



**MINUTES  
of the meeting of the  
NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS**

The Commission on Ethics held a public meeting on  
Wednesday, April 16, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.  
at the following location:

**State Bar of Nevada  
9456 Double R Boulevard, Suite B  
Reno NV 89521**

These minutes constitute a summary of the above proceedings of the Nevada Commission on Ethics. A recording of the meeting is available for public inspection at the Commission's office and on the [Commission's YouTube channel](#).

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

Chair Scott Scherer, Esq. appeared in person in Reno and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Vice Chair Kim Wallin, CPA, CMA, CFM and Commissioners Michael E. Langton, Esq., John Miller and Terry J. Reynolds also appeared in person. Commissioners Teresa Lowry, Esq. and John T. Moran III, Esq. appeared via videoconference. Commissioner Brianna Smith, Esq. was excused. Commission staff present in person were Executive Director Ross E. Armstrong, Esq., Commission Counsel Elizabeth J. Bassett, Esq., Senior Legal Researcher Curtis Hazlett, and Executive Assistant Kari Pedroza. Investigator Erron Terry and Outreach and Education Officer Sam Harvey were excused.

2. Public Comment.

Written Public Comment (Attachment A) was provided prior to the meeting by Jeff Church regarding general public comment. Jeff Church also attended via Zoom videoconference and provided verbal public comment under this item.

3. Approval of Minutes of the February 19, 2025, Commission Meeting.

Chair Scherer stated Commissioner Moran was not present at the February 19, 2025, meeting and was therefore precluded from participating in this item; all of the remaining Commissioners may participate.

Commissioner Reynolds moved to approve the February 19, 2025, Commission Meeting Minutes as presented. Vice Chair Wallin seconded the motion. The motion was put to a vote and carried as follows:

Chair Scherer:	Aye.
Vice Chair Wallin:	Aye.
Commissioner Langton:	Aye.
Commissioner Lowry:	Aye.
Commissioner Miller:	Aye.
Commissioner Moran:	Abstain.
Commissioner Reynolds:	Aye.

4. Discussion and approval of a Proposed Stipulation for Consent Order concerning Ethics Complaint No. 24-130C regarding Ron Boskovich, Commissioner, Nye County, State of Nevada.

Chair Scherer introduced the item and asked the parties to the Complaint to identify themselves for the record. Appearing on his own behalf was Executive Director Armstrong. Rebecca Bruch, Esq. with Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg appeared via Zoom video conference on behalf of Ron Boskovich, who was not in attendance but was provided proper notice of the Agenda Item and understood that the Commission would proceed in his absence.

Executive Director Armstrong presented an overview of the Proposed Stipulation for Consent Order to resolve Ethics Complaint Case No. 24-130C and explained that Mr. Boskovich waived the Ethics Law requirement of a Review Panel to enter into the agreement, the terms of which were that Mr. Boskovich agreed to stipulate to one willful violation of NRS 281A.420(1), the alleged violations of NRS 281A.400(2) and NRS 281A.420(3) are dismissed, he will comply in all material respects with the provisions of NRS Chapter 281A during the one year compliance period without being the subject of another ethics complaint arising from an alleged violation for which a Review Panel determines that there is just and sufficient cause for the Commission to render an opinion on the matter, will complete Ethics training within 60 days and seek an Advisory Opinion from the Commission regarding conflict of interest and commitment in a private capacity issues.

Ms. Bruch noted she and her client sincerely appreciated the efforts of Executive Director Armstrong. She provided her opinion that Executive Director Armstrong recognized Mr. Boskovich truly wanted to comply with the Ethics Law but had a difficult time understanding how to do so in the context of having two relatives in public service. Ms. Bruch acknowledged there was some misunderstanding on her client's part about what Executive Director Armstrong told him and thanked Executive Director Armstrong for going out of his way to provide his time and assistance to educate Mr. Boskovich. Ms. Bruch noted that she did not think that this situation would occur again and that her client understands now. She shared her appreciation for the Commission's consideration of the matter.

Vice Chair Wallin made a motion to accept the terms of the Stipulation for Consent Order as presented by the parties and direct Commission Counsel to finalize the Stipulation in the appropriate legal form. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. The motion was put to a vote and carried as follows:

Chair Scherer:	Aye.
Vice Chair Wallin:	Aye.
Commissioner Langton:	Aye.
Commissioner Lowry:	Aye.
Commissioner Miller:	Aye.
Commissioner Moran:	Aye.
Commissioner Reynolds:	Aye.

5. Discussion and approval of a Proposed Stipulated Agreement concerning Ethics Complaint No. 24-168C regarding Dwayne McClinton, Director, Governor's Office of Energy, State of Nevada.

Chair Scherer introduced the item and stated for the record Vice Chair Wallin and Commissioners Moran and Smith served as members of the Review Panel and were precluded from participating in this item pursuant to NRS 281A.220(4). He added that proper notice had been provided, and waivers were received regarding this item.

Chair Scherer asked Executive Director Armstrong to provide his presentation. Executive Director Armstrong presented an overview of Ethics Complaint Case No. 24-168C and the Proposed Stipulated Agreement, the terms of which were that Mr. McClinton agreed to stipulate to one willful violation of NRS 281A.400(1) for the acceptance of Golden Knights tickets while the

Golden Knights were attempting to secure sponsorship from his department; the alleged violations of NRS 281A.400(2) and NRS 281A.420(1) and (3) were dismissed. For the willful violation, the Commission would impose a civil penalty of \$450 and admonish Mr. McClinton providing the Stipulated Agreement as written expression of disapproval of his conduct. The terms further include that Mr. McClinton would coordinate Ethics Law training for himself and staff of the Governor's Office of Energy within 60 days following the finalization of the stipulation. Executive Director Armstrong listed the mitigating factors considered under the agreement including that Mr. McClinton had no history before the Commission and no funding transferred from the Office of Energy to the Golden Knights. He provided details regarding similar cases the Commission had considered previously.

Chief Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Greg Ott, Esq. appeared in person on behalf of Dwayne McClinton, who was not in attendance but was provided proper notice of the Agenda Item and understood that the Commission would proceed in his absence. He noted she and her client sincerely appreciated the efforts of Executive Director Armstrong. He noted his appreciation in working with Commission staff on the proposed resolution of the matter and provided some background of his involvement as representative of Mr. McClinton. Chief DAG Ott shared that Mr. McClinton accepted the tickets and attended the game in order to evaluate what was being offered in the partnership agreement proposed by the Golden Knights and observe the full impact of a potential sponsorship opportunity which could benefit his agency. He noted that the proposed stipulated agreement reflects Mr. McClinton's understanding that that was not the proper way to obtain the information he believed he legitimately needed. Chief DAG Ott expressed his appreciation for the efforts made by Executive Director Armstrong in providing education and Commission precedent information. He added that he and Mr. McClinton are committed to continuing to work with Executive Director Armstrong in good faith for a resolution of this matter should the stipulation not be approved by the Commission.

The participating Commissioners asked questions of Commission Counsel Bassett, Executive Director Armstrong and Chief DAG Ott. Commission Counsel Bassett, Executive Director Armstrong and Chief DAG Ott provided clarifying information and responded to each question. Commissioners shared feedback about the terms of the proposed stipulated agreement as compared to Commission precedent.

Commissioner Reynolds disclosed that the Department of Business and Industry through its Housing Division was a partner in the weatherization program for which grant funds and state funds were utilized to provide for energy conservation and weatherization.

Commissioner Langton made a motion to accept the terms of the Stipulated Agreement. The motion did not receive a second and failed.

Commissioner Lowry made a motion to reject the terms of the Stipulated Agreement as presented and allow the parties to make another attempt to negotiate the terms as discussed. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion.

Commissioner Reynolds asked if the Commission had to reject the Stipulated Agreement in total or if they could amend the agreement. Chair Scherer shared that his understanding was that because the agreement was negotiated the Commission would need to reject it in total and ask the parties to return to negotiations to see if they could reach a negotiated agreement. Executive Director Armstrong agreed that a rejection would be the right course of action in this situation. He suggested that if the only issue the Commission had with the Stipulated Agreement was the amount of the proposed civil penalty, the Commission could move on to the next item, allow Chief DAG Ott time to confer with his client, Mr. McClinton and then come back to the item with a renegotiated amount. Chief DAG Ott stated that he was not optimistic he could reach his client immediately, although he agreed to try to contact Mr. McClinton expeditiously. He asked for clarification on the Commission's concern pertaining to the proposed terms of the agreement, noting there were concessions and considerations already made by his client in regard to the amount proposed. Chair Scherer acknowledged that based on the conversation the matter would not be resolved that day. He noted that the Commission precedent for civil penalty imposition has

been to have some type of fine in addition to the reimbursement. Chair Scherer and Commissioners Reynolds and Miller discussed potential amounts for the civil penalty. Commissioner Lowry stated her agreement with the finding of one willful violation, requirement for Ethics Training and issuance of an admonishment by the Commission; she noted she would be inclined to accept a civil penalty of \$1,000 as raised by Commissioner Reynolds.

The motion was put to a vote and carried as follows:

Chair Scherer:	Aye.
Vice Chair Wallin:	Abstain pursuant to NRS 281A.220(4).
Commissioner Langton:	Aye.
Commissioner Lowry:	Aye.
Commissioner Miller:	Aye.
Commissioner Moran:	Abstain pursuant to NRS 281A.220(4).
Commissioner Reynolds:	Aye.

6. Report by Executive Director on agency status and operations.

Chair Scherer introduced the item and asked Executive Director Armstrong for his presentation.

Executive Director Armstrong referenced the Executive Director's report included with the meeting materials. He informed the Commission of the recent interagency collaboration meeting with other state government agencies that have government oversight such as the Division of Internal Audits and the Office of the Attorney General to determine if there might be circumstances warranting referral between the agencies in the future.

Executive Director Armstrong notified the Commission of his plan for current Senior Legal Researcher Hazlett to underfill the Associate Counsel position starting in May with auto progression to the position upon passage of the State Bar exam and an emergency appointment of a law student part time to serve as the Senior Legal Researcher Intern.

Executive Director Armstrong referenced the quarterly case logs provided in the meeting materials, reminded Commissioners that their version is confidential with the public version redacted and asked them to use the case number if they had specific questions about a case. He stated that cases were being resolved in a timely manner and after the review panel that day there would be five open investigation cases.

Executive Director Armstrong provided his legislative session status update, noting we are halfway through the session. He provided information on bills Commission staff are monitoring and agreed to continue to provide weekly legislative updates to Commissioners via email.

Executive Director reported on the status of the Commission's Strategic Plan and implementation processes.

Executive Director Armstrong confirmed that the Commission's budgetary authority was on track for the fiscal year and provided information on the proposed expense allocations included in next biennial budget.

Executive Director Armstrong noted that the next meeting of the Commission is scheduled to be held in Ely, Nevada on June 18.

Chair Scherer, Vice Chair Wallin, and Commissioners Langton and Miller asked clarifying questions which were answered by Executive Director Armstrong.

No action was taken on this Item.

7. Report on Outreach and Education Presentation.

Chair Scherer opened the item and asked Executive Director Armstrong to provide the Outreach and Education presentation in Outreach and Education Officer (OEO) Harvey's absence.

Executive Director Armstrong notified the Commission that OEO Harvey was doing well and would attend the Commission's June meeting. He referenced the written report included with meeting materials, highlighted the recent 'Ethics Day at the Legislature' event including the issuance of a commemorative proclamation to the Commission in recognition of its 50<sup>th</sup> year, and thanked Executive Assistant Pedroza for her candy suggestions and her assistance with the '50 years of excellence in Nevada' poster displayed at the event. Executive Director Armstrong informed the Commission of the article he authored for inclusion in the April 2025 volume of the Nevada Lawyer Magazine. He further outlined recently conducted and upcoming education and outreach efforts and reported public information request data.

Commissioner Lowry thanked Executive Director for his efforts and stated that the article in Nevada Lawyer was excellent.

Vice Chair Wallin shared her appreciation for the increase in education and outreach efforts. She asked the status of the public survey pertaining to the Commission's reputation and Commission Counsel Bassett provided the update.

No action was taken on this Item.

8. Commissioner Comments.

Commissioner Reynolds offered his assistance to Executive Director Armstrong with some SharePoint enhancements.

Vice Chair Wallin recognized Commission staff for doing a great job.

Chair Scherer thanked Executive Director Armstrong for wearing three hats and his continued service to the Commission. He congratulated Curtis Hazlett on the Associate Counsel position.

9. Public Comment.

Jeff Church attended via Zoom videoconference and provided verbal public comment under this item.

10. Adjournment.

Vice Chair Wallin made a motion to adjourn the public meeting. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. The Motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:04 a.m.

Minutes prepared by:

/s/ Kari Pedroza

Kari Pedroza  
Executive Assistant

/s/ Ross Armstrong

Ross Armstrong, Esq.  
Executive Director

Minutes approved June 18, 2025:

/s/ Scott Scherer

Scott Scherer, Esq.  
Chair

/s/ Kim Wallin

Kim Wallin, CPA, CMA, CFM  
Vice Chair

# **Attachment A**

Public Comment/ Meeting of April 16  
Nevada Commission on Ethics

I am Jeffrey Church and run RenoTaxRevolt.com and I offer this as an attachment to any public comment that I may make or for the record if I cannot attend via Zoom as I'm out of town.

I have expressed my distain for the NCOE in the past and it continues. It serves no real valid purpose and should be eliminated or completely 100% revamped by the legislature. My main concerns:

1. Ongoing Confidential Letters as a "get-around" from doing your job.
2. Failure to widely disseminate the Ancho decision on healthcare that affects 99% of elected officials statewide.
3. McDonald Carano conflict of interest and denial of due process to so many.

Ad Nauseum the panel skirts its duties by repeatedly issuing half-pregnant "Letters" where the matter is 'dismissed however'... which are confidential and actually deny all of due process and transparency as the recipient apparently can't appeal a dismissal and the public can only wonder what is in the letter.

However, it determined that good cause exists for the Commission to issue a **Confidential** Letter of Caution.

However, we take this opportunity to provide fair warning to any person(s) contemplating such misuse.

However, the Panel unanimously finds and concludes that there is sufficient cause to issue a **Confidential** Letter of Caution

However, in the interest of the Commission's purpose to help educate public officers, the issuance of a **Confidential** Letter of Instruction is appropriate to ensure Subject is aware of her ongoing duties under the Ethics Law ...

Nonetheless, education about the Ethics Law may be helpful to Subject regarding the allegations of the Complaint. The Commission therefore directs the Executive Director to issue a **Confidential** Letter of Instruction to Subject.

Nevertheless, this determination should not be taken to indicate that mixed use accounts with a minimal disclaimer would be allowed by the Commission. Public officers, including Mayberry, would be wise to follow the educational aspects of this Review Panel Determination or seek an advisory opinion about their individual circumstances.



Although the matter is being dismissed, the Review Panel determines that a **Confidential** Letter of Instruction shall be issued to advise Hoferer of her duty to avoid conflicts as a public officer

In almost all of these, a reading- when available- leads anyone with common sense to believe that a violation did, de facto, occur. At a bare minimum officials should be asked if they would waive confidentiality of the entire record.

In Ancho as well as apparently in 24-162C and who knows how many more hidden in the non-descriptive files of NCOE are confidential warnings that elected officials need to disclose all benefits in related votes such as healthcare benefits. It appears that such votes occur widely statewide with elected officials not disclosing that they too receive said health care/ insurance/ and other benefits. NCOE knows this and remains silent. Disgusting!

BTW: If an elected official is directly affected by a labor contract and/or budget item where they get the same level of health insurance/ benefits, how can they abstain? Then perhaps all would have to abstain, leaving no one to vote yes or no. Hummm.

"Advisory Opinion No. 23-066A Confidential " but then publish it only because **"Confidentiality Waived for Opinion Only"** "Ancho has a pecuniary interest in the cost of her health insurance and so the Ethics Law requires compliance with the disclosure and **abstention** requirements of NRS 281A.420 and the Code of Ethical Standards set forth in NRS 281A.400."\*

I am so tired of seeing an employee of McDonald Carano abstain and thus denying the public official one ore set on "eyes on". The ongoing conflict is too obvious to ignore.

McDonald Carano

Commissioner Yen is a partner at the law firm of McDonald Carano, which represents Washoe County. ... Consequently, the independence of judgment of a reasonable person in Commissioner Yen's situation could be materially affected in voting upon items related to the Subject. To avoid conflicts of interest and any appearance of impropriety and comply with the Ethics Law and Judicial Canons applicable to the Commission, Commissioner Yen is disclosing these relationships and is abstaining from participation in this matter.

Finally, I note that NCOE decisions are non-descriptive such as "In re Public Officer, Opinion No 23-094A". Do citizens or agency legal advisors need to sit around glued to the website reading one by one each decision?

I think this well explains just some reasons for my ongoing distain and disgust for the NCOE. I hope at least you remove persons that have repeated conflicts and you look to change your approach to how you do business with our tax dollars and at least disseminate and educate officials and the public on matters such as healthcare.

Jeffrey Church