



STATE OF NEVADA

BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

In re **Kevin Chisum**,
County Assessor, Mineral County,
State of Nevada,

Ethics Complaint
Case No. 25-160C

Subject. /

**DEFERRAL AGREEMENT
NRS 281A.740**

1. On January 21, 2026, a Review Panel authorized the Executive Director of the Nevada Commission on Ethics ("Commission") and Kevin Chisum ("Chisum") to develop this Deferral Agreement (the "Agreement") to address the alleged conduct at issue in Ethics Complaint No. 25-160C ("Complaint") instead of referring the Complaint to the Commission for further proceedings.

2. At all material times, Chisum is a public officer as defined in NRS 281A.160. The Ethics in Government Law ("Ethics Law") set forth in NRS Chapter 281A gives the Commission jurisdiction over Chisum as a public officer whose conduct is alleged to have violated the provisions of NRS Chapter 281A. See NRS 281A.280.

3. This Agreement is entered into based upon the January 21, 2026 Review Panel Determination that Chisum's alleged conduct may be appropriately addressed through the terms and conditions of a deferral agreement instead of referring the Complaint to the Commission for further proceedings.

4. The Review Panel Determination was based on facts established by sufficient evidence to support just and sufficient cause for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter. The facts relied upon by the Review Panel to make its determination are summarized in Appendix A ("Relevant Facts Relied Upon by the Review Panel").¹

¹ The Relevant Facts Relied Upon by the Review Panel do not constitute part of the "Investigative File" as that term is defined by NRS 281A.755. All statutory and common law protections afforded to the Investigative File shall remain and are not affected by this Agreement.

5. No findings have been made by the Review Panel or the Commission that Chisum violated the Ethics Law, and this Agreement does not constitute an admission by Chisum of any violation of the Ethics Law.

A. Procedural History:

1. On September 9, 2025, the Commission received Ethics Complaint No. 25-160C regarding Chisum, alleging violations of Ethics Law provisions NRS 281A.400(1), (2), and (4).

2. On October 27, 2025, Chisum was sent a *Notice of Complaint, Investigation, and Notice of Additional Issues and Facts* to inform him of the additional allegations regarding NRS 281A.420(1) and (3) added by the Commission for investigation.

3. On October 27, 2025, the Commission issued an *Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation* directing the Executive Director to conduct an investigation regarding Chisum's alleged violations of the following provisions of the Ethics Law:

NRS 281A.400(2) Using his position in government to secure or grant unwarranted privileges, preferences, exemptions or advantages for himself, any business entity in which he has a significant pecuniary interest, or any person to whom he has a commitment in a private capacity.

NRS 281A.420(1) Failing to sufficiently disclose the acceptance of a gift or loan, pecuniary interest, commitment in a private capacity to the interest of another person or the nature of any representation or counseling provided to a private person for compensation before another agency in the preceding year that is reasonably affected by an official matter.

NRS 281A.420(3) Failing to abstain from acting on an official matter which is materially affected by the acceptance of a gift or loan, pecuniary interest, or commitment in a private capacity to the interest of another person.

4. The *Notice of Complaint, Investigation, and Notice of Additional Issues and Facts* provided Chisum a deadline of November 30, 2025 for submitting a response to the allegations.

5. On December 17 and 18, 2025 Chisum provided written response to the allegations.

6. On January 12, 2026, the Executive Director presented a recommendation relating to just and sufficient cause to a three-member review panel pursuant to NRS 281A.725.

7. A Review Panel Determination issued on January 21, 2026 concluded that:

The Review Panel unanimously finds and concludes that the facts do establish credible evidence to support a determination that just and sufficient cause exists for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter regarding the alleged violation of NRS 281A.420(1) and (3). Pursuant to NRS 281A.730, the Review Panel reasonably believes that Chisum's conduct may be appropriately addressed through corrective action under the terms and conditions of a deferral agreement instead of referring these allegations to the Commission for further proceedings.

B. Terms and Conditions of Deferral Agreement:

1. This Agreement shall be in effect for a period of one (1) year (the "Deferral Period") from the date of the executed Deferral Agreement.

2. Chisum must comply in all material respects with the provisions of the Ethics Law set forth in NRS Chapter 281A during the Deferral Period without being the subject of another ethics complaint arising from an alleged violation of the Ethics Law which occurs during the Deferral Period and for which a Review Panel determines that there is just and sufficient cause for the Commission to determine that Chisum violated any Ethics Law.

3. Chisum must successfully complete ethics training approved by the Executive Director within 90 days from the date of the executed Deferral Agreement.

4. Chisum will have the Mineral County Assessor's Office adopt a conflict-of-interest policy within 90 days of approval of this agreement detailing the procedure for determining a conflict of interest when completing assessments and what steps must be taken upon the determination of a conflict of interest.

5. During the Deferral Period, the Executive Director shall monitor Chisum's compliance with this Agreement. Should the Executive Director discover that Chisum has not complied with any term or condition of this Agreement, the Executive Director shall:

- a. Inform the Commission of any alleged failure of Chisum to comply with this Agreement;
- b. Give Chisum written notice of any alleged failure to comply with this Agreement; and
- c. Allow Chisum not less than 15 days to respond to such a notice.

6. The Commission may vacate this Agreement and conduct further proceedings in the matter, including an adjudicatory hearing, if the Commission finds that Chisum failed to comply with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

7. If Chisum complies with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, the Commission shall dismiss this complaint with prejudice.

8. This Agreement applies only to the alleged conduct related to this Complaint.

C. Acceptance: We, the undersigned parties, have read this Agreement, understand each and every provision therein, and agree to be bound thereby.

DATED this 12 day of February, 2026.


Kevin Chisum

The above Deferral Agreement is approved:

DATED this 10th day of February, 2026.

/s/ Ross Armstrong
Ross E. Armstrong, Esq.
Executive Director
Nevada Commission on Ethics

Approved as to form by:

FOR REVIEW PANEL OF THE
NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

DATED this ___ day of _____, 2026.

/s/
Elizabeth J. Bassett, Esq.
Commission Counsel
Nevada Commission on Ethics

The above Deferral Agreement is approved by the Review Panel.

DATED this ___ day of _____, 2026.

By: /s/
Scott Scherer, Esq.
Chair

By: /s/
John T. Moran, III, Esq.
Commissioner

By: /s/
Teresa Lowry, Esq.
Commissioner

Appendix A

1. Chisum serves as the Mineral County Assessor.
2. The Assessor makes determinations on property valuation and sets assessment value to collect revenue for the County.
3. Chisum lives in Mineral County and owns property in the County.
4. Chisum's daughter lives in Mineral County and owns property in the County.
5. A county employee under Chisum's direct supervision assessed Chisum's property and Chisum's daughter's property the last two times they were assessed.
6. Chisum executed the final stages of the assessment without disclosure or abstention.
7. During the course of the investigation, Chisum communicated with County Commissioners about processes when there is a conflict of interests.
8. The investigation did not reveal that the assessments of Chisum's or his daughter's property resulted in any unwarranted benefit to either person.