

Steve Sisolak
Governor



Victoria Gonzalez
Executive Director

**STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF SENTENCING POLICY
Nevada Sentencing Commission**

625 Fairview Drive, Suite 109 / Carson City, NV 89701-5430
Phone: (775) 684-7390 / Fax: (775) 687-8363
<http://sentencing.nv.gov>

**NEVADA LOCAL JUSTICE REINVESTMENT
COORDINATING COUNCIL
TRANSCRIPT - FINAL**

Date and Time: September 27, 2021

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Demar Dahl
Dylan Frehnor
McKinzie Hilton
Tim Hipp
Brenda Ingram
Erik Levin
Julia Murray
Clinton Zens
Denni Byrd -- Vice Chair
Garrit Pruyt -- Chair

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Art Clark
Ken Gray
Dorothy Rowley
Curtis Schlepp
Tick Segerblom
Bryce Shields

STAFF

Executive Director Victoria Gonzalez,
Monica Chiazza, Management Analyst,
NDSP

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Pruyt: Alright. Good afternoon. I will now call to order the first meeting of the 2021 through 2023 Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council.

Welcome everybody. My name is Garrit Pruyt. I'm from the Carson City District Attorney's Office and I am the Chair of the Coordinating Council as appointed by the Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission.

Denni Byrd of the Sixth Judicial District Court in Humboldt County has been appointed as the Vice Chair.

We'll do more thorough introductions later on in the agenda and item number three.

As I know, many of you have had to become more accustomed to the virtual meeting format throughout the last year and a half. As a quick reminder, when you're not talking, please make sure you're on mute. And of course, when you do start to talk, please state your name so that we have that for our record before you make any comments.

So, to get us started now, I will now pass the time to staff so that we can start with our roll call.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair.

(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DIRECTOR GONZALEZ; QUORUM IS MET.)

Chair Pruyt: Thank you.

2. Public Comment

Chair Pruyt: I will now open to agenda item number two. This is our first period of public comment. There are two periods of public comment that will be had during the course of this meeting, one here at the beginning and the other at the end.

Members of the public have two options for submitting public comment. First, members of the public may do so in writing by e-mailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov.

Second, public comment may also be made verbally. Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints, public comments will be limited to two minutes in length. To any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit, you may submit any additional comments that you have in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy.

At this time, I will ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify by telephone at this time.

Ms. Chiazza: Thank you, Chair Pruyt. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone, press star nine to raise your hand. When it is your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name.

Chair, we have no callers wishing to testify.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you so much. I will now close agenda item number two. This will move us to agenda item number three.

3. Introductory Remarks from the Chair of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council

During our meeting today we're going to learn a great deal more about the mandates that we have, the items set forth in legislature and what exactly it is that this Council is intended to accomplish and how we are to accomplish that.

But first, I think it's important for each of us to kind of get to know each other a little bit better so that we can see how to best work with one another in order to accomplish the mandates that we have.

So, what I'm going to do is I will direct time to each person to introduce themselves, give us a little bit of information about who you are and what you do. And please also include the County that you work in and anything else that you would like to share with us.

So, I'll start it out. My name is Garrit Pruyt. I'm a supervising Deputy District Attorney here in Carson City. I've been working here at the Carson City District Attorney's Office for about six years. Prior to my time here, I worked for the attorney general's office defending mostly medical malpractice and section 1983 civil rights lawsuits.

I've also spent time testifying before the legislature and the Sentencing Commission, specifically as it pertains to sentencing credits and how exactly those credits actually work within our system and how to better inform the public and the judicial system on what to actually expect when someone has been sent to the Nevada Department of Corrections.

So, with that, I will pass the time now to Ms. Byrd.

Vice Chair Byrd: Thank you, Garrit. My name is Denni Byrd. I'm from Humboldt County. I moved -- I'm originally from Montana for the last 40 years and then I moved to Nevada in August of 2017. And I was introduced to Judge Montero, the district court judge.

And they had just received a grant to start a pre-trial services program as he saw kind of where the criminal justice reform was headed. And so, since then, I have been creating a pre-trial service program here in Humboldt County and pretty much have been a one-man show in the sense that it's pretty much just me.

I had a case manager for a while I'm in the process of hiring a new one. And so, I'm just building the program from the ground up with a lot of things that I think we'll be discussing. So. And before that, I worked in mental health in Montana outpatient and residential mental health with children and families. So. And I'm happy to be here. Thank you.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Mr. Dahl?

Mr. Dahl: Demar Dahl. I appreciate the opportunity to serve on this council. I've had an interest in this issue for a long time. I just term limited out as a Commissioner here in Elko County. And I think all of you know or should know that you're all welcome to come to Elko County anytime. But you need to be aware that if you do, you find it hard to be really happy anyplace else in the world. We've got a good County here.

Anyway, I look forward to meeting all of you and serving with you. And I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Mr. Frehnor?

DA Frehnor: Thank you. My name is Dylan Frehnor. I'm the Lincoln County District Attorney. I've been here for the last three years as a district attorney. Prior to that, I had a private practice here in Lincoln County for 10 years. Eight of which I was the appointed public defender for Lincoln County. So, kind of seeing issues of sentencing on both sides. And looking forward to this committee.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Ms. Hilton?

Ms. Hilton: Hi. I'm McKinzie Hilton. I'm the Chief Deputy District Attorney in White Pine County. And I'm excited to be on the committee. Thanks.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Mr. Hipp?

Mr. Hipp: Yes. My name is Timothy Hipp. I'm County Commissioner for Goldfield in Esmeralda County.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Ms. Ingram?

Ms. Ingram: Yes. Hello. My name is Brenda Ingram. And I'm the director of the Court Services Department for Churchill County. We operate Churchill County's pretrial service agency. I've been doing this for about 12 years when we created our department. I've been with the County for 31 and a half years. I worked a couple years at the sheriff's department and 18 years at the justice court as a chief court clerk. So, I'm looking forward to working with you all.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Mr. Levin?

Mr. Levin: Hi. I'm Erik Levin. I'm in the Douglas County District Attorney's Office. I've been here since 2008. I'm currently the Chief Deputy District Attorney of the criminal division. Prior to Douglas County, I was in the attorney general's office in the criminal division for three years. And prior to that, I was in Nye County primarily on the civil side of the D.A.'s office doing a little bit of the criminal work.

So, I've got a bunch of experience in the rural counties and have spent time complaining about a lack of various programs and services. So, I think I got put on this committee to stop me from complaining.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you, Mr. Levin. Mr. Zens?

Mr. Zens: Yes. I'm C.J. Zens. I am from Nye County. I've lived here for nearly 20 years myself. I own and operate a mental and outpatient mental health facility in the town of Pahrump. I -- I'm sorry I've been in Pahrump I guess for almost 20 years not all over Nye County.

I actually was originally law school bound. I got my associates in paralegal studies and my bachelor's in criminal justice. I was going to move on from there and I got sidetracked by the mental health field which was about 10 years ago and just never left it, and so here I am.

And I thank you all for the opportunity to be with you on this council.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you so much. I think that's all, Council members that we have present. No one else raising a hand, so --

Ms. Murray: I'm here.

Chair Pruyt: Sorry. Please, go ahead. I missed you on the roll call.

Ms. Murray: I had some trouble logging in. I'm Julia Murray. I apologize for that. I'm a Chief Deputy Public Defender in Clark County. I'm the training director of the office here. I've been with the office for just under 15 years and have handled criminal cases of every level.

My primary focus has been on capital defense and murder work, but regularly up here and work with the specialty courts, the competency courts, lakes crossing sign, and outpatient facilities. So, thanks for having me.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Sorry for missing you there. Did we have anyone else add in just a sec -- in the last bit? No? Thank you. I look forward to working with each and every one of you.

Before I close this agenda item, I wanted to point out that we're supported by the staff of the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. We've got a whole section of the meeting that they're going to fill in for us and tell us exactly what they do, how they do it, and more or less, kind of why we're all here. So, that'll be a very important part.

But I do want to recognize all the work that they've done to get this meeting set up to have our agendas ready and the presentation sent out to each of us so that we could move in an efficient manner through our meeting today.

So, I will now close agenda item number three.

4. Review and Discussion of Assembly Bill No. 236 from the 2019 Legislative Session

This will move to the opening of agenda item number four. As most of you likely know with the enactment of AB 236 during the 2019 legislative session, there were lots of changes made to criminal justice and there were lots of reforms that became part of that bill.

One of those apart from those other parts that many of us have learned to know about through the course of our employment was the creation of the Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council which we have here today. So, it was created. It provides technical support to implement the reforms that are set forth in AB 236. This technical support is provided by the Crime and Justice Institute also referred to as CJI.

We have representatives with us from CJI to give us some background about the enactment of AB 236, the goals of justice reinvestment and what has been done so far in regard to the implementation of AB 236.

So, now I will pass the time so that we can begin our presentation from the Crime and Justice Institute.

Ms. Strait: Thank you so much. I'm going to share my screen hopefully with you all. Can you all see slide now? Perfect. Thank you for having me. My name is Abigail Strait. As the chair mentioned, I'm from the Criminal Justice Institute or CJI which I'll say more about in a minute.

I'm here today to provide an overview of the 2019 legislation AB 236 and a brief update and implementation so far. I know you have a full agenda today so I'll try to keep it quick, but I'll provide my e-mail address at the end so you can contact me if you have any questions or would like more information about anything that I talk about here today.

As a quick introduction to who CJI is, it's based in Boston but staff all over the country. I'm coming to you virtually from Minnesota and has projects all over the country as well. CJI provides nonpartisan policy analysis and practice assessment, technical assistance, program evaluation among other things, specifically for Nevada and why I'm with you here today.

So, sorry, my dog is very mad at it fly in the room, so I'm sorry if you can hear her barking in the background.

So, for Nevada, CJI is funded by the Bureau of Assistance to provide technical assistance to Nevada as the State implements AB 236. This means we can help the State as you implement 236 including supporting this council. Types of support to the Council can include things like looking into research on any questions you have, looking into practices from other States, helping prepare materials you'd like to create things like that.

We also work with other agencies in the State that are involved in implementing 236 so it's not just you. And as I mentioned at the top this work is in Nevada and is funded by BJA, so funded at a federal level so it comes at no cost to Nevada.

As a quick overview of what I'll talk about today, I will start with an overview of AB 236 then I'll give an update on how implementation of AB 236 is going so far, and then talk some very briefly about the role this Council has laid out in AB 236.

I imagine some of you know a lot about 236 already, so I apologize if so, this will just be a review. If so, intending this presentation just to be an overview here, so especially the first two items won't be exhaustive. I'll just touch on the highlights.

So, starting with an outline overview of the policies outlined in AB 236, legislation as well now passed in 2019, and modifies several parts of the adult justice system including changes to the to the courts and prisons reentry and community supervision.

AB 236 came out of the work of the Nevada Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice or the ACAJ. The ACAJ analyzed criminal justice data from the State reviewed best practices for reducing recidivism while promoting public safety, and then from that research developed a set of recommendations. Those recommendations were then developed into AB 236.

AB 236 had several different priorities. And first was to strengthen responses to their district behavioral health challenges. Second, focus prison resources on those convicted of serious and violent offenses, third, improve the efficiency and effectiveness of community supervision, fourth, minimize barriers to successful re-entry, and finally to ensure the sustainability of AB 236.

I'll now walk through some of the policies in AB 236 that fit in with each of these goals. As I mentioned, for the purposes of this presentation I'm just going to give an overview of some of the policies in AB 236, this will be an exhaustive list but if you'd like more information about that is more exhaustive, let me know afterwards I haven't seen out some materials that have more information on that.

So, first priority area, it involved improving responses to individuals with behavioral health needs. Choose legislation standardized crisis intervention training for law enforcement. Also required training for judges on behavioral health needs and establish a deferred sentence mechanism to allow judges to send individuals, especially to court programs and allow them to dismiss the case of successful completion.

Also required in-person clinical assessments with specialty courts, remove some barriers to probation including by allowing individuals who had previously failed treatment to be eligible for probation and created a grant program housed under post to fund behavioral health responses which allow law enforcement to partner with behavioral health professionals to respond to individuals who are experiencing a crisis.

AB 236 also sought to focus prison resources on those convicted of serious or violent offenses by addressing sentencing disparities. In its research, the ACAJ found that the top offenses that admission in Nevada included burglary, trafficking, possession and theft, also found that Nevada had one of the lowest felony theft thresholds in the country.

Also found that the statute at that point did not distinguish between drug traffickers and drug sellers, and that also found that burglary attempted burglary were the two most common offenses that admission to prison in 2017.

So, looking at that research and others and digging into those offenses further, the ACAJ determined that Nevada was an outlier in that many but statutes were broad and had wide sentencing ranges, so the ACAJ made recommendations to change that. Some of which were then included into AB 236.

So, to address this and the sentencing disparities AB 236 made changes to tailor sentences for conduct including by restructuring penalties for drug offenses based on weight and substance, also distinguished penalties for burglary based on location so it created different penalties for burglary offenses depending on if the burglary was to a motor vehicle, a retail store and outbuilding or residence. And it also raised the value theft threshold from \$650 to \$1,200.

The next goal of 236 was to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of community supervision. The ACAJ in its research found the largest increase in admissions to prison over the -- the decade prior was to growth in people who had violated conditions of parole and probation.

AB 236 attempted to reduce the number of people who were cycling in and out of a prison by incorporating some measures proven effective at changing individuals' behavior into community supervision practices to help ensure that they were not returning to prison.

Those measures included requiring Nevada current probation to use a validated risk and needs assessment to provide supervision decisions related to the conditions of supervision -- supervision intensity and programming and treatment decisions, also required NPP to develop individualized case plans for all people on supervision based on the results of that risk and needs assessment and created a system of graduated responses to help NPP officers respond to non-compliant behaviors.

Those were all NPP changes that also 236 also required NDOC to provide individuals with certain resources prior to release including an I.D. and helping to having individuals enroll in Medicaid and Medicare.

Next, 236 seeks to support re-entry including by requiring NDOC to plan for re-entry starting six months prior to an individual will be eligible for parole and to collaborate with other agencies when developing that re-entry plan. Also required, as I mentioned in the last slide, NDOC to provide information with certain resources prior to release including an I.D., healthcare enrollment and access to medication.

Final goal of 236 was to ensure the changes that it made were sustainable. To do this legislation put the Nevada Sentencing Commission in charge of overseeing implementation of AB 236 and the tracking and reporting outcomes and identifying reinvestment priorities.

It also required agencies including Nevada Probation, NDOC and the records and compliance division to collect and report performance measures so that Nevada can evaluate the implementation and impact of AB 236. It also charges the Nevada Sentencing Commission with calculating any costs avoided by the legislation.

As you probably all know since the policies in AB 236 at the time of creation were expected to result in costs avoided to Nevada, the law outlines opportunities for that money to be reinvested in identified gaps in the system such as resources for law enforcement, transitional housing, support on supervision, and behavioral health treatment and also services for victims.

And then finally, it established the Local Reinvestment Coordinating Council, you all, which I'll talk more about later on in this presentation.

So, 236 was passed in 2019 and became fully effective somewhere in 2020 so it's been effective for more than a year now. I'll talk now about some of the work agencies have done to implement policies in 236.

As with the last section, this is just highlights of implementation, so far, non-exhaustive list, so just keep that in mind. I'll go through by agency and start with Nevada Parole Probation. NPP created and revised policies to comply with the legislation, trained staff on those new policies and then set up a working group to monitor fidelity to the new practices to make sure they're being implemented as intended. That group is still active.

One other thing to highlight in general about, I just mentioned here talking about NPP is the cross-agency collaboration between lots of agencies, and in particular on the probation, NDOC, the parole board and Sentencing Policy.

You know, obviously collaboration is important because individuals can cycle through multiple agencies in the justice system, and collaboration can help streamline processes, build working relationships, and reduce duplicative work.

So, after the passage of 236, those four agencies have started meeting quarterly to identify barriers, problem solving, and share resources together.

Next, NDOC began the process of training staff in several topic areas including effective practices in community supervision, case planning, and risk community assessments. NDOC has also collaborated with agencies to ensure that individuals have access with implication when they are released from institutions.

Next, the Nevada Board of Parole created and revised its existing policies to match the legislation including policies that normally discharge from parole and creating a process for geriatric parole.

Next, POST developed a standard curricula for crisis intervention for law enforcement, and also established standards for training law enforcement on this curricula, and also hired a training specialist to lay the groundwork for the behavioral response grant program, which I mentioned earlier in the presentation.

Finally, the Nevada Sentencing Commission has with the support of the Department of Sentencing Policy has created performance measures for AB 236 and begun to track assessing report outcomes from that legislation. As part of this, the Department of Sentencing Policy has established a data collection system and is working with agencies to collect data to measure outcomes from 236.

And as in addition to the Sentencing Commission in the Department of Sentencing Policy has begun to calculate costs avoided to the State by 236. One final thing I want to touch on and talk about implementation of 236 as subaward funding, along with funding our technical assistance. BJ also offered Nevada funding to support implementation of AB 236.

Through this opportunity any agency that was involved in implementing AB 236 and had costs associated with that work were invited to apply for funding through BJ, so that was federally provided funding. Several agencies applied and received the reward funding. To highlight how those funds were used I'll just go through some examples.

First, POST hired a training specialist to develop training and example policies on responding to individual behavioral health needs that was part of their work under 236. NPP did a couple different things that trained master trainers to continue implementation of Nevada's Risk Assessment System or NRAS and also purchase car adapters to increase officer efficiency in the field.

NDOC received funding to hire a quality assurance staff, to improve data tracking and analysis. The Sentencing Policy also received funding to hire a staff attorney to assist data collection reporting. The Division of Public and Behavioral Health also applied for funding and received it to hire staff to develop cognitive behavioral treatment program at Lakes Crossing.

And finally, the Washoe County District Attorney's Office received funding to hire AB 236 augmentation coordinator to train staff on policy and practice changes related to 236. So, finally, let's talk about the role of this group which was created by AB 236.

As you know the Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council includes County representatives to understand how the changes in AB 236 are experienced at a local level and not just a State level. The idea under 236 is that, you, all, as the local representative of your County, have a sense of what your communities need and are in the best position to advise the Sentencing Commission, which is the body of AB 236. And so, you can advise it on issues, local issues, and local priorities for reinvestment.

I think you're going to get more into the role of this Council on the next agenda item, so I'll be pretty quick. So, I'll just review the role of 236 set for this group.

AB 236 laid out a couple different charges for this group. First, we asked the group to advise the Sentencing Commission on matters related to implementation of 236 including rules and

regulations and budgetary changes. Also, asked this Council to identify County level programming and treatment needs for people who are involved in the system to reduce recidivism.

Also, asked this Council to make recommendations to the Sentencing Commission regarding grants to local governments and non-profit organizations from the State general funds and then to help oversee implementation of those local brands and create performance measures to assess the effectiveness of those grants.

And then finally, asked the Council to identify as opportunities for collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Services at the State and County level for treatment services and funding.

So, this is the direction of 236 gives for this Council, which I believe will dive more into Director Gonzales momentarily. That's all for me. Thank you for having me. This is all I have for my review of 236. I know this was a pretty quick overview. I just touched on the highlights, so if you would like more information about anything or have any questions, please feel free to let me know.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you, Ms. Strait. We do have a bit of time here. If anyone on the Council has questions for Ms. Strait, go ahead and unmute yourself and we can proceed from there. I'll actually start it off. I had a quick question.

As you went through there and you were mentioning the subaward funding and I think you identified a position that, I guess was funded or helped out in Washoe County by the funding. How is it that any local sheriff's office would go about obtaining that funding, or where would we be to direct our local sheriff's office or -- in that case that's what I'm looking for to be a very similar position?

Ms. Strait: Yeah. So, unfortunately, this funding has been expended. It was, the years of running together 2019 the call for requests came out and so it's been allocated now unfortunately.

Chair Pruyt: No, that's okay, that's kind of what I expected, but I thought I should check anyway.

Ms. Strait: Sorry about that. Not the answer you're hoping for.

Chair Pruyt: No, it's okay. Does anyone else on the Council have any questions that they would like to ask Ms. Strait? Alright. I'm not seeing anyone at this moment, so thank you for your time, Ms. Strait. And that will close out agenda item number four.

5. Review and Discussion of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council

And so now we will move into agenda item number five which is our review and discussion of the Coordinating Council. As I mentioned earlier, we're supported by the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. And now we will hear from the Executive Director on exactly how it is that we're to function in the mandates that this Coordinating Council has. Director?

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair. Again, for the record, my name is Victoria Gonzalez. I am the Executive Director of the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy.

I prepared a slideshow presentation for you, let me share that. It's also been included with your materials. So as the chair said, I'm going to give you an overview of not only the statutory duties of the Coordinating Council but also introduce our department to you as well.

I have organized my brief presentation into four parts. Part one, I will go over the organization of the Coordinating Council in general. In my part two I will talk about what I'm calling the substantive mandates of the Coordinating Council. And part three I'll talk about those mandates that I have characterized and administrative. And then in conclusion, I will talk about the Department of Sentencing Policy.

One of the things I wanted to point out immediately was the importance of the establishment of the Nevada Sentencing Commission, the implementation and enactment of AB 236 and the establishment of this Coordinating Council.

It is all to facilitate data-driven recommendations regarding sentencing and corrections. And so, you will hear that over and over again as we try and focus the priorities not only of the Sentencing Commission but of the Coordinating Council itself is coming back to those data-driven recommendations.

As many of us are familiar with, as most of us have been working in different areas of the criminal justice system, we know how often changes are made due to anecdotes or individual situations.

And as we know, developing data-driven recommendations are important for sustainability and ensuring that we are actually meeting the needs of ensuring public safety, reducing recidivism, and making sure that we have sustainability of our criminal justice system and those programs and things that are related to the -- the criminal justice system and ensuring that we have those things I mentioned such as public safety and addressing the needs of those individuals who are involved in the criminal justice system.

So, as I said, I'll keep mentioning this data-driven piece but I wanted to point this out and remember and remind us whenever we're wondering what should we be doing it's to advance this methodology, this practice of developing data-driven recommendations specific to sentencing and corrections policies.

So, as far as the organization is concerned, I wanted to start with the Nevada Sentencing Commission briefly. I know that we have been keeping the members of this Coordinating Council updated about the activities of the Commission and invited you to watch the meetings.

As you may be aware, the duties of the Sentencing Commission are vast. They have many duties related to evaluating the criminal justice system in all of its aspects. And the way they do that is what I've illustrated here on this slide. Is, number one, would be to collect the data.

Again, if you wanted to develop data-driven recommendations we need to collect data. And so, the Sentencing Commission works with our department provides that support in helping it collect the data in order to advance that idea of developing recommendations that are based on data.

Another component to the Commission's duties generally is looking at the fiscal impacts throughout different areas of the criminal justice system. And that means looking at our Department of Corrections, it means looking at Parole and Probation, it means looking at programs that offer a treatment and support whether it's before sentencing, during sentencing or

after sentencing. All of those areas where we are spending money on addressing concerns related to sentencing and corrections.

The third component I have here is this council. This Council is important for the Commission in fulfilling its duties to develop the data-driven recommendations and that is the local component as we will talk about more.

So, in some ways you can think of this Coordinating Council as being a component of how the Commission accomplishes its duties in developing those data-driven recommendations, you might also consider yourself kind of like a subcommittee of the Commission as part of your duties are related to reporting back to the Commission recommendations that you are developing at the local level.

And again, I put us over here to the side. That acronym is again the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. We exist to support the Sentencing Commission. And as the Coordinating Council exists as this kind of subcommittee and part of the Commission, we also support you as well in your efforts.

As most of you may know that this Coordinating Council is comprised of representatives from each County in the State including -- and in Carson City as well. If you look around there's a lot of us that are here today. At this point we still have a couple of vacancies. We still have not had our appointments from Washoe and Storey County but otherwise, all the other appointments have been made to the Coordinating Council.

And we can see that this is a really exciting opportunity to get all of these individuals together into one public body to talk about criminal justice at the local level. As I talked about, again, how maybe criminal justice policy has been developed in the past based on anecdote or just who are the stakeholders and the lobbyists that are speaking the loudest, we know, as many of us have been in these meetings, how often that input from the local counties sometimes gets discussed and sometimes doesn't.

This Coordinating Council helps ensure that that happens by being comprised of each County, and then taking that, those discussions and those meetings and findings and taking them to the Commission which then can then be delivered and informed at the State level.

I want to comment too about what's exciting about this. When you look about at this, we have all of the counties here, and before -- when the Coordinating Council was established, I wasn't quite sure how we were going to get everybody together.

And so, I will say this is one of maybe the positive things that came out of COVID for us as far as administering this was Zoom became popular and easy to use, and people are used to it now. And so now we have this amazing way to bring all these counties together. And I confess I wasn't quite sure how we were going to do that at first.

And so, I'm glad that, you know. out of the pandemic we were able to figure out a way to do that and bring everybody here together for this meeting.

So, the second part of my presentation is to talk about what I have characterized as the substantive mandates of the Council. In your materials I included a copy of the statute, which those who can see my screen looks like this. I apologize at the top, it says NSC and NSC, it should say Nevada Local Justice Coordinating Council Statutes.

So, that is the actual statute that came out of AB 236 that guides the -- the mandates of this council, what I have done to help us understand those mandates a little bit better, and to add some context to them is, I've divided the mandates up into those that are related to AB 236 and identifying programming and treatment needs and all of those duties that are related to administering grants.

I'm sure you all have a lot of questions about those, and I'm going to talk about that and what the intent is, I think, for that and where we're hoping to go with that. But generally thinking, about this statute in these two ways, I think will help this Council prioritize your activities and prioritize your goals and then work towards a larger -- a goal of administering these grants, collecting data, giving feedback, administering grants, and then creating that cycle, but we have to start somewhere.

So, with these grants, obviously, and maybe it's not obvious, but we don't have funding for those yet. So, what we are looking for is to start somewhere by focusing on the other mandates. Those mandates related to how is AB 236 affecting the local counties, the local governments, the local jurisdictions.

And then identifying those needs that are consistent with what we're trying to drive -- what we're trying to advance in terms of corrections policies related to figuring out how we reduce recidivism, how do we reduce -- how do we maintain public safety and make sure we are using our dollars effectively.

And so, my thinking is, that if we focus on these mandates related to AB 236, identifying the program treatment needs, this Commission could or this Council could then use that to then start developing those recommendations for getting funds for the grants, which I will talk about in the next couple slides. But we just have to start somewhere.

This is, as far as I know, hasn't been done in this way to bring all these local jurisdictions together and talk about what are your needs, what is happening at your level in terms of criminal justice, in terms of recidivism, or and spending corrections and sentencing dollars.

And so, we're going to start somewhere which is an exciting opportunity for this Council to figure out where are we, what do you have right now, what do you need, and how can we get you to where you need to be.

And I think the counties interacting and talking and sharing what's going on in your County is going to help inform everyone else, and help us lead to those recommendations that are truly data-driven and will get us the results we're looking for in terms of sustainability, and a long-term -- seeing long-term outcome, effective outcomes from how we're spending our sentencing and correction dollars.

I mentioned this before, and I want to mention again in a different type of slide. But that reminder in that everything needs to be data-driven. Right? We're trying to get away from the anecdotal reactionary changes and the only way we can do that is we have to collect data. We have to start somewhere.

And again, this is couched in what those mandates are for the Sentencing Commission. The Sentencing Commission was created to make these data-driven recommendations. Again, this

Coordinating Council is one part of how the Commission makes those recommendations in order to ensure that we have data.

And so, these discussions and the data you get, you will be collecting and bringing to this Council are all part of the data that the Council will use or the Commission will use in developing its recommendations. And so, your input, your identification about what is needed what is happening in your jurisdiction is part of that data that will help advance those recommendations that are truly based on data.

So, now that I've broken down the statute into the mandates, into into those two parts, the AB 236, the programming needs, and the grants. Here's how I see the direction of this Council going in how to where as a place to start.

So, the place to start is first identifying those needs. We know that the mandate is to make recommendations and identify certain needs to the Commission. So, we need to figure out where is everybody? What are your needs? What is your data like? Obviously, we want to collect data, but we can't just start collecting data if we don't know what the data looks like. So, we need to see what does the data look like and what data can we collect and then report back to the Commission.

It is possible that by collecting this data, identifying the needs they're having at each local level, the recommendation that comes out of this Council to the Commission might be a recommendation for an appropriation to that grant program.

So, what that would mean is, we gather the data, we look for what each County needs, put that together in a recommendation from this Council to the Commission and recommend an appropriation that would then fund these grants and then it would support the programs -- the funding would support the programs that have been identified in the needs and the data that was collected.

And then if the appropriation were granted, this Council could then administer those grants to each of the counties and we would continue to collect data to get feedback about how that money is being used and how it's working based on those needs that are identified.

And so, then we have a cycle we can create of recommendations from this Council that goes to the Commission that is based on data and it also fulfills the statutory duties of this council.

Next, on to what I characterize as the administrative mandates. So, this are some of the information we shared when you were first appointed. So, each of the members serve a two-year term. For our purposes, this meeting cycle begins on July 1st, 2021 and runs through June 30th, 2023. So, for our purposes, that is going to be your term appointment.

I know that everyone's appointed at different times. And we will start the official term cycle on these dates, and then request reappointments around that 2023 timeline in the summer. And so, and then from there, people can be reappointed and continue to serve on the council.

Another important administrative mandate is, as the Chair mentioned at the top of the meeting, he was appointed by the Chair of the Sentencing Commission. This is required by statute. And then finally, the statute does require that the Sentencing Commission provide staff support to the Council if there is appropriation available.

So, that is our purpose. Because we support the Sentencing Commission and the Sentencing Commission if available is able to provide support to this council. That is us, so that is NDSP.

And then, lastly, I wanted to just talk about the department and who we are. The Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. We were created in 2019 during that legislative session. For those of you that may be aware, the Sentencing Commission used to exist as a legislative interim committee in the legislative branch.

When our department was created, it moved the Sentencing Commission from the legislative branch to the executive branch, and is housed in our department. And we know that because of that data-driven, a goal to work on those data-driven sentencing and corrections recommendations, by creating the top, the department, the Commission could then have a dedicated staff to assisting to generate the data that could then be used to facilitate recommendations.

You can see here our vision for the department is to be a premier partner in facilitating reliable criminal justice data and data-driven sentencing and corrections policies in Nevada. Our mission is to assist and support the Nevada Sentencing Commission in providing those recommendations. And we also assist in the oversight of justice reinvestment which is AB 236.

And by virtue of that, then we are your support and we help you advance those same -- we help and support this Council in its duties and mandates, and then also to advance that overall vision of again, the data-driven sentencing and correction policies.

We are comprised of five staff. Currently we are not fully staffed but we are working to work on finalizing those positions and getting those filled so that we can have the full staff needed to collect the data and facilitate the Commission and the councilman's duties.

As you can see, despite not being fully staffed, we are still able to fulfill our duties and assist you in what you are doing. And we -- for those who are in Carson City, that's where we are located. We are located off of Roop and Fairview. If you ever want to come to town, and come see our office.

And then, we have faced some budgeting challenges since we were established in 2019. Obviously, we ended up trying to stand up the department during the beginning of the pandemic. And despite that, we have still been able to make a lot of advances and able to get established, and up and running and grow. But just know that's part of as we've been trying to get everything up and running.

We have had a little bit of a setback there, but as I said, we are coming out of that and really looking forward to what we're going to be able to offer this Council and the Commission in helping and assisting you in fulfilling your mandates.

So, with that, I would be happy to answer any questions that the Council may have.

Chair Pruyt: Do we have any questions at this time? Go ahead, Ms. Byrd.

Vice Chair Byrd: So, you said you're not fully staffed yet but it's five. How many staff do you have? I don't remember, maybe you've already told me.

Director Gonzalez: Oh, as of today?

Vice Chair Byrd: Yes.

Director Gonzalez: We have two.

Vice Chair Byrd: Is it just the two? Okay. That's what I thought, but I wasn't sure.

Director Gonzalez: Yes.

Vice Chair Byrd: You guys are doing an amazing job for being two of five.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you. We're looking for more like us.

Chair Pruyt: Do we have any other questions? Alright. Seeing no additional questions that will close out agenda item number six. Actually, sorry, that closed out agenda item number five. We're moving into agenda item number six.

6. Discussion of Inventory of Information to be Completed by Each Member of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council

Included within your meeting materials you all received an inventory. Now, agenda item number six is, I think a very important one. And some of the preliminary discussions we had regarding the formulation of this meeting and how we should proceed.

This was one of the items that came up within that brief, kind of, plan, was the idea that we understand that each and every person who's a part of this Council is incredibly busy, has a lot of things to do. You were all appointed to this Council for various reasons either you knew about it beforehand and sought to become part of the council, or someone contacted you and said, hey, we would like you to be part of the Council.

But either way, it's because of what you know, the people you know, and the things that you're able to accomplish and do. So, as part of each week meeting, we wanted to make sure that we moved in a progressive manner forward to make sure that something is being accomplished at each and every meeting.

I don't know about everyone else here but I am certainly one of those people who has loathed to meet just to meet, and so that's where we start with the inventory.

So, as Director Gonzalez discussed, it's important to ensure that every piece of work that we do here is completely data-driven. It's easy for each and every one of us to have varying opinions about the effectiveness of AB 236 within our own community, even based upon what we do. But we want to make sure that everything we do is supported by the data.

So, one of the first things we wanted to do is find out what types of data are actually available within our communities. We certainly recognize that every County across the State of Nevada functions in a little bit of a different way.

And because of that different functionality, certain data indicators are going to be able to be found and retrieved. And in other counties, that may not be the case. So that's one of the first parts that we look at with some of the items in the inventory.

The inventory is just preliminary information that we're proposing to collect that will foster later discussion. It's certainly not an end-all be-all, and I will say it's not going to be the first or last in - well, it is the first but it won't be the last inventory that we will be asking each of you to kind of complete and fill out.

But I don't want you to look at the inventory as something that now that you're on this council, that this is your information to fill in. That's not exactly how this is intended to work. The idea being, for the Sentencing Policy to be able to know where to collect that data. And there's really no one in better positions than each and every one of you who work within the criminal justice system in your respective counties to know where to actually find that information so that information can be collected.

So, once we go through the -- we're going to go through the inventory here shortly. Once we do that, I would like to hear from each of you on the inventory that's there. If you have questions, concerns there's some things we can address with that inventory. Understanding that it's one of many to come. And then, once we've gone through that, we'll move for a motion to approve that inventory and then we can -- we'll get a second and move on from there.

So, I will turn the time back over to the Sentencing Policy to go through the inventory.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I will walk through the inventory. It looks like this. It was included with your meeting materials. It is a fillable PDF, and so when you do complete it, you will put your answers right in the PDF. Of course, you are welcome to add any additional attachments to complete the answers.

To echo what the Chair said, this is a starting point. What we will do is after we gather everything, we will meet, and then bring it back to you for that feedback and discussion. And we're looking forward to really getting a sense of where we're at.

I want to reassure everybody with our experience already with the Commission in our short time and we work with already with a lot of agencies at the State level. And as the chair mentioned, there is not a centralized system of data as we all know. And that is not necessarily a bad thing. I see it as an opportunity, and I think it's really important for everyone to understand, to be okay with where you're at.

I think it's important for us to figure out where do we start, where do we have right now, and where can we go from here. And that's what this inventory is aimed at, is just to figure out where we're at. And so, you're -- as the Chair emphasized that, as you're gathering this information for your County and looking at what the responses look like in the County, it's important for us to really just know where it's at, not to feel bad or worry about what it looks like if you don't have what another County has.

I think being transparent about what we have right now is helpful to those when we make those recommendations that we can say, this is where it is. And this is what we can collect based on what you have right now. And if you -- if we can identify needs and areas to grow then we can get that support possibly. But I think being very open about the challenges we face with our data is important to share as well. And you will find that other counties and other entities are sharing in those as well.

So, to go through the inventory, the opening paragraph just explains, again, a reminder of the Coordinating Council and the duties and what the goal is, as far as, again, remember data-driven that we're so focused on.

The instructions we have here are to answer each question that we have put in here. You would submit the completed PDF form to myself. My e-mail is VFGonzalez@ndsp.nv.gov. You are all here in this meeting, and so hopefully, it's my e-mail is there quickly accessible, but if not, there it is again. And we'll send out reminder e-mails as well.

We would like to have the responses submitted by October 11th at the end of the day, and then we can start compiling those and then working with the Chair and the Vice Chair to then schedule our next meeting and figure out how to compile those responses.

So, the first set of questions is related to AB 236. Here we ask what is the general response to AB 236 in your County. As we know one of the mandates of this Council is to provide input about how it's being implemented, and I think this input is really important.

Maybe it wasn't provided for at the enactment of the legislation, the consideration for how it's affecting your County, but we'd like to know good or bad what's happening. And you have some space there to describe, and of course, please include an attachment about what else is happening and what the general response is that you've been able to perceive in your County in relation to AB 236.

The next set of questions is related to jail population data. We've, again, we've talked about data. And because it varies from County to County, from entity to entity, we're curious about what it looks like and what the capabilities are. And so, we just have some general questions here about, is jail population data available in your County? Is it being tracked? Is it being collected? Is it being shared? Is it possible to get data for the last five years?

And then, we realized, too, there might be multiple entities that collect data to identify those there and the point of information. We've also included here in the last response a place to put additional comments. We know that it's not always realistic to just say give a yes or no answer, and so, please use those comment sections to tell us more.

If you're not quite sure what, you know, maybe you know that two years of data is available, or you're aware that maybe some breakdowns are available, not others, please share that as we continue to figure out just where you're at.

Again, we're just trying to figure out where is everybody and then we can figure out how to really make recommendations. And look for those opportunities to say, to express and to advance the challenges or the wins in your County that you would like to share. I think those are both opportunities here.

And so, I would say use this inventory as for that as well, so we can prepare not only what's going on that's going well in each County, but then where are your needs. Because if we don't identify those needs, then they don't know, and we can't get what you need to then make any progress that you're looking to.

So, the next section of questions is related to mental health services programs and treatment. Again, not only is that important to the policies that led to the enactment of AB 236, but it's also important just in general, we're trying to evaluate the criminal justice system.

As many of you know, being in the criminal justice system, the drivers of that, you know anecdotally are probably our many drivers are related to mental access, to mental health access to substance use treatment, and anything else that that programs that may be contributing to interactions with the criminal justice system. And so, that's what these questions are geared towards.

We are also hoping that maybe this is a way to start being collecting information that could be used as a resource. I think there's a great opportunity here for this Council to collect information because that could then be compiled into a deliverable that is an opportunity to share information on their counties. Right?

So, there might be people that aren't aware of the services that are available in their County or neighboring counties, and so, we could put together a -- some sort of brochure, like I said, deliverable or something we can even put on our web site where individuals can see what programs are available. That's an opportunity to not only celebrate what's being offered in your County and what you're doing.

It's a way to identify your needs, and then also, it becomes a legitimate resource for your fellow citizens of Nevada as we're trying to again, work towards not only collecting data and making recommendations but we can make some real change and offer this information to everybody.

Again, there's a please describe section at the end of that and use that as an opportunity to provide any other input or feedback about that section of questions. Next is about alternatives to sentencing and what it looks like in your County as far as those opportunities.

As we've talked to different stakeholders, for some of you that are very familiar with this and have those opportunities in your County, it would be helpful to know that. And then it'd be helpful to know those counties where those services are not available, and those alternatives are not available. Again, that might be an opportunity to identify needs.

When we talk about identifying needs, of course, like we -- you know, the statute has us focused very much on mental health and programs and treatment. But we are looking at the criminal justice system as a whole and not just that programming. Because maybe in your County, maybe you have a strong support system for your programming, but you see a need for something like this, alternative to sentencing or something like that.

And so, we, again, this also might be a resource for other counties for what's available throughout the State, and might be a way for you to connect and find opportunities for how to get support in your County for maybe something that is a need or a strength, depending on what information you may have to share.

The last set of questions is this in response to pre-trial assessments. As we all know, with the Jimenez decision, the -- these assessments need to be provided. If we could start collecting data regarding that, I think it'd be helpful. As we know, again, we're trying to get away from anecdotes. And we have all come across these situations where whatever the issue is, they're anecdotes related to that.

But if we could be one of the leaders, meaning, this Council could be a leader in gathering the data towards a big change like this, we could start then informing other counties and the State

about how this is actually looking and what's happening in your jurisdiction and what challenges you see, and then again, looking for opportunities to implement these policies.

Because this is very similar, I think to AB 236 where you have a very big policy that needs to be implemented. And there are challenges, and maybe wins that haven't been discussed that would be helpful for other counties to hear.

And again, like I said, I see this as being a great leadership opportunity for this Council, is gathering this information from all the counties for some of these big policies and what it's looking like for you, and what information you could share that. Then we could use to be the leader in providing information to others when they want to know, how do we evaluate the effectiveness of this policy and what changes do we need to make or maybe augment in order to help ensure that policies are being implemented the way they intended.

So, with that, I would be happy to answer questions where I can turn it back over to the Chair to facilitate any other recommendations or input regarding the inventory.

Chair Pruyt: Please. Julia?

Ms. Murray: I had a couple of questions regarding the inventory. On the category that you titled jail population data, are you seeking to find out whether this information is currently publicly available or whether or not the various jail entities are maintaining this data internally, and to find those points of contacts to be able to do later follow up?

Director Gonzalez: Yes, I would -- I'd want to know both. So, if you would put that in the comment area, that would be really helpful to know that's a good clarification about just because data is being collected doesn't mean it's being shared. And that would be something to add about what information you do have about the data.

Another way to think about this is, is we just need data about the data right now. We don't actually have the data, yeah, and so any information you have would be helpful for us to evaluate what's the data about the data. I don't know if the Chair wants to comment on that. I think it would be helpful.

Chair Pruyt: I agree. Some of the ideas behind this. We encountered obviously some certain, I guess you could say obstacles, when we were looking at data. Following the passage of AB 236 we got COVID. So, as we get data, we also have to -- well, in later meetings we're likely going to have to parse out what are results of AB 236 versus what are results of COVID. Because that obviously had an impact. And jail population is one of those, so that we can kind of see some of those things.

And so, just knowing some of those makes it -- will make it easier. I know it's going to be difficult for those who are in larger counties because unfortunately, you have more jails. You have more agencies. You have many more names and numbers to compile than some of us who live in smaller counties that don't have to deal with those issues.

I'll admit I have it easier. We have one sheriff's office and one jail and that's what it is. But amazingly, after that, we have like, four other State police forces. That kind of fit in and out because everybody's headquartered here, so it makes it interesting.

And for alternatives to sentencing, just in case there's different names that are used by departments throughout the State, our Department of Alternative Sentencing is we were kind of contemplating this are generally those pre-trial -- who's conducting your pre-trial supervision and your misdemeanor supervision.

Because one of the other things that we had discussed was certainly, it's easy to say that there's cost savings perhaps by an entity like PNP. But if -- are we looking at savings or are we looking at a transfer of costs? We've taken what otherwise may have been a State cost for things that were felonies and now they're misdemeanors. And so, do we now have an increased County cost, how are those going to be addressed in those types of things.

So, those are the types of things we looked at, and obviously mental health services come up, I think in many people's -- in the criminal justice system whether you're working in direct caseload or not, it's incredibly impactful on how cases resolve and recidivism.

So, those are the things we looked at, fully recognizing that each County does not have the same resources. They just don't. They don't have the same budget to attain those resources. And so, this is, like she said is, it's the start point. And we're hopeful that by finding this we'll be able to progress to much, probably more difficult questions when we decide what to recommend and how to do it. Those may be a lot more difficult meetings to actually do.

So, do we have any other questions? Yes, Mr. Levin.

Mr. Levin: I'm not really sure what's being asked in the first question. Are we talking about the general response within the County generally or within just the criminal justice system? Regardless of the answer, that that part of it, I suspect that if I were just to go around and ask people what's your general response to AB 236, they're gonna say, what's that?

So, I could tell them some of the provisions myself, but whatever provisions I say to them that's going to influence their answer. On the other hand, if I give them all 150 plus pages of the bill and say what's your general response, they're not going to read it between now and October 11th and give me an honest answer. So, I'm not really sure what I do with that question.

Chair Pruyt: Well, I guess, I can somewhat answer that question. We started with this question. This is probably going to be directed more you and those that within the practice area that you're working with. And we recognize that we have kind of a broad group that sit here on the council. We don't expect you to necessarily go educate the members of your County and community. I would keep it within those who are working within the criminal justice system who have a kind of baseline idea of the criminal justice reform that was passed.

And so, if you could just couch whatever answer you have, and with giving us an understanding of who you spoke to. If you spoke to an entire group of prosecutors that work on your prosecution team, that's fine. The response is great. If it's an entire group of public defenders, providers in the community for substance abuse treatment courts, whatever it may be to basically kind of get a general idea.

So, this one's a little bit different but we -- yeah. To have a general idea of what people think and who they are, or I guess the types of groups that have the feelings they do.

Director Gonzalez: And then if I may, I think it would be helpful to know this is such a sweeping criminal justice reform bill. And so, I think what I'm looking for in addition to this and I appreciate

the Chair's clarification about, you know, not educating. We're not -- we're definitely not there yet. But really, understanding like how policy has been implemented.

You know, it's important for me when I go and meet with the stakeholders to understand how policies impact you today and what's happening. And so, any conversation that we could start or facilitate regarding how the policy has been implemented, and if it's just your, you know, whatever, you know, access you have to that information is helpful because it might mean we find an area to go back and make a recommendation, as far as maybe a policy that needs to be adjusted or help - how it's actually being implemented.

So, that's all that I would add too, is just how's it going on the ground, you know, with what your familiarity is with it if that helps too.

Chair Pruyt: Yes, please, Julia.

Ms. Murray: Under the mental health services category, are you looking specifically for the County sponsored, County funded services programs, treatment agencies or are you also looking for the private backers that may have ancillary contracts or provide that infrastructure to the County?

Chair Pruyt: Both.

Ms. Murray: Okay.

Chair Pruyt: Kind of a broad thing. We would like to have a general idea of truly what is fully available within the County. And we recognize that one can be a huge ask and there's probably not a way to find them all, but hopefully, with whether it's asking around or looking to find all those resources, because obviously, I think it's one of those things that may not be as well-known and there's certainly inadequacies across the State.

Ms. Murray: Okay. Thank you.

Director Gonzalez: And if you have -- if you have information too, we have staff. That's what our staff I'm hoping to do, too. Like, if you have a lead on for on that for us but we'd be happy to pull at that and make any follow-up contacts if we can just get some direction to go, but, yeah, both is really important. And like I said, that's where we're here to support you. And so, if you can provide us a starting point, we're happy to go and dig and meet with you and talk about that more as well.

Chair Pruyt: Do we have any other questions, comments, or concerns?

Mr. Dahl: Mr. Chair?

Chair Pruyt: Yes, please.

Mr. Dahl: I think I'm going to start by going to my assemblyman and find out what kind of feedback. Number one find out how much attention he's been paying there in the assembly to the bills that are being passed, and then find out what kind of feedback he has gotten. And I'm looking forward to this. This is an interesting project and I think it can be very fruitful.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Do we have anyone else? Alright. I'm not seeing any other hands raised or people off of mute. So, right now, we'll entertain a motion and a second to approve the inventories we have. Do I have anyone willing to make a motion?

JULIA MURRAY MOVED TO APPROVE THE INVENTORY AS LISTED

ERIK LEVIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNIMOUSLY.

Chair Pruyt: That will close out agenda item number six. So that moves us to agenda item number seven.

7. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Pruyt: And this is consideration for things that we would like to have discussed in future meetings.

So, this is not one I necessarily want to spring on you. If there's something that you have in mind right now, please feel free to unmute. Let us know and we will go from there. If not, you can always write to us, call Sentencing Policy as they're incredibly available. It's actually quite impressive given that they're a staff of two of five, how responsive that they are.

But I would love any feedback that you get, certainly as you go through the inventory and things come up. And there's other items that you identify are things that you think, hey, that would be a great data point to start to drive down and find out across the State, please let us know.

So, to start with, is there anything that anyone knows of now that they would like to add have added to our next meeting agenda?

DA Frehnor: When is the next meeting? Do we have a schedule?

Chair Pruyt: We do not have the scheduled meeting yet. We were going to wait until we had the inventories returned and so that we would be able to get started on the information there so that we would actually be able to report something to the group at the time that we had the next meeting, and then move on from the data there. So, that we would have something that we could move and accomplish.

DA Frehnor: And once the inventory is turned in will that be e-mailed out to the rest of us to review before the meeting as well? Before the agenda just as soon as they get it we get it as well?

Chair Pruyt: I'll pass that to Director Gonzalez, but I think so.

Director Gonzalez: Yes, we will work with the Chair about how to compile that information and get it out to everybody so you can review it.

DA Frehnor: Thank you.

Chair Pruyt: Do we have any additional questions or any thoughts that we would like to have on our next meeting? Alright, seeing none, we will get -- well, you'll each be contacted once we have a new meeting that we're able to set up, and of course with all the information that we will be discussing at that next meeting.

So, at this time we will now close up at agenda item number seven. And we will move to agenda item number eight, which is public comment.

8. Public Comment

Chair Pruyt: This will be our second public comment section just as we did in the first period which we didn't have any public comment in the first period, but we may in this. So, I'll repeat the instructions that we have for public comment for those listening online.

For those who wish to testify by telephone, due to time constraints, public comment is limited to two minutes per person. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit additional written testimony in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov.

At this time, I will pass it back to staff Sentencing Policy to proceed with public comment.

Ms. Chiazza: Thank you, Chair Pruyt. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone, press star nine to raise your hand. When it is your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name. Vice Chair Denni, do you --

Vice Chair Byrd: I have a question, but this is really the only place that it fit, so it's not really a public comment. But I know that Washoe and Storey are still vacant positions. I guess my question is, how long -- how long do we leave them vacant and at what point do we need to maybe address that?

Director Gonzalez: Would you like me to answer that, Chair? Oh. Oh, you were muted. I missed what you said.

Chair Pruyt: Please do. I'm -- yeah, I've had a technical issue there for a second.

Director Gonzalez: No, that's alright. Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Vice Chair Byrd. Yes, we have been working with the counties to get those positions appointed. I don't have any other recommendations at this point other than we communicate, we reach out to them on a regular basis to just touch base and see how things are going. We keep track of those meetings. And so, we will continue those efforts.

If any member of the Council has, I guess, a contact in those counties, I'd be happy if you want to pass that along to us and maybe we could try and do a group meeting to coordinate just some touching base with those counties. But, yeah, we've been in regular communication with them

and so, I guess I'm hoping after our first meeting maybe word gets out and we hear something else.

Vice Chair Byrd: Do you have any idea, is there resistance or is it maybe just a lack of understanding or just not a priority? Do you have any idea?

Director Gonzalez: I'm not sure yet. From what I can tell, there was some subcommittee put together in Washoe, and so it might be finding the right names and going through the formal process. And then with Storey, it's been the same like we are trying to educate and just inform. We've touched base with a few individuals, and so I think it's just the board deciding which direction they want to go.

And that's why I was hoping too, by seeing the Council put together we can see. The other counties can see, you know, the types of individuals that have been appointed and who we're looking for, you know, who could be appointed to this. And obviously, it's vast as far as we can see the experience we have here.

So, no, there hasn't been any resistance. It might just be just more education, so we're looking for those opportunities and touching base with our stakeholders to see if there's anything else, but I don't think it's resistance at this point. But we will keep looking into it and keep the Council informed.

Vice Chair Byrd: Thank you.

Chair Pruyt: Alright. Do we have anyone else waiting on for public comment?

Ms. Chiazza: Chair, we have no more callers to testify.

Chair Pruyt: Alright. Thank you. That will close out agenda item number eight. So that brings us to agenda item number nine, which is our adjournment.

9. Adjournment

Chair Pruyt: I want to thank you all for being part of this meeting. I certainly look forward to receiving all of the information that we're going to get from round one of our inventories.

And at this time, I wanted to thank staff. And our meeting is now adjourned. Thank you, all.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you.