



STATE OF NEVADA PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MINUTES

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

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

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

In-Person Members Present:

- Josh Hicks
- Kalie Work

Virtual Members Present:

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

Absent Members:

- Matt Morris

A quorum was established.

2. Public Comment (First Period)

No in-person public comment was received.

No virtual public comment was received.

Written public comment was received from Jeff Church, Washoe County School District, and Oscar Williams. Written comments are attached to these minutes.

3. Approval of February 26, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Motion passed unanimously.

4. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

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

Nomination and Election of Chair:

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

Nomination and Election of Vice Chair:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Select Remaining Task Force Meeting Dates and Locations

Discussion identified tentative dates and locations for future meetings.

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

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

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

Discussion of Future Presentations:

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

Additional discussion included:

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

10. Structure of Decisions and Actions

- No additional information was discussed on this item.

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

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

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

12. Public Comment (Second Period)

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

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 AM.

Office of the General Counsel



Sara K. Montalvo, Esq., Chief General Counsel
Kevin A. Pick, Esq., Deputy Chief General Counsel
Travis B. Lucia, Esq., General Counsel
Andrea L. Schulewitch, Esq., Associate General Counsel
P.O. Box 30425, Reno, NV 89520-3425
Phone (775) 348-0300 / Fax (775) 333-6010
legal@washoeschools.net

April 24, 2026

Sent via email to AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov

Public Records Task Force

Re: Public Records Task Force April 27, 2026 Meeting – Public Comment

Dear Public Records Task Force:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on proposed reforms to Nevada's Public Records Act and respectfully urge the task force to recommend two related clarifications: (1) express statutory authority for public entities to recover reasonable staff time costs incurred in responding to excessive or complex public records requests; and (2) codification and expansion of confidentiality protections for employee personnel records, including those of political subdivisions.

A. RECOMMENDED CLARIFICATIONS TO NEVADA'S PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

1. Fee Authority for Excessive Staff Time.

Nevada's Public Records Act has long recognized that public entities may recover the actual costs of producing public records. Legislative history confirms that earlier versions of the statute expressly allowed recovery of extraordinary personnel costs, and that, when the Legislature amended the statute and removed that specific phrase, it did so to simplify and consolidate cost-recovery provisions—not to require public agencies to absorb unlimited staff time at public expense.

The statutory amendments relocating allowable costs into the definition of "actual cost," and the removal of language prohibiting recovery of staff time, reflect a legislative intent to permit reasonable cost recovery rather than to silently eliminate it. Under well-established principles of statutory construction, when the Legislature removes an express prohibition, it is presumed to have intended to allow what was previously barred.

This clarification is increasingly necessary given the nature of modern public records requests. Many requests now require substantial staff time for:

- Locating records stored across multiple systems or departments;
- Reviewing records for attorney-client privilege, statutory exemptions, or confidential information;
- Redacting protected information before release; and
- Coordinating production to ensure completeness and accuracy.

When public entities are required to divert staff for hours—or days—from core governmental functions to respond to unusually broad or complex requests without the ability to recover reasonable costs, the result is diminished public service, delayed responsiveness to other requesters, and improper subsidization of private interests by taxpayers. Allowing cost recovery for excessive staff time promotes fairness, discourages abusive or overbroad requests, and ensures that limited public resources are used responsibly.

Making this authority explicit in statute would reduce disputes, provide transparency to requesters, and promote consistent application across agencies, while preserving public access to records through reasonable and predictable fee structures.

2. Confidentiality of Employee Personnel Records.

In addition, we respectfully recommend that the Legislature codify NAC 284.718, which deems state personnel records confidential, and extend equivalent statutory confidentiality protections to the personnel records of employees of political subdivisions, including school districts, counties, cities, and special districts.

The policy rationale underlying NAC 284.718 is sound and widely accepted: unrestricted disclosure of personnel records can subject public employees to harassment, retaliation, identity misuse, and reputational harm, while offering little insight into governmental decision-making. Personnel files typically contain sensitive information—including performance evaluations, disciplinary investigations that do not result in formal action, medical information, and personal identifiers—that does not advance transparency when disclosed.

Codifying this regulation would strengthen legal clarity and durability, ensuring that these important protections are not dependent on regulatory interpretation. Extending comparable protections to political subdivision employees would also correct an inconsistency in current practice that leaves many public servants more exposed simply because of the structure of their employer.

Importantly, protecting personnel record confidentiality does not undermine transparency or accountability. Nevada courts already recognize that the Public Records Act requires a balancing of interests, and public access to records reflecting official actions, final disciplinary outcomes, and governmental policy decisions would remain intact. Confidentiality simply ensures

Public Records Task Force

Re: Public Records Task Force April 27, 2026 Meeting – Public Comment

April 24, 2026

Page 3

that disclosure serves a legitimate public purpose rather than facilitating harassment or misuse of personal information.

B. CONCLUSION

Clarifying fee authority for excessive staff time and codifying personnel-record confidentiality work together to modernize Nevada's Public Records Act. These reforms would promote transparency while acknowledging operational realities, safeguard privacy and employee safety, reduce unnecessary conflict and litigation, and support the responsible stewardship of public resources.

I encourage the task force to advance both recommendations as part of a thoughtful and balanced update to Nevada's public records framework. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

/s/Sara K. Montalvo, Esq.
Sara K. Montalvo, Esq.
Chief General Counsel

From: Oscar <info@nevadavotersalliance.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 4:48 PM
To: AGGeneralCounsel
Subject: Two things for the Public Records Task Force:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello. Please share my comments and concerns with the members of the Public Records Task Force:

1. Washoe County has not posted video online of processing ballots of the 2024 general election. Posting video coverage should be mandatory.
2. Washoe County's Election Administration Valuation Survey (EAVS) data is being unduly withheld and denied the public. This data includes official results certified by the Secretary of State within 30-days of a general election. There is no valid reason to delay or deny voters the EAVS data from their elections. Providing the EAVS data to the public after state certification of results should be mandatory.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

-Oscar Williams, 775-240-3456

--

Oscar Williams
Nevada Voters Alliance



From: Oscar <info@nevadavotersalliance.com>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2026 1:58 PM
To: AGGeneralCounsel
Cc: Ira Hansen; Lisa Krasner; Alexis Hansen; Jill Dickman; John Steinbeck; carrie.buck@sen.state.nv.us
Subject: Comments for the Public Records Task Force

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello. Please forward the following comments to the members of the Public Records Task Force:

Open Records for Elections:

a) Cyber-security inquiries: Data transmission and network security are areas that the public cannot ask nor receive information. Audits of the system are not public knowledge. This hurts public confidence in elections. Considering Nevada had a major breach in August 2025 for which many questions linger about the data affected and what not, the public needs to know a minimum of how their tax money is being spent on equipment, software, and services. Can this committee set guidelines for the Secretary of State to review on greater transparency?

b) Timely receipt of information: Including but not limited to county voter rolls, poll pad voter data, daily check-in list, Cast Vote Records, chain-of-custody forms, and tabulator tapes.

c) Access to ballot images: An important aspect of citizen audit of elections is having the before and after ballot images and related data files that prove the ballot is real and accurate. No voter data is shared--it's just ballot images and not the real ballot.

d) Fees for data/info: Election data/info should be accessible and affordable for all. High fees hinder transparency by deterring inquiry. Abolish data/info fees.

e) Repository for election data/info: The county or state could establish a login section of their website(s) to access voter data/info.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation

Respectfully submitted on behalf of Nevada Voters Alliance and Conservative Republicans of Northern Nevada (CRNN).

Oscar Williams
Nevada Voters Alliance



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

From: WatchDogJeff <renotaxrevolt@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2026 12:27 PM
To: StateWeb; AGGeneralCounsel
Cc: publicnotice
Subject: OML Concerns (Today's Meeting)
Attachments: OML 2 2 6 26.doc; 2026.02.26 PR Task Force Materials.pdf

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

See attached. I have serious concerns about OML compliance.

Add my comments to today's vague Public Comments if applicable.

Jeff Church
WatchDogJeff.com

February 26, 2026

To Whom It May Concern:

OML Concerns As Related to:

1. Public Document Task Force, today at 130 pm (2-26-26)
2. Overall vague postings

Regarding today's **Public Document Task Force**: Assuming that it is subject to OML:

- I find it vague. See NRS 232.2175. It does not clarify the agency. This could be the Town of Gabbs, etc.

- Was it posted in time? ("b) Posting the notice on the official website of the State pursuant to NRS 232.2175 not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting is to be held, unless the public body is unable to do so because of technical problems relating to the operation or maintenance of the official website of the State." It was posted 1-23-26

- More importantly the link would not open. I see that unlike the others on the site, it lists a mailbox icon that seems to require a mail server that is compatible.

- I had a friend try and they found no agenda as well so it's not just me.

- In looking on line the attached is all I found. No real agenda, idea of how to attend etc.

- If true you need to postpone the meeting due to OML violations.

Regarding the second issue, vagueness.

NRS 232.2175 uses the term ... "clear and conspicuous manner." It further allows the State to adopt regulations. In doing so I urge the state to adopt a regulation that posting be clear and conspicuous. A perfect example is below, it simply says "Directors Office". Allowing such vague postings requires the user to click on every single site. In this case it is not really a director's office but a "NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE BENEFICIARY ADVISORY COUNCIL The Beneficiary Advisory Council (BAC) for Nevada Medicaid will conduct a public meeting at the following location: ..."






NRS also uses the terms "clear and complete". A vague posting seems to violate the legislative intent of notice. To allow this is to allow rogue agencies to intentionally engage in vague postings so as to mislead the public and hide meetings from them.

Another example was today at 9 am: "Executive Advisory Committee" that could be anything but it's RTC South.

As per NRS 232, "4. The Department may adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of this section." The State must adopt regulations to effectively carry out the legislature's intent.

NRS 241.010 Legislative declaration and intent. In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that all public bodies exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

Upcoming Meetings

02/26/2026 01:00 PM	 Aging and Disability Services Division	Date Posted: 02/20/2026
02/26/2026 01:00 PM	 Innovations International Charter School of Nevada Governing Board	Date Posted: 02/23/2026
 02/26/2026 01:30 PM	 Public Records Task Force	Date Posted: 02/23/2026
02/26/2026 01:30 PM	 Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders	Date Posted: 02/20/2026
02/26/2026 01:30 PM	 Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial	Date Posted: 02/19/2026
02/26/2026 02:00 PM	 Las Vegas Metro Police Department Civil Service Board	Date Posted: 02/18/2026
02/26/2026 02:00 PM	 Clark County Building Enterprise Fund Advisory Committee (RFFAC)	Date Posted: 02/17/2026

**Note the mail logo above vs the chain link logo.*

03/03/2026
09:00 AM

 Director's Office

Date Posted: 02/11/2026

What do you suppose that may be? "NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE BENEFICIARY ADVISORY COUNCIL The Beneficiary Advisory Council (BAC) for Nevada Medicaid will conduct a public meeting at the following location: ..."

NRS 232.2175 Posting of notices of meetings by public bodies on State's website: Requirements; duties of Department; regulations.

1. The Department shall establish and maintain a location on the official website of the State for the posting of notices by public bodies as required pursuant to **NRS 241.020**. The location must be identified on the official website of the State in a clear and conspicuous manner.

2. The location established pursuant to subsection 1 must include a place for the posting of **electronic links to the Internet website** or any electronic mail addresses, if available, of each public body which has posted a notice pursuant to NRS 241.020, from which a person may request the information and supporting materials that a public body must provide to a requester pursuant to NRS 241.020.

3. The Department **shall** provide for:

(a) The transmission to the Department by public bodies of:

(1) Notices required pursuant to NRS 241.020; and

(2) The Internet website or any electronic mail addresses, if available, of a public body that has submitted a notice for posting on the official website of the State.

(b) The timely and efficient posting of such notices and electronic links to addresses on the official website of Nevada.

4. The Department may adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.



**STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE**

MEETING MATERIALS ATTACHED

Meeting Date and Time:

February 26, 2026, 1:30 PM

1. Assembly Bill No. 128 (83rd Session 2025)

An Act relating to public records; creating the Public Records Task Force; setting forth the membership and duties of the Task Force; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Assembly Bill No. 128–Committee
on Government Affairs

CHAPTER.....

AN ACT relating to public records; creating the Public Records Task Force; setting forth the membership and duties of the Task Force; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Legislative Counsel’s Digest:

Existing law provides that, unless otherwise declared by law to be confidential, all public books and records of a state or local governmental entity are required to be open at all times during office hours for the public to inspect, copy or receive a copy thereof. Existing law also authorizes a person to request a copy of a public book or record in any medium in which the book or record is available. (NRS 239.010) This bill creates the Public Records Task Force to evaluate certain topics relating to requests for public records and make certain recommendations. This bill also: (1) prescribes the membership and duties of the Task Force; and (2) requires the Task Force to submit a written report describing its work and recommendations for transmittal to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs and the Senate and Assembly Standing Committees on Government Affairs for the 84th Session of the Legislature.

EXPLANATION – Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter between brackets ~~omitted material~~ is material to be omitted.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN
SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Sections 1-6. (Deleted by amendment.)

- Sec. 7.** 1. The Public Records Task Force is hereby created. The Task Force consists of the following 10 members:
- (a) One government representative and two transparency advocates appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;
 - (b) Two government representatives and one transparency advocate appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly;
 - (c) One government representative appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate;
 - (d) One transparency advocate appointed by the Minority Leader of the Assembly; and
 - (e) One government representative and one transparency advocate appointed by the Governor.
2. The Task Force shall:
- (a) Evaluate:
 - (1) Current exemptions to chapter 239 of NRS;
 - (2) The policies relating to public records of any review board created pursuant to NRS 289.380 or 289.383;



(3) The impact of broad requests for public records on governmental entities;

(4) The cost, burden and time constraint on governmental entities to redact confidential information;

(5) The financial burden on a person who requests a public record;

(6) Mechanisms to resolve disputes involving requests for public records, including, without limitation, mediation and other types of alternative dispute resolution; and

(7) Methods for collecting and sharing data related to requests for public records.

(b) Make recommendations, including, without limitation:

(1) To clarify the custodianship and control of public records;

(2) To protect sensitive information while promoting government transparency;

(3) To identify situations in which access to public records should be granted or denied;

(4) For penalties to impose against governmental entities for providing delayed or incomplete responses to a request for public records;

(5) For protocols to protect personal information and criminal investigations;

(6) For a standardized fee schedule; and

(7) For mechanisms to protect governmental entities from retaliatory litigation.

3. The members of the Task Force serve without compensation.

4. Each member of the Task Force who is an officer or employee of the State or local government must be relieved from his or her duties without loss of regular compensation so that the member may prepare for and attend meetings of the Task Force and perform any work necessary to carry out the duties of the Task Force in the most timely manner practicable. A state agency or local government shall not require an officer or employee who is a member of the Task Force to make up the time the member is absent from work to carry out his or her duties as a member, and shall not require the member to take annual, vacation or compensatory time for the absence.

5. The Task Force shall, at its first meeting, elect a Chair from the members who are transparency advocates and a Vice Chair from the members who are government representatives.

6. The Task Force shall meet:



(a) Upon the call of the Chair or a majority of the members of the Task Force; and

(b) At least four times.

7. A majority of the members of the Task Force constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business, and a majority of those members present at the meeting is sufficient for any official action taken by the Task Force.

8. The Task Force may apply for and accept any gift, donation, bequest, grant or other source of money to carry out the duties of the Task Force.

9. On or before October 31, 2026, the Task Force shall prepare and submit a written report to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs and the Senate and Assembly Standing Committees on Government Affairs for the 84th Session of the Legislature. The report must include, without limitation, a summary of the work and recommendations of the Task Force.

10. As used in this section:

(a) "Governmental entity" has the meaning ascribed to it in NRS 239.005.

(b) "Government representative" includes, without limitation, a representative:

- (1) From the Nevada Association of Counties or a county;
- (2) From the Nevada League of Cities or a local government;
- (3) Who is a district attorney or city attorney;
- (4) From a law enforcement agency;
- (5) From a school district;
- (6) From the Office of the Attorney General;
- (7) From a public utility that is not regulated by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada; and
- (8) From the Division of State Library, Archives and Public Records of the Department of Administration.

(c) "Transparency advocate" includes, without limitation, a representative:

- (1) From the Nevada Broadcasters Association;
- (2) From the Nevada Press Association;
- (3) From the Nevada Open Government Coalition;
- (4) From the American Civil Liberties Union;
- (5) Who is an attorney that specializes in requests for public records;
- (6) From the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and
- (7) Who is a member of the public and has experience related to public records.



Sec. 8. The members of the Public Records Task Force must be appointed pursuant to section 7 of this act not later than October 31, 2025.

Sec. 9. This act becomes effective on July 1, 2025, and expires by limitation on June 30, 2027.



