STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

APPENDIX A

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: February 26, 2026, 1:30 PM

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

This meeting may be viewed on Zoom: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83239132514

Meeting ID: 832 3913 2514

Call In Audio:

One tap mobile

+16699006833,,83239132514# US (San Jose)

+17193594580,,83239132514# US

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person or in writing on matters on the agenda at this time. Comment is not available by Zoom or telephone. In person comments will be limited to three minutes. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under a public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.

3. **Election of Chair and Vice Chair** **(For possible action)**

4. Consideration of Task Force Webpage hosted by the Office of the Attorney General **(For possible action)**

5. Consideration of Topics for Next Meeting's Agenda and Related Issues **(For discussion and possible action)**

6. Public Comment

Members of the public may comment in person or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. Comment is not available by Zoom or telephone. In person comments will be limited to three minutes. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

7. Adjournment **(For possible action)**

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force will limit public comments to three minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, up to three business days before the meeting date, in addition to testifying, or in lieu of testifying. Written comments are limited to two pages. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-3420 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-3420 or by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov, as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. City Hall, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, Nevada 89005
2. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
3. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov

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 Washe 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

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: April 27, 2026, 9:00 AM

Location: Washoe County Chambers
1001 E. 9th Street
Reno, Nevada 89512

This meeting may be viewed on

https://washoecounty-gov.zoom.us/j/92931509474

Phone one-tap:

+16699006833,,92931509474# US (San Jose)

+17193594580,,92931509474# US

Join via audio:

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Webinar ID: 929 3150 9474

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on matters on the agenda at this time. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under a public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.

3. **Approval of February 26, 2026 Meeting Minutes** **(For possible action)**

4. **Election of Chair and Vice Chair** **(For discussion and possible action)**

5. **Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a)** **(For discussion and possible action)**

   Warren Hardy, Warren Hardy Strategies, on behalf of the Urban Consortium

6. **Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a)** **(For discussion and possible action)**

   Pat Cabrera, Chief Deputy City Clerk City of Las Vegas, on behalf of the Nevada Municipal Clerk's Association

7. **Consideration of Presentation Request by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs at the June 4, 2026 Meeting** **(For discussion and possible action)**

8. **Select Remaining Task Force Meeting Dates and Locations** **(For discussion and possible action)**

9. **Structure of Meetings, Procedure for Public Comment, Topics for Discussion, and Presenters for Future Agendas** **(For discussion and possible action)**

10. **Structure of Decisions and Actions** **(For discussion and possible action)**

11. **Structure of Report to Legislature, Including Drafting, Editing, Deadlines, and Approval** **(For discussion and possible action)**

12. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

13. **Adjournment** **(For possible action)**

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force may place reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, before the meeting date, in addition to testifying, or in lieu of testifying. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Meeting agendas and materials are available for download at the Public Records Task Force meeting page of the Attorney General's website:
https://ag.nv.gov/Hot_Topics/Public_Records_Task_Force_Information_Page/

Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify washoe311@washoecounty.gov as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
2. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov
3. Washoe County Administrative Building, 1001 E. 9th Street, Reno, Nevada 89512

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date and Time: April 27, 2026 – 9:00 AM
Hybrid Meeting (In-Person and Zoom)

Physical Location: Washoe County Chambers
1001 E 9th Street
Reno, NV 89512

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM. Attendance was taken.

In-Person Members Present:
- Josh Hicks
- Kalie Work

Virtual Members Present:
- Ben Lipman
- Brittany Walker
- Colleen McCarty
- Leslie Nino Piro
- Mitch Fox
- Matt Christian
- Staci Lindberg

Absent Members:
- Matt Morris

A quorum was established.

2. Public Comment (First Period)

No in-person public comment was received.
No virtual public comment was received.
Written public comment was received from Jeff Church, Washoe County School District, and Oscar Williams. Written comments are attached to these minutes.

3. Approval of February 26, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Motion passed unanimously.

4. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Kalie Work explained that the elected Chair and Vice Chair from the first meeting needed to step down and a new vote needed to be taken. Pursuant to AB 128, the Chair must be selected from the transparency advocates; the Vice Chair from the government representatives.

Nomination and Election of Chair:

- Josh Hicks was nominated.
- No other nominations.
- Motion passed unanimously.

Nomination and Election of Vice Chair:

- Kalie Work was nominated.
- No other nominations.
- Motion passed unanimously.

5. Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a)

- Warren Hardy presented on behalf of the Urban Consortium. Topics included transparency and privacy, ambiguity in current legislation creates inconsistent decisions, need for a dispute resolution process outside of litigation, commercial requests and monetization, and risks associated with AI.

6. Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a)

- Pat Cabrera presented on behalf of the Nevada Municipal Clerk's Association. Topics included burden of redaction, impacts of broad requests, sensitive information risk, vexatious requestors, fee structure challenges and payment gaps, governance opportunities and recommended actions.

7. Consideration of Presentation Request by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs at the June 4, 2026 Meeting

The committee discussed the request by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs to present on the work of the task force to-date. Discussion raised a proposal to provide a written status report to the joint committee in advance of the June 4, 2026 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Select Remaining Task Force Meeting Dates and Locations

Discussion identified tentative dates and locations for future meetings.

- June 8, 2026 at 9:00 AM at Metro in Las Vegas
- August 5 or 6, 2026 at 9:00 AM at the Legislative Counsel Bureau in Las Vegas with a hearing room in Carson City
- September 9 or 10, 2026 at 9:00 AM at Ballard Spahr in Las Vegas

9. Structure of Meetings, Procedure for Public Comment, Topics for Discussion, and Presenters for Future Agendas

The task force discussed keeping the current meeting structure and public comment structure in place.

Discussion of Future Presentations:

- Law Enforcement
- NDOT
- County Clerks
- Broadcasters
- Press

Additional discussion included:

- There was a request to add a standing item to future agendas for open discussion about AB 128 Sec. 7.2. Matter to be added to future agendas.
- Colleen McCarty made a proposal to advance the final report if it includes a majority vote within each voting group (at least three transparency advocates and three government advocates) rather than a simple majority vote. Motion failed 3-5.

10. Structure of Decisions and Actions

- No additional information was discussed on this item.

11. Structure of Report to Legislature, Including Drafting, Editing, Deadlines, and Approval

Discussion about how the task force will remain structured and organized.

- Kalie Work offered to create a draft report template for the next meeting as framework to keep the members on task.

12. Public Comment (Second Period)

No-in person public comment received.
Christian Salmon provided virtual public comment.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 AM.

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: June 8, 2026, 9:00AM

Location: Clark County Commissioners Chambers
500 S Grand Central Pkwy
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

This meeting may be viewed on Zoom:

Join Zoom Meeting

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82048718765?pwd=5VgHHQOCfOGbJ1RGxIg8xKFLZBfwab.1

Meeting ID: 820 4871 8765
Passcode: 247777

Caller Controls
***6** - Toggle mute/unmute
***9** - Raise/Lower hand

Call In Audio:
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
Find your local number:
https://us06web.zoom.us/u/kcTCBAYiqR

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter

raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

3. **Approval of April 27, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

4. **Review Draft Report Template** (for discussion and possible action)

5. **Presentation Addressing Transparency Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Glen Cook, Las Vegas Review Journal**

6. **Presentation Addressing Transparency Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Bob Conrad, This is Reno**

7. **Presentation Addressing Transparency Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Luke Busby, Nevada Attorney**

8. **Presentation Addressing Transparency Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Dr. Sondra Cosgrove, Vote Nevada and Dave Maass, Electronic Frontier Foundation**

9. **Presentation under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) Regarding the Nature of Government Transparency, Records Involving Pending Prosecution Cases, and Records Involving Private (Non-Government) Individuals, Including but not Limited to Victims of Crime, and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's**

Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9 (for discussion and possible action)

- **Lindsay Liddell, Washoe County District Attorney's Office**

10. Evaluations and Recommendations Under AB 128, Section 7.2(a-b) (for discussion and possible action)

11. Consideration of Presentation Request by the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs at the July 9, 2026 Meeting (for discussion and possible action)

12. Consideration of Topics and Next Meeting Dates and Related Issues (for discussion and possible action)

13. Public Comment Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

14. Adjournment (for possible action)

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force will limit public comments to three minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. Written comments are limited to two pages. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Meeting agendas and materials are available for download at the Public Records Task Force meeting page of the Attorney General's website: https://ag.nv.gov/Hot_Topics/Public_Records_Task_Force/. Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify Matt Christian at (702) 828-3310 or by email at m16091c@lvmpd.com, as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
2. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov
3. Clark County Commissioners Chambers 500 S Grand Central Pkwy, Las Vegas, NV 89155

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date and Time: June 8, 2026 – 9:00 AM
Hybrid Meeting (In-Person and Zoom)

Physical Location: Clark County Government Center
Clark County Commission Chambers
500 S. Grand Central Pkwy.
Las Vegas, NV 89155

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM. Attendance was taken.

In-Person Members Present:

- Chair Josh Hicks
- Ben Lipman
- Brittany Walker
- Colleen McCarty
- Vice Chair Kalie Work
- Leslie Nino Piro
- Mitch Fox
- Matt Morris
- Matt Christian

Absent Members:

- Staci Lindberg

A quorum was established.

2. Public Comment (First Period)

Public comment was received from Kathleen Light, Jeff Church, Drew Rebar, and Oscar Williams. Comments addressed public records access, delays and litigation costs, dispute-resolution options, government accountability, and protection of personally identifiable information. No further public comment was received

3. Approval of April 27, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Motion passed unanimously.

4. Draft Report Template

The Task Force discussed the draft report template prepared by Kalie Work. Discussion of the template was deferred until after the scheduled presentations to be considered with the Task Force's AB 128 evaluations and recommendations.

5. Presentation by Glenn Cook, Las Vegas Review-Journal

Glenn Cook presented on the Nevada Public Records Act and public access to government records. Topics included the presumption of access, recurring barriers to access, investigative journalism examples, and recommendations to strengthen access and penalties for noncompliance.

6. Presentation by Bob Conrad, This Is Reno / Nevada Press Association

Bob Conrad presented on public records disputes and agency compliance. Topics included delays, missed deadlines, staff-time charges, broad denials, and agency obligations to assist requesters.

7. Presentation by Luke Busby, Nevada Attorney

Luke Busby presented from the perspective of a practitioner who litigates public records issues. Topics included agency compliance, misrepresentation and misapplication of legal authority, substantive review within five business days, written explanations for denials, redaction, expedited judicial review, and body-camera redaction fees.

8. Presentation by Dave Maass and Jesse Cabrera, Electronic Frontier Foundation and University of Nevada, Reno – Reynolds School of Journalism

Dave Maass and Jesse Cabrera presented on EFF's and UNR's public records education program with the Reynolds School of Journalism. Topics included student public records requests, agency responses, denials and fees, and addressing privacy through good-faith redaction and dialogue.

9. Presentation by Lindsay Liddell, Washoe County District Attorney's Office

Lindsay Liddell presented on transparency, privacy, and constitutional concerns under the Nevada Public Records Act. Topics included Marsy's Law, privacy

interests in the home, law-enforcement records, notice before release of sensitive records, and active prosecutions.

10. Break and Resumption of Meeting

The Task Force took a short break. After the break, Chair Hicks reconvened the meeting.

11. Draft Report Template and AB 128 Recommendations

The Task Force agreed to defer substantive discussion of the draft report template and AB 128 recommendations due to time constraints. The items will be addressed at a future meeting.

12. Presentation Request from the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs

The Task Force discussed providing a status update to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs. Kalie Work and Ben Lipman volunteered to present, and Matt Morris offered to assist with a written summary if needed. No formal motion was taken.

13. Future Meeting Topics and Scheduling

The Task Force discussed minutes preparation, a possible central repository for meeting recordings, a July meeting for substantive discussion, the August 5 meeting, future presenters, and additional meetings in September or October.

14. Public Comment (Second Period)

Public comment was received from Kathleen Light, Jeff Church, Drew Rebar, Christian Salmon, and Gary Schmidt. Comments addressed the human impact of public records disputes, dispute-resolution options, access to records as a fundamental right, website availability of meeting materials and recordings, and accountability in public records litigation. No further public comment was received.

15. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 p.m.

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: July 22, 2026, 1:00 p.m.

Las Vegas Location:
Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms
7120 Amigo Street, Room 5
Las Vegas, Nevada 891119

Carson City Location:
Legislative Building
401 South Carson Street, Room 4100
Carson City, Nevada 89701

This meeting may be viewed on Zoom:

https://lcb-state-nv-us.zoom.us/j/86006729009

Meeting ID: 860 0672 9009

Call In Audio: 888-475-4499

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

3. **Approval of June 8, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

4. **Discuss the Presentation to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs on July 9, 2026** (for discussion and possible action)

5. **Review Draft Report Template** (for discussion and possible action)

6. Evaluations and Recommendations Under AB 128, Section 7.2(a-b) (for discussion and possible action)

7. Consideration of Topics and Next Meeting Dates and Related Issues (for discussion and possible action)

8. Public Comment Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

9. Adjournment (for possible action)

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force will limit public comments to three minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. Written comments are limited to two pages. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Meeting agendas and materials are available for download at the Public Records Task Force meeting page of the Attorney General's website: https://ag.nv.gov/Hot_Topics/Public_Records_Task_Force/. Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov, as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
2. Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
3. Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701
4. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov and https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/Calendar/A/

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Date:	July 22, 2026
Time:	1:00 p.m. (hard stop at 4:30 p.m. per LCB)
Locations:	Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Buildings — hearing rooms in Carson City and Las Vegas (video-conferenced), with remote/telephonic public participation via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ben Lipman, Britney Walker, Colleen McCarty, Kalie Work, Leslie Nino Piro, Mitch Fox, Matt Morris, Matt Christian, Staci Lindberg, and Chair Josh Hicks. A quorum was present.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Hicks called the meeting of the State of Nevada Public Records Task Force to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. on July 22, 2026. Roll was called; all members indicated their presence as noted above.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT (OPENING)

The Chair opened public comment, first in Carson City, then Las Vegas, then telephonically/online. No public comment was offered in person in Carson City or Las Vegas.

- Kathleen Light (telephonic) addressed the Task Force regarding a prior public records request related to her allegations of sexual assault by a former state employee.

The Chair noted that written public comment received through the day before the meeting had been distributed to all Task Force members.

3. APPROVAL OF JUNE 8, 2026 MEETING MINUTES

No revisions were proposed.

> *MOTION: Matt Morris moved to approve the June 8, 2026 meeting minutes. SECOND: Mitch Fox. VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.*

4. UPDATE ON JULY 9, 2026 PRESENTATION TO THE JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Ben Lipman and Kalie Work reported on their July 9, 2026 presentation to the Legislature's joint interim standing committee on government affairs.

- The presentation summarized the Task Force's work to date, consistent with previously circulated written materials.
- Committee questions focused on whether the Task Force has sufficient time and what it expects to accomplish; members responded that the Task Force's charge is ambitious and that a final report is due by the end of October 2026.
- No interim status report to the joint committee is required before the final report.
- An Assembly member expressed interest in the Task Force incorporating best practices from other states, potentially as a report appendix.

5. REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT TEMPLATE

Colleen McCarty distributed a copy of suggested revisions and additions to the draft report template submitted by transparency-advocate members, both by email and in hard copy, and confirmed the document was made available to members of the public present. The Task Force proceeded through the template by section. No formal votes were taken on report content; the discussion below reflects positions and assignments discussed. This remains a working draft subject to further revision.

3.1 — Exemptions Review

- Discussion of whether to review the roughly 597 statutory references to confidentiality/exemptions to identify any that are outdated, redundant, or should be added, without redrafting substantive law.
- Ben Lipman, Matt Christian, and Leslie Nino Piro each reported having, or offered to compile, spreadsheets cataloging exemption statutes; they will informally compare/share these before the next meeting (not as a formally appointed subcommittee).
- Members noted the difficulty of being fully exhaustive given the volume of statutes and cross-references.

3.2 — Policies Relating to Review Boards

- Matt Christian will arrange for a representative of the Las Vegas Police Protective Association to present to the Task Force in August regarding review-board statutes and related pending litigation, primarily applicable to Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

3.3 — Impact of Broad Public Records Requests

- Extended discussion of a proposed addition to "identify the value" of records requests within this section. Government-entity members generally viewed this section as limited to evaluating the impact of broad requests on agencies, with any "value" discussion more appropriately placed in the report's overview or recommendations sections.

Transparency-advocate members maintained that the value of broad/bulk requests should be addressed alongside any discussion of their burdens.

- Leslie Nino Piro and Kalie Work proposed that the Task Force first develop a working definition of "broad public records request," noting the term is being used inconsistently (e.g., to describe both large/complex requests and discrete bulk-data requests).
- No resolution was reached; the discussion will continue at a future meeting.

3.4 — Cost, Burden, and Time Constraints for Redaction

- Members discussed the relationship between broad requests, redaction burden, and commercial use of records (e.g., body-worn camera footage requested for entertainment purposes).
- Proposed solutions discussed a standardized front-end mechanism/resource to help requesters narrow requests before submission; and a designated point of contact at agencies for requesters.
- Leslie Nino Piro will solicit cost and staff-hours information from state agencies to include as examples in the report.
- Members discussed redaction technology currently in use (e.g., frame-by-frame body-worn camera review, Adobe-based document redaction, exploratory use of AI) and its costs; Matt Christian and Leslie Nino Piro noted interest in surveying agencies statewide on tools and associated costs as a basis for a possible funding recommendation.
- Members noted that locating responsive records across multiple databases (not only redacting them) is itself a significant cost driver.

3.5 — Financial Burden / Fee Structures

- Assignments: Colleen McCarty will compile fee schedules from local governments/municipalities (Southern Nevada); Leslie Nino Piro will compile fee schedules from state agencies. Staci Lindberg offered to provide Lyon County's departmental fee schedule.
- Matt Christian described Metropolitan Police Department's published fee schedule, including a body-worn-camera review/redaction rate of $89/hour reflecting the actual cost of the commissioned personnel assigned to that task, and offered to explain Metro's legal basis for its fees if the department is cited as an example in the report.
- Members noted NRS requires agencies to publish fee schedules following approval at an open meeting.

3.6 — Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

- Colleen McCarty reported ongoing engagement with the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press to research dispute-resolution models (including ombudsperson models) used in other states, with a report expected at the September meeting.
- Members discussed the current litigation process (petition for writ of mandamus) under NRS Chapter 239, including its relative speed when expedited (cited example: resolved in approximately 40 days) versus the cost barrier posed by district court filing fees

(approximately $400+) for individual requesters, noting fee waivers are available for indigent filers.

- Proposals discussed included a pre-litigation mediation or administrative-review step (e.g., an independent, non-agency-employee hearing officer), whether as an optional or required step; no consensus was reached on whether such a step should be mandatory.
- Members also discussed a front-end resource/point of contact to help requesters craft requests before submission, potentially reducing the volume of disputes reaching litigation.

3.7 — Data Collection and Sharing Methods

- No comments or proposed revisions at this time; to be developed further.

4.1 — Clarification of Custodianship and Control

- Members discussed ambiguity in NRS Chapter 239 regarding "legal custody and control" of records, including circumstances where an agency possesses another entity's records or third-party materials (e.g., voluntarily provided surveillance footage), without a statutory definition of "public record."
- General agreement that this area of law would benefit from legislative clarification, though members did not agree on what the substantive rule should be.

4.2 — Protection of Sensitive Information and Transparency

- Extensive discussion of the personal privacy balancing test ("*CCSD* balancing test"). Positions included:
  - Concern (Ben Lipman) that the balancing test is frequently overused by agencies absent a genuine, legislature-recognized privacy interest, and that clarification of the applicable standard would be beneficial.
  - Support (Matt Christian) for developing a reference list of common record categories with clear confidentiality determinations, while retaining the balancing test as a fail-safe for records not otherwise categorized.
  - Concern (Colleen McCarty) that categorical lists may not account for context-dependent situations where disclosure serves an important public interest.
  - Concerns raised (Leslie Nino Piro, Kalie Work) regarding bulk/AI-driven data-aggregator requests, the potential chilling effect of disclosure on victims/witnesses, and agency liability exposure.
  - Discussion of statutory inconsistency between newly protected categories (e.g., nonprofit donor identity) and other information that remains fully public (e.g., certain property records).
  - Discussion (Staci Lindberg, Matt Christian) distinguishing records reflecting government/official conduct (appropriately public) from records primarily reflecting private individual conduct with limited public-accountability value, referencing Ninth Circuit case law (*Houston v. Maricopa County*) regarding constitutional limits on using government records that may be used for punitive/shaming purposes.

    - Countervailing view (Ben Lipman, Colleen McCarty) that expanded public disclosure and media coverage of sexual assault cases over recent decades has coincided with increased, not decreased, reporting by victims.
- Matt Morris raised NRS 239.012 (immunity for good-faith disclosure/non-disclosure decisions) as an area warranting clarification, noting it has not been judicially tested. Leslie Nino Piro noted the statute's ambiguity as to entity-level (not solely individual) liability and related financial exposure.
- Leslie Nino Piro identified two additional factors she considers in privacy-balancing analysis: potential chilling effect on future reporting by victims/witnesses, and potential for disclosed information to be used to facilitate retaliation.

4.3 — Criteria for Granting or Denying Access

- Members noted this topic had substantially been addressed through the preceding discussion; no additional comments at this time.

4.4 — Penalties for Delayed or Incomplete Responses

- Leslie Nino Piro proposed prioritizing training/certification requirements for records custodians over monetary penalties, noting that monetary penalties are ultimately funded by taxpayers.
- Matt Christian noted existing statutory penalties (including fee-shifting for unsuccessful agency defense) are already significant.
- Extended discussion regarding whether the five-business-day statutory response deadline remains realistic given the substantial increase in the volume and complexity of government-held data (email, body-worn camera footage, multiple databases) since the deadline was established, without reaching resolution. Members generally agreed that improved technology and staffing, supported by legislative funding recommendations, would help address underlying delay.

4.5 — Criminal Investigations

- Britney Walker noted this section heading had been inadvertently struck from the template and requested it be restored, as it is specifically identified in AB128.

Proposed Additional Sections (4.8–5.2)

- Matt Christian expressed a preference for maintaining the report's structure consistent with AB128's enumerated topics rather than adding new numbered sections, while noting related concepts could be incorporated within existing sections.
- Members discussed proactive online publication of public records and meeting minutes (Sections 5.1–5.2) as a means of reducing the need for individual records requests; general support was expressed for including this concept in the report.

6. SUBCOMMITTEES / INTERIM WORK

The Task Force determined that formally appointed subcommittees would trigger Open Meeting Law obligations and, given the limited time before the next meeting, declined to appoint formal subcommittees. Individual members were encouraged to independently

prepare proposed recommendations, and where practicable, proposed statutory language for the Legislature's consideration, for discussion at the next meeting. The Task Force clarified that its charge is to produce a report, not to draft legislation.

7. NEXT MEETING(S)

- **August 5, 2026, 9:00 a.m.** — LCB Building (Carson City / Las Vegas hybrid, same format as today's meeting). Agenda will substantially mirror today's, with possible presentations (Las Vegas Police Protective Association; potentially State Bar of Public Lawyers, Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, and Nevada Department of Transportation). Colleen McCarty will prepare the agenda.
- **September 10, 2026, 9:00 a.m.** (placeholder) — Location to be confirmed: LCB Building if available, or Ballard Spahr's Las Vegas office as a fallback, with a Northern Nevada location to be determined. Scheduling conflicts were noted for several members; availability will be revisited at the August 5, 2026 meeting.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT (CLOSING)

- Tyson Faulk (Carson City, in person) raised concerns regarding: the absence of any limit on repeated extensions of an agency's self-determined "reasonable" response date beyond the five-day statutory deadline; the Attorney General's Office's dual role as counsel to other state agencies while also directing requesters to those agencies for certain records; the lack of attorney-fee recovery for self-represented requesters who must litigate to obtain records; and the need for a clearer definition of "overly broad" requests, including whether pending or contemplated litigation should factor into that analysis.
- Jeff Church (telephonic) urged the Task Force to recommend an ombudsman or independent hearing-officer mechanism, citing reported delays of 18–24 months in some records disputes; objected to characterizing news-media requesters as "commercial" for fee purposes; renewed a request for comparative research on other states' approaches; reported a recurring nonfunctioning telephonic public-comment line; and described an unresolved multi-week request to Washoe County for a routine interagency contract.
- Kathleen Light (telephonic) provided further comment continuing from her earlier public comment, describing personal circumstances related to a prior public records request and a pending legal matter.

9. ADJOURNMENT

> *MOTION: Ben Lipman moved to adjourn. SECOND: Colleen McCarty. VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.*

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared from the meeting's auto-generated video transcript, available at https://www.youtube.com/live/xE8tOEp52Sc?si=L6yFD63DipMkTJ_u. The source captions were auto-generated

and, per the posting agency, "not an official representation of what is being spoken"; speaker attributions and quotations herein should be verified against the official record before adoption.

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: August 5, 2026, 9:00 a.m.

Las Vegas Location:
Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms
7120 Amigo Street, Room 5
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Carson City Location:
Legislative Building
401 South Carson Street, Room 2149
Carson City, Nevada 89701

This meeting may be viewed on YouTube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c2yUeRVbN9E

Meeting ID: 817 6049 6618

Call In Audio: 888-475-4499

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

3. **Approval of the Agenda**

4. **Approval of July 22, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

5. **Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible**

Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9 (for discussion and possible action)

- **John Abel, Las Vegas Police Protective Association**

6. **Presentation Addressing Transparency Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Gunita Singh, Reporter's Committee for Freedom of the Press**

7. **Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Sarah Bradley, State Bar Public Lawyers**

8. **Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Heather Hahn, Nevada Department of Transportation**

9. **Discussion regarding public records requests to Northern Nevada Law Enforcement** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Colleen McCarty, Task Force Member**

10. **Discussion of public records fee schedules for various Nevada government entities** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Colleen McCarty, Task Force Member**

11. **Evaluations and Recommendations Under AB 128, Section 7.2(a-b) to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)

12. Consideration of Topics and Next Meeting Dates and Related Issues (for discussion and possible action)

13. Public Comment Members of the public may comment in person, on the Zoom webinar, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

14. Adjournment (for possible action)

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force will limit public comments to three minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. Written comments are limited to two pages. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Meeting agendas and materials are available for download at the Public Records Task Force meeting page of the Attorney General's website: https://ag.nv.gov/Hot_Topics/Public_Records_Task_Force/. Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov, as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
2. Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
3. Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701
4. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov and https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/Calendar/A/

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Date:	August 5, 2026
Time:	9:00 A.M.
Locations:	Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Buildings — hearing rooms in Carson City and Las Vegas (video-conferenced), with public viewing on YouTube and in person and telephonic public participation

MEMBERS PRESENT

Present: Josh Hicks, Ben Lipman, Brittany Walker, Colleen McCarty, Kalie Work, Leslie Nino Piro, Mitch Fox, Matt Christian, Matthew Morris, Staci Lindberg

A quorum was established.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Hicks called the meeting of the State of Nevada Public Records Task Force to order at approximately 9:00 a.m. on August 5, 2026. Roll was called; all members indicated their presence as noted above.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT (OPENING)

Chair Hicks opened public comment, first in Carson City, then Las Vegas, then telephonically/online.

- Amanda Lyons explained possible loopholes and potential exploitable provisions in Nevada's public records laws, including inconsistent or vague wording.
- Kathleen Light expressed concern with delayed responses to public records requests, and incomplete, incorrect, and unrelated documents provided after a lengthy wait.
- Kevin Lyons suggested legislative changes from other states' public records law, including a five-day requirement to complete a search, and an attestation to what was searched.
- William John Connors expressed concern regarding the food quality, understaffing, and drug problems in the Ely State Prison.
- John Quintero expressed support of mediation prior to going to court.

Chair Hicks noted that written public comment received before the meeting had been distributed to all Task Force members.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A request was received for items 9 and 10 to be postponed to a future agenda. Matt Christian mentioned the presenter for item 5 may not be present due to a metro officer killed in the line of duty in Las Vegas.

> *MOTION: Colleen McCarty moved to approve the agenda. SECOND: Kalie Work. VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.*

4. APPROVAL OF JULY 22, 2026 MEETING MINUTES

No revisions were proposed.

> *MOTION: Matt Christian moved to approve the minutes. SECOND: Kalie Work. VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.*

5. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: PRESENTATION ADDRESSING GOVERNMENT ENTITIES' CONSIDERATIONS UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.2(A) AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INCORPORATE PRESENTATION, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, INTO THE TASK FORCE'S WRITTEN REPORT UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.9

John Abel, of the Las Vegas Police Protective Division, was unable to attend.

This item will be moved to a future agenda.

6. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: PRESENTATION ADDRESSING TRANSPARENCY ENTITIES' CONSIDERATIONS UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.2(A) AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INCORPORATE PRESENTATION, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, INTO THE TASK FORCE'S WRITTEN REPORT UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.9

Gunita Singh, Staff Attorney of Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, gave a presentation on the Nevada Public Records Act with topics including Strengths and Opportunities, along with suggestions including Administrative Review, and Body Worn Camera Footage.

Ms. Singh was available for questions and had discussion with the Board.
The Board recessed at 9:53 a.m. and reconvened at 10:09 a.m.

No action was taken.

7. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: PRESENTATION ADDRESSING GOVERNMENT ENTITIES' CONSIDERATIONS UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.2(A) AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INCORPORATE PRESENTATION, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, INTO THE TASK FORCE'S WRITTEN REPORT UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.9

Sarah Bradley, Chair of the State Bar Public Lawyers, made suggestions regarding personnel records and confidentiality. Suggestions and topics included adding explicit confidentiality provisions that recognize some of the common law privileges, consistency with confidentiality of personnel records, and workplace investigations a specific definition for personal identifying information, exceptions in NRS Chapter 239 and costs, third-party companies for large tasks, cost barriers to requesters, and funding for training and updating manuals.

Ms. Bradley was available for questions and had discussion with the Board.

No action was taken.

8. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: PRESENTATION ADDRESSING GOVERNMENT ENTITIES' CONSIDERATIONS UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.2(A) AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO INCORPORATE PRESENTATION, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, INTO THE TASK FORCE'S WRITTEN REPORT UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.9

Heather Hahn, Records Manager for the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), gave a presentation on A Practitioner's Perspective on Evaluation Element Criteria for NDOT public records requests.

Ms. Hahn was available for questions and had discussion with the Board.

No action was taken.

9. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION REGARDING PUBLIC RECORDS REQUESTS TO NORTHERN NEVADA LAW ENFORCEMENT

This item will be moved to a future agenda.

10. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULES FOR VARIOUS NEVADA GOVERNMENT ENTITIES

This item will be moved to a future agenda.

11. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: EVALUATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.2(A-B) TO INCORPORATE PRESENTATION, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, INTO THE TASK FORCE'S WRITTEN REPORT UNDER AB 128, SECTION 7.9

The Board discussed potential topics and related issues to narrow down and identify issues and recommendations.

Discussion was held and feedback given on the impact of broad records requests.

The Board recessed at 12:19 p.m. and reconvened at 1:18 p.m.

Discussion was postponed regarding exemptions to NRS Chapter 239 and a potential standardized fee schedule.

Discussion was held and feedback provided on multiple topics including: financial burden on a person that requests a record, alternative dispute resolution, statewide ombudsman, the methods for collecting and sharing data, data compilation, and a technology committee.

12. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULES FOR VARIOUS NEVADA GOVERNMENT ENTITIES

The Board discussed potential meeting dates in September, and September 29, 2026, was determined to be the best date, with a tentative follow-up meeting date of October 19, 2026.

Presentations for items 5, 9, and 10 will be scheduled for September 29, 2026, along with a presentation by ACLU.

13. PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice-Chair Works asked for public comment.

Kathleen Light expressed concerns about unclear and obfuscated records, and support of her suggestion for a public ombudsman.

14. ADJOURNMENT

> *MOTION: Leslie Nino Piro moved to adjourn. SECOND: Brittany Walker. VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.*

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:51 p.m.

Minutes prepared from the meeting's auto-generated video transcript, available at https://www.youtube.com/live/xE8tOEp52Sc?si=L6yFD63DipMkTJ_u. The source captions were auto-generated and, per the posting agency, "not an official representation of what is being spoken"; speaker attributions and quotations herein should be verified against the official record before adoption.

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: Tuesday, September 29, 2026, 9:00 a.m.

Las Vegas Location:
Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms
7120 Amigo Street, Room 3
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Carson City Location:
Legislative Building
401 South Carson Street, Room 2149
Carson City, Nevada 89701

This meeting may be viewed on YouTube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XV3srn480Zk

Meeting ID 849 2311 9576

Call In Audio: 888-475-4499

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the telephone, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

3. **Approval of August 25, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

4. **Presentation Addressing Government Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)

- **John Abel, Las Vegas Police Protective Association**

5. **Presentation Addressing Transparency Entities' Considerations under AB 128, Section 7.2(a) and Possible Action to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Athar Haseebullah, ACLU of Nevada**

6. **Discussion Regarding Public Records Requests to Northern Nevada Law Enforcement** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Colleen McCarty, Task Force Member**

7. **Discussion of Public Records Fee Schedules for Various Nevada Government Entities** (for discussion and possible action)
    - **Colleen McCarty, Task Force Member**

8. **Evaluations and Recommendations Under AB 128, Section 7.2(a-b) to Incorporate Presentation, or Portions thereof, into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)

9. **Consideration of Topics and Next Meeting Dates and Related Issues** (for discussion and possible action)

10. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the telephone, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

11. **Adjournment** (for possible action)

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force will limit public comments to three minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. Written

comments are limited to two pages. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Meeting agendas and materials are available for download at the Public Records Task Force meeting page of the Attorney General's website: https://ag.nv.gov/Hot_Topics/Public_Records_Task_Force/. Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov, as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
2. Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
3. Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701
4. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov and https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/Calendar/A/

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

Date:	September 29, 2026
Time:	9:13 a.m. – approx. 4:20–4:30 p.m.
Location:	Legislative Counsel Bureau — Carson City and Las Vegas (hybrid), with telephonic public comment

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ben Lipman, Brittany Walker, Colleen McCarty, Kalie Work (Vice Chair), Leslie Nino Piro, Mitch Fox, Matt Morris, Matt Christian, Staci Lindberg, and Josh Hicks (Chair). A quorum was present.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Hicks called the meeting to order at 9:13 a.m. Roll call was taken; all ten members were present (see above). The Chair noted the meeting's YouTube livestream was active.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT (OPENING)

Kathleen Light (Las Vegas, in person) addressed the Task Force regarding her unsuccessful public records lawsuit against the Attorney General's Office concerning records of the investigation into her sexual assault allegation against a former Deputy Insurance Commissioner, and concerns that responsive records may now be subject to destruction under standard retention schedules. She proposed codifying explicit record-preservation periods, including a rule tolling retention until all appeals are exhausted and an extended retention period for criminal matters tied to the statute of limitations, and submitted written comments with sample legislative language. No other public comment was offered.

3. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 5, 2026 MINUTES

The August 5, 2026 meeting minutes, previously distributed, were presented for approval.

> *MOTION: Matt Morris moved to approve the August 5, 2026 minutes.*
> *SECOND: Brittany Walker.*

> *DISCUSSION: None. The record was corrected to reflect approval of the August 5th minutes (not the 25th).*
> *VOTE: Unanimous in favor. Motion carried.*

4. PRESENTATION: JOHN ABEL, LAS VEGAS POLICE PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Abel, government affairs director for the LVPPA, the collective bargaining unit for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) officers below the rank of sergeant, presented in support of maintaining current confidentiality protections for law enforcement personnel records, including:

- NRS 289.025 (officer home address/photograph confidentiality), NRS 289.040 (exclusion of unsustained allegations from administrative files), and NRS 289.080, which the Nevada Supreme Court interpreted in a March 2026 ruling as rendering internal affairs investigative files confidential unless and until the agency recommends punitive action.
- The distinct threat model faced by peace officers and the risk that disclosure of personnel files could function as a "targeting package."
- Concerns that broader disclosure would chill internal reporting and peer-support use, cause reputational harm from unsustained complaints, and worsen recruitment and retention.

In response to a question from Chair Hicks, Mr. Abel stated that existing law adequately protects law enforcement personnel records, while acknowledging that some changes, such as addressing a citizen review board's posting of officer names online, could strengthen existing protections.

5. PRESENTATION: ACLU OF NEVADA

Athar Haseebullah (Executive Director) and Christopher Peterson (Legal Director), ACLU of Nevada, presented on barriers to records access, illustrated with three litigation examples:

- LVMPD/ICE cooperation records – encountered a broad "law enforcement privilege" and a novel "immigration privilege" claim asserting records held by a federal agency were privileged on that basis alone.
- Durango High School / Clark County School District –represented two students in litigation after a viral detention incident; the district invoked the juvenile justice information privilege (NRS Chapter 62H) to withhold records even from the subject students themselves. The district court did not agree the privilege applied. The matter settled for $1 million.
- DMV / Signal communications (pending litigation) –DMV's initial denial was later followed by a corrective affidavit (credited in part to the Office of the Attorney General) acknowledging use of the encrypted platform Signal for some communications.

The presenters recommended: (1) no record be withheld in its entirety, since even a heavily redacted record has evidentiary value in establishing scope; (2) clearer statutory definitions addressing encrypted-communications technology; and (3) a fully funded and staffed ombudsperson or inspector-general-style office with defined response timelines. On internal affairs records,

Mr. Peterson argued that key facts (e.g., the mere date of an investigation) should never be confidential, and that blanket withholding of entire investigative files—as opposed to redaction—raises more questions than it answers. On questioning by Leslie Nino Piro, Mr. Haseebullah expressed caution regarding a commercial-requester fee/waiver system, citing definitional difficulty (what counts as "commercial use," treatment of non-profits/trade associations/media and newer forms of journalism such as independent/social-media content creators), but indicated the ACLU of Nevada would not oppose exploring increased taxation of businesses as an alternative funding mechanism for public records compliance.

6. PRESENTATION: COLLEEN MCCARTY — COMPARATIVE RECORDS REQUEST TEST

Member Colleen McCarty described submitting an identical public records request (an internal staff/phone list, excluding personal contact information) to three northern Nevada law enforcement agencies in April 2026:

Agency	Time to Production	Result	Cited Legal Basis
Sparks PD	18 days (1 extension)	Produced phone directory, personnel list, HR report (all but assignments)	Non-trivial privacy interests; officer safety
Washoe County Sheriff's Office	96 days (3 extensions)	No responsive records found	N/A
Reno PD	75 days (multiple extensions)	Produced 16-page phone list; redacted personal cell/home numbers and assignments	Investigative technique; Officer's Bill of Rights; personal information

No agency met the five-business-day statutory benchmark, and extension-notice language was frequently identical across agencies. Ms. McCarty recommended amending the Nevada Public Records Act to require a substantive, individualized review within five days resulting in an actual determination, rather than an automated acknowledgment. Members Matt Christian and Brittany Walker noted mitigating factors, including multi-database recordkeeping and small-agency staffing constraints, as well as Nevada Supreme Court precedent establishing a privacy interest in undercover-officer unit assignments.

7. PRESENTATION: COLLEEN MCCARTY — PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULE RESEARCH

Member Colleen McCarty presented research on publicly posted fee schedules, finding wide inconsistency in what is charged and how much—body-camera processing rates ranged from a reported high of $89/hour (LVMPD) to roughly $30–$40/hour at other agencies, with some agencies

charging nothing. She noted that AI search tools are surfacing outdated fee information scraped from stale web pages. Member Matt Christian noted that NRS 239.052(3) already requires posting a fee schedule in a "conspicuous place" but that the statute's language should be updated to require online posting. Matt Morris noted the State Library, Archives and Public Records Division's existing rulemaking authority as a potential vehicle for achieving uniformity by regulation.

(Short recess, approximately 11:05–11:15 a.m.)

8. DRAFT FINAL REPORT — DISCUSSION

Brittany Walker, at the Chair's request, walked the Task Force through the government caucus's working draft final report, circulated and posted with the agenda. The draft was described as a group work product, incorporating Matt Morris's interim report to the Government Affairs Committee and Chair Hicks's original template. Colleen McCarty and Ben Lipman objected that the draft was circulated to the transparency caucus only the evening before the meeting. Leslie Nino Piro responded that the draft was timely produced under Open Meeting Law constraints and to comply with the statutory reporting deadline. Matt Morris proposed identifying a third "consensus/shared concerns" category in the final report alongside government- and transparency-specific positions, which was broadly supported.

Government-Entity Survey

Members discussed two separate survey—one sent to government entities and one to law-enforcement entities—to gather baseline data on records-request volume, staffing, and cost. Colleen McCarty and Ben Lipman raised concerns that the survey had not been presented to or reviewed by the transparency caucus in advance. After discussion of Open Meeting Law posting requirements, the Task Force agreed to circulate the survey questions to the full body and post them following the meeting, with results to be compiled and posted with the agenda for the October 19 meeting (survey responses due October 7).

Staff Time and Fee Charging

Extensive discussion addressed whether agencies should be permitted to charge for staff time. Matt Christian and Brittany Walker described burdensome/vexatious request patterns and the actual cost of staff time to taxpayers; Ben Lipman and Colleen McCarty maintained that staff time should never be chargeable, as it is already taxpayer-funded. Mitch Fox occupied a middle position favoring threshold-based fees for high-volume requests. Leslie Nino Piro proposed separating the uncontested standardized-fee-schedule framework (Section 4.6) from the separately contested staff-time provision so the body could vote on the former independently. Additionally, Leslie Nino Piro explained that her research found 44 states statutorily authorize some form of fee for staff time.

Ombudsperson / Advisory Council

Members expressed broad, notably bipartisan support for establishing an independent ombudsperson, dispute-resolution, and/or advisory-council office, referencing Oregon's Public Records Advocate (non-binding mediation, approximately 7-day average resolution time) and

Illinois's Public Access Counselor (binding-opinion authority, housed within the state Attorney General's office) as comparative models. Discussion addressed whether the office should function as an arbiter, a mediator, or both; potential housing within the judicial branch with Nevada Supreme Court appointment; staffing needs (general agreement on a minimum of an ombudsperson plus at least one deputy attorney and one administrative staff person); and funding approaches, including a small per-request fee dedicated to the office.

Personally Identifiable Information and Bulk / Compiled Data

Kalie Work raised concerns regarding bulk/compiled data requests from commercial entities and automated web-scraping of public-facing government portals, proposing a distinct bulk-data handling procedure, a dissemination/data-use agreement requirement for high-risk data sets, and authority to demand return of unlawfully obtained records. A detailed discussion followed regarding which categories of information should be treated as presumptively confidential personally identifying information; general sentiment favored a narrow, clearly defined list to reduce inconsistency across agencies without broadly expanding confidentiality.

Criminal Investigative Records

Matt Christian presented the government caucus's position that open/pending criminal investigation files should be categorically confidential during the pendency of investigation or prosecution, citing fair-trial, witness-contamination, and victim-privacy concerns, and noting that approximately 42 states provide some statutory protection for criminal investigative records. Ben Lipman and Colleen McCarty disputed this position, citing the absence of Nevada case law finding pretrial publicity impaired a fair trial, and using the pending *City of Sparks v. Bluth* litigation to illustrate the potential harm of categorical closure to the very individuals such a rule is meant to protect. The discussion did not reach resolution; both sides agreed to continue the discussion at a future meeting.

SCHEDULING OF FUTURE MEETINGS

After extended discussion of member availability, the Task Force confirmed two additional meeting dates:

- October 19, 2026, 9:00 a.m. — a working/discussion meeting (no votes planned).
- November 4, 2026, 1:00 p.m. — the meeting at which the Task Force intends to vote on and finalize its report, given the inability to secure full attendance for a vote any earlier. Members noted the statutory report deadline is understood as October 29, with a practical expectation of submission by approximately November 2.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT (CLOSING)

Kathleen Light (in person) again addressed the Task Force, commenting on sourcing in the draft report, describing her experience obtaining records from Vermont and difficulty obtaining an unredacted police report for victims'-compensation purposes, and reiterating her allegation that the

Attorney General's Office is withholding records related to the investigation of her sexual assault complaint against a former Deputy Insurance Commissioner. She expressed support for an independent public-records ombudsperson. No other public comment was offered.

These remarks reflect one commenter's unverified personal allegations and were not addressed substantively by the Task Force on the record.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

Chair Hicks thanked members for their engagement and for the written work contributed to the draft report. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:28 p.m. The next meetings were confirmed for October 19, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. (discussion) and November 4, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. (anticipated vote/finalization meeting).

Minutes prepared from the meeting's auto-generated video transcript, available at Nevada State Legislature - 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.

STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING AND AGENDA

Date and Time: Monday, October 19, 2026, 9:00 a.m.

Las Vegas Location:
Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms
7120 Amigo Street, Room 1
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Carson City Location:
Legislative Building
401 South Carson Street, Room 2149
Carson City, Nevada 89701

This meeting may be viewed on YouTube:

https://www.youtube.com/live/tixtBX_kmKo

Call In Audio: 888-475-4499

Meeting ID: 844 5888 7595

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** Members of the public may comment in person, on the telephone, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

3. **Approval of September 29, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

4. **Evaluations and Recommendations Under AB 128, Section 7.2(a-b) to Incorporate into the Task Force's Written Report under AB 128, Section 7.9** (for discussion and possible action)

5. Consideration of Topics and Next Meeting Dates and Related Issues (for discussion and possible action)

6. Public Comment Members of the public may comment in person, on the telephone, or in writing on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda at this time. However, no action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

7. Adjournment (for possible action)

Please Note: (1) Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; (2) The Public Records Task Force may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and (3) The Public Records Task Force may delay or remove an item from the agenda at any time.

The Public Records Task Force will limit public comments to three minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but will not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. Written comments are limited to two pages. Written comments may be submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

Meeting agendas and materials are available for download at the Public Records Task Force meeting page of the Attorney General's website: https://ag.nv.gov/Hot_Topics/Public_Records_Task_Force/. Anyone desiring the agenda or supporting materials regarding any Public Records Task Force meeting is invited to call or email Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov. Material may also be requested at at 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

The Public Records Task Force is pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If accommodations for the meeting are needed, please notify Yoon (Eunice) Lee at (702) 486-5717 or AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov, as soon as possible, and at least two days in advance of the meeting.

Notice of Public Meeting and Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Office of the Attorney General, 1 State of Nevada Way, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
2. Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
3. Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701
4. Internet: https://notice.nv.gov and https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/Calendar/A/