STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

Appendix E-2 – Written Responses to the Survey of Nevada Government Entities on Public Records Requests

This appendix reproduces every written answer to the survey's 35 open-ended questions, exactly as respondents submitted it, from the final dataset (92 responses). Answers have not been edited for spelling, punctuation, capitalization and identifying details are as submitted. 2,360 answers appear in all. A limited number of responses were reformatted for ease of reading.

Response numbers match the dataset. Blank answers are omitted. Entity types are shortened to "State," "County" and "Municipal" for agencies, departments and divisions; other entity types appear as the survey respondent selected them. Multiple-choice, frequency and rating answers, and the ranked lists of requester types, are summarized in Appendix B rather than reproduced here.

Staffing

Question 9. Identify the job titles and classifications of the employees who work on public records requests.

91 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Administrative Assistant, Department Lieutenant, Patrol Sergeant, Department Dispatch
2	State	NDOT has 3 administrative assistant 3s whose primary role it is to respond to public records requests. in addition, NDOT has an administrative assistant 4 who acts as the team lead for the public records team and the document scanner team of 3. Finally, NDOT has an administrative assistant 2 who assists the public records team with responsive records review and a program officer 2 who is the day-to-day supervisor of the team. PRR related work for the PO2, AA2, and AA4 is secondary to their primary role within the larger Records Management team.
3	Constitutional agency	Deputy general counsel; public information officer; legal assistant.
4	State	Director, Administrator, Management Analyst
5	State	Deputy Administrator, Attorney, Legal Secretary II
6	County	Office Assistant, Office Specialist, Manager, Deputy, Board Records & Minutes, Admin Assistant, Clerk
7	County	Administrative Assistant II and Senior Human Resources Specialist
8	State	Director, Deputy Director, Administrative Assistant II, Executive Assistant
9	County	Administrative Assistants, code enforcement officers, planning director, fire chief, battalion chief, office managers, clerk/treasurer, recorder, assessor,

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
		human resources director, county manager, district attorney, justice of the peace, court clerk, project managers, public works director, sheriff, communications (dispatch) manager
10	County	Office Assistant, Account Clerk 2, Collections Analyst, Deputy Treasurer,
11	County	CLERK – ELECTED, RECORDER/AUDITOR – ELECTED, ASSESSOR – ELECTED, TREASURER – ELECTED, MV JUSTICE COURT CLERK – CLERICAL, PV JUSTICE COURT CLERK – CLERICAL, ADMIN ASSISTANT – CLERICAL, GRANT ADMIN – CLERICAL, ADMIN ASSISTANT – CLERICAL,
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	General Counsel, Director of Communications, Administrative Services Coordinator, Chief Investment Officer/Deputy Investment Officer
13	County	Public records request are shared amongst county personnel. As records requests are received by the county they are forwarded to the individuals who are more than likely to be able to fulfill the request.
14	County	Chief Deputy DA, Deputy DA III, Administrative Assistant, Administrative Assistant to the Board (of County Commissioners), Assessor Clerk, Assistant County Clerk, Assistant County Manager, Chief Information Officer, Community Relations Manager, Counter Technician, Court IT Systems Technician, Court Systems Analyst, Deputy Clerk, Deputy Director, Deputy Treasurer, Deputy Treasurer Senior, Director of Community Development, Director of Public Works, Director of Human Resources, and Economic Vitality Manager.
15	County	Office Supervisor, Office Specialists
16	State	Admin Asst 3 is primary, if needed General Counsel and/or Administrator is involved. Occasionally, the Purchasing Officer 3 is required to assist.
17	County	Treasurer, Chief Deputy Treasurer, Deputy Treasurer
18	Municipal	Chief of Staff, City Attorney, Deputy City Attorney, Public Service Assistant, Police Chief, Police Captain, City Clerk, Deputy City Clerk, Administrative Assistant, Accounting Clerk, Outside IT Vendor.
19	State	Public Information Officer, Economist, Demographer, Managers, Supervisors, Tax Examiners, Auditors and Budget Analysts.
20	County	Deputy District Attorney, Legal Office Services Supervisor, Legal Secretary, Director Public Works Planning and Building, Director Social Services, Director Juvenile Probation, Director Parks and Recreation, Human Resources Manager, Library Director, Museum Director, Court Administrator, Road Supervisor, Comptroller, County Clerk/Treasurer, Deputy Clerk, County Recorder, Deputy County Recorder, Public Information Officer, County Manager, IT Professional, Office Assistant, County Assessor, Assessor employees, Planning employees, Sheriff, Sheriff Deputies. Essentially all county employees have to deal with public records requests in some way at some point.

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
21	State	Administrative Assistant III and Management Analyst III
22	County	Chief Deputy and Deputy County Clerks
23	State	Director of Communications, PIO (vacant at the moment)
24	County	Recorder - Elected Official, Chief Deputy Recorder, Deputy Recorder II
25	State	Executive Assistant, General Counsel, and Technology and Computer Systems Specialist
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Public Affairs Coordinator (Admin Faculty); Public Records Paralegal (Admin Faculty); General Counsel (Admin Faculty); Associate General Counsel (Admin Faculty); Assistant General Counsel (Admin Faculty); Attorney (Admin Faculty); Deans (Academic Faculty); Department Chairs (Academic Faculty); HR Staff (Misc); Police Staff (Misc); IT Chief Information Security Officer (Admin Faculty); Assistant Director of Purchasing (Admin Faculty); Professors (Academic Faculty); Chiefs of Staff (Admin Faculty); Marketing and Communication Director (Admin Faculty); Registrar of Students (Admin Faculty); Athletics Staff (Admin Faculty); Provost (Academic Faculty); VP of Research and Innovation (Admin Faculty); All 8,000 employees of the institution, potentially.
27	District Court	Records Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Deputy Clerk Lead, Manager (all seven are responsible for their own areas), Assistant Court Administrator, Court Administrator, Chief Information Officer, Chief Fiscal Officer, Director of Human Resources and Organizational Development
28	County	County Manager, County Clerk, County Planning (senior planner), County Recorder, County Assessor, County Comptroller, Sheriff
29	State	Licensing Administrator/Custodian of Records Licensing Supervisor, Northern Nevada
30	State	PRRs were historically handled by the agency's Public Information Officer; however, with the addition of new leadership, we are actively training other staff on PRRs.
31	County	Office Assistant (3), Business Technologist II (1), Administrative Assistant I (1), Chief Deputy Recorder (1)
32	State	Executive Director; Licensing Coordinator
33	County	Public Information Officer
34	County	District Attorney (elected official); DA Admin. Legal Secretary (full time employee); DA Legal Secretary (full time employee); Public Works Director (appointed official); Public Works Admin. Assistant (x2) (full time employees); Comptroller (appointed official); Assistant Comptroller (full time employee); Human Resource Director (appointed official); HR Admin. Assistant (part time with benefits employee); Chief Information Officer (appointed official); Assistant Chief Information Officer (full time employee); IT Professional (part time with benefits employee); Clerk Recorder (elected official); Chief Deputy Clerk Recorder (full time employee); Deputy Clerk Recorder (full time employee); Assessor (elected official); GIS/DMV Technician (x3) (full time

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
		employees); Justice of the Peace (elected official); Justice Court Manager (full time employee); Justice Court Deputy Clerk (full time employee); Sheriff (elected official); Eureka Sheriff Communications Supervisor (full time employee); Eureka Sheriff Records Technician (full time employee)
35	State	Attorney, board coordination staff, licensing staff, PMP administrator and staff, executive staff, investigators. All are unclassified employees and one contract employee.
36	Municipal	Deputy City Clerk (Salary) and Chief Deputy City Clerk (Exempt). We also task employees in other departments to provide the records in their custody for public records. This would include Fire, Engineering, Planning, IT, etc., all of which have other primary functions.
37	County	Office Specialist; Senior Office Specialist; Administrative Assistant I; Environmental Health Specialist Supervisor; Epidemiology Program Manager; Air Quality Supervisor; Division Directors; Senior Air Quality Specialist;
38	State	two Administrative Assistant II's, two Administrative Assistant III's, one Information Management Coordinator/COR
39	Board	The Executive Director works with Board Counsel to provide the requestor with all necessary documents. The Executive Director is responsible for the administration and operation of the board, subject to the authority and oversight of the governing board.
40	State	Administrator, Administrative Assistant IV, Administrative Service Officer IV, Law Enforcement and Training Specialist, Regional Managers, Park Supervisors.
41	County	Office Specialist, Planner, Engineer and Code Enforcement Officer
42	State	Administrative Assistant 3
43	State	I personally handle PRR for OPR.
44	State	Program Manager - primary duty, Conservation Staff Specialist - incidental duty, Environmental Scientist - incidental duty, Wildlife Staff Specialist - incidental duty
45	State	Senior Advisor to the Lieutenant Governor
46	County	Esmeralda DA, Esmeralda DA Chief Deputy Legal Assistant, Chief Deputy Clerk, Assessor, Recorder/Auditor, Sheriff Chief Deputy Assistant
47	County	Office Assistant, Office Specialist, and Media Production Specialist positions
48	County	Breanne Read, ACP; Kaaren Andersen, Paralegal; Cameron Dyer, Attorney. Numerous Administrators over varying departments and offices depending on the nature of the request and the materials sought
49	State	Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, Chief, Finance, and Administration Officer, assigned Special Counsel, Executive Assistant Manager and Department Managers.

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
50	State	Public Information Officer, Education Information Officer, Executive Assistant
51	State	Public information officer is the sole employee assigned to this task; involvement by any others here in DHS Director's Office is purely as the request of the public information officer to help fulfill individual requests.
52	County	Recorder, Chief Deputy Recorder & Records Administrator
53	State	Chief Executive Administrator
54	State	Executive Director, Commission Counsel, Education and Outreach Officer
55	State	Program Manager, Program Conservation Staff Specialist, -for CD boards. Program Manager with directors' office PIO staff for State Program inquiries.
56	County	Assistant general counsel, detectives & sergeant, public records specialists, communications specialist, central intelligence unit research and analysis unit, and any LVMPD employees in possession of public records.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Paralegal (mainly responsible), Assistant Attorney, Associate Attorney, General Counsel (review if necessary)
58	State	Archivist - grade 33 Supervisor, Archives - grade 37 Manager, Library, Archives, and Public Records - grade 41
59	State	Executive Director, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Compliance Officer, Chief Accountant, Lead Licensing Specialist, Regulatory Compliance Specialist, Licensing Specialists (3).
60	State	Public Information Officer II, Administrative Assistant II (With support, as needed, from the Chief Strategy Officer, IT team, and subject matter experts at the Department)
61	State	Chief of Standards, Deputy Director, Executive Director
62	State	Management Analyst, Administrative Services Officer, Business Process Analysts, Public Information Officer
63	County	Accounting Manager, Payroll Coordinator, Senior Accounting Technician, Chief Information Officer (CIO), Deputy CIO, IT Manager, Director, Deputy Director, Division Manager, Administrative Assistant, Sheriff Support Specialist, Civil and Records Manager, Deputy District Attorney (DA), Assistant DA, DA, Operations Supervisor, Recreation Supervisor, Open Space Manager, Treasurer, Chief Deputy Treasurer, Deputy Treasurer, Accountant, and others.
64	State	Primary - AAII, AAIII Secondary - MAIV, Captain
65	State	Primarily dealt with by Chief of Staff; sent to respective Deputies for assistance.

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
66	State	Administrative Assistant III 2.211
67	County	Forensic Medical Transcriber, Administrative Assistant I, Medicolegal Data Specialist, Operations Manager
68	Municipal	Accountant, Activation Coordinator, Administrative Services Manager, Asset Data Program Manager, Assistant City Manager, Associate Civil Engineer, Assistant Director, Business License Tech Supervisor, Business License Technician, Chief Examiner, Communications Program Manager, Community Relationships Manager, Deputy City Attorney, Digital Experience Manager, Digital Redaction Technician, Director of Communications, Director of Council and Executive Operations, Engineering Manager, Environmental Services Manager, Environmental Services Supervisor, Fire Assistant, Housing Manager, Labor Relations Manager, Maintenance & Operations Manager, Maintenance & Ops Manager, Management Analyst, Management Assistant, Office Assistant II, Parking Enforcement Officer, Parks Manager, Payroll Manager, Police Assistant I, Police Records Manager, Police Records Specialist I, Police Records Specialist II, Police Records Supervisor, Police Services Specialist, Program Assistant, Program Coordinator, Project Coordinator, Public Art Coordinator, Public Communications Specialist, Public Safety Dispatch Manager, Public Safety Dispatch Supervisor, Public Safety Intern, Records Management Program Coordinator, Records Systems Manager, Recreation Manager, Risk Manager, Senior Civil Engineer, Senior Constituent Engagement Representative, Senior Engineering Tech I, Senior Engineering Technician II, Senior Management Analyst, Therapeutic Rec Specialist, Traffic Engineer, Traffic Signals Supervisor
70	Municipal	Individuals from every City Department, including City Clerk, Assistant City Clerk, Deputy City Clerk, Communications Manager, Manager Police Records, Police Records Supervisor, Police Records Specialist, Police Officer, Investigative Specialist, City Attorney, Chief Deputy City Attorney, Senior Deputy City Attorney, Deputy City Attorney, Legal Secretary, Special Assistant, Office Assistant, Principal Planner, Planning Assistant, Building Support Specialist, Permit Application Manger, Permit Application Specialist, Fire Prevention Inspector, Deputy Fire Marshal, Code Enforcement Manager, Buyer, Purchasing Manager, Financial Analyst, IT Director, IT Infrastructure Manger, IT Analyst, Systems Support Analyst, IT Systems Technician, Senior Compensation and Classification Analyst, HRIS Business Analyst
71	Municipal	Each of the City's approximately 20 departments have staff assigned to respond to public records requests on the departments' behalf, most frequently as a secondary duty. Their titles vary across departments and include, but are not limited to, Management Analyst, Administrative Support Assistant, Records Technician, Records Specialist, Administrative Officer, etc.
72	County	Interpreter/Clerk, Court Clerk, Court Administrator
73	County	Chief Deputy Treasurer, Assistant Chief Deputy, Deputy Treasurer.
74	State	Public Information Officer, Deputy General Counsel, Assistant System Counsel, Director of Payroll, Senior Manager of Human Resources, Director of Business Center North Purchasing, Senior Desktop Support Analyst, Chief of

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
		Staff to the Board of Regents, Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, Assistant Chief Financial Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Executive Legal Assistant, Legal Assistant
75	State	Chloe Chism, Public Information Officer II; Julie Knight, Senior Management Analyst; Savanah Taylor, Education and Information Officer (there are two open positions at NVHA that will also be working on records requests)
76	State	Public Information Officer
77	State	The Nevada DMV's public records function is supported by a combination of operational records staff, executive oversight, and specialized data governance and analytics personnel. Roles and classifications include: Customer Service Representative II (CSR II) — Classified Senior Customer Service Representative (Records Lead) — Classified Supervisor I, Customer Service Representative — Classified Records Administrator, Chief Data Officer (Chief IT Manager) — Classified Deputy Director — Classified Director — Executive classification Senior Management Analyst — Classified Supporting technical roles (IT Professional III/IV, DMV Tech II/IV, Administrative Aid) — Classified technical series supporting data analytics, governance, and secure records processing functions.
78	County	General Counsel, Assistant General Counsel, Legal Assistant
79	State	Director of Public Affairs, Public Affairs Coordinator, Associate Vice President and Associate General Counsel (1), Assistant General Counsel (6), Contracts Counsel (2), Information Security and Student-Augmented SOC Program Manager, Senior IT Application Administrator – Cloud Collaboration Suite/Supervisor, Senior IT Support Specialist – Google Workspace, Senior Deputy Athletics Director, Chief Operating Officer, Executive Senior Associate Athletics Director, Strategic Communications & Creative Content, Associate Director, Athletics Compliance, Assistant Athletics Director, Athletics Financial Reporting, Personnel Tech III, Athletics, Vice Provost for Decision Support Director for Reporting Institutional Research Analyst, Executive Director, Purchasing (1), Interim Assistant Director, Purchasing (1), Senior Purchasing Analyst/Contract Administrator (2), Senior Purchasing Analyst (6), Purchasing Manager (1), Administrative Assistant 4, Police Services (1), IT Manager, Police Services (2)
80	State	Public Information Officer is the job title and classification, although some staff may be called upon to upload responsive records into our portal.
81	State	Agency Manager (U5304), Social Services Specialist 2 (12.315), Family Services Specialist 2 (12.376), Administrative Assistant 3 (2.210)
82	State	Administrator; Deputy Administrator; Historic Preservation Specialist 3; Historic Preservation Specialist 2; Grants & Projects Coordinator

No.	Entity type	Question 9 – Answer as submitted
83	County	Each department uses different employees to ensure the County is complying with its statutory duties regarding public records. The positions vary from Office Specialist, Office Specialist Supervisors, etc.
84	County	County Manger, Executive Assistant (County Manager's Office), HR Director, Chief Deputy District Attorney, County Clerk, Deputy County Clerk, Justice Court Clerk, District Court Filing Clerk, Assessor's Office personnel (various), County Treasurer, Deputy Treasurer, Planning Supervisor, Building & Safety Permit Technicians, Sheriff's Office Support Staff, Undersheriff, Staff Accountant, Comptroller
85	State	General Counsel Office Coordinator, Deputy General Counsel, General Counsel.
86	County	Chief Deputy Assessor Division Manager - Assessment Services
87	Municipal	Several staff members work on public records requests. Departments typically fulfill their own requests.
88	State	Depending on the nature of the PRR: Administrator, Deputy Administrator, Chiefs, Supervisors, technical staff (environmental scientists, staff engineers and engineers), administrative staff (administrative assistants, management analysts)
89	County	Job titles include, but are not limited to the following: Office Supervisor, Technology Systems Administrator, Deputy District Attorney (levels 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5), Comptroller, Purchasing and Contracts Manager, Public Information Officer, Administrative Assistant (levels 1 and 2), Division Director, Office Specialist, HR Division Director, Chief Human Resources Director, Division Director-Accounting, Risk Management Analyst, Collections Supervisor, IT Manager, County Security Administrator, Senior Technology Systems Administrator, Temp Employee, Code Enforcement Officer, Office Manager, Animal Services Dispatch Supervisor, Animal Services Dispatcher, Independent Contractor, Media and Communications Program Manager
90	State	Public Information Officer II, Administrative Assistant III, Marketing Coordinator
91	State	All 85 employees (grades 21-42 + unclassifieds) work on public records requests in some capacity (whether gathering records, reviewing for confidential/privileged information, redacting, or creating privilege logs).
92	State	General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, Deputy Attorneys General, Legal Researcher

Staff and Attorney Hours

Question 18. Total Staff Hours expended responding to Public Records Requests in 2023

51 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 18 – Answer as submitted
1	County	1000
2	State	Approximately 6,246.
3	Constitutional agency	100
4	State	0
8	State	Unknown
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
15	County	Around 300 hours
16	State	Approx 5-10 hours per week
17	County	Unknown
19	State	300
24	County	576
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 10,000 hours (Calculated as 5 full-time position hours)
29	State	25
30	State	unknown
31	County	6,300
32	State	Unknown
36	Municipal	We dont have time to manually track staff hours because it involves numerous departments
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	Unknown
46	County	50 hours
48	County	1,550
50	State	Not tracked

No.	Entity type	Question 18 – Answer as submitted
51	State	Estimated one-third of Director's Office PIO (one FTE) workload
52	County	not tracked
53	State	3 hours
56	County	25,000
57	Bistate Compact Agency	18
58	State	Did not track in 2023
61	State	24 hrs.
62	State	51
63	County	Estimate 2000+ hours across all Carson City Departments
64	State	Programming glitch - data was not accessible at the time of this submission.
65	State	Unknown
66	State	172.4
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
70	Municipal	The City does not keep track, but estimates this to be several thousand hours between all Departments.
71	Municipal	With 1000+ requests, it would likely be thousands of hours.
72	County	6
74	State	1379
76	State	81.5
77	State	12,000
78	County	450
81	State	628
83	County	Not tracked but extensive across Clark County
84	County	Unknown
88	State	unknown
89	County	Approx. 2,200
91	State	412
92	State	1904

Question 19. If separable from the total figure for 2023, the total attorney hours and applicable hourly rate(s).

37 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 19 – Answer as submitted
1	County	100
2	State	Attorney hours not tracked.
3	Constitutional agency	30
4	State	0
8	State	Unknown
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
17	County	Unknown
19	State	Unknown
24	County	unknown
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 2080 hours - Attorneys make about $120/hour
30	State	unknown
31	County	0
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	Unknown.
46	County	30 hours. DA not paid separately
48	County	30; no hourly rate set; public lawyer
50	State	211.40 hours
56	County	1000 hours total at $275/hr of in house attorney hourly rates
57	Bistate Compact Agency	not separable
61	State	Do not have this breakdown
62	State	Unknown

No.	Entity type	Question 19 – Answer as submitted
63	County	Estimate 200+ hours
64	State	Not Separable
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
74	State	160-226
75	State	NVHA is a new department as of July 1, 2025 so answers reflect data from that point in time
76	State	21.3
77	State	Unknown
78	County	300
83	County	Not tracked
84	County	Unknown
89	County	Approx. 1,000 (attorney hourly wages ranged from $38.50 to $81.42/hour, does not include cost of employee benefits such as medical, dental, vision and PERS)
91	State	260; $59.70 and $65.19
92	State	2,226 @ $163 AG CAP rate

Question 20. Total Staff Hours expended responding to Public Records Requests in 2024

50 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 20 – Answer as submitted
1	County	1000
2	State	Approximately 6,246.
3	Constitutional agency	100
4	State	1
6	County	none
8	State	Unknown
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
15	County	Around 300 hours
16	State	Approx 5-10 hours per week
17	County	Unknown
19	State	350

No.	Entity type	Question 20 – Answer as submitted
24	County	576
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 10,000 hours (Calculated as 5 full-time position hours)
29	State	35
30	State	unknown
31	County	6,300
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	88 hours
46	County	50 hours
48	County	1,675
50	State	Not tracked
51	State	Estimated one-third of Director's Office PIO (one FTE) workload
52	County	not tracked
53	State	0
56	County	30,000
57	Bistate Compact Agency	24
58	State	Did not track
61	State	10 hrs
62	State	295
63	County	Estimate 2500+ hours across all Carson City Departments
64	State	Programming glitch - data was not accessible at the time of this submission.
66	State	193.32
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
70	Municipal	The City does not keep track, but estimates this to be several thousand hours between all Departments.
71	Municipal	With 1000+ requests, it would likely be thousands of hours.
72	County	6

No.	Entity type	Question 20 – Answer as submitted
74	State	1478
76	State	149
77	State	12,000
78	County	525
81	State	3000
83	County	N/A see above
84	County	Unknown
88	State	unknown
89	County	Approx. 2,400
91	State	575
92	State	1899

Question 21. If separable from the total figure for 2024, the total attorney hours and applicable hourly rate(s).

38 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 21 – Answer as submitted
1	County	100
2	State	Attorney hours not tracked.
3	Constitutional agency	30
4	State	1
6	County	none
8	State	Unknown
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
17	County	Unknown
19	State	Unknown
24	County	unknown
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 2080 hours - Attorneys make about $120/hour
30	State	unknown

No.	Entity type	Question 21 – Answer as submitted
31	County	0
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	Unknown
46	County	30 hours, DA not paid separately
48	County	50; no hourly rate set; public lawyer
50	State	602.05 hours
53	State	0
56	County	850 hours total at $300/hr of in house attorney hourly rates
57	Bistate Compact Agency	3, $70/hr fee
61	State	Do not have this breakdown
62	State	Unknown
63	County	Estimate 250+ hours
64	State	Not Separable
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
74	State	213-312
75	State	NVHA is a new department as of July 1, 2025 so answers reflect data from that point in time
76	State	37
77	State	Unknown
78	County	400
84	County	Unknown
89	County	Approx. 1,250 (attorney hourly wages ranged from $53.34 to $114.32/hour, does not include cost of employee benefits such as medical, dental, vision and PERS)
91	State	260; $66.27 and $72.36
92	State	2,321 @ $157 AG CAP rate

Question 22. Total Staff Hours expended responding to Public Records Requests in 2025

49 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 22 – Answer as submitted
1	County	1000
2	State	Approximately 6,246.
3	Constitutional agency	100
4	State	40
8	State	30
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
15	County	Around 250 hours
16	State	Approx 5-10 hours per week
17	County	Unknown
19	State	400
20	County	500
24	County	576
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 10,000 hours (Calculated as 5 full-time position hours)
29	State	39
30	State	50-100
31	County	6,300
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	172 Hours
46	County	70 hours
48	County	1,850
50	State	Not tracked
51	State	Estimated one-third of Director's Office PIO (one FTE) workload
52	County	not tracked

No.	Entity type	Question 22 – Answer as submitted
53	State	0
56	County	35,000
57	Bistate Compact Agency	90
58	State	Did not track
61	State	15 hrs.
62	State	52
63	County	Estimate 3500+ hours across all Carson City Departments
64	State	Programming glitch - data was not accessible at the time of this submission.
66	State	165.02
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
70	Municipal	The City does not keep track, but estimates this to be several thousand hours between all Departments.
71	Municipal	With 1000+ requests, it would likely be thousands of hours.
72	County	6
74	State	1367
76	State	176
77	State	12,000
78	County	650
81	State	5000
84	County	Unknown
88	State	unknown
89	County	Approx. 2,600
91	State	1272
92	State	1,428

Question 23. If separable from the total figure for 2025, the total attorney hours and applicable hourly rate(s).

36 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 23 – Answer as submitted
1	County	100
2	State	Attorney hours not tracked.

No.	Entity type	Question 23 – Answer as submitted
3	Constitutional agency	30
4	State	2
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
17	County	Unknown
19	State	Unknown
20	County	100
24	County	unknown
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 2080 hours - Attorneys make about $120/hour
30	State	unknown
31	County	0
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	Unknown
46	County	50 hours, DA not paid separately
48	County	50; no hourly rate set; public lawyer
50	State	639.60 hours
53	State	0
56	County	750 total hours at $325/hr with mostly in house and some outside attorney rates
57	Bistate Compact Agency	5, $70/hr fee
61	State	Do not have this breakdown
62	State	Unknown
63	County	Estimate 300+ hours
64	State	Not Separable
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked

No.	Entity type	Question 23 – Answer as submitted
74	State	150-225
76	State	48.5
77	State	Unknown
78	County	550
84	County	Unknown
89	County	Approx. 1,700 (attorney hourly wages ranged from $55.07 to $118.04/hour, does not include cost of employee benefits such as medical, dental, vision and PERS)
91	State	364; $66.27 and $72.36
92	State	2,008 @ $157 AG CAP rate

Question 24. Total Staff Hours expended responding to Public Records Requests through August 31, 2026

48 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 24 – Answer as submitted
1	County	700
2	State	Approximately 4,008.
3	Constitutional agency	100
4	State	2
8	State	30
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
15	County	Around 850 hours
16	State	Approx 5-10 hours per week
17	County	Unknown
19	State	325
24	County	384
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 10,000 hours (Calculated as 5 full-time position hours)
29	State	145
30	State	25-50

No.	Entity type	Question 24 – Answer as submitted
31	County	4,200
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	40
45	State	73 hours
46	County	40 hours
48	County	2,200
50	State	Not tracked
51	State	Estimated one-third of Director's Office PIO (one FTE) workload
52	County	not tracked
53	State	0
56	County	27,000
57	Bistate Compact Agency	70 (estimate)
58	State	Did not track
61	State	20 hrs.
62	State	69
63	County	Estimate 2700+ hours across all Carson City Departments
64	State	approximately 235.50 hours
66	State	115.13
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
70	Municipal	The City does not keep track, but estimates this to be several thousand hours between all Departments.
71	Municipal	With 1000+ requests, it would likely be thousands of hours.
72	County	6
74	State	1434
76	State	623.3
77	State	12,000
78	County	325
81	State	12000

No.	Entity type	Question 24 – Answer as submitted
84	County	Unknown
88	State	unknown
89	County	Approx. 2700
91	State	1635
92	State	1,199

Question 25. If separable from the total figure through August 31, 2026, the total attorney hours and applicable hourly rate(s).

35 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 25 – Answer as submitted
1	County	100
2	State	Attorney hours not tracked.
3	Constitutional agency	30
4	State	2
11	County	UNKNOWN
14	County	Unknown
17	County	Unknown
19	State	Unknown
24	County	unknown
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Estimate approximately 2080 hours - Attorneys make about $120/hour
30	State	unknown
31	County	4
32	State	Unknown
40	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown
45	State	unknown
46	County	25 hours, DA not paid separately
48	County	50; no hourly rate set; public lawyer
50	State	347.75

No.	Entity type	Question 25 – Answer as submitted
53	State	0
56	County	500 total at $325/hr
57	Bistate Compact Agency	10 @ $70/hr (fee) Estimate
61	State	Do not have this breakdown
62	State	Unknown
63	County	Estimate 200+ hours
64	State	Not Seperable
68	Municipal	NA - Not tracked
74	State	234-351
76	State	76.5
77	State	Unknown
78	County	275
84	County	Unknown
89	County	Approx. 1,500 (attorney hourly wages ranged from $57.00 to $122.17/hour, does not include cost of employee benefits such as medical, dental, vision and PERS)
91	State	310; $66.27 and $72.36
92	State	2,991 $250 AG CAP rate

Systems, Technology, and Costs

Identify the software or system(s) used for each function below (product/system name and vendor). If a function is performed manually, type "manual":

Question 32. Request intake / public portal

91 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 32 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Zimbra Email
2	State	https://www.dot.nv.gov/doing-business/contact-us/public-records-request/public-records-request-form
3	Constitutional agency	website
4	State	Manual

No.	Entity type	Question 32 – Answer as submitted
5	State	email
6	County	email
7	County	NextRequest
8	State	HAL
9	County	OnBase Portal
10	County	Q-Alert, Washoe 311, Next Request
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Website link (webmaster account)
13	County	Email
14	County	Opal, Microsoft, manual
15	County	Civic Plus Next Request
16	State	manual
17	County	email
18	Municipal	Microsoft Exchange
19	State	Manual
21	State	Excel Spreadsheet
22	County	email
23	State	Gov QA
24	County	Phone Calls, Tyler Technology Eagle Recording, manually
25	State	Nevada Nurse Portal account and via NSBN email
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	JustFOIA
27	District Court	Microsoft Forms or email
28	County	Email
29	State	public portal, email, in person, fax
30	State	State of Nevada Helpful Algorithms and Logic portal
31	County	(1) Tyler Technologies Enterprise Records Management, (2) Manual (over-the-counter and phone calls), (3) Washoe 311 QAlert, (4) Next Request

No.	Entity type	Question 32 – Answer as submitted
32	State	Manual
33	County	https://washoecountynv.nextrequest.com/
34	County	Email - outlook
35	State	Download a form from the website and send to an email account
36	Municipal	Link to OnBase by Hyland Workflow on our public website
37	County	NextRequest
38	State	https://hal.nv.gov/form/Gaming/Gaming_Public_Records_Request
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Agency Email
41	County	NextRequest
42	State	email or mail
43	State	GovQA
44	State	Manual
45	State	Website
46	County	none
47	County	Granicus - GovQA
48	County	manual
49	State	Website/Walk-In
50	State	By email at ccbprr@ccb.nv.gov
51	State	GovQA
52	County	Tyler Technology electronic recording system
53	State	Manuel
54	State	Precision Document Imaging
55	State	staff state email, board member elected supervisor email, and occasionally physical mail to headquarters or local offices.
56	County	Granicus
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Accella
58	State	Email
59	State	legacy software, adobe

No.	Entity type	Question 32 – Answer as submitted
60	State	Smartsheet form at doe.nv.gov
61	State	Email
62	State	Granicus/GovQA
63	County	Manual/website
64	State	GovQA, outlook email, manual (in person)
65	State	Form on STO website
66	State	GovQA / Microsoft Outlook / Telephone
67	County	NextRequest (Washoe County); SeamlessDocs (Department)
68	Municipal	GovQA - Granicus
69	Local agency	Application developed in-house.
70	Municipal	Online, LexisNexis report portals, email, in-person
71	Municipal	GovQA
72	County	justicecourts.washoecounty.gov/OnlineServices/
73	County	Next Request
74	State	WordPress-based web form; submissions routed to dedicated Microsoft Outlook/Microsoft 365 email box
75	State	GovQA
76	State	Website/Email
77	State	Granicus GovQA
78	County	Manual
79	State	JustFOIA https://unlv.justfoia.com/publicportal/home/track
80	State	GOVQA
81	State	GovQA
82	State	website
83	County	Some County departments use JustFOIA but also manual processes
84	County	Manual
85	State	gov.nv.gov
86	County	Next Request
87	Municipal	Laserfiche, email, phone, in-person
88	State	website portal, emails
89	County	NextRequest

No.	Entity type	Question 32 – Answer as submitted
90	State	Manual
91	State	Manual
92	State	Microsoft Outlook (email)

Question 33. Request tracking and workflow

91 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 33 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Manual
2	State	Tracking and workflow management are completed using an Excel spreadsheet.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Manual
5	State	email Outlook Excel
6	County	manual spreadsheet
7	County	NextRequest
8	State	Excel
9	County	OnBase Portal, Email, Excel
10	County	Q-Alert, Washoe 311, Next Request
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Internal
14	County	Opal, Microsoft, manual
15	County	Civic Plus Next Request
16	State	manual
17	County	Clerks office
18	Municipal	Spreadsheet
19	State	Manual
20	County	Elected Official/Department specific
21	State	Excel Spreadsheet

No.	Entity type	Question 33 – Answer as submitted
22	County	manual
23	State	Manual
24	County	Tyler Technology Eagle Recording Reporting and manual
25	State	manual
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	JustFOIA
27	District Court	Excel or manual
28	County	Manual
29	State	manual
30	State	Microsoft Excel
31	County	(1) Tyler Technologies Enterprise Records Management, (2) QAlert, (3) Next Request
32	State	Manual
33	County	https://washoecountynv.nextrequest.com/
34	County	Manual
35	State	Excel with an assigned request number
36	Municipal	OnBase by Hyland
37	County	NextRequest
38	State	manual
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Manual
41	County	NextRequest
42	State	manual
43	State	GovQA
44	State	Manual
45	State	Manual
46	County	non
47	County	Granicus - GovQA
48	County	manual
49	State	Spreadsheet

No.	Entity type	Question 33 – Answer as submitted
50	State	Manual
51	State	GovQA
52	County	Talbot
53	State	Manuel
54	State	Precision Document Imaging & Microsoft Office Suite
55	State	manual
56	County	Granicus
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Accella manual
59	State	Google calendar
60	State	Smartsheet and manual
61	State	Email
62	State	Granicus/GovQA
63	County	Manual
64	State	GOVQA, Excel Spreadsheets (manual)
65	State	Excel spreadsheet
66	State	GovQA / Microsoft Teams SharePoint / Microsoft Outlook
67	County	NextRequest (Washoe County); N/A (Department)
68	Municipal	GovQA - Granicus
69	Local agency	Application developed in-house.
70	Municipal	Manual. The City is currently looking into workflow software options given the significant increase in PRRs in the last few years.
71	Municipal	GovQA
72	County	Manual
73	County	Next Request
74	State	manual
75	State	GovQA
76	State	Outlook Calendar
77	State	Granicus GovQA, Solar Winds Service Desk, Atlassian Jira
78	County	Manual

No.	Entity type	Question 33 – Answer as submitted
79	State	JustFOIA
80	State	GOVQA
81	State	Excel
82	State	manual
83	County	Some County Departments use JustFOIA but also manual processes
84	County	Manual
85	State	Spreadsheet; Reminders
86	County	Next Request
87	Municipal	Laserfiche, Outlook, Sharepoint, Excel
88	State	excel spreadsheet
89	County	NextRequest
90	State	Manual
91	State	Manual
92	State	Microsoft Excel

Question 34. Search and collection — e-mail

89 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 34 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Zimbra
2	State	NDOT utilizes Microsoft Purview and Exterro to search, collect, and review/redact emails.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Manual and State Technology Office Administrators
5	State	email
6	County	internal search engines, Eagle Clerk
7	County	Manual
8	State	Outlook
9	County	Outlook
10	County	Q-Alert, Washoe 311, Next Request
11	County	VARIES

No.	Entity type	Question 34 – Answer as submitted
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Outlook
14	County	Microsoft and manual
16	State	manual
17	County	email
18	Municipal	Microsoft Exchange
19	State	Manual
20	County	Third-Party IT Contractor
21	State	Outlook
22	County	manual
23	State	Purview - the worst program ever.
24	County	Dell Technology for PC e-mail requests and provided copy attachments, Tyler Technology Eagle Recording no-reply e-mails
25	State	nursingboard@nsbn.state.nv.us
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Outlook
27	District Court	Outlook
28	County	Manual
29	State	manual
30	State	Governor's Technology Office does this for us.
31	County	(1) Tyler Technologies Enterprise Records Management, (2) QAlert, (3) Next Request, (4) Outlook
32	State	Manual
34	County	Mimecast
35	State	Outlook - email appropriate parties to search their email
36	Municipal	Outlook, SMARSH, IMazing
37	County	Unknown
38	State	Purview
39	Board	chirobd@chirobd.nv.gov

No.	Entity type	Question 34 – Answer as submitted
40	State	Microsoft E-Discover
41	County	Information may be provided in responses by other Agency department(s).
42	State	manual
43	State	GovQA
44	State	Manual search through OUtlook
45	State	Manual
46	County	none
47	County	N/A - County level record via Microsoft Outlook
48	County	Microsoft eDiscovery
49	State	Local and Network Drives (LANs/NAS)/Cloud Storage Files/Outlook
50	State	GTO Request
51	State	Microsoft Purview eDiscovery
52	County	Talbot
53	State	manuel
54	State	IT Managed (Microsoft Purview) & Microsoft Outlook
55	State	manual
56	County	E-Discover and Microsoft
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Outlook, Microsoft Purview, Everlaw
58	State	ePADD, emailchemy
59	State	Legacy software, google, google spreadsheet
60	State	Internal IT staff
61	State	Manual
62	State	GTO
63	County	Manual/mimecast
64	State	Email(Governor's Technology Office, Manual), cFive, Mainframe, Spillman, Microfilm, OnBase, Shared Drive, INet.
65	State	In-house IT staff
66	State	GovQA
67	County	Unknown

No.	Entity type	Question 34 – Answer as submitted
68	Municipal	Mimecast – Permira (email), Smarsh (text message)
69	Local agency	Search tools within Outlook.
70	Municipal	Manual (Outlook)
71	Municipal	Smarsh
72	County	Occasionally
73	County	Next Request
74	State	Microsoft 365 A5 licensing
75	State	Microsoft Purview
76	State	Manual or EDiscovery
77	State	MS O365 Purview
78	County	Manual
79	State	Google Mail
80	State	GOVQA
81	State	Microsoft eDiscovery
82	State	manual
83	County	Microsoft
84	County	Manual
85	State	eDiscovery
87	Municipal	Outlook, Proofpoint
88	State	Outlook, Microsoft Purview eDiscovery
89	County	Mimecast
90	State	Requested via our in house IT department
91	State	Manual
92	State	Microsoft Purview Compliance Portal

Question 35. Search and collection — documents and shared drives

90 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 35 – Answer as submitted
1	County	manual
2	State	The NDOT public records team relies on members of operational Divisions to act as subject matter experts to assist with the collection of responsive records.

No.	Entity type	Question 35 – Answer as submitted
		In addition, the public records team utilizes the NDOT records management systems to search for applicable records, ApplicationXtender and DOMA.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Manual and State Technology Office Administrators
5	State	share drive Accela
6	County	internal search functions
7	County	Manual
8	State	One Drive and S Drive
9	County	Onbase
10	County	Q-Alert, Washoe 311, Next Request
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Microsoft 365
14	County	Axon, Microsoft, and Manual
15	County	N/A
16	State	manual
17	County	email
18	Municipal	Active Directory
19	State	MYNT, Outlook, Teams
20	County	Elected Official/Department specific
21	State	Outlook
22	County	manual
23	State	Manual
24	County	Tyler Technology Eagle Recording, HP copiers, Canon Scanner and Canon Large Format Copier/Scanner
25	State	manual
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Nevada Box, Teams, Sharepoint, OneDrive

No.	Entity type	Question 35 – Answer as submitted
27	District Court	SharePoint, OneDrive, Teams, eCourt, eFlex, Outlook
28	County	Manual
29	State	manual
30	State	Governor's Technology Office does this for us.
31	County	Tyler Technologies Enterprise Records Management
32	State	Manual
34	County	All departments retain their own records; there is no central database for all records.
35	State	Microsoft - do a search of the server; and InLumon
36	Municipal	Too many to list
37	County	Unknown
38	State	manual
39	Board	Computer hard drive
40	State	Microsoft E-Discover
41	County	Information may be provided in responses by other Agency department(s).
42	State	manual
43	State	Manual
44	State	Manual search through Drives
45	State	Manual
46	County	none
47	County	Document Manager - Application Xtender, Other Specialized Police Reporting Systems (AXON, Tiburon, Security Desk, etc.)
48	County	manual and/or Microsoft SharePoint
49	State	Local and Network Drives (LANs/NAS)/Cloud Storage Files/Outlook/Physical Files
50	State	SharePoint, METRC
51	State	Microsoft Purview eDiscovery
52	County	Lyon County
53	State	manuel
54	State	Shared drives file explorer, Share Point
55	State	manual

No.	Entity type	Question 35 – Answer as submitted
56	County	manual
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Microsoft Purview
58	State	manual
59	State	legacy software, google spreadsheet
60	State	Internal IT staff
61	State	Database
62	State	GTO
63	County	Manual/mimecast
64	State	Email(Govenor's Technology Office, Manual), cFive, Mainframe, Spillman, Microfilm, OnBase, Shared Drive, INet.
65	State	Chief of Staff
66	State	Microsoft Outlook / Microsoft Teams SharePoint
67	County	Unknown
68	Municipal	OnBase
69	Local agency	Search tools within Windows.
70	Municipal	Manual (various databases)
71	Municipal	Manual
72	County	Never
73	County	Manual
74	State	manual
75	State	Microsoft Purview
76	State	Manual
77	State	MS O365 Purview
78	County	Manual
79	State	Google Mail, Google Vault
80	State	Manual
81	State	Microsoft eDiscovery
82	State	manual
83	County	Unknown at time of submitting survey

No.	Entity type	Question 35 – Answer as submitted
84	County	Manual
85	State	Handled on a per-request basis
87	Municipal	Sharepoint, shared drives, Flex, AS 400, Laserfiche, Munis, City Works, Safe, Red Desk, etc.
88	State	manual, OnBase
89	County	Manual, Madison AI, Sharepoint
90	State	Requested via our IT department
91	State	Manual
92	State	ProLaw, Microsoft OneDrive, Request Tracker (RT)

Question 36. Review and redaction — documents

92 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 36 – Answer as submitted
1	County	evidence.com
2	State	Review and redaction is completed using either Adobe Pro and Exterro.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Adobe
5	State	adobe
6	County	Eagle software
7	County	Manual
8	State	Adobe
9	County	Onbase/Adobe
10	County	Manual
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Microsoft Office
14	County	Microsoft and manual
15	County	N/A
16	State	manual

No.	Entity type	Question 36 – Answer as submitted
17	County	DA
18	Municipal	Adobe/MailDex
19	State	Adobe
20	County	Staff
21	State	Outlook
22	County	manual
23	State	Adobe
24	County	Tyler Technology Eagle Recording
25	State	adobe
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Logikcull
27	District Court	Adobe Acrobat, manual
28	County	Manual
29	State	manual
30	State	Adobe Acrobat
31	County	Tyler Technologies Enterprise Records Management
32	State	Manual
33	County	Adobe Acrobat
34	County	Manual
35	State	Adobe Acrobat Pro
36	Municipal	OnBase by Hyland
37	County	Manual
38	State	manual
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Manual
41	County	Manual
42	State	manual
43	State	Adobe
44	State	Manual redaction through Adobe and ArcGIS

No.	Entity type	Question 36 – Answer as submitted
45	State	Manual
46	County	none
47	County	Adobe
48	County	manual and Adobe
49	State	Local and Network Drives (LANs/NAS)/PDF/Cloud Storage Files/PDF
50	State	SharePoint and Adobe Kofax/Acrobat
51	State	GovQA
52	County	OCR
53	State	manuel
54	State	Adobe
55	State	manual
56	County	Adobe Pro
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Everlaw
58	State	Adobe Acrobat and manual
59	State	Adobe
60	State	Manual (review) and Adobe Acrobat (redaction)
61	State	Manual
62	State	Adobe Pro
63	County	Manual/adobe
64	State	Adobe (manual)
65	State	Chief of Staff
66	State	Adobe Acrobat
67	County	Adobe Acrobat
68	Municipal	Adobe, Nuance
69	Local agency	Adobe Pro
70	Municipal	Manual, Adobe
71	Municipal	Logikcull / Adobe Acrobat
72	County	Manual and PDF
73	County	Manual

No.	Entity type	Question 36 – Answer as submitted
74	State	EverMap Auto Portfolio
75	State	Adobe
76	State	Manual
77	State	Adobe Pro, Granicus GovQA
78	County	Manual
79	State	Logikcull
80	State	GOVQA
81	State	GovQA
82	State	manual
83	County	Adobe and Just FOIA
84	County	Adobe
85	State	Adobe Acrobat
86	County	Adobe
87	Municipal	Adobe PDF
88	State	Microsoft Purview eDiscovery, Outlook, Adobe Pro
89	County	Manual, Adobe Pro
90	State	Unknown
91	State	Manual
92	State	Adobe Acrobat Pro, Everlaw e-Discovery Platform

Question 37. Review and redaction — audio & video

40 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 37 – Answer as submitted
1	County	axon/ evidence.com
2	State	N/A - redactions of this nature are very rare.
6	County	online link for requests
9	County	NA - Sheriff does have special separate softwar
11	County	VARIES
14	County	Outside vendor (HOLO and So-Su)
15	County	N/A
18	Municipal	Lenslock

No.	Entity type	Question 37 – Answer as submitted
20	County	Staff
22	County	manual
24	County	Tyler Technology Eagle Recording
25	State	Teams
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Police software - unknown
27	District Court	JAVS, OBS, Zoom (we do not redact video)
29	State	audio and video
34	County	Manual
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Axon Evidence
43	State	Axon
45	State	Manual
46	County	none, maybe adobe pdf editor
47	County	AXON - Evidence.com
48	County	manual
56	County	Axon
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Everlaw
58	State	N?A
63	County	Axon/DEVNET
64	State	Axon (manual)
66	State	Parole Board Share drive
68	Municipal	Veritone, Axon
70	Municipal	Core Force DEMS
71	Municipal	Axon Evidence
78	County	Manual
79	State	Logikcull, Acrobat Adobe
80	State	GOVQA

No.	Entity type	Question 37 – Answer as submitted
83	County	Audacity
84	County	Manual
87	Municipal	Lenslock, Verint
91	State	Manual
92	State	Everlaw e-Discovery Platform

Question 38. Correspondence with requesters

92 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 38 – Answer as submitted
1	County	email, phone
2	State	The majority of correspondence with a requester is done via Microsoft Outlook.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Manual
5	State	email
6	County	email, web links, USPS
7	County	NextRequest
8	State	Outlook
9	County	email/onbase
10	County	Q-Alert, Washoe 311, Next Request, Email
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Outlook
14	County	Microsoft (email) and manual (letters)
15	County	Civic Plus Next Request
16	State	manual
17	County	email
18	Municipal	Microsoft Exchange
19	State	Manual
20	County	Elected Official/Department specific

No.	Entity type	Question 38 – Answer as submitted
21	State	Outlook
22	County	manual
23	State	Outlook / GovQA
24	County	Phone Calls, e-mails through Dell PC, Tyler Technology Eagle Recording no-reply e-mails
25	State	manual and email
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	JustFOIA
27	District Court	Outlook or mail
28	County	Email, typically
29	State	manual
30	State	outlook
31	County	Phone, email, mail, over-the-counter
32	State	Manual
33	County	https://washoecountynv.nextrequest.com/
34	County	Whoever receives the request responds via email.
35	State	Outlook
36	Municipal	Email and some automated messaging through our PRR system OnBase by Hyland
37	County	NextRequest
38	State	manual
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Email
41	County	NextRequest or Outlook email
42	State	manual
43	State	GovQA
44	State	Manual
45	State	Manual
46	County	none
47	County	Granicus - GovQA

No.	Entity type	Question 38 – Answer as submitted
48	County	manual by email
49	State	Email/Phone
50	State	Email
51	State	GovQA
52	County	atalbot@lyon-county.org
53	State	email
54	State	Outlook
55	State	manual
56	County	Granicus, Outlook, and phone calls
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Outlook
58	State	email
59	State	Word, Adobe
60	State	Manual
61	State	Email
62	State	Granicus/GovQA
63	County	Manual
64	State	GOVQA, Fax, Email
65	State	Chief of Staff via outlook/email (or hard copy if incarcerated)
66	State	GovQA / Microsoft Outlook
67	County	NextRequest (Washoe County); Oulook/E-mail (Department)
68	Municipal	GovQA – Granicus
69	Local agency	Outlook and in-house application
70	Municipal	Email, phone (preferred method for clarifying requests, but phone numbers often not provided), US mail, fax
71	Municipal	GovQA
72	County	Via email, mail, or at the counter
73	County	Manual
74	State	Microsoft Word, Adobe Acrobat, Outlook email, telephone
75	State	GovQA

No.	Entity type	Question 38 – Answer as submitted
76	State	Email/Mail/In Person
77	State	Granicus GovQA email
78	County	Manual
79	State	JustFOIA
80	State	GOVQA
81	State	GovQA and Outlook
82	State	manual
83	County	County Email and Just FOIA
84	County	Manual
85	State	Email
86	County	Next Request
87	Municipal	Email, Laserfiche, phone, Dropbox, Sharepoint, Fax
88	State	Outlook - email
89	County	NextRequest
90	State	Manual
91	State	Manual
92	State	Microsoft Outlook (email)

Question 39. Production and delivery

92 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 39 – Answer as submitted
1	County	evidence.com
2	State	Responsive records are produced and delivered to the requester via Microsoft outlook attachment or OneDrive links for larger requests.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Manual
5	State	email
6	County	unknown
7	County	NextRequest
8	State	Outlook, Adobe
9	County	email/adobe/onbase

No.	Entity type	Question 39 – Answer as submitted
10	County	Q-Alert, Washoe 311, Next Request, Email
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Outlook
14	County	Microsoft (email) and manual (letters)
15	County	Civic Plus Next Request
16	State	manual
17	County	email
18	Municipal	Microsoft Exchange/Adobe/Physical Media
19	State	Manual
20	County	Email/Hard Copy
21	State	Outlook
22	County	manual
23	State	Outlook/GovQA
24	County	Epson, HP Printer, Canon Scanner, Microfiche Reader (Canon), Tyler Technology Eagle Recording no-reply e-mails
25	State	email, mailings, and box.com
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	JustFOIA
27	District Court	digital or print
28	County	Manual
29	State	email attachments or using box.com
30	State	pdf/native file structure where possible; exported from GTO's ediscovery software (unknown).
31	County	Email, mail, over-the-counter
32	State	Manual
33	County	https://washoecountynv.nextrequest.com/
34	County	Email or U.S. Mail
35	State	Email or USB for larger files

No.	Entity type	Question 39 – Answer as submitted
36	Municipal	OnBase by Hyland
37	County	NextRequest
38	State	manual
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Email
41	County	NextRequest or secure large file storage location
42	State	manual
43	State	GovQA
44	State	Manual
45	State	Manual
46	County	none
47	County	Granicus - GovQA
48	County	manual by email
49	State	PDF, Email, USPS, or FedEx.
50	State	Email and Standard Mail
51	State	GovQA
52	County	via mail or email
53	State	email
54	State	Outlook & SharePoint
55	State	manual
56	County	Granicus, USPS, Outlook, and Axon
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Everlaw and OneDrive
58	State	manual
59	State	Adobe, google gmail
60	State	Manual
61	State	Database and Email
62	State	Granicus/GovQA
63	County	Manual/axon/DEVNET
64	State	GOVQA, Fax, email, temporary shared link access for videos (AXON)

No.	Entity type	Question 39 – Answer as submitted
65	State	chief of staff via outlook/email (or hard copy if incarcerated)
66	State	GovQA / Manual
67	County	NextRequest (Washoe County); Oulook/E-mail (Department)
68	Municipal	GovQA - Granicus
69	Local agency	Outlook and Mimecast file transfer application.
70	Municipal	Email, Sharepoint, in-person, fax, US mail
71	Municipal	GovQA
72	County	Via email, mail, or at the counter
73	County	Next Request
74	State	Outlook email, Adobe Acrobat
75	State	GovQA
76	State	Email/Mail/In Person
77	State	Granicus GovQA email
78	County	Manual
79	State	JustFOIA
80	State	GOVQA
81	State	GovQA
82	State	manual
83	County	Email and Just FOIA, One Drive
84	County	Manual
85	State	Email
86	County	Next Request
87	Municipal	Email, Laserfiche, phone, Dropbox, Sharepoint, Fax, in-person, mail
88	State	Adobe Pro, Outlook, FTP server
89	County	NextRequest
90	State	Manual
91	State	Manual
92	State	Adobe Acrobat Pro, Microsoft SharePoint, Everlaw e-Discovery Platform

Question 40. Records retention and archiving

84 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 40 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Motorolla Spillman CAD system and manual
2	State	Retention of public records request records are maintained in a shared drive location, and the records are disposed of per retention manually.
3	Constitutional agency	manual
4	State	Manual
5	State	local digital retention
6	County	daily process through Eagle
8	State	Whatever GTO provides
9	County	onbase
10	County	Manual
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	manual
13	County	Internal Servers
14	County	Microsoft
15	County	Civic Plus Next Request
16	State	manual
17	County	microfilm and paper
18	Municipal	Active Directory/Adobe/Microsoft Exchange
19	State	Manual
20	County	Per Nevada Local Government Records Retention Schedule
21	State	Outlook
22	County	manual
23	State	Shared Drive
24	County	Canon Microfiche Reader for upload into Tyler Technology Eagle Recording Document Exploration and Archiving
25	State	manual
26	Higher Education	Network

No.	Entity type	Question 40 – Answer as submitted
	Institution under NSHE	
28	County	Manual
29	State	manual
30	State	We follow State of Nevada Records Retention protocol; stored on Microsoft drives and/or SharePoint.
31	County	ERM, Sony Optical Disk Archive
32	State	Manual
34	County	Eureka County does not have a records retention policy.
35	State	Unknown
36	Municipal	Main records system is OnBase by Hyland, but we use numerous systems to store records across the city.
37	County	NextRequest
38	State	AppEnhancer, Flex, internal program SAGE
39	Board	Manual
40	State	Manual
42	State	manual
43	State	GovQA
44	State	Manual
45	State	Manual
46	County	none
48	County	manual via Microsoft SharePoint
49	State	Local and Network Drives (LANs/NAS)/Cloud Storage Files
50	State	SharePoint and Accela
51	State	GovQA
52	County	Simple Records Manager
53	State	manuel
54	State	SharePoint, Share Drive, Flash Drives
55	State	manual
56	County	Granicus, Axon, Onbase, manual retention, and many other internal systems

No.	Entity type	Question 40 – Answer as submitted
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Intranet
58	State	Versatile, ArchivesSpace, ArchiveSocial
59	State	Adobe, legacy software
61	State	Manual
62	State	Granicus/GovQA
63	County	Manual/munis
64	State	Docs and Images within cFive Program, Microfilm, OnBase, Mainframe, Axon
65	State	Shared drive
66	State	Manual
67	County	AppXtender/Document Manager (Washoe County); VertiQ (Department)
68	Municipal	OnBase
70	Municipal	SIRE
71	Municipal	Content Manager / Smarsh
72	County	Manual from 2013 and prior
73	County	Next request
74	State	Manual (no automatic program)
76	State	Manual
77	State	State retention schedules per NRS 239; public records stored and archived according to State Records Committee approved retention and disposition schedules.
78	County	Manual
79	State	Google Vault, TeamDynamicx, JustFOIA
80	State	Manual, varies by program area
81	State	Microsoft Sharepoint
82	State	manual
83	County	Just FOIA and internal processes
84	County	Manual
85	State	External Hard Drive; Transfer to NSLA (eventually)
86	County	handled by County Manager's office
87	Municipal	Laserfiche, Sharepoint, physical storage, Flex, AS 400

No.	Entity type	Question 40 – Answer as submitted
88	State	hardcopy files, digital files, OnBase
89	County	Mimecast, Sharepoint, Smarsh
90	State	Manual
91	State	Manual
92	State	ProLaw, Microsoft OneDrive, Request Tracker (RT), Enterprise Shared Drives

Question 41. Annual licensing, subscription, and maintenance cost for each system identified above

64 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 41 – Answer as submitted
1	County	approximately $80,000. evidence.com and body cameras and redaction studio is roughly $25,000.00
2	State	Unknown, the costs associated with the systems mentioned above are incurred by our IT Division or the Attorney General's Office for the Exterro system.
4	State	$450
5	State	Accela $4800 per user per year Adobe $ 100 per user per year Outlook $100 per user per year ESTIMATES
6	County	not available
8	State	Blended costs
9	County	Onbase /Naviant $115,000
10	County	Don't know
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Unknown
14	County	$5,000 for Microsoft Purview eDiscovery Premium. Does not include subscription for Microsoft Office Suite
17	County	not sure
18	Municipal	Microsoft Exchange - ~$7,000 Adobe - ~ $6,000 Active Directory - Purchased

No.	Entity type	Question 41 – Answer as submitted
		MailDex - ~$500
19	State	Unknown
20	County	Unknown
21	State	unknown
23	State	~6,000/year (Granicus contract is for 4 years) ~240.00/year (Adobe Pro)
24	County	$25,000
25	State	Adobe $6621.00 per year, Box.com $448.00 per month
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	JustFOIA = $8600/year; Logikcull ($36,000) - others unknown
28	County	Email platform, servers, network access
29	State	These systems are used for all NSCB work, not just records requests
30	State	unknown
31	County	Tyler Technologies Enterprise Records Management annual cost $192,000 Sony Optical Disk Archive annual cost $200
34	County	Unknown
35	State	Unknown
36	Municipal	OnBase by Hyland $130,000/year
37	County	Unknown - Washoe County
38	State	AppEnhancer - $20,507.26, Flex Maintenance $44,579.36, SAGE is our own so now fees.
43	State	Unknown
44	State	Cost of Outlook ($2887.80) and Adobe ($388.36) and ArcGIS ($8478.08) - $11,754.24
46	County	none
47	County	Granicus - GovQA ($32,000+). This is the only invoice I was able to obtain within the time provided.
48	County	Unk; each program has multiple uses besides processing NPRA requests.
50	State	Approximate annual cost for each system GTO: $19,476 annually METRC: $101,200 annually Office 365 (Sharepoint): $51,972 annually Accela: $349,622 annually

No.	Entity type	Question 41 – Answer as submitted
51	State	$66,257.13 for all DHS ($13,251.43 per division)
52	County	$610.00
53	State	$400.00
54	State	Precision Document Imaging $7,200 Adobe $350 Microsoft Office $3,600
56	County	Axon $139k/year Adobe $135k/year Granicus $90k/year
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Everlaw - $10,000/yr
58	State	$15,000; $12,000; $7,000
61	State	Do not have that breakdown
62	State	Granicus - about $37,000 per year
63	County	Adobe Pro - $102/license for approximately 20 people - $2,040 annually Axon - Total suite costs (tools beyond video redaction) - $460,000 annually Civic Plus (implementation currently in progress) - $11,327.40 annually Sweeps Software - $13,000 annually
64	State	AXON licensing cost is per camera for redactions, and averages approximately $39, 402 per year. Adobe licenses are approximately $112 a year.
66	State	$3,126 / Annual
67	County	Unknown
68	Municipal	Naviant Onbase: $91,663.89 SAAS, API Integration Toolkit $5,160, Training $9,200 Mimecast: $126,335 (Archiving emails $61,959.30 & Email Security & Awareness Training $64,375.30) Granicus FOIA: $53,045.01 Smarsh: $95,355.24 (1,040 devices) Veritone: $49,999 (2 licenses) Axon (pricing not available for redaction specific tools—this is part of a larger bundle)
69	Local agency	Unknown
70	Municipal	Unknown
71	Municipal	GovQA $27k per year (used almost exclusively for public records requests) LogikCull $29K per year (also used for litigation)

No.	Entity type	Question 41 – Answer as submitted
		Axom $16k per year (redaction tool add-on for surveillance camera agreement) Content Manager $297k per year (not used exclusively for public records requests) Smarsh $343k per year (not used exclusively for public records requests) Adobe Pro Not tracked with respect to redaction and public records
73	County	Unknown
74	State	approximately $20,100
75	State	$54,525.22
77	State	GovQA (Granicus) — $50,548.61 annually (includes hosting, maintenance, DR) SolarWinds Service Desk — Amount not recorded in Records' artifacts; enterprise ITSM licensing managed outside PRR program. (No separate PRR-specific subscription/maintenance cost on file.) Atlassian Jira/Confluence (Cloud) — Amount not recorded in Records' artifacts; enterprise SaaS licensing managed under DTE/IT, not PRR-specific.
78	County	$50,000 per year for records maintenance, retention, disclosure
79	State	JustFOIA - $5,370.41, Logikcull - $19,200, TeamDynamix - $113,131.18
80	State	$66,257.13 for the entire Department, with DPBH contributing $13,251.43
81	State	$13,251.43
83	County	unknown - would have to research across the county
88	State	OnBase licensing: $67,245
89	County	Mimecast- approx. $126,000/year baseline NextRequest, Sharepoint, and Smarsh currently unknown (can provide figures on request)
92	State	$10,659 Everlaw e-Discovery Platform (2025 annual spend) $939 Adobe Acrobat Pro (annual licensing for public records team) All other software/systems (e.g., M365) costs excluded as they are used for more than public records requests

Question 42. Annual data storage and hosting costs attributable to public records request processing.

57 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 42 – Answer as submitted
1	County	approximately $30,000

No.	Entity type	Question 42 – Answer as submitted
2	State	Storage costs do not attribute to public records request processing. However, over retention, unnecessary duplication of records, and lack of resource support to properly maintain/retain records in an efficient and accessible manner contribute to potential slowdowns of public records request processing.
4	State	$0
5	State	Too difficult to answer--part of GTO server storage
6	County	unknown
8	State	Through GTO
9	County	Onbase /Naviant $115,000
10	County	Don't know
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Unknown
14	County	$80,000
17	County	no sure
19	State	Unknown
20	County	Unknown
21	State	unknown
24	County	$25,000
25	State	No additional costs
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Unknown
28	County	Unknown
29	State	These systems are used for all NSCB work, not just records requests
30	State	unknown
32	State	Unknown
34	County	Unknown
35	State	Unknown
37	County	Unknown - Washoe County

No.	Entity type	Question 42 – Answer as submitted
38	State	There are no additional data storage and hosting costs.
43	State	Unknown
44	State	Unknown.
46	County	less than $100
47	County	Granicus - GovQA - included in fees above
48	County	Unk
50	State	Metrc, Office 365, and Accela amounts listed above.
51	State	included in above
54	State	$1,300
56	County	see above
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Everlaw see above
61	State	Do not have that breakdown
62	State	Granicus - about $37,000 per year
63	County	No data available, data hosting and storage is not broken down by public records requests.
64	State	Cost is not separable from overall data storage cost for the Division.
66	State	Data Storage: $736 / Annual Hosting Cost: $2088 / Annual
67	County	Unknown
68	Municipal	Granicus FOIA: $53,045.01
69	Local agency	Unknown
70	Municipal	Unknown
71	Municipal	Not tracked.
73	County	Unknown
74	State	unidentifiable specific to public records requests
77	State	GovQA (Granicus) — Included in subscription; $0 additional DMV hosting/storage. SolarWinds Service Desk — No PRR-specific hosting/storage cost on file; enterprise ITSM SaaS. Atlassian Jira/Confluence — No PRR-specific hosting/storage cost on file; enterprise SaaS.
79	State	included in subscriptions listed above

No.	Entity type	Question 42 – Answer as submitted
80	State	Included in above
83	County	unknown would have to research across the county
88	State	unknown
89	County	Unknown at this time
90	State	Unknown
91	State	Unknown
92	State	$10,659 Everlaw e-Discovery Platform (2025 annual spend)

Question 43. Does your Gov Entity use AI or other automated tools to assist in searching, reviewing, or redacting records? If so, describe. If not, has your Gov Entity evaluated such tools, and what were the barriers—cost, procurement, accuracy, legal risk, or other?

87 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 43 – Answer as submitted
1	County	We do not use AI for redactions. We have evaluated some programs, but the end result is the same, man hours to review and perform further redactions as they are not very accurate and cost prohibitive.
2	State	Currently, NDOT is not utilizing AI to automate review or redaction. Currently NDOT IT is using AI and Microsoft Purview to better identify structured data sources and develop data classification taxonomies. It should be noted; IT Divisions have the technological resources to begin pilot programs such as AI automation, but rarely is Records Management included in the project discussion or implementation. This is a cultural issue across State of Nevada government.
3	Constitutional agency	no
4	State	No
5	State	cost
6	County	no AI at the time
7	County	No
8	State	No. Numerous issues with legal risk.
9	County	Onabse/Naviant, but not yet to full capabilities, we just migrated. AI will be utilized as we become more educated in the new software.
10	County	Don’t know
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the	N/A and have not evaluated yet.

No.	Entity type	Question 43 – Answer as submitted
	Nevada Constitution	
13	County	Standard Language Learning Models have been used to review records.
14	County	We do not use AI as an organization. Some staff use their own accounts or the free trial use. The main barrier is cost and procurement.
15	County	no
16	State	No
17	County	not sure
19	State	No
20	County	No
21	State	no
22	County	no
23	State	WOULD LOVE TO DO THIS! No we haven't. Hoping this is a possibility in the future. It would save so much time and not make records requests feel so overwhelming.
24	County	No for my department Unknown on evaluation and cost approval by other County Departments of possible software that would maybe be used county-wide
25	State	No and evaluation of such tools has started.
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	NA - No, concerns about accuracy and reliability
27	District Court	No. Concerns with AI include cost, confidentiality, accuracy, etc.
28	County	No
29	State	Not currently. The NSCB is going through a database transition and may begin using a closed AI system.
30	State	No.
31	County	We only use AI for image cropping at this time. We are reviewing new integrated tools with our software provider this fiscal year for redaction and auto-indexing.
32	State	No
33	County	No
34	County	No.

No.	Entity type	Question 43 – Answer as submitted
35	State	Not yet, but may in the future.
36	Municipal	No, we do not currently use AI. Yes, we have evaluated tools but the cost and lack of manpower to implement are prohibitive. We have concerns about utilizing AI as well.
37	County	Unknown
38	State	We do no use AI or any other automated tools. We have not evaluated such tools.
39	Board	No. The Board has not had to look into other tools at this time.
40	State	No & No
41	County	Not at this time. AI is being considered for search and collection functions.
42	State	No
43	State	Rarely
44	State	No, Concerns about legal and environmental risks. Accuracy concerns.
46	County	no
47	County	For Video Redaction Only, through AXON Evidence.com. There is automated facial detection and document detection that can be utilized. For documents, CaseGuard was evaluated for possible automation but it was inaccurate and took more time to process than to manually redact using Adobe.
48	County	No
50	State	No
51	State	Only a search function for patterns such as phone numbers, date of birth and other as built into GovQA to search for PII.
52	County	no
53	State	NO
54	State	No we do not. Tested Power Automate to automate searching for key terms in SharePoint files, but it was buggy and took more time than searching manually at least upon initial set up. Our agency has not strongly considered using AI to search, review, or redact records due to the legal risk and perceived unlikelihood that AI would produce results that would save time or effort given the importance of accuracy.
55	State	no
56	County	Yes, Axon has AI assistance but it is not accurate and requires significant corrections. We have not found a better program using AI efficiently.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	We don't yet but I anticipate using Anthropic's AI to start assisting with search and review. We are still developing our policy and evaluating cost, legal risk, etc.

No.	Entity type	Question 43 – Answer as submitted
58	State	No
59	State	No. Issues are accuracy, legal risk, and cost
60	State	No
61	State	No
62	State	Not at this time.
63	County	One Department uses Axon Reduction Studio Madison AI can be used for publicly available records (a small percentage of the records)
64	State	No
65	State	No - legal risk/confidential information being uploaded into AI makes me uncomfortable (personally)
66	State	Limited to Copilot per IT. Have not considered at this time.
67	County	No
68	Municipal	We use AI-assisted video redaction for Body Worn Camera. An employee runs these tools and then manually reviews for accuracy.
69	Local agency	No
70	Municipal	No.
72	County	No
73	County	Unknown
74	State	No. We have not formally evaluated such tools and the associated barriers.
75	State	No. The barriers were cost and legal risk.
76	State	No
77	State	The DMV does not currently use AI or LLM-based tools for searching, reviewing, or redacting public records. All redaction is performed manually through Adobe Pro and GovQA's in-tool redaction features, which are human-driven and do not incorporate AI. The State has evaluated AI and automation at a policy and governance level, but not deployed them for PRR processing. The State Chief Information Officer's AI policy and DMV's AI vendor-risk assessment frameworks identify significant barriers to adopting AI for sensitive record workflows, including: Legal and privacy risks around regulated data and PII Model transparency and provenance concerns Security and compliance obligations (NIST AI RMF, ISO 42001, OWASP LLM security)

No.	Entity type	Question 43 – Answer as submitted
		Procurement and contract risks, including mandatory no-training commitments, disclosure requirements, and auditability
78	County	No. Cost, time to implement and train, legal risk.
79	State	No, however we're researching SMARSH and Everlaw for their eDiscovery tools.
80	State	Only a search function for patterns such as phone numbers, date of birth and other as built into GovQA to search for PII.
81	State	No, our agency has not evaluated.
82	State	No, but we are considering prudent use of these tools.
83	County	No, but the County is currently evaluating such tools, but one largest struggle is not having a definition of a public record in Nevada law
84	County	No, cost and procurement. Concern with accuracy and legal risk.
85	State	No
86	County	no
87	Municipal	No
88	State	No - No
89	County	Not currently. County staff worked to create Madison AI, which is in the process of developing public records AI tools.
91	State	1. No. 2. Yes. Barriers are the budget, procurement, authority, approvals, implementation, staff to manage.
92	State	No - not used. We have evaluated an AI add-on in Everlaw for redactions and locating responsive records. The additional AI features would cost an additional $5,100 each year.

Question 44. Identify technology your Government Entity needs but does not have and the estimated cost of acquiring such technology, if known.

60 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 44 – Answer as submitted
1	County	We need an updated CAD system that allows for tracking of requests through the system rather than relying on manual entries into a spreadsheet
2	State	NDOT needs more members of the public records team to complete processing of public records requests, members of the public records team need to be classified at a program officer 1 due to the complex nature of the requests received, the nuanced understanding of what information needs to be redacted, and the communication skills needed to communicate complex scenarios across multiple levels of NDOT, including with legal and executive

No.	Entity type	Question 44 – Answer as submitted
		staff. NDOT needs a robust enterprise-wide content management system that would provide the Department with a central repository for all records and a way to manage processes including public records requests, records retention, and open meeting management. Finally, the State of Nevada needs a cultural shift to help all State employees understand the importance of the records they create or receive. Currently, I have no estimated cost for the items listed above, however, I would guess approximately 2 million dollars would be needed to implement the items listed above, and further personnel funding each year to address the change in job classification for the public records team.
4	State	Better redaction software. Unknown.
5	State	auto redaction
6	County	unknown
10	County	Don't know
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Unknown
14	County	JustFOIA ($19,500) and FOIAXpress ($80,000)
16	State	We are considering a software solution, but we are in the very beginning stages of this search, and do not have any quotes or ideas of cost at this time.
17	County	not sure
19	State	Unknown
20	County	Public records management software and portal. $7,500 per year
21	State	unknown
22	County	Any competent software - $10,000+
23	State	Would love to figure out how to better search for e-mails and have them be PDF's. It takes so much time trying to figure out Purview and then having to download to my own outlook and then try and download to PDF. It makes no sense and takes up a lot of time. ALL FOR AI TOOLS to shorten the process.
24	County	Unknown
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Unknown
28	County	Unknown
29	State	The NSCB is going through a database transition. This was budgeted and will be paid through NSCB funds.

No.	Entity type	Question 44 – Answer as submitted
30	State	No.
31	County	We are interested in AI capable hardware (NVIDIA graphic processors) for our county data center so we can keep county data inside the county, while still taking advantage of the capabilities of AI in order to create AI solutions internally. Estimated cost $50,000.
32	State	Unknown
35	State	File Transfer Protocol (FTP)
36	Municipal	We would like to upgrade our OnBase system to use Agentic AI for records. Hyland offers powerful tools to assist but we cannot afford it.
37	County	Unknown
38	State	We still have lots of documents on microfilm. It can be challenging to retrieve and research records on film. We have begun the process of having some film digitize through NV State Library, Archives and Public Records. This process will take several years, if not decades to complete. Our barriers are more staff time utilized to research and review requests, we could see where AI assistance could potentially be helpful for these processes in the future.
40	State	Unknown at this time. However, public records seem to be increasing and new technology may prove helpful.
43	State	Unknown
44	State	There are options?
46	County	unknown at this time
48	County	Unk
50	State	Document Management System. Unknown estimated cost.
51	State	none
52	County	none
53	State	Unknown
56	County	Advanced computers with higher RAM/faster processors and associated infrastructure. Unknown cost
57	Bistate Compact Agency	A way to preserve and produce text messages and similar from personal devices. Could been anywhere from $300 one time fee to a subscription fee
58	State	We would encourge the State to explore NextRequest (CivicsPlus) for managing public records requests and QEPS (appx software $72,000 implementation and $15,000 annual subscription) . The volume of requests we receive doesn't justify the expense for our division alone.
62	State	Unknown

No.	Entity type	Question 44 – Answer as submitted
63	County	Additional data storage will be needed if the volume of record requests continues, additional Adobe Pro licenses would be helpful for redaction. Estimated cost: $15,000.
64	State	Digitizing microfilm into an onsite storage - approximately $280,752. Staff and additional workstations and licenses for staff to complete these tasks.
66	State	Unknown
67	County	Unknown
68	Municipal	Additional licenses for RPD AI-assisted redaction software ($49,999 per 2 licenses).
69	Local agency	None identified at this time.
70	Municipal	PRR processing platform such as JustFOIA. The City recently received a quote for this program for approximately $35,000 year.
71	Municipal	Federated search tools that allow document content level searching across the entire enterprise and across an arbitrary number of repositories as well as network shares. Estimated total cost of ownership is approximately $150,000–$300,000 for first year implementation and $100,000–$250,000 in annual recurring costs.
73	County	Unknown
74	State	Request tracking software; document review software; cost unknown
77	State	The DMV has identified several technology needs that would significantly improve its ability to process and secure public records: 1. Automated redaction tools (non-AI or AI-augmented) No automated redaction system is currently in use; all redaction is manual in Adobe Pro & GovQA. Needed to reduce processing time and error risk. Cost unknown but would require compliance with Nevada's AI and data-security policies and a full vendor risk assessment. 2. Centralized federated search across systems Records are stored across multiple systems requiring separate manual searches (GovQA, Jira, SolarWinds Service Desk, email, file shares) etc. A federated search tool would reduce search time, improve auditability, and ensure records completeness. Cost unknown; would require enterprise procurement approval. 3. Modernized secure communication and PII-handling tools The DMV has documented risks in legacy communication channels (fax, voice, etc.) and identified need for secure digital workflows.

No.	Entity type	Question 44 – Answer as submitted
		Upgrades would include: Secure digital intake Encrypted data-exchange mechanisms Automated audit and tracking capabilities These needs are recognized but unfunded; cost varies by solution. 4. Additional enterprise security and compliance tools Enhancement concept documents highlight gaps in governance, audit mitigation, and security tooling required to reduce operational risk.
78	County	Granicus, CivicPlus, Casepoint
79	State	A better eDiscovery tool to help narrow overly broad requests.
82	State	None.
83	County	With such a large organization each department has unique needs, and one technology may not meet the needs of all departments.
84	County	Unknown, but technology would definitely be helpful.
85	State	Unsure if it is a need. However, we would benefit from resources that would make our processes more efficient.
90	State	Automatic retrieval system for records, public facing web portal front end, automated response and prompt system, tracking system. Unknown cost
91	State	GovQA (cost unknown) Everlaw (~ $15,000 (estimate from 2/26 was $16.44 per GB per month with an estimate of 50 GB per month)
92	State	$15,000 Everlaw Public Request Portal (*proposed* annual fee, additional $5,100 for AI features). Other request management software/systems (GovQA, JustFOIA, Civic Plus, etc.) are substantially more expensive.

Question 46. Approximately how many digital systems must be searched to respond to a typical request?

87 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 46 – Answer as submitted
1	County	2-3, our cad system, axon/evidence.com, and our physical shared drives.
2	State	3-6
3	Constitutional agency	6
4	State	Two or three

No.	Entity type	Question 46 – Answer as submitted
5	State	3
6	County	5
7	County	2
8	State	Unknown, requests go to GTO
9	County	5+
10	County	5-10
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	1
13	County	5
14	County	Depending on the request, usually 3 to 4.
15	County	1
16	State	Two
17	County	three
18	Municipal	5
19	State	1-4
20	County	2
21	State	multiple
22	County	unknown
23	State	~5
24	County	1
25	State	ORBS, Preceptive, Teams, and Outlook
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	1-3
28	County	3-5
29	State	up to 2 systems
30	State	3-5
31	County	1
32	State	1

No.	Entity type	Question 46 – Answer as submitted
33	County	2
34	County	1-10
35	State	4-5
36	Municipal	Too many to list
37	County	Unknown exactly how many; guess is 5
38	State	3-5
39	Board	One
40	State	Three
42	State	0
43	State	1-3
44	State	5
45	State	11
46	County	3
47	County	5-6
48	County	Varies; up to a dozen is a good estimate
50	State	3
51	State	unknown
52	County	one
53	State	2
54	State	4
55	State	2
56	County	5-15
57	Bistate Compact Agency	5-7
58	State	3
59	State	2
61	State	One
62	State	Depends on the type of request.
63	County	Approximately 15 to 20 systems across all Carson City Departments.
64	State	5 - cFive, Mainframe, Microfilm, and OnBase, AXON

No.	Entity type	Question 46 – Answer as submitted
65	State	Depends on the request - it really does vary widely but if it's a search for documents it's usually 2-3 - emails, shared drives, etc.
66	State	0
67	County	3
68	Municipal	2-5 systems
69	Local agency	1-2
70	Municipal	3-5
71	Municipal	15+
72	County	3-4
73	County	Several
74	State	unknown
75	State	2-3
77	State	5–7 systems. This reflects the typical workflow for DMV PRRs, some simple requests may require fewer, but anything involving correspondence, insurance (NV LIVE), security documents, or technical records almost always requires 5 or more systems.
78	County	Three
79	State	3-4 systems are used to respond to almost every request.
80	State	There is a large number of variation based on the specific request made
81	State	2
82	State	3
83	County	Depends but could be multiple
84	County	Unknown, many
85	State	5-6
86	County	unknown
87	Municipal	5-10
88	State	1 to 3
89	County	Depends on the request, email, text messages,
90	State	3
91	State	At least 8
92	State	3-4

Fees and Prepayment

Question 49. Identify the rate(s) charged for staff or attorney time and any threshold that must be met before staff or attorney time is charged.

22 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 49 – Answer as submitted
1	County	$35 per hour of staff time. The first hour is free.
15	County	The first 10 hours spent on a request are waived; after that, they are charged the fee of an Office Assistant, which is $25.45 an hour.
20	County	$23.31 per hour for requests taking more than 10 hours
27	District Court	For court records, we charge 50 cents a page, $3 per document for certification, $25 for video, $5 for exemplification per document, $90 deposit for "binders" (large document requests). For administrative records, charges are for voluminous requests requiring more than approximately 10 hours at the Deputy Clerk or Records Clerk rate.
33	County	10 Hours of Staff Time
34	County	Depends if we are using an outside attorney. An outside attorney is charging Eureka County $250/hour for attorney services and $110/hour for paralegal services.
37	County	$30.42/hr for anything over 2 hours for staff; unknown what attorney may charge
41	County	Information will be provided in responses by other Agency department(s).
46	County	the Government workers wage and benefits
47	County	The first 10 hours of work are completed at no charge using the county-approved fees; the current rate for the lowest-level office position (Office Assistant) is $26.34, charged for each hour beyond the first 10.
48	County	Our current policy is to charge up to $0.50 per page (even if sent electronically) for requests that exceed two hours of staff time to process.
50	State	Personnel costs after 10 hours: Hourly rate of reasonably available and qualified personnel.
56	County	$89/hr for BWC for non media. $14/narrative document and after 20 pages it is 40 cents per page for non media documents. Case files are 10 pages/hour, unless it is not a full page of text. Each request is reviewed and the cost is determined by the volume of the request.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/TRPA_Public-Records-Request-Cost-Sheet.pdf
63	County	Unavailable at time of submission, can provide later upon request.
67	County	Over 10 hours of staff time, per county policy

No.	Entity type	Question 49 – Answer as submitted
68	Municipal	The City charges for staff time on body-worn camera (BWC) recording requests, at $34.00 per hour, billed in 15-minute increments: 1 to 15 minutes, $8.50 (minimum charge); 16 to 30 minutes, $17.00; 31 to 45 minutes, $25.50; 46 to 60 minutes, $34.00. There is no threshold before the charge applies; the $8.50 minimum is charged from the first minute. The City does not charge for staff or attorney time on any other type of public records request.
69	Local agency	$30 for Staff, $60 for attorney time. Fees begin after one hour of research time on request.
71	Municipal	A requester is charged $32.00 per hour if a request will take more than 10 hours to complete in accordance with R-48-2019.
77	State	DMV charges a statutory Research Fee of $3.00 per page when staff must perform additional searching, reviewing, or redaction of records. No hourly rate is used. The fee applies only when staff must conduct work beyond simple record retrieval
87	Municipal	$25 per hour
89	County	Staff time is charged for any request that is estimated to take longer than 10 hours (first 10 hours are not charged). It is charged at the lowest hourly rate of an Office Support Specialist (approx. $20/hour) regardless of which employee actually works on the request (i.e., attorney staff time is still charged at the lower $20/hour rate)

Question 50. Does your Government Entity require prepayment or a deposit before beginning work? Describe any threshold and the practice.

72 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 50 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Prepayment or deposit is typically required for large requests that we know will take at least a certain amount of time. A quote is given before proceeding and communication is left open with the requestor to ensure they are aware of all costs incurred.
2	State	No, NDOT does not currently charge fees.
4	State	No
5	State	No threshold as we have not implemented the practice yet
6	County	in some cases, yes
8	State	No
9	County	No. But would like to in the future as the searches are becoming for frequent and excessive; awaiting various determinations, statutes, regulations and court cases to be determined prior to initiating this practice.
10	County	No as we don't charge
13	County	In certain cases dependent upon the request.

No.	Entity type	Question 50 – Answer as submitted
14	County	No, the nominal costs that are allowed to be recovered under NRS are not worth the administrative burden of tracking.
15	County	If a request is going to take longer than 10 hours, then they will need to pay 50 percent of the fee to begin the request. The rest needs to be paid before the request can be released.
16	State	Per NRS 239.052, a government entity is permitted to charge a fee for the actual cost incurred in the provision of a public record. This includes, without limitation, the cost of ink, toner, paper, media, and postage. Pursuant to NRS 239.052(2), the Purchasing Division chooses to waive this fee except for the following exceptions: Hard copy requests of 50 or more single pages Postage costs The media used to provide electronic records (e.g., thumb drive, discs) The Division will inform the requestor of any fees prior to responding to the request. Fees List : Black and white copies, up to 8.5" x 11": $0.05 per page Color, up to 8.5" x 11": $0.50 per page Compact Disc/DVD/Thumb Drive: $5.00 per device Electronic versions (.pdf) could be too large to be emailed so other means of delivery can be discussed. The Department PIO will reach out to the requestor if the materials are too large to email.
17	County	no
18	Municipal	Only where the City was going to incur a significant cost to comply, which was not a part of normal operations.
19	State	No
20	County	Yes - 1/2 of estimated staff cost up front when staff fees are being charged
21	State	no
22	County	no
23	State	I was told we werent allowed to do any of this.
24	County	No
25	State	No
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	No.
27	District Court	Occasionally, if the request is voluminous.
28	County	Not yet
29	State	Yes, for over $10.00

No.	Entity type	Question 50 – Answer as submitted
30	State	No.
31	County	Yes. NRS 247.330 Fees payable in advance. A county recorder shall not record any document, furnish any copies or render any other service connected with his or her office, until the fees for the services, as prescribed by law, are paid or tendered.
32	State	No
33	County	For requests over 10 hours, a deposit of half total payment is required.
34	County	Yes and no. We rely upon outside counsel to determine the amount of deposit. However, work does begin even without the deposit to ensure we comply with State law.
35	State	No
36	Municipal	We charge for actual fees incurred as outlined in the statute. This includes postage, cost of flash drives, and .05/page for printed copies. We only provide B/W copies on 8 1/2 x 11 paper. No color or large copies.
37	County	1/2 $ amount for deposit
38	State	We only charge for physical print outs of documents, mailing costs, or flash drives.
40	State	No
42	State	No
45	State	Yes.
46	County	Only on very large requests
47	County	Yes, one half of the total estimated fee is required to begin work on the request. Upon completion of work, the remaining fee is due prior to the release of any records. The requester is provided with the actual hours of work, and the fee estimate is finalized with those actual hours worked.
48	County	Yes. When a fee notice is issued, we request a 50% fee up front and the remainder before the records are released
49	State	Fees will be imposed in accordance with the posted Fee Schedule. The Requestor is advised if the request will require significant use of personnel and/or resources and if the cost will exceed $25.00. Payment of half of the estimated amount is required
50	State	The CCB will provide an estimate of the actual fees if that estimate exceeds $25.00. Depending on the scope and magnitude of the records request, a fifty (50) percent deposit of fees prior to the start of retrieval may be required. If a deposit is required or an estimate of fees is provided, CCB staff shall wait for requester approval of the fee estimate prior to continuing the work. The remainder of fees must be paid before records are delivered.
51	State	DHS has a fee schedule but has never levied any charges related to public records requests.

No.	Entity type	Question 50 – Answer as submitted
53	State	NO
55	State	no
56	County	Yes, the work is done to locate and determine if the records exist and the work needed to produce the records. Then an invoice is sent and work is completed once payment is received.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Yes, see 15.6 https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/documents/Rules-of-Procedure.pdf
59	State	No.
61	State	No
62	State	There is no charge for Public Records Requests.
63	County	No
64	State	No
66	State	no
67	County	Prepayment required.
68	Municipal	Yes. Lengthy video redaction requests require a deposit prior to record production. An estimate is sent to the requester for their confirmation, and then an invoice for a deposit is required to be paid before work begins on the request.
70	Municipal	The Police Department generally requests a $40 deposit for extensive requests. The City does not currently require a deposit for other extensive requests. However, in light of the significant increase in voluminous and burdensome commercial requests, the City is considering enacting such a deposit fee in certain circumstances and as permitted by law.
71	Municipal	Yes. Pre-payment is required. A requester is charged $32.00 per hour if a request will take more than 10 hours to complete in accordance with R-48-2019.
72	County	N/A. Our court only does records request not public records search.
73	County	Not at this time
75	State	No
77	State	DMV provides an estimate and requests confirmation before proceeding when fees may be incurred.
78	County	No
79	State	A shipping and handling fee is required before sending records by mail carrier.
80	State	We will only charge for excessive production of physical materials (i.e, requests to print a large number of pages), but has not needed to levy any charges related to public records requests recently.

No.	Entity type	Question 50 – Answer as submitted
81	State	Nothing is required
82	State	No
83	County	Depends on the department. Election does based on statutory approved fees.
86	County	no
87	Municipal	Only in certain circumstances
88	State	No
89	County	When a request meets the threshold for charging staff time, staff requests a deposit of 50% of the estimated staff time cost prior to continuing processing the request.
91	State	Not anymore. DOI created a fee schedule that required a deposit, but after a few experiences, DOI found that collecting deposits were difficult because often a refund was owed to the requester. Getting a refund from the State is a cumbersome process.

Disputes and Dispute Resolution

Question 55. Number of public records disputes from January 1, 2023, to August 31, 2026, that escalated beyond ordinary correspondence — for example, a demand letter or threat of litigation?

74 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 55 – Answer as submitted
1	County	2
2	State	Approximately 5% of requester correspondence escalates beyond ordinary correspondence.
3	Constitutional agency	none
4	State	0
5	State	3
8	State	Several but usually because they were unhappy with what the records showed (or didn't)
9	County	5-10 to my knowledge, could be more.
10	County	3-4
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	3 (estimated)

No.	Entity type	Question 55 – Answer as submitted
13	County	8
14	County	I can only think of three. Our practice is to make every effort to gather the records even if it means physically going to a warehouse to search for old permit records from 30 years ago.
15	County	Around 15-20.
16	State	None that I am aware of
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	Two
20	County	3
21	State	unknown
22	County	a few
23	State	None that I am aware of. Currently dealing with one right now though.
24	County	3
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Approximately 5-7.
27	District Court	Unknown, multiple litigants in each year.
28	County	1-3
29	State	not many
32	State	0
33	County	None, defer to Washoe DA's Office
34	County	25-50
35	State	One
36	Municipal	1
37	County	0
38	State	We have only had one or two requestors that have disagreed with our response and threatened to escalate their request in legal way or threat but have not seen it through.
40	State	28
42	State	0
43	State	None to my knowledge
44	State	0

No.	Entity type	Question 55 – Answer as submitted
45	State	0
46	County	1
48	County	Not tracked, but I would guess less than 20.
51	State	unknown
53	State	0
54	State	0
55	State	0
56	County	100-200
59	State	3
62	State	Unknown
63	County	10
64	State	exact number unknown at this time, approximately 2-3 cases.
65	State	None that I can think of
66	State	Approximately three - These are not tracked
67	County	0
68	Municipal	Not tracked
69	Local agency	Less than 10.
70	Municipal	Approximately 5
71	Municipal	This information isn't tracked, but with the rise of AI an increasing number of requesters are threatening litigation in their initial request if their request isn't fulfilled (as opposed to responded to) within 5 days. This is frequently in conjunction with overbroad and overburdensome requests that would take in excess of the free 10 hours of labor that the City affords. The same requesters also use boiler-plate language to respond to delay notices and requests for clarification.
73	County	Unknown
74	State	2
75	State	Nevada Health Authority is a new organization as of July 1, 2025. Since that time and to the best of my knowledge, 10-20 have escalated past normal correspondence.
77	State	1
78	County	Fewer than 10
79	State	We were unable to collect this information before the survey deadline.

No.	Entity type	Question 55 – Answer as submitted
80	State	We are aware of at least one such threat, although no formal litigation was filed.
81	State	0
82	State	0
83	County	just a handful maybe less than 5
84	County	Approximately 10
85	State	None.
86	County	none that we are aware of for our specific county office
87	Municipal	3
88	State	0
89	County	Approx. 2 (does not include Sheriff's Office)
90	State	Unknown
91	State	At least 4 times
92	State	40

Question 56. Number of petitions filed against your Government Entity under NRS Chapter 239 from January 1, 2023, to August 31, 2026.

72 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 56 – Answer as submitted
1	County	0
2	State	To my knowledge, one requester filed a complaint with the Attorney General's Office related to the timeframe necessary to review and redact his request. There are no other petitions files against NDOT that I am aware of.
3	Constitutional agency	none
4	State	0
5	State	0
8	State	None that I'm aware of
9	County	None that I am aware of
10	County	0
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the	0

No.	Entity type	Question 56 – Answer as submitted
	Nevada Constitution	
13	County	0
14	County	Zero. We make EVERY effort to be responsive and provide the requested information even if it takes an inordinate amount of IT resources and staff time. The County has even hired an outside firm to assist with complicated and burdensome requests in order to gather and produce the requested records. The threat of litigation, attorney's fees, and costs makes it impractical to resist even overly broad requests.
15	County	Around 10.
16	State	None that I am aware of
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	0
20	County	0
21	State	unknown
22	County	none
23	State	None that Im aware of
24	County	3
25	State	No
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	0
28	County	0
29	State	I don't know what this means so cannot respond
32	State	0
33	County	None, defer to Washoe DA's Office
34	County	0
35	State	One
36	Municipal	0
37	County	0
38	State	None that I am aware of
40	State	0
42	State	0

No.	Entity type	Question 56 – Answer as submitted
43	State	None to my knowledge
44	State	0
45	State	0
46	County	0
48	County	One
51	State	unknown
53	State	0
54	State	0
55	State	0
56	County	approximately 5
59	State	0
62	State	Unknown
63	County	2
64	State	unknown
65	State	None that I can think of
66	State	Approximately three - These are not tracked
67	County	0
68	Municipal	At least 1
70	Municipal	1
73	County	Unknown
74	State	0
75	State	Nevada Health Authority is a new organization as of July 1, 2025. Since that time and to the best of knowledge, approximately 1-5 petitions have been filed related to public records.
77	State	1
78	County	1
79	State	We were unable to collect this information before the survey deadline.
80	State	None that we are aware of.
81	State	0
82	State	0
83	County	one

No.	Entity type	Question 56 – Answer as submitted
84	County	1
85	State	None.
86	County	none that we are aware of for our specific county office
87	Municipal	0
88	State	0
89	County	Approx. 3
90	State	Unknown
91	State	At least 2 times
92	State	4

Question 57. Has your Government Entity used mediation or any other form of alternative dispute resolution in a public records dispute? Describe the process and the outcome.

65 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 57 – Answer as submitted
1	County	No
2	State	None that I am aware of.
3	Constitutional agency	no
4	State	No
9	County	None that I am aware of
10	County	Yes. They are directed to the DA's Office for response, not answered by our office.
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	None have yet escalated in that manner (which would be amenable to ADR)
13	County	No
14	County	We have used the County Manager and individual County Commissioners, including the chairperson, to act as an advocate for members of the public. The result has been to do whatever it takes to provide the requested information.
15	County	Don't believe so.
16	State	None that I am aware of

No.	Entity type	Question 57 – Answer as submitted
17	County	Unknown
20	County	No
21	State	no
22	County	no
23	State	None that I know of
24	County	No
25	State	No
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	No.
27	District Court	No
28	County	No
29	State	Not that I'm aware of.
32	State	No
35	State	No
36	Municipal	No
37	County	None used
38	State	No.
39	Board	No
40	State	No
42	State	No
43	State	None to my knowledge
45	State	0
46	County	no
48	County	No
51	State	unknown
53	State	NO
54	State	No
55	State	no

No.	Entity type	Question 57 – Answer as submitted
57	Bistate Compact Agency	N/a
59	State	No
62	State	Unknown
63	County	No
64	State	unknown
65	State	Not applicable
66	State	No
67	County	No.
68	Municipal	No/NA
69	Local agency	No
70	Municipal	No.
73	County	Unknown
75	State	Not to my knowledge.
77	State	No. DMV has not used mediation or ADR in public-records disputes. Issues are resolved through statutory review, requester clarification, and coordination with the Attorney General's Office
78	County	No
79	State	We were unable to collect this information before the survey deadline.
80	State	No
81	State	No, our agency has not looked into this.
82	State	No
83	County	When a dispute arises the District Attorney attempts to work with the requester to meet the requesters needed within the law.
84	County	No
85	State	No.
86	County	unknown
87	Municipal	No
89	County	Informal discussions with opposing counsel that occasionally resolve the issue prior to litigation.
91	State	No

Question 59. Identify any features that would make a non-judicial dispute resolution mechanism workable for your Government Entity, and any features that would make it unworkable.

81 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 59 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Unknown
2	State	What would make a non-judicial dispute resolution mechanism workable for NDOT is if said mechanism was operating on behalf of the requester and the government agency, allowing the government agency equal opportunity to provide context to complaints or disputes and had the authority to hold the requester accountable when their communication escalated or became hostile toward staff. What would make the mechanism unworkable is if the playing field so to speak was one sided in favor of the government agency or the requester.
4	State	If it fit within the requirements of a specific request. This has not been needed to date.
5	State	cost
7	County	Unsure
8	State	Unworkable in that the records often involve confidential data. Workable if the timelines were quick.
9	County	would need more info
10	County	Unsure
11	County	UNKNOWN
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	The willingness (or lack thereof) of pro se litigants to reduce or constrain the scope of their future redundant and argumentative public records requests.
14	County	The resolution process must be binding, truly neutral (i.e., no presumption in favor of anyone), and it must cap the County's exposure to attorney's fees and costs. Otherwise, the cost-benefit analysis will almost always favor producing records for even burdensome requests.
15	County	Does not apply.
16	State	We haven't had any disputes, so unable to speculate on this
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	Submitter screening process for non-public records requests or outside of scope.
19	State	Taxation has an ALJ which would take care of any disputes
20	County	Unknown
21	State	unknown

No.	Entity type	Question 59 – Answer as submitted
22	County	unknown
24	County	Requests placed within ample time, professionalism, precise and detailed requests
25	State	unknown
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Workable: led by a knowledgeable, objective, unbiased fact-finder/decision-maker. Prompt, simple process. Unworkable: led by someone politically-motivated, biased, person or someone without relevant knowledge or experience related to public records.
27	District Court	Workable - voluntary, non-binding Unworkable - mandatory for courts to participate, cost to participate, time to participate. If it requires as much information and time as a judicial resolution, and the judicial resolution is still available to both parties, then it is unworkable.
28	County	Workable - Timely, not create more work for staff Unworkable - lots of back and forth that would take time from staff
29	State	NSCB statutes governing confidentially are very specific. The NSCB very rarely receives disputes regarding records requests which cannot be resolved by explaining the law, and none have been unresolved during my tenure in the custodian of records position. I can't see how a dispute resolution mechanism would benefit the NSCB.
30	State	Availability, access & training.
31	County	Unknown
32	State	Unknown
33	County	Any feature imposing additional operational burden on staff would make it unworkable.
34	County	Some kind of mediation for the overly broad and burdensome records would be ideal. A neutral third party mediator for the requesters that are simply trying to overwhelm and harass a governmental entity by using Nevada Public Records Act.
35	State	Unknown at this time.
36	Municipal	Unless an ADR process would be statutorily the only way to resolve PRR conflicts, adding or requiring ADR would just increase the PRR burden on government entities by adding an additional administrative step that would not resolve PRR conflicts. The PRR conflicts we have are legal determinations that documents are not releasable that are challenged by the requester. ADR would not help the requester change their view of the City's legal position, and the City's legal position would already have been challenged and retained prior to the requester filing litigation
37	County	Unknown
38	State	I think it all depends on how the dispute would work.

No.	Entity type	Question 59 – Answer as submitted
39	Board	An efficient process that is cost effective.
41	County	Information may be provided in responses by other Agency department(s) - specifically Office of the District Attorney.
42	State	Unknown
43	State	Unsure
44	State	I would have to check with my DAG
46	County	Remote mediation would work
47	County	Clearly identify which disputes may be submitted and confirm that the Government Entity has legal authority to participate and resolve them. There should be a confidential process clause for disputes involving records subject to additional protections afforded to victims of crime, to criminal history, and to investigative techniques, pursuant to applicable law and case law. This would ensure that the sensitive details of the public records request are not further distributed through minutes, meeting transcripts, or additional correspondence used in the dispute resolution mechanism.
48	County	Unknown aside from cost. I do not have the ability to answer this question at my level.
49	State	Unworkable - Absolute Confidentiality Clauses, Prohibitive Fee-Shifting Structures, Waiver of Sovereign Immunity
51	State	unknown
52	County	Unknown
53	State	Unsure
54	State	Knowledge of the decision maker, binding nature of their decision and potential for appeal
55	State	if it saved time in replying to AI inquiries it would be helpful to have an automatic reply back to those systems.
56	County	Yes, 1 of the 5 lawsuits mentioned above was assigned to the settlement program in the courts. A senior judge was assigned and the process is still ongoing. To date, it has been successful at resolving disputes from burdensome/complex/and AI driven requests and incessant/vexatious demands.
59	State	Requestor needing to be reasonable in their burdensome requests and the government entity's lack of resources to devote one individual to it - not cost effective.
60	State	Unknown
62	State	Clear limits on the scope of disputes, confidentiality protections, low or no cost to the government entity
63	County	Disputes often revolve around time to produce records or confidentiality and privacy of records. Those disputes are not likely to be resolved in dispute

No.	Entity type	Question 59 – Answer as submitted
		resolution. It is not clear whether dispute resolution would be helpful or would be a time delay before litigation. Some disputes also center around the types of records requested and clarification about what is being requested, and those disputes may benefit from dispute resolution.
64	State	Helping minimize the frequency of cases that would result in litigation.
65	State	Depends on staff time necessary to participate. Unfortunately, most of the disagreements in recent times arise because an AI generated response suggests that records exist (that actually don't) or something along those lines.
66	State	Budget limitations prevent from consideration.
67	County	Quick/efficient; reasonable standards.
68	Municipal	NA – Not interested.
69	Local agency	The mechanism should not require extensive briefing or in-person time commitments. Resolutions should be overseen by a limited number of trained individuals with judicial oversight. Timing should be more relaxed than the five-day response deadline.
70	Municipal	Some ideal features would be that the mechanism be presided over by an individual familiar with all aspects of relevant PRR issues, would first require some sort of good faith "meet-and-confer" between the requester and the Government Entity, would ideally be mandatory prior to filing suit, and should not involve any penalty against the City for good faith actions. Overall, the City is open to this idea if it appears to work for all sides and is a true deterrent to litigation.
71	Municipal	The City may like the creation of a neutral dispute resolute mechanism that can fairly balance the reasonableness of requests with respect to the City's resources and applicable law.
73	County	Unknown
74	State	unknown at this time
75	State	Cost, legal risk.
76	State	A moderator that would assist in responses and coordination. Would not work if it caused excessive staff hours.
77	State	A non-judicial dispute-resolution mechanism would be workable for the DMV only if it is designed to operate within strict statutory and regulatory limits governing DMV data. For example, DMV denial notices show that release of many records is prohibited by the Driver's Privacy Protection Act and NRS 481.063, and cannot be negotiated or waived. Any ADR mechanism must therefore respect mandatory confidentiality and not require DMV to release protected PII under any circumstances. Features that would make ADR workable: • Clear statutory boundaries ensuring ADR decisions cannot override DPPA, NRS 481.063, NRS 239.0107, or NAC 239.867.

No.	Entity type	Question 59 – Answer as submitted
		• Neutral reviewers familiar with Nevada public-records law and the unique confidentiality requirements of DMV systems. • Fast and lightweight processes that reduce, rather than increase, administrative burden—important because DMV commonly handles complicated, multicomponent requests. • Structured clarification tools, since many disputes arise from unclear or overbroad PRRs (e.g., requests for system diagrams, algorithms, or identity-matching processes that are not public records). • Mechanisms that support scope-narrowing, not the creation of new records, which DMV is legally prohibited from doing. Features that would make ADR unworkable: • Any requirement to release records that state or federal law protects, including PII, biometric data, driver-record details, or regulated system information. • Expectations to produce explanations, new documents, or analysis rather than existing records—DMV frequently must deny requests for non-records or technically detailed information. • Processes that add significant staff workload or duplicate the Attorney General/DAG review DMV already relies on for complex requests. • Any approach that conflicts with DMV's legal obligation to protect its data systems and accreditation boundary, which is repeatedly reinforced in interagency agreements and data-authority documentation.
78	County	The primary complaint regarding our records disclosure is time to produce final records. Dispute resolution may add additional time to that.
79	State	We were unable to collect this information before the survey deadline.
80	State	Excessive cost or commitment of staff hours would be some of the biggest potential difficulties that would make such a feature unworkable
81	State	We would want to further evaluate with our collogues across the state.
82	State	No experience with this issue; cannot suggest features.
83	County	The dispute resolution mechanism should involve a lawyer with public experience that understands the issues regarding government records, unworkable if the decision is final.
84	County	A non-judicial dispute resolution mechanism would be workable for Elko County if it provides a fair, timely, and affordable way to resolve disagreements. Helpful features would include clear eligibility criteria and procedures; impartial decision-makers with experience in local government; reasonable deadlines; remote participation; and an opportunity for both parties to explain their positions and provide supporting documentation. The process should encourage early, informal resolution and account for the staffing and resource limitations of rural counties. It should also clearly define whether outcomes are advisory or binding, preserve access to judicial review when necessary, and recognize statutory requirements and the authority of elected governing bodies.

No.	Entity type	Question 59 – Answer as submitted
		Features that would make the mechanism unworkable include substantial fees, mandatory travel, extensive filing requirements, unrealistic response deadlines, or a process that adds another layer of proceedings without resolving the underlying dispute. It would also be problematic if the process allows repetitive or abusive claims, lacks impartiality, or requires the County to take actions outside its legal authority. Any mandatory process should have safeguards to prevent unnecessary expense and diversion of staff from essential public services.
85	State	Two unworkable factors to consider: 1) Potential for variation in interpretation from administrative hearing officer(s); and 2) Unintended consequences including a potential increase in filings by requestors who would not have to go to court to submit complaints—bogging down the system.
86	County	unknown
87	Municipal	The Oregon Public Advocate model seems like a good model. Models that result in costs similar to litigation or other substantial costs to local government would be unworkable.
88	State	unknown at this time
89	County	A dispute resolution framework that remains within the government entity so as not to provide confidential records to an unknown third party. A framework that requires some kind of informal appeal to the division director or county manager, with notice to attorneys, would be extremely helpful. Sometimes issues are unknown, and can be resolved if higher-level staff are alerted before resorting to litigation.
90	State	Unknown
91	State	Make it required as a first resort and in good faith as a condition to get to litigation; ability to have staff dedicated to meet timelines; concern with having to release confidential records to a nonjudicial officer who is not subject to confidentiality; concern with having a nonexpert make decisions on agency records that could have considerable impacts on the market being regulated; concern with undermining Commissioner's authority to designate records as confidential
92	State	Requiring requesters to pay a minimal fee to discourage frivolous and automatic appeals on every request. Fast resolution. Judicial review.

Data Collection Capacity

Question 61. What metrics would your Government Entity find useful for its own management purposes, whether or not they are currently tracked?

87 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
1	County	average response time and time spent on requests.

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
2	State	NDOT has found number of PRRs, document/page count, and processing hours/days useful to attempt to address the rise in PRR requests over the last 3 years. Additional metrics that would be helpful for NDOT would be a mechanism to articulate the complexity of records requests and their impact on time and resources. If NDOT were able to better articulate impact on time and resources, the legislature could act accordingly to ensure government agencies were provided the resources necessary to complete requests in an more efficient and timely manner, better serving the public.
4	State	Date, timeline to respond, request, information responded with, repeat requestor, tracking of data to determine potential public posting for repeated requests, redaction needs, time invested into each request by personnel
6	County	time management, maybe
8	State	Ticketing systems for tracking and follow-up, would be nice to not use email to respond.
9	County	hours spent, and cost based on employee hourly pay to demonstrate the amount of taxpayer funds being utilized on public records requests by non county or non Nevada residents.
10	County	Unsure. A different entity tracks on our behalf
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Litigation-related metrics (statewide number or quantity of actual NRS Chapter 239 suits filed and statistics by victory, defeat, and whether attorneys' fees were awarded)
13	County	Number of requests, response time, staff hours spent,
14	County	Billing system so that each request received a project code that IT resources and staff time were billed to. But until there is a mechanism to recover those costs from the requestor, implementing the system only increases the already high cost to comply with records requests (at least for the worst abusers of the current system).
15	County	Our platforms allow us to search and pull reports.
16	State	Unknown. Perhaps hours spent by AAIII, hours spent by counsel, hours spent by Purch Off 3
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	Centralized coordination system
19	State	I do not know
20	County	Total number of requests and total time expended in responding to same.
21	State	N/A
22	County	type of request, time spent, cost

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
23	State	Work hours applied to the each request.
24	County	I really cannot name any
25	State	Increases of requests by type.
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Departments involved with each request; hours expended; how long it took to fill request, redact, etc.
27	District Court	For court record requests, we track the date of request, manner received, requestor's name, case number, document requested, amount paid, date request fulfilled for court records request. We do not uniformly track administrative records requests as they are sent out to the person most knowledgeable for response.
28	County	Requestor - Entity - Type of request - redaction? - time spent - responsible department - time to respond - request date - response date
29	State	The NSCB currently tracks and reports on the number of public records requests and subpoena's duces tecum received.
30	State	Tracking repeat/frequent requesters; more tracking of time; agency time spent training employees on PRRs.
31	County	Quantity of public records fulfilled (plain vs. certified) - by meta data vs. record production - by requestor type - by medium type (FTP, digital, paper) Fees collected Cost to the agency to produce records (by mail via paper, digital, FTP) - Employee hours fulfilling records requests
32	State	It may be helpful to track the number of public records requests received, how long they take to complete, how many are still pending, and the amount of staff time involved. Tracking the types and complexity of requests, common redactions or exemptions, and any appeals or complaints could also help. This would give us a better understanding of workload, staffing needs, and where we may be able to improve the process.
33	County	Currently tracks: Requestor information, correspondence, staff hours tracked, requestor frequency, and request timeline.
34	County	One specific department that handled public records requests. However, requesters send the requests to anyone with a County email address. Trying to streamline the process of receiving the request and completing the request needs to be more uniform for all County departments.
35	State	Unknown
36	Municipal	We could provide the total number of PRR's if requested. However, we are already overburdened and understaffed. We don't need additional unfunded mandates from the state. We need clarity. Please do not add work to our daily

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
		workload. Sending reports to the state is burdensome because we don't have time to track the data they want. We need the statutes cleaned up so we have clear guidance. NRS 239 was better before the changes in 2019. We need clear and complete rules surrounding public records. Fees used to be very clear and now every agency is doing something different. Require the requester to be clear and work with the agency. The agency is required to work with the requester, but they can be vague and we just have to roll with it. The AG used to provide a Public Records Act Manual and it was super helpful. That stopped in 2019. Please bring that back too.
37	County	Unknown
38	State	Staff hours spent, specifically on searching systems or reviewing records. It might be helpful to measure which formats and systems have been researched as well.
39	Board	Total requests received and closed; Average time to final completion; Staff Hours Spent; Number of Appeals; Outcome of Appeals; Number of requests from the same group
40	State	Number of request, time, pages, staff hours.
41	County	Total number of hours spent fulfilling requests. Average time to fulfillment. Utilization of self-service resources available with identical information requested.
42	State	Number of requests, employee hours per request, information requested.
43	State	Hours spent on PRRs
45	State	Staff hours utilized.
46	County	total page volume and redaction time statewide
47	County	volume of requests, time spent by staff per request, types of records requested, number of staff assigned to research, review, redact, and respond to public records requests, requester affiliation (general public, community member, media, commercial requester, litigator, etc.)
48	County	Unk
49	State	Number of requests where the records were provided within five days of receiving the request. Number of requests where an estimated response time beyond five days was provided. Average and median number of days from receipt of request to the date the request is closed. Total number of requests, by type of requester.
50	State	Individual requestor frequency and volume of documents supplied.
51	State	number of staff hours spent on PRRs broken down by task type
52	County	not known

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
53	State	Unsure
54	State	Number of requests, time to respond, source of requests, outcome
55	State	number of inquiries to all boards and commissions and time spent on each reply.
56	County	The mechanism would need to be speedy because the current system is not as onerous as some have portrayed. Litigation is not difficult to initiate & the court must make a decision quickly. It would be unworkable if the government was responsible for all the cost.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Staff time spent that does not count to fees (tracking, inputting requests submitted outside of the requested portal, filling out templates, telling requesters what the rules are)
58	State	Number of requests, number of hours spent on requests
59	State	# of requests, page volume of requests, types of requests, time and costs asserted by personnel diverting their attention form serving the public in their regular duties to protect the public health and safety.
60	State	Number of yearly requests, number of requests filed per requester, breakdown of the type of entity filing the request, and number of requests that required an extension
61	State	Records Request management system
62	State	Number of requests received, number of hours spent on request
63	County	Number of Requests, time per request and time for initial review, gathering of records, review, and redaction. Type of records requested. Department where requested records are held. Purpose of the request.
64	State	Metrics for commonly requested documents to consider the creation of public accessible documents. Metrics that would assist in tracking workload for the creation of new positions.
65	State	Staff time spent on responding, reviewing, redacting, etc.
66	State	Unknown at this time, potentially an additional position dedicated to fulfilling Public Record requests.
67	County	Type of record requested and by whom.
68	Municipal	Time to complete requests by type of record requested
69	Local agency	If request is for commercial purpose.
70	Municipal	Number of requests divided by type of request (commercial, litigation, etc.), total number of staff hours, total number of staff hours expended per request.
71	Municipal	The impact of public records requests upon City resources.
72	County	Our court only does record search requests. Public records are designated to Washoe County.

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
73	County	Unknown
74	State	number and type of requests, identity of requesters, clarification sought, disposition, work hours and days until closure
75	State	Tracking staff hours spent on records requests
76	State	Number of commercial inquiries .
77	State	The DMV would benefit from structured metrics that improve visibility into workload, statutory compliance, and resource planning. Useful metrics include: 1. Staff-hour tracking by request stage Time spent searching Time spent reviewing Time spent redacting Time spent preparing releases This supports compliance documentation and resourcing needs, as current staff capacity is already strained. 2. Redaction workload metrics Number of records requiring redaction Volume of pages redacted Average redaction time per request Redaction is a major labor driver for DMV PRRs, but metrics are not automatically captured today. 3. Multi-system search metrics Number of systems searched per request Frequency of cross-system retrieval This reflects DMV's fragmented system landscape and could justify modernization or automation efforts. 4. Request complexity and clarification metrics % of requests requiring clarification % of requests that are overbroad or unclear % of requests seeking non-records These align with the high rate of scope issues DMV encounters. 5. Confidentiality-triggered denial/redaction metrics Number of denials under DPPA / NRS 481.063

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
		Number of partial releases requiring statutory exemptions These are core compliance obligations reflected in denial notices. 6. External-entity referral or multi-agency routing metrics Number of requests requiring routing to or coordination with other State agencies Helpful for executive reporting and identifying systemic inefficiencies. 7. Litigation-related metrics Number of disputes escalating beyond standard correspondence Number of NPRA petitions filed These support risk and resource planning. 8. Customer-experience-oriented metrics (aligned with DTE governance improvements) Average response time Backlog size and age % of electronic vs. manual fulfillment These were highlighted as key improvement drivers in DMV transformation planning.
78	County	Number of requests, number of potentially responsive documents, time spent per request
79	State	Unknown at this time.
80	State	Some of the most important metrics we currently track are whether the requestor is a member of the media, the number of requests assigned to specific staff, and the date at which records requests are due.
81	State	Staff hours spent on each request & record categories.
82	State	Number of hours expended on requests.
83	County	Volume of requests, hours to fulfill requests
84	County	Elko County would find the following public records request metrics useful for management purposes: *Number of requests received, by department and general subject. *Time to acknowledge requests and provide records or otherwise close the request. *Number of pending requests and how long they have been open.

No.	Entity type	Question 61– Answer as submitted
		*Frequency of requests requiring extensive searches, review, redaction, or coordination across departments. *Commonly requested records that could be made readily available online. These measures would help us understand workload, identify delays, allocate staff resources, and improve public access. Given limited data collection capacity, we would prioritize information captured through a simple request log or existing system. Detailed tracking of staff hours and costs for each request would be useful but more difficult to maintain.
86	County	unknown
87	Municipal	Many metrics would be helpful if tracked in a consistent manner across agencies.
88	State	Number of PRR Staff hour spent for PRR Time to respond to PRR
89	County	Request totals per year.
90	State	Staff time logs for the purposes of public records.
91	State	State statistics for public records;
92	State	Number of: (1) requests received and processed, (2) requests referred to other government entities, (3) petitions for judicial review or mandamus relief, (4) staff and attorney hours required to fulfill individual requests, (5) staff and attorney hours required to redact records, (6) fee waiver requests granted and denied and the grounds therefore, and (7) number of requests for which the government entity sought clarification. (8) The average and median number of days to fulfill a request. (9) The total amount of fees collected for processing requests. (10) The number of full time and part-time staff devoted to processing requests. (11) The total government entity staff and attorney cost for fulfilling public records requests.

Statutory Issues and Other Comments

Question 75. What are the three most significant operational challenges your Government Entity faces in complying with the Nevada Public Records Act?

83 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
1	County	1. Online media outlets demanding records for ongoing investigations and threatening legal action when our district attorney denies the request due to our limited jury pool.

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
		2. Staffing limitations when a burdensome request is made. Due to us not having an actual records department, redactions are separated between the admin. assistant and a dispatcher. If call volume increases, redactions get put on the back burner and it is difficult for us to comply with some response time requirements. We are nearing the point of needing to hire a full-time employee to receive requests then redact and respond to requests. 3. Outdated and non- user-friendly records management system. 4. Volume of requests - The number of social media channel companies that request videos to repost and profit.
2	State	Quantity of requests received without additional resources being approved or provided to address the increase. The complexity of requests received requiring more time to research, requiring clarity from the requester, and collect the responsive records. Requesters being unwilling to participate in the PRR process in a constructive manner. The public doesn't trust the government, and government staff are learning not to trust the public.
4	State	Confidentiality of Data Volume of Request Lack of Personnel
5	State	Not enough employee time--everyone is already overworked Turn-around time is too quick for a short-staffed agency
6	County	information is available online. Customers could use the online portal on their own, but it is easier to just put in a request.
8	State	Public misunderstanding of what can be provided. AI/Data scraping requests Demands for things confidential by statute (investigation)
9	County	No set fees across the state Ability for requesters to ask for any records in certain circumstances dating back 150+ years Harassment by records requesters and their lawsuits
10	County	Time consuming requests Spam/sale requests for repeat requestors Rude and abusive language used in requests where nothing is requested, but used to complain.
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	1. Data scrapers. 2. Pro se litigants. 3. Good-faith but confused citizen records requests which result in mere generalized requests for information, but require research and drafting to respond due to the obtuse and tangential verbiage of the request.

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
14	County	1. No consequences for abusive behavior. I have personally worked on multiple requests that required multiple staff resources and hours of work and the requestor failed to pick up the requested records. 2. The County must maintain and search records on obsolete records systems that are no longer used and are no longer functioning. Records searches often involve multiple software products that have been discontinued and, in some case, the vendor is out-of-business. 3. Coordinating requests across multiple departments and various elected officials who do not answer to the County Manager's Office.
15	County	No challenges.
16	State	1. Not all of our records are housed in the same system. 2. Procurement will be moving from the EPro system to CoreNV in 2027 - this will create challenges, as we will eventually lose access to EPro - workarounds are in process, but will add additional time, and we aren't sure what it will look like yet. 3. We are considering a software solution, but the price is unknown, and it will have to be budgeted.
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	1. Staff time, 2. system management of production of records, 3. legal review and challenges
19	State	1. Public Records near a clear and concise description
20	County	Time spent searching emails, compiling documents, redacting documents.
21	State	Responding in a timely manner Producing the full extent of documents in a timely manner Filter through the volume of non-record requests
22	County	having to do it all manually
23	State	The whole system for E-mail searches, turning them into PDFs is ridiculous. Would love to speak to someone about how awful it is to do, especially if responding to a large request/date range. We definitely need a better system (especially with AI being available) so we can gather these e-mails, put them into PDFs and get them out the door. The process is so ancient and takes so much time and effort and Im not even sure if I am able to get all the right things.
24	County	1-Staffing Restrictions 2-Budgetary Restrictions 3-Unclear Requests
25	State	1. Staff time 2. Difficulties with software systems 3. No specific account or system for public record requests
26	Higher Education	1. Unduly burdensome requests;

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
	Institution under NSHE	2. Requests that seek records from multiple data sources or are not clear regarding what specific record is sought; 3. Budget challenges with getting and retaining enough staff to handle requests.
27	District Court	We do not believe the Nevada judiciary falls under the Nevada Public Records Act. However, we provide both the court record and administrative records. Our current challenges include requests for metadata or other technological data, AI generated requests where the requestor escalates quickly, and repeated requests where they continue to request the same or similar data.
28	County	It would be nice to have a single individual to be in charge of this, however in a small, efficient county government, that is impossible, so requests get bounced from department to department for information. The amount of these requests is getting very tedious, granted many only take a matter of minutes to gather, but when you get several a day, it really impedes actual work. Follow up requests have gotten cumbersome, wherein requestors receive the information they gathered, then inquire about some more information and this process goes on. The amount of AI generated or assisted requests is increasing and those can be quite cumbersome as AI knows what to ask for, which is usually way more than the requestor actually needs. IMO.
29	State	1. Requests created using AI creates unnecessarily large documents and uses valuable space on the NSCB's servers to received, store and respond to said requests. This statement is not specific to the NSCB, but it would be helpful if email systems could filter out and/or reject requests made using AI 2. Currently, the way the NSCB's system is set up creates an operational challenge but I'm hopeful that will be resolved within a year.
30	State	Staff availability, training, and lack of ability to control timing/volume of requests.
31	County	1. Appropriate fee collection based on type of records delivery method and quantity of records. (NRS 239 and NRS 247 conflict). 2. There is not a uniform contract for sale or MOU in place for Recorders conducting business with commercial requestors. Land records are made available for public inspection in the recorder's office or over the internet. To protect the privacy of the consumer, some recorders have asked about the buyer's intended use of bulk records. The national Property Records Industry Association (PRIA) encourages Recorders to create a contract with each buyer to spell out the specifics of the agreement for access or purchasing data in bulk. State law should be reviewed as it relates to accessing government data, and agreements should be reviewed by legal counsel. Some state laws set limits on the purchaser's ability to resell or redistribute purchased information; however, limitations should be based on the intent of use. These restrictions are be designed to prevent fraud and protect individuals' personally identifiable information (PII) in accordance with state or local law.
32	State	1. Managing the complexity of some public records requests

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
		2. Locating and reviewing records and meeting statutory response timelines while balancing competing priorities. 3. Time and resources needed to properly review and redact responsive records.
33	County	1. Staff member assigned to Public Records being inundated with requests during critical operational periods. 2. Requestors asking for repeatedly asking for records that do not exist. 3. Limited staff resources.
34	County	1. There is not one central department who handles all public records requests. 2. Not all County departments understand the NPRA. 3. Records are all over the place in the County.
35	State	Staffing resources is the biggest challenge for large requests.
36	Municipal	Clarity. We need the statute cleaned up so it's clear and complete. The changes made in 2019 made it more difficult, especially when it came to fees. Bring back the NPRA manual. Finish the Retention schedule updates the State started a couple of years ago. They worked on it and then right before the release it was scrapped. Having the ability to purge unnecessary records will be extremely helpful and cut down on expenses. We do not need a state ombudsman. We need clear statute, good resources, training, and no unfunded mandates.
37	County	Unknown
38	State	1) Staffing - we do not have staff solely dedicated to working on public records requests so we must compete with deadline for other records management tasks. 2) Large requests - overly labor some requests that take days to months to review records and to ensure our search is thorough, we are searching across several systems/formats. eDiscovery is also complex in that one search can result in hundreds of thousands of responsive documents. 3) Complex requests that require assistance from the OAG to review records and responses to ensure we are providing access to records that are public and responsive while protecting the records that are considered confidential by statute.
40	State	1. Staff time to compile information. Requests often disrupt normal scheduling of daily duties.
43	State	Time. No dedicated team to fulfill requests.
44	State	Size and amount of data, not knowing the reason behind the request to be able to answer the request most efficiently, time it takes to find, compile, and redact the data.
45	State	Staff time. Staff time. Facilitation Resources.
46	County	Finding the proper entity, finding where the documents are that fit the request, and redaction

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
47	County	The law is broad, and a record is broadly defined. The volume and complexity of requests have increased, but staffing has not. Requests are often lengthy and worded in a way that can be duplicative or confusing. Being able to specify which types of records can be requested would be helpful. Records requests can currently be submitted to anyone by any means, including verbally; the government entity should be able to designate how these requests can be received and by whom, as long as a variety of means are provided for the requester, including in person, online, and by mail. Determining whether information is exempt or confidential often requires detailed legal analysis, which is inherently subjective and can lead to government entities being seen as inconsistent in their responses.
48	County	staffing; technology to redact records when student names and other information is not known without first reading the record; software for efficient and effective pdf conversion of emails
50	State	Volume of staff/attorney hours to review and respond to requests.
51	State	1. Number of staff assigned to work on records management/public records requests 2. Burdensome requesters 3. Clear agency definition of "record"
53	State	We do not get many requests so unsure of this.
54	State	Staff capacity, technology to find relevant documents, technology to sort through communication records
55	State	Staff time. staff training, board supervisor training by DA's or DAG to handle requests.
56	County	Overburdensome AI requests, staffing, and volume and complexity of requests.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Personnel, complexity of requests, folks not understanding or following the procedures
58	State	1. No staff dedicated to answering public records requests 2. Manual processes for search and redaction 3. Time spent on burdensome requests
59	State	1) number of requests 2) time to produce with limited staff 3) staff time
60	State	Noncompliance with records retention requirements; systems infrastructure; and staffing/capacity.
61	State	1. Media outlets use this agency to attempt to obtain information refused by employing agency. 2. Overly broad requests 3. Staff to assist with large requests 4. Gray area we fall in because the records we maintain are not employees of our agency

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
62	State	Determining disclosure requirements and exemptions, Processing large and complex requests within statutory timeframes, and Managing electronic records across multiple systems and formats.
63	County	Labor/manpower/staffing. Too short of a response time. Requests being too broad/not specific enough. Lack of centralized data. Locating records and reviewing and redacting records for requests seeking a large volume of records. Some records request can also lead to data and operational security concerns. Requesters should not be permitted to seek data concerning government buildings or systems.
64	State	Staffing, time spent on task, and unclear expectations and consistency of what should and should not be released.
65	State	Having to respond and emailing back and forth with AI agents. Staff time spent. Challenges with requestors requesting vague records, or records that aren't actually records (i.e., fishing expeditions).
66	State	Quantity of request, Mail services, and Time constraints.
67	County	Overburdensome volume of requests for records
68	Municipal	Clarity in definitions for what is subject to public record, internal statutory and Constitutional conflicts with NPRA (for example, NPRA and case law potentially allow public access to records in a criminal proceeding which not even the defendant is entitled to under Nevada criminal procedure statutes); persistent NPRA litigation due to differing interpretation of NPRA; budgetary constraints on dedicated staffing; burdensome requests
69	Local agency	Large volumes of requests from commercial businesses for inspection records, "any and all documents related to x" requests that require searches of large amounts of data and subsequent content review without a clear line of compliance, redaction of images of members of the public in electronic media. It's hard to quantify staff's time on public records request, but the volume on requests for commercial purposes are for one program (approximately 60% annually), year over year, and the individual responsible spends approximately 50% of her time processing those requests.
70	Municipal	1) Insufficient staff resources to keep up with the number of requests and the timing requirements in light of staff's other duties and responsibilities. 2) Broad and burdensome requests for commercial purposes, such as to identify customers, create content on personal media platforms, or add to commercial databases, which often require searching numerous City databases and extensive review for potential redactions. 3) The lack of clear guidance on common requests such as requests for law enforcement records for open investigations/pending prosecutions, which forces the City to use its best efforts to balance the competing interests, all while facing the risk of a significant attorneys' fee penalty should a requester file a lawsuit and "prevail" by obtaining even one page of records.
71	Municipal	1. Locating records across decentralized systems is a challenge.

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
		2. Although the City fulfills the vast majority of requests at no cost to the requester, certain high volume, and privacy sensitive record types, particularly correspondence and video footage, require substantial staff time for review and redaction. These requests frequently exceed the ten hours of labor CLV provides at no charge. Clarifying in NRS that agencies may recover staff time for these categories would help ensure consistent statewide practices and reduce disputes. 3. Overbroad and voluminous requests divert City staff from their primary duties. Moreso with requesters that are unwilling to narrow the scope of their requests. The City often spends the 10 hours of free labor it affords requesters under R-48-2019 just researching and compiling records to provide an estimate.
73	County	Unclear requests
74	State	staffing, resources, software
75	State	Because NVHA deals with high volume and protected health information, it requires extremely in-depth analysis and creates challenges related to competing interests of transparency and upholding significant privacy laws that apply to our agency. Additionally, time and significant staff burden is a huge challenge for our agency.
76	State	Lack of dedicated staff to respond to public records requests. Lack of a centralized statewide system for responding to requests. Time committed to responding to requests takes away from fulfilling the Department's mission.
77	State	1. High-volume, labor-intensive redaction and confidentiality review DMV must redact or deny large categories of records due to DPPA and NRS 481.063, which prohibit releasing personal information without a permissible use or authorization. This results in substantial staff hours reviewing and redacting records and producing denial notices. 2. Fragmented systems requiring multi-system searches PRR fulfillment requires searching email, GovQA, CARRS, file shares, Jira, Service Desk systems, and other operational platforms. This fragmentation dramatically increases search time and creates risk of incomplete retrieval. 3. Complex, vague, or multi-agency requests that require clarification Requests routinely include broad, multi-topic, or multi-agency components requiring significant clarification before a lawful and accurate search can begin. Some requests include legal arguments or requests for non-records, delaying fulfillment.
78	County	Limited staff, time to review and disclose
79	State	1. Overly broad requests that don't identify a record but appear to be a fishing expedition (i.e. "any and all records"). 2. We have an intake form, but requesters refuse to use it. Therefore, we must enter the request based on the limited information in their email, pause the request to seek further information, and await their response.

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
		3. Requesters expect records to be released within 5 business days. With the increased number of requests, it's very hard to accomplish this unrealistic expectation.
80	State	- Educating a large number of staff regarding the requirements of Nevada's Public Records law - Appropriately maintaining a large volume of records across multiple different file storage systems and retention systems - The number of staff hours required for burdensome requests
81	State	Staffing, training & interpretation of NRS.
82	State	Volume of records requested and frequency of requests could quickly overwhelm our small staff and its manual processing of requests.
83	County	Volume, identifying what is a public record and redactions
84	County	Staff capacity and technology
85	State	Staff time required. Broad expansive requests. Records management systems costs.
86	County	the security of our data as well as data scraping concerns
87	Municipal	Staff time Lack of centralized training materials for compliance Ambiguities in the law
88	State	Time and staff resources.
89	County	(1) Staff time limitations/capacity, (2) abusive requests from disgruntled individuals using the NPRA as a weapon to monopolize staff time or harass a specific staff person, (3) lack of enumerated exceptions to the NPRA to facilitate quicker processing.
90	State	Lack of staff for public records requests. Additionally lack of automated data collection and response systems.
91	State	Overbroad requests with no duty to narrow The most significant challenge is requests that do not identify an existing record with reasonable specificity. Typical examples ask for "all communications," "all records relating to," or every document in a subject area over a multi-year period; sometimes not including a date range. Nevada law does not require the requester to describe records so they can be located with a reasonable effort, and a requester can refuse to narrow. Staff must then search email, shared drives, case files, and "legacy systems"; export large data sets; and review each item page by page for responsiveness and exemption. A small number of unbounded requests can consume thousands of staff hours and delay not only other requests, but important agency functions. The five-business-day clock does not scale to volume or legal review NRS 239.01017 requires a written response by the end of the fifth business day: production, a dated estimate of when the record will be available, or a denial citing the specific authority. That deadline is barely workable for a readily available record. It is unworkable when a request requires multiple

No.	Entity type	Question 75 – Answer as submitted
		custodians, compiling records for export from outdated systems, and applying layered confidentiality statutes before releasing the documents. It is generally heads of division sections that must compile records (as they're usually implicated in the request) and then legal (only two attorneys at the DOI) must then also provide responsive records and then review all of the documents for identifying information, trade-secrets, proprietary rate and form filings, and/or attorney work product. This requires the core agency workforce to drop what they are doing and make herculean efforts to comply with the law. Simply put, complex requests displace ordinary regulatory work and push other requesters out further. The Nevada Revised Statutes are not well written, making it very difficult to navigate complex records issues, and the Legislature and courts continue to impose more responsibility on the agencies without the means to accomplish these responsibilities, which is causing considerable stress and anxiety for state employees and affecting morale.
92	State	(1) insufficient staffing, (2) lack of software or systems to improve workflows, and (3) overbroad and unduly burdensome requests (exacerbated by requester use of AI)

Question 76. What statutory ambiguities most often produce disputes, or a danger of inconsistent handling within your Government Entity?

70 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Chapter 239 does not have a section specifically for police records, and therefore it causes issues when we deny requests based on ongoing investigations or litigation.
2	State	The ambiguity related to more complex confidentially. For example, NRS 239C outlines the confidentiality of critical infrastructure, but NDOT has not been able to determine what is critical infrastructure as it relates to our roadways and those other agencies that would be able to guide us on that have not provided that guidance. In addition, NRS does not generally identify technology information that should be confidential to protect the technology infrastructure of the State.
5	State	Not enough specific statutory confidentiality provisions How much to charge for employee time for lengthy and large requests--too vague now and not mandatory
6	County	unknown
8	State	Lack of clarity about who holds which records
9	County	Ability for requesters to ask for any records in certain circumstances dating back 150+ years
10	County	Extremely cumbersome requests involving multiple and very old tax years.
11	County	VARIES

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	The voluminous list of statutory exceptions to public records under NRS 239.010(1) often confuses pro litigants, leading them to erroneously believe that an actual bona fide statutory confidentiality provision or privilege isn't real. It's usually more helpful just to cite directly to the agency's own (separate NRS chapter) confidentiality provisions.
14	County	NRS 239.010(4) and (5). Can the requestor demand how the information is going to be produced? Why can't we provide a copier and make the requestor search for the records and copy them?
16	State	Requestors often ask for information rather than records. We have standard responses, but sometimes get pushback.
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	Fees for costs incurred by government entity
19	State	A public record is not clearly and concisely described in Statute! Anyone can ask for any document they think the Department has or has created including working documents that may not be finalized or change prior to publication. All public records should be described as any record produced and published by a government agency, no working documents and no communications.
20	County	"legal custody or control" NRS 239.010 should be re-written to better outline to applicable exceptions for the general public.
21	State	Response times.
22	County	inability to charge for cumbersome or burdensome requests
23	State	Lack of clear guidance around what constitutes as reasonable search and the appropriate scope of a request, particularly for large or broad requests. It can also be difficult to determine how much searching, review, redaction and production is expected when a request is expansive or uses broad terms. A centralized place to go to for records request would improve efficiency in my opinion. State IT is very hands off and I often find myself alone.
24	County	I do not believe its the statutory ambiguity that produces disputes, it's the interpretation by all the various individuals
25	State	How far back record request span.
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Whether or not we can charge for staff time for unduly burdensome requests; whether or not we can flat out deny unduly burdensome requests; what is an unduly burdensome request, or what factors should be considered in declaring a request unduly burdensome.
27	District Court	Definition of confidential records.
28	County	Unknown
29	State	NRS 624.327 is the most often misunderstood statute regarding confidentiality for the NSCB. Staff is aware of how it is handled but external

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
		individuals do not immediately understand and often email several times after clarification has been provided.
30	State	Applicability of exemptions
31	County	1. NRS lacks information as it relates to fee collection for producing large-scale data and image requests often made by commercial requestors who later resell our data. 2. NRS 239.070 is irrelevant as our office no longer uses microfilm. The cost of producing copies is no longer connected to physical media or computer media. Recommend removing NRS 239.070 and replacing with a digital bulk records fee defined in NRS 247. 3. NRS 247.560(f) states a county recorder may provide confidential information for use: ... "In the bulk distribution of surveys, marketing material or solicitations, if the county recorder has adopted policies and procedures to ensure that the information will be used or sold only for use in the bulk distribution of surveys, marketing material or solicitations." County Recorder's are only redacting certain fields for the purposes of confidentiality if a person or entity listed in NRS 247.540 obtains a court order. I disagree that County Recorder's should provide marketers and solicitors with confidential information of our citizens, as supported by the Court. Lifting confidentiality has not been a practice and this statute needs to be addressed. 4. NRS 247.520 the "Personal information" definition should consider including an Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) for property related records to ensure that the Court Order requiring confidentiality sufficiently conceals the confidential persons residential address. 5. Some recorders believe that they do not need to also provide documents or indexes for sale in bulk since they provide internet access. Typically, internet access is used to research and view records for individual properties, but not for bulk purchases. With the evolution of technology and the availability of the internet, more data has become readily available to the public. The ease with which personal information can be accessed on-line is now being weighed against individual concerns related to privacy and safety. 6. There are significant costs associated with creating and maintaining land records. These include operating costs, salaries, and supplies as well as capital investments for modernizing technical infrastructure. Many people assume that these costs are covered by fees collected when documents are recorded, and that these recording fees are set at a rate sufficient to fund these costs, however that is not the case. One way to cover increasing costs is to charge for the purchase of bulk records by those private entities who benefit most from technology investments, and for whom access to public records generates business revenue. NRS sets fees for individual document copy requests; however, fees for bulk record requests are not addressed in the law. The consumers of bulk records are generally businesses, e.g., title insurers,

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
		mortgage lenders, industry service providers, and data aggregators, therefore, many business partners conclude that it is fair and reasonable for them to help cover any expense gaps. Revenue collected by the recorder's office is historically intended to cover operating expenses to create and maintain the land records. The cost of upgrading and maintaining its processes and systems is generally covered by recording office revenue. If the recording fee is sufficient to cover its operating expenses, the recorder can fulfill bulk record requests at near actual cost. 7. NRS doesn't define the Sale in Bulk and Data Sets. The national Property Records Industry Association defines it as " the transfer to buyers of either historical or ongoing recorded indexed data, images or both. The transfer not only includes a copy of the existing data requested by the buyer but may also provide regularly scheduled updates of information, so the buyer can continually update records with modified and new information. The transfer of data from the recorder to the buyer may involve paper-based data, microfilm-based data, electronic data, or any combination of these."
32	State	Determining what constitutes a reasonable search, interpreting exemptions and redaction requirements, and determining the appropriate scope of a request. There can also be questions about response timelines, particularly when a request is broad.
33	County	Ambiguity around election records being public and confidentiality of voter's publicly identifiable information.
34	County	Fees and when they can be demanded. Define overly broad and burdensome.
36	Municipal	• Identity of reporting parties in Code Enforcement cases. • Custody and control. Each entity should be responsible for redacting its own records, and SPD should not be redacted WCSO's records that happen to be in our file. • Open and active criminal case files—the balancing test of Donrey and NRS 179A.070, NRS 239.010. • The proper procedure of the Writ proceeding when it is filed. Timelines, etc. • Overall, statutory exemptions are not the topics that usually produce disputes, but rather it is the common law balancing tests like Donrey and Cameronesi. * The allowable fees need to be clear in the statute
37	County	Redaction
38	State	I think lack of clarity as to which specific records are public and which are not. Also, without the requirement to make requestors narrow overly broad requests, or limit the amount of production, it creates a larger margin of error during our internal review process. Additionally, without a statute that outlines how and when an agency can charge and what they can charge for

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
		when it comes to resources and time spent on public records requests, it creates confusion and inconsistencies across agencies.
40	State	None that we are aware of.
43	State	Unknown
46	County	Who is the proper authority
47	County	The interpretation of the law and case law applicable to afford confidentiality to a case that is pending adjudication. The definition of what a public record is not clearly defined, and by default, it is often interpreted as anything that could possibly exist is public. These issues lead to a case-by-case basis for public records and require extensive review and legal analysis on how to respond to each request
48	County	charging fees for staff time and confidentiality of personnel records for local entities
50	State	As the statutory language has not been modernized, ambiguities arise around large data sets and interpreting e-data.
51	State	1. Agency obligations (although this is often a result of requester misunderstanding of the law rather than ambiguity) 2. Ability of an agency to charge fees for requests
53	State	Unsure
54	State	Inadequate definitions of what a public record is
55	State	lack of understanding and training in OML and public records by board supervisors.
56	County	Open investigation exemption and charging for records
57	Bistate Compact Agency	We're not a NV agency so folks get confused about which law governs
58	State	Whether or not to charge fees.
59	State	confidential investigations by law made confidential and the requestor does not like it or disagrees.
61	State	What is confidential information and how does that pertain to my agency and the release of information? Our records are maintained for certification purposes only, we are not the employer of these peace officers and therefore should not be releasing any employment or personal information on these individuals.
62	State	what constitutes a reasonable search and response when requests are broad, complex, or involve multiple systems and custodians
63	County	How requests are submitted. What constitutes a records request versus a request for information or other communication with the City. What records are available pursuant to a records request. Redactions for personal

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
		information, juvenile records, and open investigations. Statutory ambiguities RE: fess (what can be charged, what materials are eligible).
64	State	NRS176.156, NRS213.1075, 179A.100 compared to NRS239 - What has to be released and what is considered confidential and protected.
65	State	Personnel files and what information about a staff member is required to be produced. Likewise, information regarding financial information comes up less often but is likewise vague in what is and isn't publishable.
66	State	Mail service delays and delivery delays to Inmates.
67	County	Specific records are not well defined as being public or non-public; differing legal opinions and judicial decisions.
68	Municipal	Open cases/investigation (and internal investigation) and implications on constitutional due process and criminal procedure; employee and personnel information (e.g., state employees have express statutory protections that local government employees do not), victim/witness information
69	Local agency	What constitutes a valid request, i.e., when a request asks for records containing information related to a particular subject matter versus an identifiable document or category of document.
70	Municipal	The lack of clear statutory guidance regarding several common types of requests, such as requests for records in open criminal investigations and records containing the personal contact information of citizens such as witnesses in criminal matters and complainants in code enforcement matters. The ambiguities regarding when fees can be charged. Due to these ambiguities, the City has generally taken the approach to not charge for requests over the last several years. However, in light of the recent significant increase in requests that are clearly solely for commercial purposes to benefit the requester, the City would appreciate additional guidance to allow the City to fulfill requests without overly burdening its limited staff resources, especially on commercial requests that do not fall within the stated purpose of the NPRA.
71	Municipal	The lack of a defined fee structure under NRS. Requesters frequently dispute the City's ability to charge for requests that will take more than ten hours under the City's R-48-2019. A clearer, more concise list of exemptions to NRS 239 would be beneficial. The current structure of hundreds of separate exemptions is unworkable.
73	County	Unknown
75	State	ambiguity related to whether a record is confidential or should be redacted, and ambiguity over whether records being requested should be considered data/ information.
76	State	Questions on what can/can't be redacted and/or not provided.
77	State	1. Boundaries of DPPA and NRS 481.063 vs. NRS 239 disclosure requirements

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
		DMV must reconcile mandatory confidentiality obligations for motor-vehicle and driver PII with the general presumption of openness in NRS 239. Ambiguity around what is considered "personal information," what constitutes a permissible use, and when authorization is required often triggers disputes. 2. Handling of overbroad or multi-agency requests Statutes do not clearly define agencies' obligations when PRRs span multiple agencies or include information outside the agency's custody. DMV frequently needs to clarify scope before proceeding, creating risk of inconsistent handling and requester misunderstandings. 3. Requests that seek explanations, analysis, or creation of new records NAC 239.867 specifies that agencies are not required to create records to satisfy a PRR, but NRS 239 does not always prevent requesters from demanding interpretations, data analyses, or system explanations. Ambiguity in distinguishing "records" from "information" creates disputes and inconsistent outcomes.
79	State	1. What is a 'record'? NAC 239.863 (C) the description must clearly point to a specific document. 2. What we can and cannot charge a fee for. The current law is based on an old system of gathering records and having a clearly outlined fee schedule would be helpful.
80	State	The Division of Public and Behavioral Health is filing a bill draft request to clean up the language in NRS 439.5108 for the Committee to Review Suicide Fatalities and formally label it as an exemption to Pubic Records requests under NRS 239.010. While the statute explicitly prevents information from being disclosed under any circumstances except a subpoena after 30 years, it is difficult to cite the NRS for the Committee to Review Suicide Fatalities when receiving records requests related to an individual has died of suicide and the Committee. While the NRS is perfectly clear that it still an exemption, DPBH does not want to utilize the statute in response to a public records request and inadvertently reveal PHI and an individual's cause of death.
81	State	Confidentiality & detailed definition of a record
82	State	Few to no disputes for our Division.
83	County	what is the public record, personnel records, investigations and general privacy rights
89	County	There is a lack of enumerated exceptions to clearly guide staff as to what is/is not confidential. As a result, attorney involvement and review is often required to advise staff.

No.	Entity type	Question 76 – Answer as submitted
90	State	The purpose of public records requests is for transparency, not to fish for litigation.
91	State	No clear specificity standard for a valid request NRS 239.0107 requires a governmental entity to respond to a request to inspect or copy a "public book or record," but the statute does not define how specifically the records must be described, nor does it expressly authorize the agency to the treat an overly broad request as incomplete. Crucially, the statute itself does not stop the five-business-day clock or create a clear duty on the requestor to cooperate when an agency attempts to narrow the scope. The result is inconsistent handling across agencies and no toolbox to lean on to make a request more reasonable. Further, requesters exploit this gap by refusing to narrow, then alleging noncompliance when the agency cannot produce everything within a short period. A statutory "reasonably described" or "identifiable record" requirement, coupled with an express right to require clarification before the response clock runs out would reduce disputes and agency variation. Undefined "reasonable" timeline when records are not readily available. NRS 239.0107(1)(c) permits an agency that cannot produce records by the end of the fifth business day to give written notice and state the earliest date and time after which the records will be available. The statute fails, however, to supply a standard for what constitutes a reasonable future date. Many of the statutes identifying things as confidential or privileged are not clear or contain ambiguities that increase frustrations for both state employees and requesters. Sometimes there are no laws for specific situations but common sense is not a justification for protecting information. Sometimes there are laws that specifically make things public, and maybe that was fine at the time the law was created, but as things have evolved, releasing certain information would be embarrassing to the person or irresponsible or would disrupt the market.
92	State	No clear statutory exemptions for records of pending investigations (civil, personnel, and criminal) and criminal prosecutions, victim and witness information (PII), and personnel records, forcing a balancing of interests. No definition of "record," "legal custodian," or "legal custody and control." Statutory five-day deadline to respond is viewed by the public as a hard response deadline, rather than a deadline to provide records OR acknowledge the request and provide an estimated response date.

Question 77. What changes to NRS Chapter 239 would most improve your Government Entity's ability to respond promptly and completely to public records requests?

69 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
1	County	A specific section for police and public safety related files. Add a section that body cameras and dash camera video of military bases are confidential Add a section that requests from foreign countries do not need to be filled.

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
2	State	Require requesters to narrow the scope of their requests especially when requesting correspondence or large quantity records sets. Possibly setting quantity thresholds if not in NRS, in NAC.
4	State	Unknown
6	County	unknown
8	State	Safe harbor language when the agency is waiting on a response from another agency (such as GTO).
9	County	Fees and a limit on the number of years of documents they are able to request
10	County	Unsure
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	1. A commercial purpose exception to public records should be codified to bar data scrapers and lead generators at the threshold. This is absolutely critical and a recognized reason for denial of a public records request in many states. Under existing law, it's frustrating to expend the staff time and labor to provide good-faith public records responses, especially when providing investment and purchasing data, to vendors who immediately use that responsive information to spam our employees with product and service solicitations or sell the data to other vendors for more or less the same purposes. 2. There should be a "statute of limitation" or time-bar for ancient public records which seek stale data (such as investment performance and past portfolio composition) from a decade or more ago and which is usually available in a variety of redundant formats from multiple sources, such as annual ACFRs and discussed openly at public body meetings. Public records requests for old investment performance and portfolio composition information is laborious and time-consuming, especially because much of it is summarized elsewhere in readily-available formats.
14	County	Explicitly state that a governmental entity may charge any fee attributable to the cost to research, locate, and provide a public record. NRS 239.011 should either remove the attorney's fee provision or, at a minimum, allow the prevailing party to obtain attorney's fees so the government can be awarded attorney's fees if it prevails against an burdensome records request.
16	State	Unknown.
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	More limits on the definition of public records and the qualifications of requesters.
19	State	A public record is not clearly and concisely described in Statute! Anyone can ask for any document they think the Department has or has created including working documents that may not be finalized or change prior to publication.

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
		All public records should be described as any record produced and published by a government agency, no working documents and no communications.
20	County	5 days to respond is far too short in almost all instances.
21	State	Initial 5 day requirement to provide the requested records.
22	County	ability to charge for time, state funded software
23	State	Limit your request. People are using AI to put these together and I just received a 16 page public records request and as I start to break it down and sending over they run it through the AI service and creates more work. Happy to discuss more, but have a feeling this is going to be the new way people put in requests.
24	County	I cannot identify any changes that would make response easier other than for it to be stated that entities like this one need clarification when we request it, and that we should be allowed to operate in a manner allowable to us considering budget, staffing and technological burdens
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Adding more express confidentiality exceptions recognizing common law exceptions (such as for heirs having a right to privacy in decedent photos). Expressly stating we can charge for staff time for unduly burdensome requests. Expressly stating we can deny unduly burdensome requests. Expressly defining what is an unduly burdensome request or what factors should be considered in declaring a request unduly burdensome. Adding funding for records staff. Penalizing people for sending requests just to be vexatious, harassing, and to waste government time and resources.
28	County	Fees that we can charge that may help to facilitate getting a specific staff member to address these requests. Some sort of simple tracking program would also be very beneficial.
29	State	The NSCB has no suggestions.
30	State	Not sure.
31	County	1. Remove NRS 239.070. Update NRS 239.015 to remove the microfilm reference and move to NRS 247. It's my understanding only one organization nationwide produces microfilm and many counties have not used microfilm in several years. 2. Consider adding security and privacy provisions from NRS 603A to NRS 239 for large scale commercial requestors/data collectors who seek records containing PII. 3. Consider if requests for entire databases of property records is an acceptable request for non-industry recognized businesses, foreign entities, etc.? Technologically advanced agencies can produce those records at scale without great effort, but at what cost to the public?
32	State	More clarity around response timelines, reasonable search requirements, and the handling of broad or complex requests, and clearer guidance on electronic records, redactions, and transmission of records to the requesting party.
33	County	Defined fee schedule and payment requirements.

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
34	County	Create a portion of the law that says if the request is broad, the request is denied.
35	State	Increase amount of time from 5 days to respond to a longer period to account for staff being out of the office, etc.
36	Municipal	• Funding for redactions and processing – this would address any concerns about delays in processing. The volume of records kept by government entities has increased exponentially in recent years with increased use of email and other electronic communications, and body worn camera footage for law enforcement agencies. While law enforcement agencies enjoy the protections and certainty that bodycam brings, it has resulted in an unfunded mandate in the context of public records requests, which on average require four hours of staff time to review and redact one hour of BWC footage. This results in hundreds of thousands of dollars for smaller government entities and certainly millions of dollars in larger entities being dedicated to the production of BWC at the expense of proactive law enforcement and community outreach functions. • Clear and reduced timeframes for government entity document retention. • Allowing the charging of fees for extraordinary use of personnel time, like PRRs that require the manual review of 29k emails or 30 hours of BWC. These large requests can request dozens of taxpayer-funded staff time to review for withholdings/redactions, resulting in sometimes thousands of dollars of cost on governments. • Actually defining what is a "public record." My suggestion would be records generated or created by or at the request of the entity. * Examples of what should NOT be public record: * Citizens' ring camera footage * Citizens' contact information (cell phones, email addresses, home addresses, license plate #s) * Phone dumps (i.e., a victim of a crime's phone is dumped, and somehow the entire contents of her phone are now public record? Nonsense) • 1 lawsuit (or writ proceeding) per PRR dispute, no aggregation of disputes.
37	County	Specific redaction information regarding investigations
38	State	I believe changes that would allow agencies to limit or deny requests that exceed a defined volume of records as well as require requestors to narrow requests that are overly broad or vague.
39	Board	Amend the law to limit repetitive public information requests from the same requester when substantially identical information or questions have already been addressed.
40	State	More time to respond.
43	State	Limit over burdensome requests, add fees, define the need for such records, remove 5 day response mandate.

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
44	State	Limit size and scope, and state reason why the request.
46	County	cant think of one
47	County	Clearly state that the government entity is not required to respond to the request with records within 5 days of receiving the request, but must notify the requester that the request has been received and communicate its status. This is worded in a way that often leads to misinterpretation and disputes with public records requesters. Define that the government entity may designate proper submission of a public records request and that any submissions not provided via the designated process are not subject to response. Require the requester to provide name and contact information to ensure delivery of the requested records.
48	County	Unk
51	State	None, as Ch. 239 is not the issue affecting DHS' ability to respond promptly and completely.
53	State	Unsure
54	State	Not required to produce records outside of the retention timeframe when still held by the agency
55	State	one portal for submissions with required information provided by the requestor in advance to weed out AI bots and other none-sense requests that do not apply to our boards or our work. A central state location for all requests to go for tracking.
56	County	Breakdown request and categorize requestors to triage requests. Clarify exemptions for law enforcement and privacy exemptions. Allowing government agencies to appropriately manage vexatious requestors. If NRS is changed to limit staff time, response time will be limited.
57	Bistate Compact Agency	Consistent fees so that people aren't surprised by ours
58	State	Addition of direction on how agencies calculate fees for requests. This will support consistent and equal treatment of requests across agencies.
59	State	Narrow what requestor can request due to extreme requests causing increased staff time and costs
62	State	reasonable search/response standards, exemption/redaction clarity, and clarification of overly broad requests
63	County	Requiring specificity or clear language for records requests rather than requiring employees to offer opinion or guidance on what a requester may be seeking, standardizing guidance for body camera videos and other videos, adopting a statewide fee schedule, and limiting who can receive records.
64	State	It would be helpful if there was clearer definition of records from a government entity should be truly open to public review and release.

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
65	State	Clarification on the personnel information that's available for public consumption and clarification for financial information.
66	State	Unknown
68	Municipal	Clearly defining that personnel files and internal investigations are not subject to public record, clearly defining that open and active criminal cases are not subject to public record (curtailing onerous redaction work by staff not in the position to determine what information is appropriately withheld/disclosed in a criminal case file, defining a reasonable scope of a request
69	Local agency	Clarifying fee provision, allowing fees for commercial requesters, requiring requesters to cooperate in clarifying requests (rather than request "any and all documents related to x").
70	Municipal	a) The creation of a specific law enforcement records section, including provisions dealing specifically with the production of body worn camera videos and permitting additional time to process and setting an hourly processing rate. This issue is becoming more prevalent as the City has seen a significant increase in voluminous requests for police records by individuals or entities claiming to be members of the media, but appear to only be using these records to create true crime content on their personal pages on platforms such as YouTube. b) Provisions to handle complex or voluminous requests that would allow government entities longer time frames, have greater flexibility to charge fees, and/or require the requester to make good faith efforts focus their request. c) Provisions providing that requests for commercial purposes be subject to different statutory provisions regarding time frames and fees. This would not include requests from bona fide members of the media.
71	Municipal	A standardized, reasonable fee structure—such as the City's R-48-2019 would be a beneficial tool to help requesters focus requests while protecting the City's resources at the same time. Additionally, a clearer, more concise list of exemptions to NRS 239 would be beneficial. Clearer direction on the treatment of BWC/jail footage and records relating to pending investigations.
73	County	Unknown
74	State	reduce commercial purpose requests, encourage narrow scope, ability to recover costs related to staff and resources
75	State	Clarity surrounding privileges that the agency may either be obligated to or permissively elect to use.
77	State	1. Clarify confidentiality protections for highly sensitive DMV data and align NPRA with DPPA/NRS 481.063

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
		Because DMV must deny or redact protected PII under federal and state law, clearer statutory alignment would reduce disputes, streamline redactions, and eliminate confusion about disclosure limits. 2. Permit phased or limited production for large-volume or unduly burdensome requests DMV receives high-volume, multi-year, or multi-system requests that consume extensive staff hours. A statutory mechanism to phase production or limit volume would improve timeliness and operational sustainability. 3. Require sufficient requester information and allow agencies to request scope clarification Requiring requesters to provide adequate contact information and sufficiently specific scope (e.g., date ranges, system identifiers) would reduce delays and ensure search accuracy. DMV repeatedly needs clarification for multi-topic or unclear requests.
79	State	1. Defining what is a record. 2. Establishing a fee structure for burdensome AI and commercial entities that request records for profit.
80	State	The creation of a standardized fee schedule for billing for staff hours through NRS 239 or accompanying regulations, and the creation of a statewide Ombudsman for educational purposes and conflict resolution as described in earlier survey questions through NRS 239 would be massive helps.
81	State	A good change would be requiring requesters to provide a brief, specific explanation of the purpose of their public records request. Rather than relying on a general statement such as "in the public interest," requesters could identify the issue they are seeking to understand or the information they hope to obtain. This would help agencies identify topics receiving significant public attention and determine whether related reports, data, or other records should be made proactively available and posted publicly.
83	County	definition of a public record.
85	State	Not opposed to fees and related increased clarity, but are concerned that a Standardized Fee structure may not be workable across varyingly-sized government entities. For example, a small local government office may experience a greater burden processing a records request than a large state agency. Additionally, as to the question regarding ADR and administrative appeals, an ombudsperson with unilateral authority is not advisable, but requiring complainants to go through an administrative appeal procedure would be appropriate.
86	County	Being allowed to limit the data that we provide. Not having to provide our entire database of information, but rather a requestor needing to provide a more specific request
89	County	Enumerated exceptions to the NPRA, explicit ability to charge for staff time to better fund an increase in staff who can dedicate time to processing requests.

No.	Entity type	Question 77 – Answer as submitted
90	State	Narrow down the scope of what is available to specific data that should be transparent to the public.
91	State	Remove list of conf. statutes, 5-business day acknowledgment, burden to agencies, resources, define "public record" Add a "reasonably described" requirement and clarify the clarification process. Amend NRS 239 to require that a request reasonably describe an existing, identifiable public record so that it can be located with a reasonable effort. Expressly authorize the agency to request clarification or a narrowed scope (date range, custodian, file type, or subject) and provide that the five-business-day response period does not begin or is tolled, until the requester supplies a reasonably described request. The 5 business days to respond is set up to fail. It is impossible to know if there are no records until the agency has the chance to go through records. With the volume of records, it takes a long time to determine if there is anything responsive. PRRs compete with other important regulatory interests. If PRRs are always to take priority, then that should be specific and resources should be directed to support this goal, including software, people, training, and resolutions
92	State	Time-limited exemptions for records of pending investigations (civil, personnel, and criminal) and criminal prosecutions. Definitions of "record," "legal custodian," or "legal custody and control."

Question 78. Categories of records that should be expressly addressed by statute — either as clearly disclosable or clearly exempt — in order to reduce case-by-case disputes and litigation?

66 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
1	County	Incident and case reports. Autopsy/ coroner reports for homicides. Cases with victim families that could be affected by the information being put out on public forums for the purpose of entertainment. Body cameras and dash camera video of military bases are confidential. Requests from foreign countries do not need to be filled.
2	State	Email as disclosable but there should be a quantity threshold.
4	State	Clearly exempt items must be addressed in statute to ensure ease in production or lack thereof for requests on the layman State employee.
5	State	Insurance records of regulated transportation industries--we often are asked for them in order to reveal coverage amounts for personal injury suits Interoffice emails or emails between differing governmental departments---these are burdensome to pour through

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
6	County	all of our records are already addressed in NRS
8	State	Repeat requests within a short period of time
9	County	Fees and a limit on the number of years of documents they are able to request
10	County	Personnel email and correspondence
11	County	VARIES
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Clearly exempt - 1. Commercial purpose requests; 2. Confidential member and retiree account information (already expressly barred by statute, NRS 286.117 and NRS 286.118); 3. audit-related inquiries as to pending audits. Clearly disclosable - 1. Recent (5 years or less ago) investment performance data and statistics (already available via publicly published ACFRs on our official website)
14	County	Records involving criminal proceedings. Records involving pending civil litigation. Personnel records. Have a hard statute of limitations for all records notwithstanding other records retention requirements. In other words, the government may have to keep a record forever, but it does not need to produce it after 10 or 14 years. Or require the requestor to go digging through old, outdated databases and dig through dusty boxes to find the records themselves after a 10-year period or, at most, 14 years (which is double the 7 year statute of limitations to sue under NRS 11.040).
16	State	Not that affect us.
17	County	Unknown
18	Municipal	-Records sought in anticipation of litigation.
19	State	Working documents by staff for the Government Entity. Public records should only be produced and published documents.
20	County	personnel files, active criminal investigations, pending criminal prosecutions,
21	State	unknown
24	County	Not at this time
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	Yes. Adding more express confidentiality exceptions recognizing common law exceptions (such as for heirs having a right to privacy in decedent photos). Protecting pending investigations, internal affairs records, personnel records, student records, etc.
28	County	juvenile case records, personnel records, water/wastewater/utility infrastructure, network infrastructure, public safety communication infrastructure, economic development (which can be covered by NDA),
30	State	Not sure.
32	State	Electronic records, personnel-related records, security-sensitive information and personal.

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
34	County	Police reports of active criminal investigations and prosecutions should be withheld until the case is adjudicated.
35	State	No, because it is clear that our investigatory files are confidential, as well as patient records.
36	Municipal	• Personnel records. Under current law, State employees' personnel files are explicitly protected (NAC 284), but not County or City employees? • Open and active criminal case files – see NRS Chapter 174 • Interior of citizens' homes—see 4th Amendment and privacy interests for private citizens who happen to either call police or have criminal activity extend into their homes. • Having statutorily recognized privacy interests. Examples: * Civilian/non-government contact information. * Victims' and witnesses' faces (retaliation, intimidation, stigma). * Reporting party faces and identifying information. * Nudity. * Children (currently, seemingly only juveniles involved in the justice system get privacy, not other children. I could be wrong about this.) * Gruesome crime scene images. These images do not shine light on any government action or potential misconduct, but their release can cause signification trauma to the victim if they survive and their families. * Victim 911 call audio, can release transcript (example: Patrick Clancy's 911 call).
37	County	HIPAA
38	State	Yes, I believe specifically outlining which records are considered public and which are not would be extremely helpful to both the agencies and the requestors.
40	State	The release of financial records of a commercial vendor operating on state property should be prohibited. This information potentially provides an unfair advantage to competitors in a solicitation period.
43	State	IA investigations
44	State	Non-public documents, such as preliminary scoping or pre-NEPA speculations and data collection should be exempt, as should pre-project speculative emails.
46	County	no
47	County	Records involving a designated group of crimes and criminal investigations, such as those involving the death of an individual, sexual assault, rape, children, and records that if released would cause harm and distress of those who were victimized or witnessed the incidents should be confidential or allow for all names, contact information, personal identifying information and the specific details of the crime to removed unless expressly permitted by those who were involved.
48	County	personnel records for local entities

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
50	State	The CCB has defined disclosable and exempt categories of records listed under NRS 678A.470 which has been extremely helpful in responding clearly to requests.
51	State	No, the categories of DHS records are fairly well defined.
53	State	Unsure
55	State	information requested about project work done with partners under grant funding is difficult to answer and address without extensive time and research done by the person who originally received the request. It can be a burden to staff and volunteer boards.
56	County	SAR/counter terrorism records Juvenile victim information ALPR data
57	Bistate Compact Agency	No
61	State	Having a clear understanding of all exempt categories, or any categories that must be disclosed, would be helpful. A clear understanding of an agency's responsibility when it comes to an agency like mine would also be helpful, i.e. what is considered my agency's records and what am I required by law to release?
62	State	law-enforcement and investigative records, body-worn/dash-camera and other audio/video records, and personally identifying information involving victims, witnesses, suspects, and law-enforcement personnel.
63	County	In addition to the above discussion, video records should be more clearly addressed, including body-worn camera video, video from government cameras (traffic (ok to release), building security (not ok to release)), and video obtained from businesses or individuals in a law enforcement investigation (do not release). Billing and financial transactions should be confidential, except for the client; e.g., water service/utility billing, taxes, financial transactions with the City. At the very least, personal addresses and account information should be confidential or redacted.
64	State	Employee personnel, discipline records, Administrative Investigation records are currently protected under NRS and that should not change. Those records should continue to be confidential.
65	State	Please see above mostly regarding personnel information and financial information.
66	State	Correspondence to be deemed exempt
67	County	Coroner/Medical Examiner death investigation/autopsy records
68	Municipal	Under investigation (for criminal cases as well as internal investigations), employee/personnel information, victim/witness information

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
69	Local agency	Personnel records. They are already confidential for the state employees, other government employees should also have the same consistent confidentiality.
70	Municipal	1) An exemption for law enforcement investigation records for open investigations or pending criminal actions, perhaps with a rebuttable presumption for open investigations into public officials, if necessary. 2) An exemption for sensitive videos and crime scene photos, including videos and photos showing victims at the scene of their death or autopsy. 3) An exemption for IA records and most municipal employee personnel records (or at least a rebuttable presumption). 3) Architect plans (no opinion either way, but ambiguities appear to exist).
71	Municipal	Clarification on whether metadata counts as a record, and if it is requestable. If so, which types of metadata, such as operating system file metadata, structured metadata attached to unstructured records in a records repository, database fields and values, etc. Clarification on the exact types of juvenile records and information (particularly with respect to the City's Departments of Public Safety and Parks & Recreation) are public records and disclosable. Clarification that personnel records are exempt.
73	County	Unknown
74	State	Personnel records and internal investigations should be confidential. Drafts are non-records.
75	State	Medicaid claims should be expressly addressed as exempt, and HCQC complaint and survey records should be clarified in statue
76	State	Confidentiality of employee records.
77	State	1. Driver and vehicle record information regulated by DPPA and NRS 481.063 DMV denial notices show that many disputes arise because requesters do not understand why personal information (name, address, DL number, SSN, etc.) cannot be disclosed without a DPPA-permissible use or notarized authorization. Explicit statutory reinforcement of these boundaries would prevent repeated clarification cycles and potential litigation. 2. Internal investigation and internal-affairs-type materials DMV HR and IT-security investigations include system logs, access histories, emails, Teams chats, and video footage, all of which are marked "strictly confidential" and subject to chain-of-custody rules. Express statutory exemption would prevent disputes over whether such investigative files must be produced. 3. Records that do not exist or require record creation Many requesters demand analysis, explanations, system architecture, or newly generated datasets, which are not "records" under NPRA.

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
		Statutory clarity that agencies are not required to create records or provide non-record information would prevent disputes and ensure consistent handling. 4. Highly sensitive operational or security-related system information Documents describing DMV system architecture, data-protection boundaries, access controls, and regulated data flows should be expressly exempt to prevent security risks and inconsistent handling across agencies. 5. Records maintained by other agencies but requested from DMV Statutory clarification on multi-agency custodial responsibility would reduce confusion when DMV receives overly broad requests that involve other state entities' systems or information.
78	County	Emails.
79	State	1. Recognize technical and administrative staff time as a cost. Current practice focuses on physical copies (which no one uses anymore) and time spent on redactions. However, search construction, export, validation, and uploads are often the larger burden and these are not currently considered. 2. Require reasonable specificity. Requests should identify custodians, a date range, and search terms. Without these, agencies are forced to guess at the scope, which produces either over-collection or repeated re-reruns. 3. Account for collection time in response deadlines. Multi-custodian email or document requests across multi-year ranges routinely require several days of processing and multiple iterations before review can even begin.
80	State	The Division of Public and Behavioral Health is filing a bill draft request to clean up the language in NRS 439.5108 for the Committee to Review Suicide Fatalities and formally label it as an exemption to Pubic Records requests under NRS 239.010. While the statute explicitly prevents information from being disclosed under any circumstances except a subpoena after 30 years, it is difficult to cite the NRS for the Committee to Review Suicide Fatalities when receiving records requests related to an individual has died of suicide and the Committee. While the NRS is perfectly clear that it still an exemption, DPBH does not want to utilize the statute in response to a public records request and inadvertently reveal PHI and an individual's cause of death.
81	State	Informal documents such as notes and drafts.
82	State	We rarely if ever encounter disputes and defer to other state agencies with more acute concerns.
83	County	personnel information, discipline, medical responses by fire departments, evaluators of purchasing contracts.

No.	Entity type	Question 78 – Answer as submitted
85	State	Enhancing statutory clarity regarding records that implicate safety and security concerns, PII, law enforcement balancing, and privacy considerations that are currently only addressed in caselaw balancing.
89	County	Exemptions: -private citizen information (faces and sensitive information concerning witnesses, victims, and reporting parties; home addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers for private citizens) -records regarding pending prosecutions -personnel records
90	State	Human Resources information, specific to discipline.
91	State	consumer info w/out consent. Attorney-client communications, work product, and deliberative materials for decision-makers. These categories are protected in litigation but lack a clear, self-executing exemption under the NPRA. Agencies must therefore prepare detailed logs and risk inconsistent privilege decisions (can differ based on who is making the judgement call). An express exemption modeled on the attorney-client privilege and work-product doctrine, limited to materials created for the purpose of legal advice or in anticipation of litigation or administrative proceedings would reduce disputes.
92	State	(1) Records of pending investigations (civil, personnel, and criminal), criminal prosecutions, and personnel records. (2) Personally identifiable information (PII), both direct identifiers (SSN, names, DL #, etc.) and indirect (race, religion, DOB, etc.) that can be combined to identify a person. (3) Records related to pending or threatened litigation or official proceedings. (4) Any record made confidential by court order or rule, including settlement negotiations.

Question 79. Is there anything else the Task Force should know that this survey did not ask?

48 answers

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
1	County	As a records person in a small town, I have a huge problem with releasing information to YouTube media agencies. For example, my father's best friend was murdered, but due to it being a homicide the victim had "no right to privacy", which I felt was a disgusting disservice to his family and my father who had found the body. The company requesting it puts out clickbait you tube videos, and, in my opinion, abuses the spirit of the FOIA for their own monetary gain. I'm not sure the exact way to go about fixing this issue, but I find it absolutely appalling that my parents could be put out on YouTube without their consent, just because they were friends of a victim and interviewed by police who had their body cams on.
2	State	If better records management and retention practices across State government were enforced, it would go hand in hand with making the public records

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
		request process more streamlined and timely. Currently there is no enforcement mechanism in NRS 239.
5	State	Each DAG has a different approach to charging for employee time and/or for costs in a huge production--either with respect to avoiding a dispute or otherwise poking the bear. So, we don't request reimbursement anymore. It would be most helpful if there were mandatory charges for employee time/at what precise cost/and what fee for costs. Right now--we don't charge. There have been several instances where the time required to respond easily would suggest reimbursement.
8	State	- The task force didn't address violations of 333 single point of contact rules with records requests to end run quiet period provisions - The task force did not address litigants (just incarcerated persons) and their families
9	County	Harassment issues by repeated requests from the same requester that requests documents very similar in nature
12	Trust fund created by the Nevada Constitution	Great work for anticipating the needs of State of Nevada agencies, entities, and organizations in this context (you already knew about the commercial purpose trend/problem nationwide)
13	County	The biggest issue my office has faced with public records requests, especially over the past year, is the rise of AI generated requests. It would be extremely helpful to have statutory authority to deny a request if it can be proven to be AI generated. In July, I spent an entire work week fulfilling public records requests submitted by members of the public that I could clearly demonstrate were produced by AI, but I had no ability under statute to deny them. At that time, we also did not have a fee schedule in place. I ultimately had to involve the District Attorney and was advised to continue fulfilling the requests. The problem with AI generated requests is that the tool can be used as a means of harassment. With each response I provided, I would quickly receive a follow up request. That made it obvious the requester was feeding my responses directly into an AI system to generate an equally burdensome and extensive new request. This has happened twice since July 1, 2026, involving two different members of the public. I foresee this becoming a serious issue and a new way to harass local governments, with prompts specifically designed to overwhelm public offices and create undue hardship. To be clear, my concern is not with AI itself. I actively embrace AI in my office. My concern is with using AI as a weapon, particularly in the context of public records requests.
14	County	Using scarce resources paid by all taxpayers to benefit select individuals who abuse NRS Chapter 239 is a waste of valuable tax revenues. If an individual, special interest group, or member of the media wants information, then they should pay the cost for that information. There should be no presumption that these records are "their" records and staff work for "them." As NRS Chapter 293 is currently written, a dedicated person or group of individuals could CRIPPLE a local government, particularly a rural county, with a coordinated public records request campaign. The Task Force should examine whether my assertion is accurate and how to prevent bad actors from harming the

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
		government (which exists to aid in all of the people's business, not just the bad actors).
15	County	no
16	State	The most time consuming requests are from incarcerated persons. They don't use email, so everything goes back and forth using US Mail. This becomes costly, in time and resources. We are hoping that a software solution may assist us in being more consistent in responses. Also, since it's likely we will not be able to send links to RFP's and contracts once we've migrated to CoreNV, we have to search for another way to fulfil these requests.
17	County	I received this survey and I only handle limited requests for the treasurer's office so I did not know the answers for many of these questsions.
19	State	Please define what a Public Record is and can be requested by the public. Thank you!
20	County	Responding to public records requests has, in recent years, gone from a minimal time demand on county staff to a significant time demand.
22	County	no
23	State	Biggest thing is that public records requests can require a significant amount of time and technical knowledge, particularly when they involve large volumes or e-mails. There needs to be more efficient and user friendly processes for searching, reviewing, redacting and producing records. Clearer guidance, training sessions, better tools and more consistent standards would make it not so overwhelming. This isn't my only job.
24	County	not that I can think of
26	Higher Education Institution under NSHE	CA has a great model.
27	District Court	The court record requests are typically appropriate in scope and content. Where we struggle is with administrative requests and demands for technological data. Some requestors become fixated on the idea that someone modified the court record and escalate from there.
30	State	Small agencies struggle with PRRs due to low staff availability and training. PRR training/certification could be similar to CCM training available to all State employees.
31	County	NRS 603A.040, section 2 needs to be updated. A Social Security Number (SSN) is a nine-digit code formatted as XXX-XX-XXXX that is divided into three distinct parts: an area number, a group number, and a serial number. County Recorders and other agencies should be required to redact the entire social security number, not just the first 5 digits.
32	State	No

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
33	County	Election voter records could use another review to establish what could be confidential, while taking into consideration federal requirements.
34	County	No.
36	Municipal	The Clerks need clarity in NRS 239, so we are not reading between the lines looking for an answer. We do not need unfunded mandates, required state reporting, or an ombudsman. We need an updated Records Retention Schedule - the state started and never finished it last year. We need training resources as well as an up-to-date NPRA manual that is updated after every legislative session. Years ago, the state, Teri Marx, used to provide PRR training. When she retired that stopped. There were great training opportunities and online resources we could utilize at the local level. Bring all of that back and support the records programs. I have personally spent countless hours assisting other agencies from across the state with training and mentoring.
37	County	Unknown
38	State	Our Records team, with the support of our leadership and subject matter experts within the agency, do our best everyday to fulfill many of these complex and challenging requests. We put in our best effort to respond as completely and promptly as possible. Our biggest challenge is reviewing thousands of records, where it feels like we are searching for a needle in a haystack to produce public responsive documents while understanding what records to deny pursuant to statute. Our largest challenges include having many records that span different formats in different systems as well as newer eDiscovery challenges where a Purview email search can potentially have hundreds of thousands of "hits" for one keyword search.
40	State	No
43	State	Nope
44	State	When we get a public records request, we have to search and provide not only forms and files but also extensive ArcGIS files, and numerous emails and chats. The last file we sent was over 11Gb of data, and that was after we requested more information to limit it. We don't have an easy way to send that much data to people. And it takes a very long time to gather that data and takes up server space to do so.
46	County	no
48	County	not that I can think of
51	State	no
53	State	Again we get so few requests I am very unsure on some of these questions.
54	State	No, thank you for doing the work to consider potential improvements and incorporate agencies input.
56	County	Parameters within the state
59	State	No
61	State	No

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
62	State	No, not at this time.
63	County	AB 152 from the 83rd session of the Nevada Legislature would have allowed governmental entities to exclude records kept beyond their retention date from being considered as part of a public records request to reduce the staff time burden on government entities. Carson city testified in support of this legislation, though it did not pass into law.
65	State	I'm happy to discuss in depth the challenges we've faced recently with PRR if helpful to any members of the Task Force. Unfortunately, we've been really really challenged in the last year and a half with AI. Many of our requests appear to be AI-generated. This is incredibly challenging, as oftentimes AI hallucinates records that we don't have/don't exist/cite statutes that don't exist, etc. When we respond, we oftentimes are met with a response that's also AI-generated. We then find ourselves in a back and forth not with a real human/constituent who's looking to solve a problem or get information, but rather a back and forth with a computer.
66	State	No.
68	Municipal	We would appreciate providing statuary basis for timely response to requests that could not possibly be completed within 5-business-days. Updating language for changing technology to be broader as not to exclude certain records for the purposes of charging fees (for example, some language pertains to body worn camera specifically but not photos or other video). Updating requirements for how people can submit requests: reasonable accommodations should be made for people who are not able to submit requests online, but it would be helpful if we could still require request submissions through standard intake forms/locations.
70	Municipal	The majority of the non-law enforcement PRRs the City receives are processed without issue. The City would ultimately just like to see some legislative changes that address the common PRR issues impacting the City, including the significant rise in purely commercial requests that do not appear to fall within the purview of what the NPRA was intended to accomplish and protect. The City appreciates the Task Force allowing the City and other government entities to provide input on these important issues and is willing to provide any additional information that may assist in this process.
74	State	There should be fees for extraordinary staff time.
77	State	1. System fragmentation drives cost, delay, and inconsistent outcomes. DMV must search multiple unconnected systems — GovQA, email, CARRS, file shares, Jira, Service Desk, and others — for a single PRR. This structural problem is not addressed by current statutes and is one of the largest contributors to response time and staff workload. 2. Clarification requests are not optional — they are essential to lawful compliance.

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
		The high frequency of overly broad, ambiguous, or multi-agency requests requires DMV to seek clarification before beginning searches; otherwise agencies risk improper disclosure. This clarification burden consumes significant staff time. 3. Lack of alignment between NPRA and confidentiality statutes creates unnecessary disputes. DPPA and NRS 481.063 mandate strict confidentiality, but requesters often assume NRS 239 overrides these protections. This misunderstanding drives many disputes, escalations, and litigation threats, including the documented ACLU matter. 4. Secure communication pathways are essential to protect PII. DMV is actively working to eliminate fax and phone PII transmission due to security weaknesses. Statewide guidance supporting secure, auditable PRR communication methods would meaningfully reduce risk. 5. Agencies need statutory protection for phased production to avoid operational disruption. Large or complex requests can consume dozens of hours, affecting core operations. Statutory authority to phase production is necessary for practical compliance.
78	County	Given the nature of modern business communications being primarily email, communications are being reduced to a writing at a volume that was never contemplated by the Legislature. Requests that produce tens of thousands of pages of potentially responsive documents today would have produced virtually no records ten years ago.
81	State	A major challenge is that records may remain accessible through statewide eDiscovery systems even after they are deleted from an agency's regular systems. Because the Governor's Technology Office maintains backups that can make deleted emails and other records retrievable, retention rules requiring records to be deleted after a set period may not fully achieve that purpose. Clearer guidance is needed on how public records obligations apply to records retained in backups and eDiscovery systems.
91	State	Litigation is the only enforcement mechanism, and that affects behavior of both record-seeking parties and the Division. More specifically, a requestor's remedy for delay, denial, or a disputed fee is a district-court action under NRS 239.011, with attorney's fees if the requestor prevails. Agencies internalize that risk. Staff sometimes over-produce, or under redact for fear of a lawsuit they are likely to lose. An intermediate step may quell this risk. Something like a short conference requirement, i.e., arbitration would help both sides. NRS 239 was written for paper files and needs to be updated with modern technology. A large share of responsive material now lives in shared drives, email, and databases. Chapter 239 does not clearly address search obligations across

No.	Entity type	Question 79 – Answer as submitted
		those systems. Specifically, what counts as creating a new record v. exporting an existing one is muddy and could use statutory clarity. A small number of requests can be a driving force for backlog Broad requests such as "all communications" type PRR's and/or repeated requests from the same party who will not narrow the request drives the backlog. Nothing in Chapter 239 lets an agency sequence them behind ordinary requests or require the requestor to share the extraordinary cost. Complex requests should be deemed as such early on and there should be something in statute that allows for more time in responding. Providing information in any medium creates a problem for macros, which may contain confidential, sensitive, or privileged information. Issues with records that require the use of confidential records to verify.