

Steve Sisolak
Governor



Richard Whitley, MS
Director

**DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**
DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH
Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



Lisa Sherych
Administrator

Ihsan Azzam,
Ph.D., M.D.
Chief Medical Officer

**Senate Bill 275 (2021) – ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON HIV EXPOSURE
MODERNIZATION**

March 17, 2022

5 PM

Microsoft Teams Teleconference

Draft Minutes – February 17, 2022

1. Call to Order, Roll Call – Tory Johnson, Office of HIV

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Quentin Savwoir
Cheryl Radeloff
Stephan Page
Gary Costa
Jesus Coleman
Vince Collins

TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jennifer Howell
Martin Walker
Andre' Wade (Excused)

DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH STAFF PRESENT:

Tory Johnson

GUESTS PRESENT:

Linda Anderson

Tory Johnson conducted the roll call and called the meeting to order at 5:08 pm. Six (6) of the nine (9) members were present.

2. Public Comment – Chair Quentin Savwoir

The following statement was read, with no public comment following after statement was read: *No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been included specifically on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.*

3. For Possible Action – Review of February 3, 2022, meeting minutes – Chair Savwoir

- Stephan page commented that his name was misspelled “Stephen.”

Motion to approve meetings, Cheryl Radloff

Second, Vince Collins

All in favor vote, zero oppose or abstentions.

4. Informational Only – Open Meeting Law and Ethics in Government Presentation – DPBH
Deputy Attorney General, Pierron Tackes

Points or questions that came up during the presentation:

Q: Will the task force be identified in NRS or NAC?

A: Because it's not permanent in nature, so the bill that created this task force created it on a limited basis. So it authorized this task force to be created and to meet and to fulfill the obligations that were set forth and then to make recommendations on or before September 1, 2022, so it didn't extend into the future so that's not going to be put into the Nevada revised statutes. Instead, this lives in the statutes of Nevada, which are also online. It's a bulkier citation to make so.

Q: Thank you just some clarity on this because it says solicit input and research. So is that for like let's say you know within not only the state of Nevada. But I know we had some folks outside of Nevada. So is that mainly like informational only or is that also like down the line like writing reports or actually writing statute or language for statute is that defined at all or is that clarified or.

A: It's not defined so to the extent that you want to solicit input on recommended language. That's something that that could be done and it's not specified to in state so the assignment is to be looking at Nevada, statutes, and regulations, but to the extent that you're comparing those to other states that's still valuable to the intent of this.

Q: Could you clarify non-governmental agencies or soliciting non-governmental agencies?

A: It doesn't prohibit reaching out to governmental agencies, what it's asking is that you seek input from persons and non-government. I think non-government agencies is a confusing term to begin with because when you see agencies you think of governmental agencies, but the call is to solicit input from persons and non-governmental bodies.

Q: We may be able to accept available grants. But with gifts, you know would that be for things like if people needed it for travel or for other resources.

A: Great question, I don't know but that is something I can look into and get back to you and I can provide Tory with that answer.

Q: I'm just curious if we were to or want to apply for any type of grant funding could any individual here on the task force do that. But it have to go through the Department of Public and behavioral health? What would that process look like.

A: Great question so for the task force to apply for a grant it would need to be approved by the task force at an open meeting on an agenda so it would have to be properly agenzized that this task force was authorizing one person or staff or a group of people to apply for that grant and then so long as the task force approved. Also, The question was if the task force decides to apply for a grant is there some process that requires that the task force would need to go through with division of public and behavioral health to apply for that grant.

Q: Were there some changes with open meeting law regarding to like if it's online that we have to show our faces and also be able to be heard is that correct too?

A: Great question yes, so there were some changes in the last legislative session, which allows public bodies to meet via zoom or teams remotely. It doesn't speak specifically to whether or not members are required to have their cameras on I always advise that members keep their cameras on and the reason I do that is it's the best way to ensure that you're maintaining quorum so you know if you're a public body on a public body and your camera is off the doorbell rings, you get up walk away from your computer you potentially lose quorum by someone doing that, so I do always advise that.

Requiring video and sound that is requiring access to the public so whatever access that the members of the body have the public has to have the same, so for today's example. We all have the ability to use our video and to see a screen so the public must also be able to see whatever we're seeing and here whatever we're hearing so in today's instance, they have the public has access to join this.

Q: Conflict of interest disclosure, is that verbal or in writing?

A: It will need to be verbal so it needs to be given at the time that the item is considered so when the item is called on the agenda so typically how it works is the chair will call the item and then the individual make their disclosure statement.

5. For Possible Action – Review of existing bylaws and possible action to edit or amend bylaw language

Open discussion around next steps in updating the bylaws, such as:

Could I have clarification. You said something about the naming convention could you tell me a little more about that? There are a lot of it still referencing Senate bill 284. So I don't know if you all want to necessarily leave it to reflect the current Senate bill or just kind of leave it open you know, and just say task force so those are things that you all can determine for yourselves. But as it stands right now. These bylaws are basically in effect for a task force that is not in operation right now.

Senate bill 284 (2019) has pretty similar language to Senate Bill 275 (2021) for this task force so I don't think there's a ton, we need to change maybe we could just. And possibly a motion to copy and paste Senate Bill 275, but I think it's mostly just dates and of course, the number of the bill. And I haven't completely gone through the whole bill yet, but it'll it seems pretty similar from what I'm reading right now.

I do have a question because I think the old bill like with SB 284 was really about HIV modernization. And if my understanding is correct SB 275 it went from HIV monetization to communicable diseases so. That's something I think we need to consider because that's a much taller order than just HIV modernization. If there are other entities or appointed bodies that would cover the modernization of other communicable diseases. And if there are that could inform rather or not, our scope remains on HIV aids or rather we need to expand it and even if we're legally able to expand it to communicable diseases. DPBH DAG reported the following, my reading of SB 275 it does address communicable diseases. Broadly this section that reestablishes the task force is fairly limited. I don't see language that pulls in other communicable diseases. So I would say that the scope is still limited to HIV.

Entertain a motion from the vice chair, Stephan Page, suggestion to copy paste the bill

language into our bylaws to outline. No second, as the motion was introduced by Co-chair. All in favor vote, zero oppose or abstentions.

Previous motion and vote were rescinded. After further discussion, it was decided to table action on the bylaws until the March 3, 2022, meeting to allow members time to review the bylaws. Chair made the motion, 2nd by Vince Collins. All in favor vote, zero oppose or abstentions.

6. For Possible Action – Overview of submission required by SB 275 (2021) and possible action to establish strategy.

Discussion pertaining to when report is due, which is September 1, 2022, and will be made to the Governor and LCB. Discussion also entailed what the report should encompass, what information should be included and whom the responsibility of the report falls under, which is the Chair/Co-chair, with input and assistance from the task force members.

Further topics included:

- Engaging a law firm for information and recommendations on what items to look at or into;
- Webinar from the Boyd School of Law in December;
- Possibility of making Senate bill 275 retroactive to apply to pass come criminalization;
- Soliciting the Council of a law firm to conduct research for us to help in the composition of our report;
- solicit feedback from the community, including:
 - Sex workers, Cupcake Girls
 - Signs of Hope is an organization that works with sexual assault
 - Brothels, owners and workers
- Community presentation related to changes that happened with SB 284 (2019) and now SB 275 (2021);
- Public Education, such as a tool kit, similar to what is being created by UNR AETC for SB 211 (2021);

Further action on this agenda item was tabled until the next meeting.

7. For Possible Action – Make recommendations for next meeting’s agenda.

- Item #5 – Existing bylaws
- Item #6 – Overview of submission required by SB 275 (2021)
- Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law Report on HIV Criminalization
- Follow-up about outreach to community partners

There was some discussion around member composition. There are 15 allotted spots, only nine (9) have been appointed, leaving one (1) for a political person, and five (5) general community members. Further discussion happened around how to recruit the additional members with no clear action plan.

Co-chair made the motion, 2nd by Chair. All in favor vote, zero oppose or abstentions.

8. Public Comment – Chair Savvoir

The following statement was read, with no public comment following after statement was read: *No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been included specifically on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.*

9. Adjournment – Chair Savwior

Co-Chair Page motioned for adjournment of the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 6:53 pm.

DRAFT