

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**Minutes for the**  
**Nevada Occupational Safety and Health Review Board**  
**Reno, Nevada**

**March 11 and 12, 2026**

**Jorge Macias (Management)**  
**Tyson Hollis (Public at Large)**  
**Gled Bautista (Management)**  
**Shannon Chambers (Labor)**

The meeting of the State of Nevada Occupational Safety and Health Review Board was called to order by Chairman Jorge Macias on March 11, 2026, at approximately 9:00 o'clock a.m. The meeting was duly noticed in compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law to take place at the Division of Industrial Relations, 4600 Kietzke Lane, Suite 150, Reno, NV 89502. In accordance with the Nevada Open Meeting law, each Board member participating in the meeting either had before him or her all written materials to be considered during the deliberations or was obliged to refrain from voting if not in possession of the materials.

**1. Roll Call.**

Chairman Macias called the roll of the Board for the meeting. Board members present were Jorge Macias Chairman, Tyson Hollis, Board Secretary, and Board Members Gled Bautista and Shannon Chambers. As a member representing Labor and a member representing Management were present for the meeting, a quorum of the Board was present to proceed to conduct the business of the Board on this date. Also present for the hearing at this time were Charles R. Zeh, Esq., of The Law Offices of Charles R. Zeh, Esq., and Pete Cladianos, Esq., also of The Law Offices of Charles R. Zeh, Esq. Salli Ortiz, Esq., was present as legal counsel for the State. Messrs. Zeh and Cladianos are legal counsel to the Board of Review.

The Notice of Meeting was duly provided under Chapter 618 of the Nevada Revised Statutes and in accordance with NRS Chapter 241 of the Nevada Open Meeting Law. A copy of the Notice is attached to these Minutes and made a part hereof as though fully set forth herein.

Notice of the meeting was posted or published, electronically or otherwise, consistent with the requirements of the Nevada Open Meeting Law as amended by AB 253.

Notice was posted at the following locations:

The Law Offices of Charles R. Zeh, Esq.  
6900 South McCarran Blvd., Suite 2040  
Reno, NV 89509

Division of Industrial Relations  
4600 Kietzke Lane, Building F, Suite 150  
Reno, NV 89502

This Notice was also timely posted at the following website addresses:

State of Nevada, Department of Business and Industry, Industrial Relations (DIR) website at <https://dir.nv.gov/Meetings/Meetings>

Nevada Public Notices at <https://notice.nv.gov>

**2. Public Comment.**

Chairman Macias called item 2 to be heard, Public Comment. Mr. Zeh advised that his office had received no Public Comment prior to the commencement of the meeting. Chairman Macias advised that there was no Public Comment received by the Board prior to the commencement of the meeting on this date.

Chairman Macias then called Item 3, on the Agenda to be heard, Contested Case Hearings.

**3. Contested Case Hearings.**

Board Chairman called this item to be heard. Board counsel advised that there would be no contested matters heard on this date before the Board as Item 3, a., through 3, k., constituting all of the contested matters that were initially noticed to be heard on this date, have either settled or been withdrawn. Therefore, there are no contested matters to be heard by the Board as the 11 matters noticed to be heard originally as contested matters have been vacated. Board Counsel, Mr. Zeh, then advised the Board that the Board would be proceeding under Item 4, the Administrative Meeting.

**4. Administrative Meeting.**

**a. Approval of previous Review Board meeting minutes of February 11-12, 2026 minutes.**

Chairman Macias called this matter to be heard. Shannon Chambers moved to approve the minutes from the February 11 and 12, 2026 Review Board meeting. Board counsel advised, however, that there are no minutes to review at this time. Chairman Macias acknowledged that there were no minutes to be reviewed and approved at this time and, therefore, proceeded to Item 4 b., consisting of Items i. through x, proposed settlements/withdrawals. The Board's action will be informed by the contents of hearing on this item commencing with RNO 23-2226, UHS of No. Nevada, LLC; Willow Springs LLC dba Willow Springs Center.

- i. RNO 23-2226, UHS of No. Nevada, LLC; Willow Springs LLC dba Willow Springs Center.

The matter was before the Board on a withdrawal. The complaint claimed relief for \$2,256. The matter was settled for \$1,579.20. As with all of the cases under this heading, the Board members had a copy of the pleadings and the settlement/withdrawal memo from this office. Unless there is an objection to the resolution of this matter or a question concerning this

matter, a Motion to approve the withdrawal would be in Order. It was moved by Shannon Chambers, seconded by Tyson Hollis, to approve the settlement. Motion adopted. Vote 4-0.

ii. LV 24-2235 - Caliber Holdings LLC dba Caliber Collision Centers.

The Board then called this matter to be heard. Notice was given by the State of the withdrawal of the citation and notification of penalty in this matter. By virtue of the withdrawal, complaint will take nothing by reason of this complaint. The prayer for relief was originally in the amount of \$3,416. Unless there was an objection or a questions about the withdrawal, the matter was ripe for a motion to approve. It was moved by Tyson Hollis to approve, seconded by Shannon Chambers. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4 in favor and 0 against.

iii. LV 19-1987 - Clark County School District.

The Board then called this matter to be heard. Before the Board is a withdrawal of the complaint that was originally brought in the sum of \$10,000. The complaint was settled for a \$0.00 recovery on the withdrawal. Unless there was an objection or a questions about the complaint, the matter was ripe for a motion to approve. It was moved by Shannon Chambers to approve the settlement in the amount of \$0.00. Tyson Hollis seconded the motion. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4 in favor and 0 against.

iv. RNO 24-2291 - Polaris Sales Inc. dba Polaris Industries.

The Board then moved to this matter to be heard. The complaint prayed for relief in the amount of \$27,426. The settlement amount in this matter was \$16,134. Unless there is an objection to or a question about the complaint, the matter was ripe for a motion to approve. It was moved by Tyson Hollis, seconded by Shannon Chambers, to approve the settlement. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4 in favor and 0 against of the motion.

v. LV 23-2199 - Gaughan South, LLC.

The Board then considered this matter to be heard. The complaint prayed for relief in the amount of \$26,104. The settlement amount in this matter was \$6,526. The Board received notice of settlement on August 13, 2024. Unless there is an objection or question regarding the settlement in this matter, a motion to approve would be in order. It was moved by Shannon Chambers, seconded Tyson Hollis to approve the settlement. There was no further discussion, the motion was made and seconded and the motion was adopted on a vote of 4-0.

vi. LV 23-2211 - Clauss Construction.

The Board then moved to consider this matter to be heard. The complaint and summons were filed in this matter on March 6, 2023. We received notice of the settlement on December 5, 2023. The matter was settled for the sum of \$4,000, an amount slightly higher then was prayed for in the complaint. It was moved by Shannon Chambers to approve the settlement, Tyson Hollis seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was adopted approving settlement on a vote of 4-0.

vii. LV 25-2316 - Federal Express Corporation.

The Board next moved to consider this matter to be heard. The complaint in this case was filed September 3, 2024. The Board received notice that the respondent was unilaterally withdrawing its contest as of June 10, 2025. Based upon the Respondent's withdraw the complainant will receive the sum of \$9,795 in settlement by virtue of the withdrawal of this matter. Unless there were questions about the settlement/withdrawal or objection, a motion to approve would be in order. It was moved by Tyson Hollis, seconded by Shannon Chambers to approve the withdrawal. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4-0 in favor.

viii. RNO 25-2308 - Legacy Specialties, Inc.

The Board then moved to this matter. The complaint and summons were filed on July 8, 2024. The amount prayed for in the complaint was the sum of \$15,083. The amount of settlement in this matter was the sum of \$10,588.10. It was moved by Shannon Chambers, seconded by Tyson Hollis, to approve the settlement. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4 in favor and 0 against.

ix. RNO 24-2268 - Feldmeier Equipment, Inc.

Board Counsel advised that the Board would move to this matter. The summons and complaint were filed on February 12, 2024. The complaint prayed for relief in the amount of \$22,951. The amount of settlement in this matter was \$22,951. It was moved by Shannon Chambers to approve the settlement, Tyson Hollis seconded the motion. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4-0 in favor of the motion.

x. LV 24-2259 - DNN, LLC dba Best Western Plus.

Board Counsel advised that the Board would move on to this matter. The summons and complaint were filed on December 28, 2023. The complaint sought relief in the amount of \$35,714. Settlement for this matter was the sum amount of \$5,000. It was moved by Tyson Hollis, seconded by Shannon Chambers, to approve settlement in the amount of \$5,000. The motion was adopted on a vote of 4 in favor of the motion and 0 against.

The Board then took out of order under the heading of Status Conferences, LV 19-1990, Sofidel America Corp. dba Sofidel America. This matter was placed under the status conference portion of the agenda because it was remanded, in part, from the District Court on Appeal by the respondent, the disposition of this matter on merits by the Board.

Citation 2, Item 2, of the complaint was disposed of in favor of the Board. Citation 1, Item 1, was remanded. No one appeared on behalf of Sofidel on this matter.

The matter was brought back to the Board under the status conference heading because in the disposition at the District Court level, it simply ordered that the Board's decision on Citation 1, Item 1, is remanded. The question is remanded for what?

According to Ms. Ortiz, who was counsel for the State and was present for the hearing, this date, the Court is asking the Board to revisit the evidence again, to see if it would still support their decision. This is different from disposition of Citation 1, Item 2, where the matter was reversed. It was not remanded for consideration or remanded for a hearing. Accordingly, Board Counsel advised, that as Ms. Ortiz advised, the matter should be taken back up again with respect to Citation 1, Item 1, and only Citation 1, Item 1, for the Board to review the existing record and decide whether it supports the decision made with respect to Citation 1, Item 1, or the existing record supports some other disposition.

Thus, it was the consensus of the Board that this case should be taken up again by the Board on Citation 1, Item 1, alone, wherein the Board will review the existing record to determine whether the Board would leave the disposition of Citation 1, Item 1, as is or would take further action against or with respect to Citation 1, Item 1. The matter should be placed on the agenda on that basis, wherein the Board members would review the entire record as remanded to them by the District Court.

While awaiting for Mr. Cladianos to rejoin the meeting, the Board continued with General discussion that would fall under the heading of Item 4, c, General Administration and/or procedural issues, General matters of import to Board members and Old and New Business.

Board Chairman announced that he had received notice that a new member had been appointed for the Board. This happened last week so that member did not appear here today. The Board Chairman wanted to know, however, if Jose Perez, the new appointee, was online. Mr. Perez said he was, and he wished the Board members a good morning.

Mr. Perez also advised that he had sent in all of the documentation to get him formally appointed and is waiting for the "follow-up." Mr. Perez was welcomed to the Board by the Board Chairman and Board Legal Counsel, on behalf of the Board and Counsel advised Mr. Perez that he, Board Counsel, would be in touch with Mr. Perez to provide him with background information about the Board and its process, in order for him to fully participate in the meetings as held in the future. The Board briefly recessed after that to await the return of Mr. Cladianos to the Board meeting.

9 Board Chairman Macias then called the Board meeting back in order and proceeded under the heading of 4.c. General administrative matters. That is, the Board received a letter from Dr. Sanchez, complaining that the Board had not provided a clear plan for addressing the volume of the case load, confronting the Board.

Board member Tyson Hollis shared that since Dr. Sanchez thinks that we have not provided a clear plan, he wondered if this was something where we just need to move forward and check the box because there is a presumption in there that we have not assisted, you know, to deliver what was requested. Chairman Macias said he definitely thought we should address it with some more specifics. He was also concerned because Dr. Sanchez only gave the Board until March 17<sup>th</sup> which is this coming Tuesday, to address a plan. Chairman Macias was also concerned because it was being suggested that at least one more meeting a month should be held. The Chairman wanted to bring this up because the Board members would be required to give up one more day a month at their work schedules, if that is what is being proposed. This may create

job related issues for Board members if their employers balk at missing three more days of work. It was suggested that perhaps deploying two Board panels of three people, each, might solve this issue.

Board member Chambers said she is not opposed to increasing the number of days the Board might meet a month. Chairman Macias then asked Mr. Zeh if he could help the Board put together a program to address the issues raised by Dr. Sanchez. Board Counsel advised that this was what is being done already and includes having the Board schedule the oldest cases first dating all the way back to 2018. Board Counsel advised that the Board had already instituted a process forcing cases to be resolved sooner rather than later. This included when noticing cases that the parties should understand that if a matter is continued, it will be continued to a date certain such that if the matter has not been settled, it will go onto the contested calendar and remain on the contested calendar unless and until either the matter is settled or the matter is tried.

This discussion continued and the Board agreed that it would continue to decide cases and also develop a plan for the disposition of cases with the objective of reducing the case load and hearing the oldest cases first on the contested calendar.

The full depth of this discussion requires more than a synopsis for the minutes. Thus the Board returned back to the agenda when the Chairman called the next topic in order, the Status conference segment of the meeting. The Chairman called Westcor Construction, LV 18-1952, to be heard.

LV 18-1952, Westcor Construction.

This matter was appealed to the District Court where the Eighth Judicial District remanded the case back to the Board. Raymond Perez, Esq. appeared on behalf of Westcor and Salli Ortiz, Esq., appeared on behalf of the State. Ms. Ortiz, on behalf of the State, advised that the matter was remanded back for further hearing, so she thought it just needs to be reset for hearing to go over this Citation Item. Mr. Perez, on behalf of the employer, respondent, offered that it would be unnecessary for further hearing on this matter at this time. Board Counsel advised the Board that it could conduct a hearing based on the existing record and the argument of the parties as to whether other evidence in the record exists that might alter or support the disposition of the this matter. Chairman Macias responded by saying "perfect." This matter is accordingly set over to June 2026 for the Board to consider the matter based upon the existing record to determine whether there is sufficient evidence in the record to support the Board's conclusion or some other conclusion based upon the existing record in this case. An Order will be issued to give direction to the parties.

LV 21-2132, Counts Kustoms, LLC.

The Board then took up under the settlement conference portion of the Agenda, LV 21-2132, Counts Kustoms, LLC. This is a default judgment matter. The case was filed on June 28, 2021. The application for entry of default was June 18, 2025. In the pleadings, however, there was no application for the entry of a default judgment supported by an affidavit. The case is, therefore, not in a position where a default judgment could be granted. After some vitriolic back and forth between the parties, the Chairman advised that there should be a settlement proposed and submitted to the Board to be considered as an administrative item by the next month. Mr.

Mack, counsel the respondent said perfect, that is all I am asking for. This matter will be set at the earliest convenience on the contested docket if not the status conference docket to finally resolve this matter.

#### LV 22-2154, Opus Prime Solutions LLC.

The Board and Mr. Cladianos then took up Opus Prime Solution to be heard. In this case, the summons and complaint were mailed to an out-of-state address. Thereafter, the Board has made attempts to communicate with the respondent. These were unsuccessful. All the mail sent from the office of Board Counsel was returned. Mailing to the last known address constitutes service so it is then up to the State or the Board to proceed with the matter. Ms. Ortiz advised the Board that she was waiting to see if anybody showed up today for the hearing. No one showed up on behalf of respondent for the hearing. Ms. Ortiz, therefore, needs to perfect the judgment and advised she would take care of this matter by the end of the week. This concluded the discussion of this matter. The ball is in the State's court as of this time to determine the next steps to be taken in this case.

#### RNO 25-2367, Prietos Roofing

The Board then considered this matter for hearing. This is another default judgment case. The Notice of Intent to take default was mailed on September 15, 2025, after no answer had been filed in this matter. The application for the entry of default and a supporting affidavit were filed November 20, 2025. The issue here is that the employer is not defaulted yet so, the case cannot proceed. The respondent was represented on this date by Efrain Parra of Prietos Roofing. Board Counsel advised the parties that his office had not received an answer from the respondent in this case. Mr. Parra claimed that he filed an answer such that a default would not be in order. Mr. Parra stated that he was pretty sure that he did that, advising he was pretty sure he included Board Counsel's office. Board Counsel advised that the file does not reflect an answer. Board Counsel advised further that if Mr. Parra wants to resubmit an answer, he needs to do it by certified mail, return receipt requested, as required by the regulations governing these OSHA proceedings. The way that it was left with the parties was that Mr. Parra, on behalf of the respondent, would get a second chance at filing an answer, provided the answer was filed by certified mail, return receipt requested. The case could go on from there assuming the answer was actually filed. Or, the parties could settle or otherwise a default would be the process going forward.

#### RNO 21-2066, RAC Guns and Ammo LLC.

The Board then heard this matter next. The complaint was filed in this case on September 1, 2020. The complaint was answered on September 21, 2020. A Notice of Intent to enter default was sent to the company's attorney on August 5, 2025. Board Counsel questioned how the default could proceed when there is an answer in the file. Accordingly, this matter is to be set for trial.

LV 21-2100 - Realty Holdings, LTD dba Halloween Town Pumpkin Patch and Realty Holdings, LTD.

The Board then called through Mr. Cladianos the final matter on this docket, Realty Holdings, LTD dba Halloween Town Pumpkin Patch and Realty Holding, LTD. In this matter, a notice of intent to take default was filed on July 25, 2022. On January 13, 2025 an application for entry of default and an affidavit in support of the application were filed. Then, a document entitled Default Judgment was filed but the only application was for a Default, not an application for a Default Judgment. The State advised that when this matter was last set for a status hearing, the employer showed up and the State and Respondent negotiated and a stipulation was sent to the employer for review and signature on March 5. The stipulation should be returned soon by the respondent and filed with the Board. The Board needs to review the status of this matter in light of the action purported to be taken by the parties in this matter as of the status conference. The matter will be set out for 30 days and if the settlement is not resolved or the matter is not resolved by then, the case will be set on the contested calendar.

This matter concluded the status conferences on the agenda.

The Chairman then took up Item 4.d., Schedule of hearings on pending cases. The Chairman then based the discussion of whether there was any old or new business that needed to be discussed. And he moved on to Item 4.d, which is the schedule of hearings on pending cases. The hearing dates were reviewed. Board members had no objection to the hearing dates.

Board Counsel stated that there was one more item to be added, namely, the hearing dates for the November 2026 meeting of the Board. The hearing date needs to be set because Board Counsel cannot fill out the hearing date for a case unless they have a date for the hearing. The Board needs to be mindful that November 11 is a holiday. The State does not work on holidays and so the hearing cannot be scheduled on November 11. The Board, therefore, agreed to set the November hearing on November 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

The Chairman then asked for any public comment. Board counsel advised that his office received no public comment during the course of the hearing on this date. Chairman Macias said that there was no public comment of online and there was no public comment from the room. Ms. Ortiz, however, indicated that she would hope the Board could go back to giving 60 days in order to submit a settlement because 20 days is not practical. Specifically, she was referring to the situation where once she informs the Board that a matter has settled, we were a lot more successful with 60 days to present the settlement documents then would the current practice of 20 days. Chairman Macias thanked Ms. Ortiz for her public comment.

It was then moved by Tyson Hollis to adjourn the meeting, Shannon Chambers seconded the motion. The motion was adopted. Vote 3 in favor and 0 against as Member Bautista had to leave the meeting early for another appointment on his calendar.

Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2026.

/s/Charles R. Zeh, Esq.  
Board Legal Counsel

S:\Clients\OSHA\Minutes\2026\03.11.2026 Minutes.R3.wpd