

STATE OF NEVADA

STEVE SISOLAK  
*Governor*

RICHARD WHITLEY, MS  
*Director*



LISA SHERYCH  
*Administrator*

IHSAN AZZAM, PhD, MD  
*Chief Medical Officer*

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH  
HEALTH WELLNESS AND PREVENTION**

Office of HIV/AIDS  
4126 Technology Way, Suite 200  
Carson City, Nevada 89706  
Telephone: (775) 684-4200 · Fax: (775) 684-4056

<https://notice.nv.gov/>

**SB 284 – ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON HIV EXPOSURE MODERNIZATION**

August 12, 2020  
5 p.m.

*Zoom Teleconference*

**Draft Minutes**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator David Parks  
Senator Dallas Harris  
Steve Amend  
Andre' Wade  
Stephan Page  
Ruben Murillo (joined at 5:32 p.m.)  
Quentin Savvoir  
Octavio Posada  
Vince Collins

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH STAFF PRESENT:**

Juan "Tony" Garcia, Grants & Projects Analyst I, Office of HIV  
Michael "Thomas" Blissett, Health Program Specialist I, Office of HIV  
Rhonda Buckley, Administrative Assistant II, Office of HIV

## **GUESTS PRESENT:**

Chris Reynolds  
Cheryl Radeloff  
Tami Haught  
Marguerite Shauer  
Davina Conner  
Connie Shear

1. Call to Order, Roll Call – Chair Wade called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m., and asked Administrative Assistant II Rhonda Buckley to conduct roll call. Eight (8) of nine (9) Task Force members are present at time of roll call; quorum met.
2. Public Comment  
*(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.)* – Chair Wade asked if there was any public comment and if so, state their name for the record, spell it and they have one (1) minute to speak.  
Guest Connie Shear announced herself (as a woman with HIV) and spoke on statistics of women with HIV. She said she is thankful for the Task Force, but is disheartened with the makeup of the Task Force panel, because as far as she knows, there is not one woman with HIV on the Task Force. She gave her history of living with HIV, its affect on her family, her health, and how she began to practice “survival sex work.” She respectfully asked as an impacted person living with HIV, to please consider treating people with public health issues. Chair Wade thanked Ms. Shear for her heartfelt comments.  
Marguerite Shauer also spoke, referring to the content of the Bill (2019 SB284), on the makeup of the Task Force and its representatives. And there should be at least one (1) woman on the Task Force living with HIV (for accurate representation).  
Task Force member Steve Amend said he too, is disappointed the Task Force is not diverse and does not reflect what the legislature asked it to be. He asked for the Task Force to reach out to the Governor’s Office. Mr. Savvoir concurred with Mr. Amend’s remarks. Mr. Posada asked if the Task Force was asking for a revision, review of the applications that were received, but maybe not processed. Or, in addition to that to get more people on the Task Force. Chair Wade asked Mr. Posada if he was asking for review of the applicants. Mr. Posada clarified, for a status of those who applied but never heard back. Chair Wade said, okay. Mr. Blissett let the Task Force know if there were action to be taken it would need to be on the next meeting’s agenda, then they could make a motion and act upon it. Mr. Amend suggested reaching out to the person in charge of appointing to the state, and ask why the remainder of the seats have not been doled out (as intended by the legislature). Mr. Page said the Task Force should include that (information) in the report to the LCB and Governor they should highlight the lack of diversity. Mr. Collins asked for a copy of the Bill that lists this information. Mr. Reynolds also concurred, and added there are numerous people who have, or made to apply, several times, (for various reasons). And they would make up the places on the Task Force. He agrees in inquiring about the status of the applicants. Senator Parks said as Chair of the Task Force, Andre, to correspond with the Governor’s Office in a letter, indicating the lack of diversity on the committee and ask them to take a second look as far as at look at filling the number of vacancies. Senator Parks said he did not think the group would be in violation of anything, statutorily. And he would be happy to work with Chair Wade on drafting such a letter. Mr.

Collins noted there was a conversation early on about the process of individuals asked to be on the Task Force. He asked if they could get clarification about the criteria. He recalled background checks, a list of criteria, but was wondering about disclosure, of people on the Task Force and disclosing their status. There were no other comments.

3. Review and approval of meeting minutes of Aug. 5, 2020 (*For possible action*)

Chair Wade asked if there were any revisions/corrections to be made to the minutes. Mr. Collins asked it be noted he was in attendance on Aug. 5, 2020 (albeit late). Sen. Parks asked for the correction to the name of Antioco Carillo. There were no other corrections/revisions. Chair Wade moves to approve minutes with additions; Sen. Parks seconds the motion. All in favor say, 'Aye,' none opposed. Motion carried.

4. Presentations concerning work around HIV Modernization in Nevada

Chair Wade noted from the last meeting they decided to invite a few different people in groups to the meetings. He introduced Marguerite Schauer, who will give her presentation at the meeting of Aug. 19. Mr. Reynolds, standing presenter, said he was asked to pull information together for language around U = U, also NIH and WHO. He has compiled the information and will send it to Chair Wade after the meeting. He did look over other information being discussed in the Coalition and are looking at updating some of the information sent to them (by the Task Force).

Cheryl Radeloff, making comment not formally as a representative with SNHD, notes there will be a meeting on Aug. 21, 2020, which will cover aspects of prevention and care as they do relate to modernization efforts. Including, identifying new cases (testing in various environments), people who use substances, folks living with HIV, and use in young adults. There is concern, too, looking at modernization efforts, there is some push from the CDC regarding molecular surveillance. Ms. Radeloff will have more information at the next meeting. It is noted for the record member Ruben Murillo joined the meeting at 5:32 p.m. Mr. Collins had a question regarding the payment of \$100 (NRS201.356) for HIV testing. He asked if the Task Force knew if the health district administered testing for the courts. As an outlet, when individuals are mandated, are they assigned to the health district or, where would they do that? Mr. Reynolds said if someone is arrested for active solicitation, and they're tested, their blood is drawn by medical staff at the facility. Mr. Collins said he was specifically speaking to the cost (of the test). He sees it as part of a penalty to cover the cost. Mr. Reynolds said it is when the person is arrested, brought in and booked (they would be tested). Mr. Collins said it was a lingering issue and whether or not the Task Force continue to endorse the policy or do they need to look into that it. Mr. Reynolds said it may be on the agenda later for discussion. Ms. Radeloff asked for clarification as to who would be ordering the test. As the SNHD goes in to the facilities to offer testing to those who are interested, or those who are maintaining care. But if it's related to the NRS statute, it's done by the incarcerating agency. Mr. Wade asked if anyone from the Department of Sociology from UNLV was present. Ms. Radeloff said she spoke to Dr. Brents and she was unable to be on the call, as well as Sy Bernaby was unavailable. Chair Wade noted Ms. Bernaby may be able to get someone from the trans community to speak to the Task Force as well. Chair Wade asked if anyone from the Red Umbrella Project was present; there was no one. He then asked if anyone from Sex Workers Outreach Project was present; there was no one. Chair Wade said there was a placeholder for the office of Gov. Andrew Cuomo, N.Y. Mr. Posada said it was to be Kamilla Sjodin, an attorney from New York, she will be presenting next week, as a representative of Gay Men's Health Crisis. Chair Wade asked Task Force members if they had questions for representatives

present. Mr. Posada asked if there is any data on incarcerations that relate specifically to HIV exposure. He searched and the information is not available. Mr. Reynolds said he asked UNLV to research this information. He also said there have been three public cases in Nevada; one in Clark County, Nye County and possible Washoe County. He also mentioned the Supreme Court case Mr. Amend has brought forward.

Ms. Radeloff said she contacted a colleague who works in the legal profession and asked if they had recommendations for the best way to research in Nevada for individuals charged with HIV-enhanced law, and they recommended the State's Criminal Record Repository may have some information. Some could be criminal or civil, potentially. And also newspapers. Chair Wade asked if there were any more questions. There were none.

5. Report Writing – Executive Summary, headers, statutes, themes, etc. (Make recommendastios)  
– Chair, Andre' Wade

Chair Wade noted from the last meeting they spoke about how the report would look, the template – with headers, and asked Mr. Amend to go over briefly what the report includes, as it will be presented to the Task Force next week. Mr. Amend said he looked at other reports done for the legislature, and said it starts with an executive summary, background, a summary of the work completed, research, then themes of what was discussed. As a placeholder, he put the themes down as what Mr. Sears recommended from the Williams Institute, various laws, and other themes. Also a number of recommendations and next steps. He said some of the sections may be incomplete at the end of August so the Task Force may need to add another section to note this is just a preliminary report and it will be supplemented. Chair Wade asked if there were questions of feedback. Chair Wade noted items must be given the State by 3 p.m. on the Thursday prior to the next meeting, for public notice posting and presentation on the agenda. Mr. Posada said he submitted a document to Ms. Buckley as information for the Task Force, to be distributed for the next meeting. Mr. Amend noted as part of the report there will be a number of appendices to include the number of work that's been collected, to use for their recommendations, which includes the Williams Institute Report and other reports received. Mr. Page had a question about the development of the report. If during this or the next meeting, collaborate on a Google Doc, would that be in violation of Open Meeting Law. Mr. Amend said he was pretty sure it would be, but what they could do is assign people specific sections, put it back on the agenda and discuss it together.

Mr. Blissett said another way around it is to create subcommittees, where the subcommittees could work on certain portions of the report, but they would have to have an agenda for the subcommittee as well. Although it would be a subcommittee it would still have to have agendas for posting and the timeframes would need to be documented within the agenda. Mr. Amend said maybe it would be a good idea after the (Sept. 1) deadline when they dig deep into the report, but there's no way to get it before the end of this month. Mr. Blissett offered another option to Chair Wade, if placed on the next agenda as a possible voting measure, the Task Force could vote on particular members to work on a portion of the report. An example would be for two members to work on one portion, they would vote on it as a Task Force. That way they could communicate because the Task Force voted on it. It would not be in violation of Open Meeting Law. Mr. Amend said he thinks it's getting sticky with the OML. Mr. Blissett said it is, but if the Task Force voted, then it's okay, because there's no action being taken and it's going back to the committee for final vote. Mr. Amend mentioned the DAG said they group could run into serial communications that may violate OML, and the spirit of the OML. Mr. Amend said the fact the report is due at the end of the month and the Task Force is supposed to bring a final report, there will be a lot of holes in it, and placeholders. It's going to be more of a

report on what we're going to do. Once it is completed the group will have more time to get it done throughout the rest of the year. The Williams Institute estimated it will take three to six months to do their report alone. Maybe revisit this after the group have some substance to the report and see where it takes us. Mr. Collins commented the group will have to decide on the framework in which information is being pushed out, circulated among the members, and where the group will lay out all this information. Not only for discussion but to finalize the actual draft or a draft, as they move forward. Mr. Collins understands what Mr. Blissett is saying, in the ability to section off pieces of it, but he also understands what Mr. Amend is saying. But if they get specific about the information that is being worked on, that is what they're voting on as well. Mr. Posada asked about using notes from the meetings in the report. Because if they're discussing some of the recommendations as they're being written, why not use some of those notes. Mr. Murillo asked about waiting for more information to come in before writing the report, and as was discussed earlier in the meeting, the end of August would be the group's goal, but would have to go after the first of September to provide a report and let the legislature know this was a work in progress. He would rather do things cautiously and make sure the work is thorough. Mr. Blissett told the Task Force he wanted to give them all the options, and for the Task Force to figure out which one is the best option. He said he would rather go with the subcommittees, for the work to be done within the subcommittees, they report back to the Task Force, as it is the legitimate spirit and letter of the OML.

\*\*TIME\*\* 1:03:15 \*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Collins asked when the Task Force will make the determination as to the information compiled for the report for the specific areas. Chair Wade noted the Task Force went through each of the letters, a-h, at the last meeting, regarding breakdown, research and getting information. He feels the Task Force is on a good path to getting what they need, especially with information coming from Mr. Sears (Williams Institute). Mr. Reynolds noted to Chair Wade the Task Force actually has only one week left, and will then need to vote on the report to be submitted, as the first (of September) is on a Tuesday. Chair Wade said there are two meetings left and they need to figure out what their strategy is to get some sort of report done, and complete it later in the year. As he understands, they will do what they can with the two meetings left to write some things into the report. But they will be asking for more time. The Task Force has agreed to continue to meet to work on the report. Mr. Murillo commented he understood the timeline, saying there is one meeting left to look at the report, then to take a vote on the 26<sup>th</sup> (August).

Chair Wade said given the Task Force's timeline, how does the Task Force want to start framing the information gathered so far, and how are they going to request additional time in the report. Mr. Amend said maybe do a letter, or a report, and the key sections needed are; background – stating what they were tasked with (like in the by-laws); a summary of work done so far; and a conclusion, that they need additional time, and next steps on when the plan on getting it done by. Maybe they could make the report a little more simpler. Mr. Murillo agrees with Mr. Amend's approach. He thinks what should be in the report are the challenges the Task Force has been faced with, so the legislature knows that it wasn't for lack of trying, but for the challenges they've had. Mr. Posada commented on the statutes, that so far they want to keep three of them as is, they want to repeal four, and three to continue to discuss. Mr. Page disagrees with not making recommendations in the report, but to say they've reviewed several statutes and made decisions on how some of them need to be reformed. He said he mentioned in the last meeting they make decisions on the final statutes and what should be done at this meeting. Mr. Collins questioned, if they list the statutes, would they offer how they came to the

recommendations on them, and he agrees with Mr. Amend on simplifying the report. Chair Wade reminded attendees not to use the 'chat' button during the meeting.

Mr. Page said they should list all twelve (12) statutes and say whether or not there should be a change, as they have all this information and doesn't see why they would not put it down. Mr. Amend said the only issue is, the legislature tasked them to look at all the background information first, before making a decision. He's not so sure they should put in their interim report the final conclusions then go look for the evidence, to back up personal opinions to be submitted later. He said it's not like the legislative counsel bureau will start drafting legislation based on the interim report.

Mr. Page said his fear is that if they don't submit an interim report with recommendations by the first, they won't take the report. Or, any recommendations. Mr. Murillo does not agree the legislature won't take anything after Sept. 1 because they have a solid argument as to why (not getting started until late). He would like to ask Senator Parks and Senator Harris, as they are legislatures and actually do the work and are part of this process. That if the Task Force does not submit a full report they won't accept the work that has been done. Senator Parks said the original idea of putting something together and letting the legislature know that more is forthcoming, is probably the better and safer option. She does not think there is some scenario where they reject the report and won't submit it to the legislature or show it to other legislators because it's late. She does think the best bet would be trying to put something together with an indication that, as further members are appointed, they would like to continue work with leaving some options open. She referred to Senator Parks. Sen. Parks noted he serves on a number of interim committees and they are so far behind in those committees as to come out final reports and actions, that he's sure this legislature is going to have to adjust the timelines. He will make it a point to follow up to see if he can't get something more definitive for the committee, from the LCB. Mr. Collins asked how they would be submitting the report (with summary and headers), without recommendations, and give an update, status report. Mr. Page said if they're not going to make recommendations they should list the statutes and have a section for elements of modernization (what it looks like in general) which is in the HIV Modernization Coalition packet. Mr. Posada commented the HIV Modernization Coalition has provided some of their own background in the packet. Mr. Collins asked if it be adopted in its entirety, or parts of it. Mr. Collins said in how it relates to the statutes. Mr. Page suggested submitting the whole packet, but also type out a section of the elements of modernization. Mr. Collins said to review the information and discuss (adaptation) it at the next meeting. Chair Wade noted it was the third meeting they voted on including modernization in the work they are doing. But to make sure they're all on the same page, they can chat through it at the next meeting. Mr. Murillo said, for the next meeting they're going to look at a rough draft of what the report will look like. He does not want to submit a report that's half-way done, but does want to be on the record for some of the things they have accomplished. He said the letter should start off with the request for an extension, then document the work that has been done, and if they're not comfortable with recommendations yet, say they are forthcoming, and look at this next week and make some quick decisions. Mr. Posada said they also have a challenges section that includes some of the challenges they've had. Mr. Page, said to keep track of what they've already decided, list out the statutes, challenges, elements of modernization, executive summary, and asked if there was anything else. Mr. Amend said listing (as background) what was asked of the Task Force to do, then a summary of the Task Force work (what has been done, looked at and considered), and the last section are the steps as to what they need, what they are waiting to receive, and other input and an estimated time of when they think they can get this all done. Three sections total. Mr. Murillo said to document the work they have done,

and indicate in the recommendations they aren't be-all, end-all. They still have additional work to do. Chair Wade clarified that it be preliminary findings, preliminary recommendations. Mr. Murillo said they could say that, and that there are preliminary recommendations to be included in a final reading or final draft. To let the legislature know they have made some recommendations and there will be more recommendations coming in a later report. Mr. Collins wondered if making a report that they've made recommendations would shift the consensus of other people coming in and they have a different opinion about recommendations already put forward. Also, do they look to add more members to the Task Force before putting recommendations forward. Mr. Murillo said Mr. Collins made a good point. Mr. Murillo is comfortable now, with the (members of) the Task Force. The work has been done and they've agreed to it. Mr. Amend said one of his biggest concerns is seeing some of the reports, they see statutes that are felonies he would be inclined to ask they be misdemeanors, but after seeing more information as to what they're doing in other states, and what the Williams Institute recommends, people affected by HIV that these laws are targeting, to decriminalize these completely. He would not be comfortable making an interim report without hearing from all of these people and having all this information. Mr. Page moves to taking a vote, on the interim report. Chair Wade acknowledges Mr. Page's motion; it is seconded by Mr. Collins. Mr. Amend asked to clarify, the motion would include recommendations in the interim report (whatever report is to be provided at the end of the month). Chair Wade said, yes. Mr. Murillo had a question on the motion. Could they list specific recommendations including asking for an extension. Mr. Page clarified his motion: to add a section (to the report) for recommendations on specific statutes. Mr. Amend said for point of order, to have a second motion so they could hold discussion. Mr. Posada seconds the motion. Chair Wade asked Mr. Amend if he wanted to discuss the motion. Mr. Page said he was assuming they could come back, and all of this would just be headers and either next week or the week after, with additional motions with specific recommendations. Mr. Page also said that was his understanding. Chair Wade asked Mr. Page if his recommendation was for the next meeting, to vote on these items. Mr. Page said the motion was whether or not to include recommendations. Then, either late today or the next meeting, the Task Force should decide what those recommendations are. Mr. Posada wanted to bring attention to the time they have left, in reference to the experts they have at the meetings, that could they afford to have a discussion of 40 minutes (by the presenters), and asks the Task Force to be specific in who they want to bring the to meetings. Chair Wade noted to vote on the motion to include recommendations on statutes in the preliminary report. All in favor say, 'Aye,' Mr. Amend opposed. Mr. Murillo has a question for clarification, as far as recommendations of statutes. Mr. Page said he rescinded his (original) motion to include specific statutes. Mr. Murillo then asked if it allowed them to add additional recommendations that aren't in the statutes. Mr. Page said the motion on the table is for recommendations on Nevada statutes. They're only including recommendations on how to change Nevada statutes. Mr. Posada said he feels they're getting stuck on the word recommendations. Mr. Page said maybe the phrase should be, 'possible amendments.' Mr. Murillo said this will have to be put into the minutes that this is what the intention is. And, one of the recommendations is to get an extension. Mr. Page said this made sense, and asked if he should rescind his motion as maybe it has caused confusion. Mr. Murillo said he didn't think Mr. Page needed to, as long as the point of the conversation is the intention of the motion is explained. Chair Wade asked Mr. Page where he was on his motion. Mr. Page clarified again, the motion was to include a section of recommendations to the state statutes, and whether the report should include possible amendments (to the state statutes).

Mr. Blissett advised Chair Wade there has been two motions that have been seconded. And to keep the minutes clean, if they could complete their current voting on Mr. Page's second motion, it will help clean up the record. So if they could vote their current vote down, to say 'no,' then start the new motion, with a new second, that way the minutes would read better. Mr. Amend said it would be allowable for Mr. Page to withdraw his motion because Chair Wade never said it had passed. Chair Wade asked Mr. Page if he would like to withdraw his motion. Mr. Page said he moved to withdraw his two recent motions. Sen. Parks said since a vote was taken, we would need to have a motion that says we withdraw the previous motion and start fresh. Mr. Page moves to withdraw his previous motions; Mr. Murillo seconds. Chair Wade asks for a vote to withdraw, all in favor say, 'Aye,' none opposed. Motion carried. Mr. Page noted Quentin Savvoir has joined the meeting (6:34 p.m.) Mr. Murillo said there were two motions on the floor. They took care of one, was there still a motion on the floor. Chair Wade asked Mr. Page to make a motion to withdraw his second motion. Mr. Page said he would like to motion to withdraw his second motion. Mr. Collins seconds this motion. Chair Wade calls for a vote, all in favor say, 'Aye,' none opposed, motion carried for Mr. Page's second motion to be withdrawn. Mr. Page then makes a motion, the report include recommendations on how to amend Nevada state statutes. Chair Wade asked if there was a second to the motion. Mr. Posada asked for clarification on the word 'recommendation.' Mr. Page clarified. Mr. Posada seconds the motion. It is now up for discussion. Mr. Amend said he was a little confused, as to how this motion was different from the first one. Mr. Page said it was not, just that the first motion was confusing. Mr. Murillo asked Mr. Page to read his motion again. Mr. Page said the motion is to include recommendations on how to amend state statutes. Mr. Murillo said that was pretty specific. The recommendations is, just statutes. So if he wanted to make a recommendation to the legislature for an extension, the way it has been written would not allow that to happen. Mr. Page clarified his motion as to what it included. Any other recommendations were not a part of it. So yes, they can include any other recommendations in the report. Chair Wade said they would take a vote on the motion. All in favor say, 'Aye,' any opposed; Mr. Amend voted 'Nay.' Motion carried. Mr. Murillo made a motion to include non-statutory recommendations as needed in the report. Mr. Amend seconded the motion. The motion is up for discussion. There was none. Chair Wade calls for a vote; all in favor say, 'Aye,' any opposed, there was none. Motion carried to include non-statutory recommendations in the report. Chair Wade asked if there was further discussion on agenda item #5. Mr. Amend asked if they wanted to discuss as to who might want to take a stab at the different sections. He would be happy to do the background. They would need someone to summarize the work they have already done. Then a conclusion and timeline on getting the rest of the work done. Chair Wade asked if anyone was interested in helping. A question was asked as to when the work needed to be submitted. Mr. Blissett clarified the timelines to post materials to the websites for the Task Force. What documents were mandatory and when they needed to be posted, as well as other documents. Chair Wade asked the members if this timeline worked for them. Mr. Savvoir said he could make it work. Mr. Posada asked Mr. Amend about the background (information), as he would be happy to look at it. Mr. Amend said to keep it simple, and maybe the scope of work around it, and a summary. Mr. Posada asked about submitting the information to Mr. Blissett, who would then forward it. Mr. Blissett clarified the documents would be posted to the EndHIV website. Then everybody, including the public would have a chance to review them. Mr. Blissett added that administratively, they could review the documents for grammar, etc. Mr. Murillo asked if there would be a section on the challenges as to why the report would not be completed on time. Chair Wade said yes. Mr. Murillo said he could probably work on this section. He asked if he could work with someone else on this.

Chair Wade noted per Mr. Blissett's comments earlier, there would need to be a subcommittee and it would need to be on another agenda. Chair Wade asked Mr. Amend about working on the background, and that Mr. Posada said he would work on it. Mr. Amend said he is okay with Mr. Posada doing this section. Chair Wade asked if anyone was interested in working on recommendations. Mr. Page said he would. Chair Wade asked if anyone would like to work on conclusions. Mr. Amend said for conclusions and next steps he could do that (what they're still waiting on and timeline, but may be difficult without all information). Chair Wade said he would on summarizing the work they have done so far. Chair Wade summarized who would do each section; Mr. Posada background, himself the summary, Mr. Page recommendations, Mr. Amend next steps and what else needs to be done with timelines. Mr. Amend asked Mr. Murillo if he wanted to take the section (with the state) a more diverse appointment and the original intent of the legislation. Mr. Murillo said yes. Chair Wade noted this as non-statutory recommendations. And Mr. Page will have statutory recommendations. Chair Wade noted the time of 6:54 p.m., and asked the Task Force to move Item Agenda Item 5 to the next meeting; Mr. Murillo seconded the motion. Chair Wade called for a vote, all in favor say, 'Aye,' any opposed, there were none. No discussion; motion carried.

6. Review and approve timeline with benchmarks, to complete report by due date to legislature (*For possible action*) – Chair, Andre' Wade  
Chair Wade moved to have Agenda Item #6 moved to the next meeting; Mr. Page seconded the motion. Chair Wade called for a vote, all in favor say, 'Aye,' none opposed. Motion carried.
7. Review and discuss research on HIV Modernization done by the HIV Modernization Coalition and Silver State Equality, which includes Nevada Revised Statutes pertaining to 2019 Senate Bill 284 (19SB284) and approve recommendations for the report to the legislature from the Task Force (*For possible action*) – Chair, Andre' Wade  
Chair Wade this was discussed today, and moved to hold further discussion in the next meeting. Mr. Posada seconded. All in favor vote, 'Aye,' any opposed, there were none. Motion carried.
8. Review and discuss next meeting's agenda – Chair, Andre' Wade  
Chair Wade noted items for the next meeting's agenda, including who may be presenting to the Task Force (Kamilla Sjodin), with Gay Men's Health Crises and World Without Exploitation. Mr. Murillo asked if it was necessary to have presenters at the next meeting as they have a lot of work to get done, and maybe have to them present after the report deadline. Mr. Posada asked if the presenters could be limited in (time) in their presentations. He recommended no longer than seven (7) minutes. Chair Wade noted the presenters would have seven (7) to ten (10) minutes. Chair Wade said there would also be someone from the HIV Law and Policy speaking. Mr. Reynolds asked if the HIV Coalition was on the agenda; Chair Wade said yes. Chair Wade also asked if they wanted to have on the agenda discussion on more members for the Task Force. Mr. Murillo said it would be part of the non-statutory recommendations. Chair Wade said he and Sen. Parks will be working on a letter to the Governor's Office.
9. Public Comment  
(*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.*)  
Chair Wade asked if there was any public comment to be made and if so, state their name and keep comments to one (1) minute in length of time. Mr. Shauer gave a general thought, in

asking for more time (from the legislature), if there are more appointments to the Task Force, they should ask for more time to make their recommendations. There was no other public comment.

10. Adjournment

Chair Wade motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:08 p.m.; Sen. Parks seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Chair Wade called for a vote, all in favor say, 'Aye,' none opposed. Motion to end the meeting carried.

DRAFT