STATE OF NEVADA
PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MATERIALS

Meeting Date and Time: October 19, 2026, 9:00 AM

1. Written Public Comment received as of October 16, 2026

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

From: Kathleen Mitchell
To: AGGeneralCounsel
Subject: Re: Public Records Task Force comments
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2026 7:16:58 AM

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

Given you cut my comments from the video available and I implore you to immediately if not sooner post the audio or the transcript. Immediately.

I will be filing a complaint regarding this, but given it is your office that has yet to respond to any complaint I have made, I will very much be reaching out to Channel 13 to see if their reporter who was sitting directly behind me recalls my comments as well as the gentlemen from the ACLU.

Please, look forward to my comments at the next meeting.

You are not the end all be all and whomever I have to get involved, I will do so.

Kathleen Light

From: Kathleen Mitchell <TheKatieMitchell@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2026 9:01 AM
To: AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov <AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov>
Subject: Public Records Task Force comments

Hello!

I know I am limited to two pages, so I have gone ahead and shrunk this down to tow pages but I am include the full-size proposal as well

Thanks!
Kathleen Light

From: Kathleen Mitchell
To: AGGeneralCounsel
Subject: Public Records Task Force Remarks 9/29
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2026 3:49:25 AM
Attachments: 0929prtfwrittebcimments.pdf

You don't often get email from thekatiemitchell@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

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

Please include the attached written comments, which closely reflect my remarks at the September 29, 2026 meeting, intact as an attachment to the minutes pursuant to NRS 241.035(1)(d).

I previously submitted a two-page written proposal. These two-page comments are a separate submission documenting my public testimony that was excluded from the recording of the meeting. Please do not combine them for purposes of the two-page limit or treat my proposal as having exhausted my opportunity to submit written comments.

Please clarify whether the agenda's advance-submission deadline concerns distribution of materials or is being used to restrict inclusion in the minutes. NRS 241.035(1)(d) does not expressly impose a prior-business-day submission deadline. If you contend that the deadline authorizes rejection of this submission, please identify the legal authority.

I also object to any interpretation that would require me to submit my intended remarks to the Attorney General's Office for substantive approval before I may address the Task Force. If advance submission is used to decide which viewpoints may be expressed, it would amount to pre-screening public criticism rather than merely processing meeting materials. This concern is particularly serious when the comments address the Attorney General's Office itself.

Nevada Attorney General guidance citing OMLO 99-11 cautions against unnecessarily restrictive advance sign-up requirements. ***Barrett v. Walker County School District***, 872 F.3d 1209 (11th Cir. 2017), invalidated an advance process that gave officials unchecked power to delay access to speak, while ***Reza v. Pearce***, 806 F.3d 497 (9th Cir. 2015), requires reasonable, viewpoint-neutral restrictions.

Please confirm receipt and inclusion of both documents in the appropriate meeting record. If either is refused, please provide the specific reason and legal authority in writing.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Light

Get Outlook for iOS

Written Public Comments for Inclusion in the September 29, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Pursuant to NRS 241.035(1)(d), I, Kathleen Light, submit these written comments as a substantially accurate representation of my oral remarks at the September 29, 2026 meeting of the Nevada Public Records Task Force. Because my actual remarks are absent from the publicly available recording I reviewed, I request that this submission be included intact as an attachment incorporated into the meeting minutes to preserve the substance of my testimony. These comments are separate from my previously submitted written proposal.

First Comment

I have to start with this. I wasn't going to come in person today, but it concerned me that this task force has taken away the Zoom access to the meeting and left us with a phone-only option this time, when the phone option has yet to work, as witnessed by my friend Joe Panicaro in Reno. I don't want to be here, as we are directly across the street from where I was raped, and I'm silently having a panic attack, so bear with me.

Now I have written up a bit of a tome on the topics of transparency and preservation with sample legislative language. What can I say? I'm unemployed, and I was bored. Unfortunately, I am limited to two pages. So I wrote small. Zoom in or use the QR code in the footer to access the full-size documents.

Let's start with preservation.

I just lost my public records lawsuit against the attorney general's office, which has refused to give me any record of the investigation into my sexual assault by the former deputy insurance commissioner. They have ignored requests and just haven't produced any substantive records in my case.

This happened right at the two-year mark. And two years is how long Nevada retains emails.

Because it was a procedural issue—because I didn't serve them in person in Carson City—I can go back and file the public-records case again.

But here's the problem.

The majority of the records I was trying to obtain are potentially already gone.

Ta-da. That is how we solve problems in Nevada state government.

There is a phenomenon that I personally call lawyers doing lawyer stuff.

Sometimes you just have a series of perfectly legal procedural barriers that happen to produce the exact same result.

It took a full year to get the public records.

The records about the investigation into me personally that I received included evidence that I had called and no one responded. I had emailed and no one responded. I received copies of the lawsuit I had filed to get the records I was receiving. That is some form of bureaucratic irony: getting your own lawsuit back in the public records response you had sued them for. But not a word about the counterterrorism investigation into a rape victim.

Some of the records I was asking for were approaching, and now have reached, the end of their ordinary retention period.

That creates a fundamental problem because you have a very simple loophole: run out the clock.

What I propose is preservation periods. We have some in place; however, they should be codified and explicit. I.e., I am asking for all potentially responsive records to be preserved until all appeals have been exhausted. And a special rule for criminal matters extending that retention period to the length of the statute of limitations for the crime.

Please take a look, and hopefully you can discuss this at the next and final meeting. I'll be back to talk about transparency at the end.

Second Comment

As a failed academic, you guys are killing me.

Research bias is the word you are looking for.

Citations matter.

1. The Nevada Public Records Act provides for all citizens, for whatever reason, to be able to receive public records. It is literally part of the government's job description to do the work and provide those public records regardless of use. I could be wallpapering my bathroom with these documents.

Written Public Comments for Inclusion in the September 29, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Pursuant to NRS 241.035(1)(d), I, Kathleen Light, submit these written comments as a substantially accurate representation of my oral remarks at the September 29, 2026 meeting of the Nevada Public Records Task Force. Because my actual remarks are absent from the publicly available recording I reviewed, I request that this submission be included intact as an attachment incorporated into the meeting minutes to preserve the substance of my testimony. These comments are separate from my previously submitted written proposal.

2. The state of Vermont charged me $90 for four redacted emails about my rapist's resignation, but here's the thing: it took 3 days, start to finish. Make me wait a year? I'm not paying you. If you want to modernize, you might want to charge per byte of data rather than per page because the cost is in the data storage, not paper and toner.
3. The public is left with 180 seconds to articulate law and two pages. The language mightn't be legally precise, as opposed to written statements with no limits from government entities.
4. A victim needs the police report for several reasons, including victims' relief funds.

Back to transparency.

I allege that a public official raped me on video. That's not nothing. There was a felony warrant request in this case. I was told he was being arrested, but it was a jurisdictional issue. The only possibility for jurisdiction would be between the AG and the DA. I have spent years trying to reconstruct what happened through public records that the AG refuses to give me.

I am not asking this Task Force to decide whether my allegations are true. I'm stating in plain language that they exist, but the attorney general is now withholding the record that it ever happened.

I don't know why.

I will never know.

That is precisely the problem.

I'm not special. If it can happen to me, it has happened to others and will happen again unless we take steps to tighten the law and prevent obfuscation of the public records.

So what I propose is an addition to the law regarding elected, appointed, and potentially exempt employees.

People in those positions should be beyond reproach.

I could have easily, if I were a different type of person, extorted or blackmailed the deputy insurance commissioner.

In addition to that, there is the matter that the tens of millions of dollars he collected as the head of enforcement for the Division of Insurance during his tenure could be challenged due to his misconduct and possibly need to be returned to those who paid those fines and chose to challenge the decisions, at the taxpayers' expense.

This is the reality and the potential issues with what happened with me.

This is why we need transparency.

As a citizen, I do generally want to know when my public officials have been credibly accused to the point that administrative synopses have been authored to determine whether they should be immediately forced to resign, as was the case with my rapist.

I would want to know what happened there, particularly when the entire administration of the Division of Insurance was gone without a word or a trace within 6 months, while insurance across the board increased for all Nevadans during that time.

Something happened here.

So please take a look at what I wrote and take it into consideration as a possible recommendation.

Because what happened here isn't okay.

The end of it shouldn't be throwing your hands in the air and saying, "Who knows?" The answer to that question is the AG's office. The AG is the one who knows the answers and won't give them to me.

From:	Kathleen Light
To:	AGGeneralCounsel
Subject:	PRTF 9/29 meeting minutes
Date:	Wednesday, October 14, 2026 1:27:45 PM
Attachments:	AMNDOPPtoDissLightvAGO.pdf

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

Hello-

I noticed you have the minutes up along with a video link, of course you did it in a docx so most people won't open it that way, but you are the lawyers.

There are inaccuracies in the minutes when it comes to the public comment, my public comments specifically. They are noted as being telephonic. I was in person. I struggled to make it there in person as it is right across the street from where I was raped and I stated as much in my comments.

Neither the written version of my comments nor my proposals are attached to the minutes or available in the website. I have specifically emailed you requesting they be attached. If they are not to be attached I have requested that you cite the reason why including the legal authority.

It's almost as though the Attorney General's Office is trying to make my comments disappear by playing within the finer points of open meeting law.

I'm certain the Attorney General wouldn't want such a thing to happen. He seemed so shaken up and concerned when I spoke in front of him yesterday at the CDVSA meeting. It was almost like he had never heard the story. That would be odd seeing as his email was a service contact in the Odyssey system when I filed motions into the public records suit I had against your office. He would have received it directly and I'm certain that the Attorney General of Nevada would read an 82 page filing with that amount of detail. I've attached the file. I'm sure you know where to put it.

I don't know, take a look. He was positively shaken yesterday.
https://youtu.be/0brCALt7iyc

And please, correct the minutes. I won't even go into the purpose and breadth of the synopsis you put together of them.

Kathleen Faye Light

From: Kenny Goranson
To: AGGeneralCounsel
Subject: Public Comment for October 19 PRTF Meeting: Election Records and EAVS Data
Date: Thursday, October 15, 2026 1:29:34 PM

You don't often get email from kennygoranson3@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

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

Dear Public Records Task Force,

Please include this written comment with the minutes of the October 19 meeting. I ask the Task Force to include election-administration records in its discussions and recommendations under agenda item 5.

I recently submitted a public-records request to the Washoe County Registrar of Voters for existing records used to prepare Washoe County's 2024 Election Administration and Voting Survey (EAVS) response. The request seeks the completed response, drafts and source records, related correspondence, and submission or correction dates.

EAVS information may be compiled and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission months after an election. In the meantime, the county's source records can help the public understand election administration soon after results are certified and transmitted to the Secretary of State. I ask the Task Force to consider recommending that local election records used to prepare EAVS responses be made available within 30 days after the county transmits its certified election data to the Secretary of State, subject to lawful, narrowly tailored redactions.

I believe the Task Force should clarify how public-records rules apply when a local government prepares information for a federal survey: which records remain in the local government's custody or control, how agencies should handle records they say belong to another entity, and what explanation and legal authority should be provided when access is denied or limited. Any recommendations on fees, bulk data, personally identifiable information, and dispute resolution should expressly account for election records as well as law-enforcement records.

I am not asking the Task Force to decide my pending request. I ask that it add election-administration records and EAVS-related records to a future meeting agenda and consider them in its final recommendations.

Thank you,

Kenny Goranson

From:	WatchDogJeff
To:	AGGeneralCounsel
Cc:	Leslie M. Nino Piro
Subject:	PRTF Public Comment/ Oct 19
Date:	Thursday, October 15, 2026 2:56:18 PM
Attachments:	PRTF Oct PC.pdf

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

Please see attached

Jeff Church
RenoTaxRevolt.com

Public Comment, Public Records Task Force

I do not have high hopes of anything coming out of the PRTF supporting the legislative intent of NRS239.

That said, I note that the ACLU supported "a fully funded and staffed ombudsperson or inspector-general-style office with defined response timelines." I agree! I note from the minutes: "Members expressed broad, notably bipartisan support for establishing an independent ombudsperson, dispute-resolution, and/or advisory-council office, …"

The devil is in the details. It MUST NOT be in the A.G.'s office. The A.G. defends state agencies in PDR matters- the conflict is obvious. Also the A.G. is one year + behind in OML resolution, rendering all complaints void. The NV RED HOA Ombudsman is an example of how not to do it creating a bureaucratic and burdensome process that only an expert with a lot of time can untangle. **KISS: Keep It Simple (and) Speedy**.

Perhaps a new office or placed somewhere in the Judicial system. A hearing officer, via Zoom style, can be located anywhere in the state and quickly hear cases and render an advisory decision. That would allow for confidential in-camera review. Let's face it, at times it has been proven that the delay is caused by an agency hiding bad behavior (perhaps liability) and not for true NRS239 purposes.

One PDR I did showed the lead committee chair asking to meet an applicant privately "for coffee" suggesting a possible romantic intention and bias. Other matters might be more serious and support criminal and corruption concerns- allowing an in-camera review addresses that. Do not kid yourself into thinking that corruption does not or cannot exist here.

The 2027 Legislature is fast approaching and time is of the essence but perhaps as this overall recommendation moves forward, UNR or UNLV or the Guinn Institute might be able to look nationwide for best practices. Perhaps students working on their Masters or PhD thesis.

Yes to an Ombudsman/ Hearing Officer and KISS: Keep it simple and speedy! Allow confidential review by the hearing officer.

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

From:	Oscar
To:	AGGeneralCounsel
Subject:	Public comments for Public Records Task Force for meeting of Oct. 19
Date:	Friday, October 16, 2026 10:08:24 AM

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

Hello. I wish to provide the following comments regarding the Oct. 19 agenda and future meetings:

My interest is election related.

My comments cover the minutes of the last meeting and agenda item 5-Consideration of Topics and Next Meeting Dates and Related
Issues.

Regarding the minutes of the last meeting:

Staff Time and Fee Charging also relates to requests for voter roll data. Does the PRTF's proposal include that data? Or is it just for police records?

Please note that the Washoe ROV is charging $3,300 for a snapshot of unredacted voter roll data. A single snapshot is helpful but it's most limited. Meaningful analysis of voter rolls requires multiple and maybe sequential snapshots, imposing prohibitive costs to the requester.

The situation is not dissimilar to info requests to law enforcement that incur prohibitive fees.

Please, create policy regarding excessive fees for unredacted voter roll data. I wish to suggest a 1- or 2-year subscription with unlimited downloads; fees lowest possible.

Ombudsperson / Advisory Council is a good idea for all record requests that are denied or severely limited in response. We need one in Washoe County and they need to have authority in elections or election-related issues.

Personally Identifiable Information and Bulk/Compiled Data is an issue I've been concerned about for some time. Unfortunately, the PRTF has ignored PII violations in elections.

Recent news states ERIC and CEIR "allegedly violating the federal Driver's Privacy Protection Act by sharing state motor-vehicle and voter data."
https://standingrecord.com/entries/2026/09/02/federal-politicized-investigations-029f458b/

Please, consider making policy recommendation to state legislature to close the gaping holes in protecting PII, including handwritten signatures on ballot return envelopes that have no notice of risk of identity theft and forgery on them though such risks are present.

The discussion of *Criminal Investigative Records* appears similar to the lack of disclosure by the Washoe ROV.

In addition to the excessive voter rolls fees mentioned above, my main disclosure concerns are:

1) No objective person in place to resolve perceived violations of the Nevada Public Records Act. This goes to the need for Ombudsperson or Inspector General who's given authority to investigate and to render opinions and actions to resolve disputes of lack of disclosure, tardy disclosure, records retention/security, excessive fees, etc.

2) The post-election EAV Survey of election data that is later compiled and published by the EAC, eight months after the election. I want that data thirty-days after the election, when the certified election data is delivered to the SOS.

The Washoe ROV has denied my requests for this data in the past without adequate explanation. I was told that it was the EAC's data and could not be shared.

Really? The EAC has a form but the data is Washoe's and belongs to the people.

The election data is paid for by my tax dollars, is not proprietary, and causes no harm to the county to produce. So, why the denial?

Maybe I should I have my own form the ROV can fill out while they fill out the EAC's form?

This is a prime issue for the PRTF to discuss.

Closing:

Please, give my concerns your consideration. Thank you for your interest and understanding.

Sincerely,

Oscar Williams
1540 Whisper Rock Way
Reno, NV 89523
C: (775) 240-3456