflect Ms. Light's in-person appearance.*
>
> *SECOND: Ben Lipman.*
>
> *DISCUSSION: None.*
>
> *VOTE: Unanimous in favor. Motion carried.*

4. EVALUATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER AB128

Proposed Report Appendices

Leslie Nino Piro described the proposed appendix structure to the draft final report:

Appendix	Content
A	Task force agendas and approved minutes
B-1 – B3	Presentation materials from presenters; other meeting materials posted to the Task Force website
C	AI-generated summary chart of the exemptions in NRS Chapter 239 (illustrative only; not independently verified; not a legal conclusion)
D	50-state-plus-D.C. survey of statutes addressing records of criminal investigation (Westlaw-sourced; reviewed)
E (E1–E4)	Government members' survey of government entities statewide — summary/analysis (E), survey questions (E1), written open-ended

	responses (E2), fee schedules collected (E3), and examples of overly broad/burdensome requests submitted by government entities (E4)
F	Separate survey of Nevada law enforcement agencies

Ben Lipman objected that several of the appendix materials bore the Task Force seal and letterhead despite having been produced solely by the government caucus and government entities without transparency-caucus involvement and reported that an AI tool he used flagged the Appendix C exemptions chart as containing errors. Brittany Walker and Leslie Nino Piro responded that the shared letterhead/template had been used consistently on all Task Force materials without prior objection, that Appendix C already carried a disclaimer identifying it as AI-generated, illustrative, and not a legal conclusion, and that Appendix D (unlike Appendix C) was sourced from a reviewed Westlaw 50-state survey.

Matt Morris identified potential internal inconsistencies in Appendix E's summary figures. Leslie Nino Piro clarified that 92 government entities responded to a 79-question survey (35 of which were open-ended), that per-question totals reflect how many of the 92 entities answered that particular question, and that the cumulative "2,300" figure represents the sum of all individual answers across all open-ended questions and respondents. Matt Morris distinguished between the underlying survey data (to which he raised no objection) and the summary "key findings" appearing early in Appendix E, which he characterized as unreviewed task-force-attributed conclusions. Government-caucus members agreed to re-label Appendix E as the government members' summary and analysis.

Colleen McCarty stated she would not support including Appendices B through F as task-force work product or carrying the task-force seal, given the absence of full-body collaboration or vote on their production and renewed her objection to reliance on unverified AI-generated content. Leslie Nino Piro responded that the survey process had been conducted transparently, with survey materials posted publicly following the September 29 meeting, and that the responses represent a form of public comment from 92 government entities that should not be excluded from the record.

Draft Final Report — Section-by-Section Discussion

The Task Force worked through the October 16, 2026 draft report, addressing the legislative mandate/objectives sections, the executive summary's identified areas of consensus (an ombudsman/review panel, a standardized fee schedule, a designated point of contact, and a scoped public reading room), and Section 3 (exemptions chart, review-board policy under NRS Chapter 289, and the burden/cost impact of broad requests). Discussion included:

- Brittany Walker's proposal to soften executive-summary language regarding posting of public records online (to "should strive to post certain public records"), in light of resource disparities among smaller agencies and privacy concerns for some technically public record types.
- Leslie Nino Piro's concern that the ombudsman and fee-schedule items be accurately described as areas of conceptual, rather than detailed, agreement, given continued disagreement over whether current law already permits charging for staff time.

- Extended disagreement, principally between Matt Christian and Ben Lipman, over whether background/explanatory sections addressing NRS Chapter 289 review-board policy and presentation summaries were being drafted and edited neutrally, including a disputed hypothetical posed by Matt Christian concerning body-camera footage of a child involved in a reported abuse matter, to which Ben Lipman objected.

- Discussion of whether the statute's primary deficiency, from the government caucus's perspective, is a lack of clarity (as opposed to the burden of compliance itself), including reference to survey data indicating 84 of 92 responding entities involve attorneys in records-request handling; Ben Lipman responded that the statute already directs that genuine ambiguity be resolved in favor of disclosure.

- Discussion of the Appendix C exemptions chart (Section 3.1), including a proposal to reduce it to NRS citations and chapter headings only, removing the AI-generated description column; no consensus was reached on including any version of the chart, with Colleen McCarty and Ben Lipman stating they would not support including AI-generated content even with a disclaimer. No Transparency Member volunteered when asked to conduct a citation check and proposed revisions to the exemptions chart prepared by Government Members.

(Recess for lunch and to allow Matt Christian to complete a previously scheduled mediation, approximately 11:11 a.m.; meeting resumed at approximately 12:36 p.m.)

Report Structure — Motions and Votes

Following resumption, the Task Force took up the unresolved question of whether to submit the final report as a single consolidated document, as two fully separate caucus reports, or as a hybrid structure. Three motions were made:

> ***MOTION 1**: Colleen McCarty moved that the government members and transparency members each prepare and submit entirely separate reports to the legislature.*
>
> *SECOND: Brittany Walker (for purposes of discussion).*
>
> *DISCUSSION: Matt Morris questioned whether AB128 contemplates more than one report. Brittany Walker noted the current draft is already substantively divided section-by-section between the two caucuses. Mitch Fox urged continued work toward consensus items before concluding no further joint work was possible.*
>
> *VOTE: Failed (more members opposed than in favor, including the Chair).*
>
> ***MOTION 2**: Ben Lipman moved to retain the existing draft structure — a single report with a shared introductory/consensus portion followed by separately labeled government and transparency sections throughout.*
>
> *SECOND: Mitch Fox.*
>
> *DISCUSSION: Matt Christian stated the motion did not reflect the Task Force's earlier agreement to vote section-by-section on individual findings and recommendations and indicated a*

> *preference for two clearly separate reports if no such votes would occur. Leslie Nino Piro noted that, under AB128 Section 7, a majority of members present may take official Task Force action and expressed concern that no individual recommendation had yet been put to a vote.*
>
> *VOTE: 5 in favor, 5 opposed. Motion failed on a tie.*
>
> ***MOTION 3**: Kalie Work moved, as restated by Ben Lipman, that the Task Force submit one report consisting of pages 1 through approximately 14 of the October 16, 2026 draft (the overview sections and areas of conceptual agreement between the caucuses), to be finalized and voted on at the next meeting, with two separately attached reports — one containing the transparency caucus's findings, evaluations, and recommendations, and one containing the government caucus's — covering Section 3 onward.*
>
> *SECOND: Ben Lipman.*
>
> *DISCUSSION: Members discussed whether a vote under this structure would still be required on the accuracy of each caucus's separately attached section; it was clarified that the motion addressed report structure only, not approval of either caucus's substantive content. Brittany Walker and Leslie Nino Piro reiterated a preference for the report to also reflect up-or-down votes on individual recommendations.*
>
> *VOTE: Passed (three members opposed).*

The Task Force will finalize and vote on pages 1 through approximately 14–15 of the October 16 draft at its next meeting; from Section 3 onward, the government and transparency caucuses will each prepare separate content for attachment to the report.

Future Meeting Scheduling

Following discussion of member availability (including Matt Morris's travel schedule and confirmation of Mitch Fox's and Matt Christian's availability, received before adjournment), the Task Force confirmed its next meeting for:

- November 10, 2026, 1:00 p.m. — anticipated to be the Task Force's final meeting, at which it intends to finalize and vote on the consensus/overview portion of the report (pages 1–14/15), with each caucus's separate findings and recommendations sections to be completed and attached in the interim.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT (CLOSING)

Kathleen Light (telephonic) again addressed the Task Force, characterizing the government-entity survey as methodologically biased given that government employees both designed and substantially populated it, and questioning the scheduling of the Task Force's final vote relative to the general election. She renewed extensive personal allegations against a former Deputy Insurance Commissioner and other individuals, and referenced the personal impact of her situation, including a reference to her own mental health. No other public comment was offered.

These remarks reflect one commenter's unverified personal allegations and references to sensitive personal matters; they were not addressed substantively by the Task Force on the record and are noted here for completeness of the public comment record only.

6. ADJOURNMENT

> *MOTION: To adjourn.*
> *SECOND: Given.*
> *VOTE: Unanimous in favor. Motion carried.*

Chair Hicks thanked members and the public for their participation. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:34 p.m. The next meeting was confirmed for November 10, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. (anticipated final meeting).

Note: These minutes were prepared from the meeting's auto-generated video transcript, available at YouTube: 10/19/2026 - Public Records Task Force Meeting, and confirmed by Task Force members, to summarize official Task Force action (motions, seconds, and votes) and the substance of discussion.