

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

DENNIS A. PEREA
Interim Director

SHELLEY CHINCHILLA
Administrator



COMMISSIONERS
Patricia Cafferata
Swadeep Nigam
Lee Plotkin
Tiffany Young
Scott Youngs

DRAFT

Minutes

Of the Nevada Equal Rights Commissioners'

Meeting on June 29, 2011

I. Call to Order

Patricia Cafferata, chair, called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call and Confirmation of Quorum

Norma Delaney, Administrative Assistant III, called roll and confirmed that a quorum was present.

Members present: Patricia Cafferata, Chair; Swadeep Nigam; Lee Plotkin, Tiffany Young.

Staff Present: Shelley Chinchilla, Administrator, Nevada Equal Rights Commission (NERC); RoseMarie Reynolds, Deputy Attorney General (DAG); Michael Baltz, Chief Compliance Investigator, NERC; Rita Rodriguez, Compliance Investigator I, NERC; Ted Watkins, Compliance Investigator I, NERC; Alanna Anthony-Ganas, Compliance Investigator I, NERC; Joyce Martines, Administrative Assistant III, NERC; and Norma Delaney, Administrative Assistant III, NERC.

Public Present: Dane Claussen, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); Jane Heehan, Equality Nevada.

III. Verification of Posting

Norma Delaney verified that the agenda had been posted and that certificates of posting are on file.

IV. Approval of the Minutes of the April 20, 2011 Meeting of the Commission

In discussion, the following corrections are to be made and sent to Lee Plotkin, Commissioner/Secretary, for signature:

- page 4, third paragraph, first sentence – change “ran” to “run”;
- page 12, under Public Comments, sixth paragraph, correct to reflect as follows: Ms. Cafferata, Chair, advised that the Commission cannot take action as action item not listed on agenda

Mr. Plotkin made motion to approve with changes; Mr. Nigam seconded; motion carried.

V. Administrator's Report

a. Budget Update

Ms. Chinchilla advised that Tab 3 of the packet is a copy of the budget report dated April 30, 2011, and that an updated version was provided, dated May 31, 2011, and that there were certain items she wanted to point out:

-**Revenues 3435**, federal EEOC Contract, column 4, shows the money NERC has drawn as of May 31, 2011, total of \$331,750.00; that this is the extent of Federal Fiscal Year 2010 contract.

-In regards to Federal Fiscal Year 2010 (FFY10), the federal contract was for 918 cases; that due to staffing shortages over the past year, the contract was reduced to 600 cases, which is why there is an available balance under column 6, Balance Available, \$119,353.00; that NERC will not be drawing this money down as it does not exist at this time.

-Contract credit is for 600 cases at \$550 each and 35 intake credits at \$50 each, totals \$331,750.00; that after the contract was modified to 600 cases, NERC did meet contract; that under column 9, the \$119,353.00 is not included.

-Expenditures, Category 01, Personnel Services, the number of positions still have not been corrected; NERC is budgeted for 18 staff members, 2 which NERC will lose on July 1, 2011, which are the 2 positions NERC lost in the special session two years ago; NERC is budgeted for 5 Commissioners by statute, to which the budget office is aware.

-Under column 8, Projected Balance, shows what is left in each of the accounts; under Operating Expenses, NERC will be ordering office supplies to bring that amount down as whatever NERC does not spend will be reverted back to the general fund.

-Under column 8, the amount of \$202,803.00 is a salary savings for the 2 positions that NERC will be losing based on the special session; that these positions have been vacant for approximately two years – not being filled are the Deputy Administrator position and a vacant Compliance Investigator position; that no layoffs will result in NERC losing the 2 positions; the \$202,803.00 will be reverted back to the general fund.

Ms. Cafferata inquired about Category 30, Training, under Expenditures, and asked if training is for staff or outreach, to which Ms. Chinchilla advised the training is for staff; that training was to be provided by the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and money was put aside, but the training is not going to be in FFY10 so the funds will be reverted; that on July 1, 2011, there will be a new allocation for training.

Ms. Cafferata inquired about Category 59, Utilities, under Expenditures, to which Ms. Chinchilla advised the utilities are included in the rent at both NERC locations.

Mr. Nigam inquired about Category 03, In State Travel, under Expenditures, and asked if this category was over-budgeted as the legislature was in session, and if future years this amount would be reduced. Ms. Chinchilla agreed that Category 03 was over-budgeted but that the amount was increased due to the loss of the Deputy Administrator/supervisory position in Reno; that when she held the Chief Compliance Investigator position, she had hoped to travel to meet with the Reno staff for coaching/mentoring, but the Administrator left in October 2010 and she was unable to travel as much due to resources/staffing issues; that being able to travel to Reno would

benefit both offices; that the funds will be reverted back to the general fund, but as of July 1, 2011, there will be a new appropriation.

Mr. Plotkin commented that NERC Commissioners previously would travel to Las Vegas for every other meeting and vice versa, but that over the past couple of years the meetings have been via video-conference.

Ms. Chinchilla advised that at the last meeting she advised that an account for the Gift Fund was set up so that the funds are not co-mingled; that there is \$15,000.00 in the Gift Fund; she will provide accounting in regards to the Gift Fund, and that the only item purchases at this time is a remote for the laptop computer to advance the frames in PowerPoint; this fund will be used to reprint NERC's brochures due to address changes, and to purchase training videos which she is currently reviewing.

Ms. Chinchilla referenced Tab 6 in the packet, Outreach and Training for State Fiscal Year 2011 (SFY11); that NERC provided 18 sessions reaching a total of 511 individuals – in 2010 there were 16 sessions, reaching 964 individuals, and in 2009 there were 11 sessions reaching 658 individuals.

Mr. Plotkin inquired about how businesses find out about the training/education NERC provides; that several years ago the NERC Administrator, Lynda Parven, provided articles in the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce newsletter which gave scenarios and explained who NERC is/what NERC does, and that it may be another opportunity to provide training/education to businesses and better educate the public; that when NERC provided training to Liberty Mutual Realty, the training reached approximately 1,000 people; that he was able to see the process/interactive process and that if there is an opportunity, whether Northern or Southern Nevada, it may be helpful if the Commissioners knew so they could be present if they so desired, especially with the new categories taking effect October 1, 2011, and what does/does not constitute discrimination.

Ms. Cafferata agreed with Mr. Plotkin and indicated that Ms. Chinchilla should not limit her contacts to the various Chambers, that there are labor union groups/trade unions, the casino industry has the National Resort Association; that Mr. Plotkin's suggestion for outreach to various employer groups is a good idea.

Ms. Chinchilla advised that when NERC does provide training, there is an evaluation form handout for feedback; that she would inform the Commissioners of upcoming training; that with the legislative session over she will have more time to pursue some of these organizations.

Ms. Chinchilla advised that in regards to NERC's budget, the Reno office will be moving to the Sparks Job Connect Office the week of July 18, 2011 as part of the Governor's recommended cuts; that unbeknownst to not only her as the Administrator, but to the Deputy Director and Director of DETR (Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation), the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) opened NERC's budget account, put money there to move the Las Vegas office, and closed the account, so she is looking for space that is centrally located, on a bus route, and provides security. She added that the LCB gave NERC \$85,665 in Category 04, Operating Expenses, for SFY12 to move NERC; \$15,600.00 in Category 05 for large equipment which would include desks; for SFY13, an additional \$20,664 to cover any increased rent that NERC may incur. She advised that while the office square footage can be slightly reduced as a cost savings, it may not allow for security; that she is trying to get on the agenda for the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) should NERC need to ask for additional funds for security. Ms. Chinchilla advised that it appears NERC will not be moving until after FFY11, which ends September 30, 2011, which will allow staff focus on meeting the federal contract.

b. Update on Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (FFY11) Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) work sharing agreement

-Tab 4 of the packet references that FFY11 ends on September 30, 2011; that EEOC did increase the amount per closed case from \$550 to \$600 per case, with contract credit of 659 case closures; \$50 per intake credit (cases that are transferred to the EEOC in which NERC has no jurisdiction); \$1,700 for NERC to travel to the EEOC training conference.

Ms. Chinchilla advised that she will be having a meeting with the Director of the EEOC Los Angeles District Office during the first week of July 2011 to provide how many cases she believes that NERC can close towards contract credit; that since April 2011,

NERC has had only 3 full-time investigators for the entire state with 2 additional investigators acting as the intake officer/mediator; that she did not believe NERC can reach the contract credit of 659 case closures and is striving for 600 case closures; that NERC currently has 402 closures towards contract credit, federal jurisdiction only, plus an additional 39 pending closure for a total of 441 closures with three months left in FFY11; that there are an additional 39 closures that are state only and do **not** (emphasis added) count toward the federal contract. Ms. Chinchilla added that to meet contract, the mediator, Chief Investigator, and herself are carrying a case load, and with the full-time investigators closing 10 per month, it may be a stretch, but possible.

Mr. Nigam questioned Ms. Chinchilla if she knew the reason behind the increase from \$550 to \$600 per case closure and if she knew how much it cost NERC to investigate a case. Ms. Chinchilla advised that NERC does not make a profit and that she would have to break the cost down by salary/benefits; that the federal budget supplements NERC's funding by approximately 23%, with 77% received from the state's general fund.

d. Personnel Issues - Staffing

-Ms. Chinchilla introduced the 3 new Compliance Investigators located in the Las Vegas office, Ted Watkins, Alanna Anthony-Ganas, and Rita Rodriguez; introduced Joyce Martines, Administrative Assistant III in the Las Vegas office; and Javier Fernandez, Administrative Assistant I in the Reno office. Ms. Chinchilla also advised that with the budget cuts, initially NERC would lose 3 positions, 1 lay off and 2 positions eliminated, but that during session the legislature reinstated the positions; NERC is not losing the additional 3 positions; rather, NERC will be hiring 2 more additional investigators to start on July 25, 2011 – total of 10 investigators.

c. Legislative update (AB211, SB331, SB368, AB37, AB 159, AB479, AB474)

-AB211 was passed/signed by Governor Sandoval which adds gender identity or expressions which is a new category under employment law; advised of handouts in packets; that there was

a change to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 613 and correspondingly to NRS 233;

-SB331 adds gender identity or expression to public accommodation, NRS 651 and NRS 233 are now congruent; also adds sex as protected category under public accommodation; there is an amendment passed/signed by Governor Sandoval which exempts gender based pricing – no more ladies night; sex is a protected category but does not include gender based pricing;

-SB368 adds sexual orientation as a protected category in housing; adds gender identity or expressing under housing, NRS 118 and NRS 233;

-AB37 advises that a state agency has to physically post their hours of operation and must give 30 days notice of any changes; advised that at times it would present a problem for the Reno office as they are so small and there have been occasions in which the office has had to close, but since they are moving it will no longer be an issue;

-AB159 did not pass; that if someone requests a public record, staff would have to stop what they were doing and process immediately – now there is 5 days to produce copy of public record;

-AB479 did not pass – mandated a 4-day work week;

-AB474 did not receive the Governor's signature, but did pass Assembly/Senate; this bill created the Sunset Subcommittee which would look at various boards/commissions to see if it should be consolidated/done away with;

-advised that all state employee did get a 2-1/2% pay cut in addition to 6 furlough days during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Plotkin asked what the exemption was for the sexual based pricing as this is what the public hearing was about that the Commission held a few years back. Ms. Chinchilla read into the record the following:
“...Notwithstanding any provisions of NRS 651.050 to 651.110 inclusive, it is not unlawful and is not a ground for a civil action for any place of public accommodation to offer differential pricing, discounted pricing, or special

offers based on sex to promote or market the place of public accommodation.”

Mr. Plotkin stated that the reason he wanted this read into the record was for clarification as the one public hearing that was held was an athletic club where they allowed women to join free and charged males, and that under this amendment it would no longer apply.

Ms. Cafferata acknowledge Rose Marie Reynolds, DAG.

Ms. Reynolds advised that there were two Assembly Bills that made some changes in the Open Meeting Law and wanted to advise of the highlights:

-**AB59**, new requirement that if the Attorney General investigates and determines that a public body has violated the Open Meeting Law, there is a requirement for that public body to agenda that Attorney General's opinion finding it (public body) violated the Open Meeting Law so it is reported to the public; clarified the definition of a public body as the scope has expanded; made notice requirements mandatory effective July 1, 2011 that items may be taken out of order, items may be combined for consideration by the public body, items may be pooled or removed; that if under public comments there is a restriction to the number of minutes the public may speak, it must be noted on the agenda; that the Attorney General's office has the authority to seek monetary penalty up to \$500.00 against a member of a public body and that you as the public body would pay the fine personally

-**AB257**, public comments will be required in multiple periods; one choice is prior to/after meeting, or public comment before each action item; easiest is general public comment at the beginning of the meeting/end of meeting; that in regards to a public hearing, there would have to be public comment before a decision is rendered.

VI. 25 minute, joint presentation by American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Nevada, and Equality Nevada entitled, “The road to equality: A briefing on Nevada’s newly signed transgender and LGBS (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, transgender) equality.”

Jane Heenan identified herself as the Executive Director of Equality Nevada; stated that she has been in private practice in Psychotherapy for many years; instructor in Dept of Human Behavior at the College of Southern Nevada since 2001; is/has been an activist/transactivist for approximately 15 years and has been intimately involved in getting transinclusive civil rights laws passed; that she is working on acquainting the Commission and Nevada regarding transgender communities.

Ms. Heenan stated that the transgender person is not complicated but the challenge is for people who believe the body parts of a male/female are the identifying difference. She added that Equality Nevada and the ACLU are willing to work with NERC in educating the public/businesses to learn about the transcommunity.

Ms. Heenan stated she will explain the difference between who transgender persons are and how transgender persons are different than lesbians, gay, bisexual persons; that the expression of being a transgender person is who we are, how we express ourselves in the world in relation to our internal identities – transgender or gender identity/expression is who we are – sexual orientation is more who we love/who we are erotically or sexually attracted to. Ms. Heenan referred to a handout titled “Who are Transgender Persons?” ; that transgender persons get into trouble when their identity does not match how we have been told to be in the world – in other words, you are a girl, you should do this as this is what girls do – or, all men look like men/act like men – or, all women look like women/act like women – stated that there is a broad overlap in the expressions of human beings; gender expressions have changed over time – example, a young married girl is a homemaker, husband works, over time they divorce, the female changes as she may have to do things that normally the man of the house would do – people change over time, everyone does.

Ms. Heenan stated that a transgender person makes changes in a more visible and what seems a more dramatic way and over a shorter period of time; in response to their gender identity, changes are made over a period of years and include psychotherapy, medical intervention such as hormones, surgery, variety of checks along the way, family/friends are involved, the individual has to come out, there are reactions regarding choices made.

Ms. Heenan added that in her experience in working with transgender people, that employment discrimination is the most significant and pervasive form of discrimination, but that her experience is only in Nevada, specifically Southern Nevada, but that discrimination is in other parts of the United States as well; that public accommodation discrimination is perhaps the second most pervasive, primarily in medical circumstances and other service arenas; example given – homeless transgender went to a various homeless shelters and was denied access at each and every one; one shelter even told this person that they did not want the individual to spend the night outside and suggested the individual purchase a bus pass and ride the buss all night – the level of response in terms of exclusion can be quite severe and damaging to a lot of people. She stated that another issue under public accommodation that comes up is the restroom; that the persons who are at risk are not gender conformist persons but gender variance persons; that for a transgender to walk into that type of a public place is to invite response; stated she has worked with hundreds of transgender persons over many years and does not know any transgender persons acting out in an aggressive/harmful way in a public restroom; the transgender persons are the scared individuals; the transgender person would arrange to have keys to other peoples' homes so as they go about their day they have access to a private home/restroom so as not to subject themselves to these types of issues as it can be very overwhelming.

**RECORDING MALFUNCTION – ECHO THROUGH
VIDEOCONFERENCE EQUIPMENT CAUSING STATIC/BUZZING –
APPROXIMATELY 7-9 MINUTES**

Dane Claussen identified himself as the Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in Nevada; stated that the ACLU has been in the forefront of GLBT (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender) rights for a long time; that in researching the early history of the ACLU, discovered that the ACLU started the gay rights movement in Nevada, the first GLBT organization in Nevada, and was part of its board and funded the first GLBT publication in Nevada and continues with that commitment today.

Mr. Claussen stated that during the break, there was discussion that during the legislative session there was not as much opposition to the transgender bill(s) as there was in 2009; stated he believes it is not a fluke but a fact that

society's views of GLBT persons are moving rapidly – the percentage of the American public that supports same sex marriage is now over 50% in many polls and has gone up dramatically from 1/3 of the population over a year/year and a-half ago and now it is more than half; stated that the ACLU first came out in favor of same sex marriage in the early 1990's; that he was a member of the ACLU back then and believed that national headquarters of the ACLU would probably receive a lot of flack about this issue.

Mr. Claussen stated that in regards to Nevada, the ACLU has resources/information available; that PLAN (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada) conducted a statewide study on situations/status of transgender people before the legislative session started and PLAN estimated there were 27,000 transgender persons in Nevada, only half a percentage – significant in the number of persons but not in the percentage; that the PLAN study found instances of discrimination were pervasive; that one of the most shocking statistics to him was that nearly 90% of African American transgender persons were underemployed/unemployed, and that none of the other states were that high, but that all were shocking and needed to be rectified by this legislative session.

Mr. Claussen stated that in regards to gender identity or expressions and sexual orientation, the legislation is designed to be very inclusive; that gender identity and gender expression are not the same and there is no correlation between identity/expression and sexual orientation; that NERC will be receiving complaints over the coming months/years from gay/lesbian persons making gender identity complaints; gay/lesbian persons making gender expressions complaints; heterosexual persons making gender identity/expression complaints – NERC will see various combinations of the individuals' characteristics and how it meshes with legal protection. Mr. Claussen stated that there is case law in various states with these types of characteristics, citing Price Waterhouse Cooper, an accounting and consulting firm, in which a self-identified heterosexual man who was perceived by others as being too feminine; that resources are available – National Center for Transgender Equality, NCTE.org which is a very good web site on the internet; transequalitylaw.org is linked to NCTE but is not the same organization and is a web site/organization that focuses on legal developments for transgender communities in the United States; ACLU is another resource not just nationally but locally too.

Mr. Claussen stated that in regards to rapid change, President Obama's administration is moving quickly, although fairly quietly, to protect transgender persons in different administrative processes, procedures and policies in various federal government agencies:

- a recent United Nations resolution advocating protection for GLBT people which just passed and in which the United Nations received a lot of publicity;

- the Veteran's Health Administration, at the federal level, issued a new transgender healthcare directive so that all U.S. Veterans who are transgender are able to receive wide/broad medical care associated with their transgender status in the nations Veteran's Hospitals and related facilities; that the Veteran's Health Administration is not covering sex reassignment surgery, it is offering all other services in terms of physical and psychological/psychiatric care;

- the U.S. Dept of Labor has added gender identity to the department's internal equal opportunity policy;

- adding protection for transgender persons into federal employment policies also has been adopted within the past few months by the Office of Personnel Management, Justice Department, Civil Rights Division, Dept of Health/Human Services, U.S. Postal Office, etc.

- in January 2011, the State Department has issued new instructions/policies in regards to passports for persons who want their gender marker changed;

- new policies/procedures with regard to transgender persons in Social Security;

Mr. Claussen stated that these changes received media coverage; that many agencies within the federal government have been moving over the past months/year to fully protect transgender employees and more transgender Americans, even though the federal government has not yet passed protection for transgender persons. Mr. Clausen concluded his presentation.

Ms. Heenan provided more web site resources: National Center for Lesbian Rights and Transgender Law Center, both of which are in San Francisco, CA; stated she would be happy to make the PLAN survey available, which is also on-line.

Ms. Cafferata advised that she believes this information would be very helpful to the staff; asked for a copy of the handout Ms. Heenan provided.

Mr. Plotkin stated that he has heard Ms. Heenan's presentation before and believes it important to establish criteria for staff as complaints will be filed; commented how cases would be ranked, referencing the charge prioritization of A, B, or C; that he believes staff and the Attorney General's office should have case law and workplace complaints as training for staff; that there are a number of resources available; that there is a public accommodation concern regarding transgender persons as it is uncharted territory for NERC; that he would encourage staff/DAG's office to research case law and possibly the ACLU would forward case law they may have.

Mr. Claussen responded that the various web sites previously mentioned have links to case law in other states; that there are some states ahead of Nevada in protection of transgender individuals in housing/public accommodations and/or employment; that some states started protecting transgender persons/ruling for transgender persons on the basis of gender discrimination law even before the state passed any specific transgender protection legislation.

Ms. Reynolds commented that transgender persons are being stereotyped and that basing discrimination on gender is a way to get around the prohibition of sexual identity not being a protected characteristic.

Mr. Plotkin asked Ms. Heenan how best is the way to educate the community/business industry regarding what is/is not discrimination in regards to transgender persons, to which Ms. Heenan advised that in regards to education in the community, there are community leaders who could work with NERC to provide presentations, in addition to Equality Nevada and the ACLU; that this type of presentation also allows leaders in the community to be more knowledgeable about what NERC is/does.

Mr. Claussen advised that the ACLU has had a "Know Your Rights" leaflet for transgender persons for several years and is currently in the process of revising it and has distributed the leaflet at various public events/schools and it is not uncommon for the ACLU to get requests for the leaflets for presentations/seminars. Ms. Heenan added that possibly on-line the ACLU and Equality Nevada could have a link to the NERC website.

Ms. Cafferata thanked Ms. Heenan and Mr. Claussen for their presentation.

VII. Discussion and possible decision regarding the Administrator's future report format, and information that should be include in the report

Ms. Chinchilla explained the various reports under Tab 7 and asked what the Commissioners' pleasure was in regards to the information submitted. In discussion, the Commissioners' advised Ms. Chinchilla that they preferred the first report on Performance Indicators referencing Challenges vs Strategy, and that the more information they are provided the better.

Mr. Nigam commented that he would like to see the information in a graph format.

VIII. Discussion and possible decision regarding the role of the Commissioners (Pursuant to NRS 233.010, NRS 233.020, NRS 233.140, NRS 233.150, NRS 233.180, NRS 233.200 and NAC 233.002 through NAC 233.270 inclusive).

Ms. Cafferata advised that she asked that the NRS and NAC be put on the agenda as she wants to make sure she understands the role of the Commission versus staff and addressed each NRS and NAC specifically; that it appears some items in NRS and NAC are not being followed by the Commissioners (accepting complaints, charge prioritization, signing of charges under penalty of perjury, investigating discrimination complaints, dismissal of complaints, hearings, public hearings, hearing officers, annual reports to the Governor, meetings per calendar year, NERC web site not accurate); that the term Commission, meaning Commissioners, is used interchangeably with the Commission, meaning the agency; that she does not see where the Commission, meaning Commissioners, have formally delegated certain responsibilities to the Administrator; that while no

decisions need to be made at the meeting, she would like to meet with the DAG and Administrator to look into these issues, and if there need to be changes/clarification in the statutes/regulations, now is the time to start working on these matters as it is a time consuming process.

Mr. Plotkin added that he is pleased to see Ms. Cafferata bring up these points as he has done so since he was appointed by Governor Guinn and there appears to be an issue as to who the Commission, meaning NERC and./or NERC's Administrator report to; that every Administrator has been responsive to the Director of DETR, referencing the letterhead showing DETR.

Ms. Chinchilla advised that she will work on scheduling a meeting with Ms. Cafferata and Ms. Reynolds, and that she will check with the budget office regarding the costs associated with the changes. Ms. Reynolds added that there is a Governor's executive order limiting circumstances in which new regulations can be passed; Ms. Chinchilla advised she will get a copy of that order.

Ms. Cafferata took agenda item XII out of order and advised that agenda items IX and X will be put on the next agenda for discussion.

XI. Discussion and possible decision regarding the delegation of power to issue subpoenas, pursuant to NRS 233.150(4)

In discussion with Ms. Chinchilla and Ms. Cafferata, it was decided that subpoenas would be e-mailed to Ms. Cafferata for signature and she would send back to the NERC office via FedEx.

XII. Public Comment

Ms. Cafferata asked if there were any public comments from anyone; being none, moved to next agenda item.

XIII. Schedule next meeting (location/time) and agenda items

Discussion regarding next date; tentative date set for October 19, 2011. Norma Delaney will contact Commissioners for confirmation of date based on availability of Commissioners, DAG, room availability.

Agenda items: carry over agenda items IX, Discussion and possible decision on the policy regarding the election of a Secretary, pursuant to NRS 233.050(1); agenda item X, Possible election of a Commission Secretary (pursuant to NRS 233.050); update on process for transgender education/training for staff/DAG and information provided to businesses; update on discussion with Ms. Cafferata, Rose Marie Reynolds, Shelley Chinchilla regarding regulation changes.

XIV. Adjournment

Ms. Cafferata adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee Plotkin
Secretary/Commissioner

Date