



**STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF SENTENCING POLICY**

625 Fairview Drive, Suite 109
Carson City, NV 89701-5430
Phone: (775) 684-7390
Sentencing.nv.gov

**NEVADA LOCAL JUSTICE REINVESTMENT
COORDINATING COUNCIL**

MINUTES DRAFT

Date and Time:

February 1, 2023 1:30 PM

Location:

VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Demar Dahl
McKinzie Hilton
Brenda Ingram
Erik Levin
Julia Murray
Dorothy Rowley
Bryce Shields
Clinton Zens
Denni Byrd -- Vice Chair
Garrit Pruyt – Chair

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Jeff Clark
Elliott Sattler
Curtis Schlepp

MEMBERS UNEXCUSED

Art Clark
Dylan Frehner
Tick Segerblom

STAFF

Executive Director Victoria Gonzalez
Manager of Policy Analysis, Jorja Powers
Management Analyst II, Erasmo Cosio
Administrative Assistant, Jose Sepulveda

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Garrit Pruyt: I will now call to order the February 1, 2023, meeting of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. Good afternoon, it's good to see everyone here and I want to welcome all those who may be viewing on the Department of Sentencing Policy's YouTube channel. This is the fifth meeting of our 2021-2023 meeting cycle. I will now ask Director Gonzalez to take the roll.

Director Victoria Gonzalez: Thank you Chair.

(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DIRECTOR GONZALEZ; QUOROM IS MET)

2. Public Comment

Chair Pruyt: We will now open agenda item 2. This is our first period of public comment as always there will be two periods of public comment, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end. Members of the public have two options for submitting public comment. First, members may do so in writing by emailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comment received in writing will be provided to the council and be included by reference in the minutes of the meeting. Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints public comment is limited to two minutes. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit comments 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, Mr. Sepulveda.

Mr. Jose Sepulveda: Thank you Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone press star nine to raise your hand. When it's your turn to speak please slowly state and spell your first and last name. We currently don't have any callers Chair.

Chair Pruyt: Excellent, that'll close out our first period of public comment. Thank you.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Meeting of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council held on December 7, 2022

Chair Pruyt: Moving on to agenda item 3. Members of the council have been provided prior to this meeting a copy of the minutes from our December 7, 2022, meeting. At this time I would like to know if any of the members of the Council have any edits, comments, or corrections they wish to make to the minutes that were previously sent out.

Vice Chair Denni Byrd: I have a question. It says members present, members excused, can maybe Victoria can just jog my memory? So there was none that were actually absent that were unexcused, everybody was excused?

Director Gonzalez: That's correct.

Vice Chair Byrd: Okay, I was trying to remember which meeting we had the discussion about making sure we had enough of a quorum and what not and that there was some that we just hadn't had contact from versus those that had contacted you and been excused. So I just wanted to make sure all members were, the last meeting was we had everybody excused that wasn't present that's where we weren't still missing members?

Director Gonzalez: That's a good question. Actually, I don't have specific guidance on how you would like us to distinguish between excused and unexcused so we didn't distinguish. So we could either just put members absent or we could distinguish on what the Coordinating Council would like for us to keep of track of who's excused and unexcused. So, I apologize for not clarifying that distinction earlier.

Vice Chair Byrd: I think I only bring it up because we've had a discussion about that to make sure that we had our quorum so I guess that's why I brought it up just to make sure because in my mind there's two different things if they're excused because they couldn't be here but if we're lacking presence from a community or a county that's a different thing.

Director Gonzalez: So then to clarify, the distinction would be if someone has contacted us in advance and asked to be excused versus someone who just has not responded at all?

Vice Chair Byrd: In my mind, yes, but I look forward to hearing from others as well.

Chair Pruty: So I guess with that, is there any other thoughts on whether we should have a differentiation between members who are excused and members who are just absent without notice?

Mr. Clinton Zens: I mean I guess I would second that same differentiation whether or not you know they contacted Victoria ahead of time to say, hey you know I'm not going to make it versus just flat you know no call no show kind of thing.

Chair Pruty: Any other thoughts? No, so I guess at this time would there be a motion to amend the minutes to simply delineate that the persons not there were absent?

Vice Chair Byrd: I make a motion to amend the minutes to differentiate those that had contacted Victoria in advance to be excused from the meeting versus those that were just not present.

DENNI BYRD MOVED TO AMEND THE MINUTES TO DIFFERENTIATE THOSE EXCUSED AND UNEXCUSED FROM THE MEETING

CLINTON ZENS SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Chair Pruty: Any other requested edits or comments or corrections to the minutes? Seeing none and I'll defer to Director Byrd to make sure I do this right, can we get a motion to approve the minutes that would include the amendment that we've just passed.

DEMAR DAHL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2022 MEETING

CLINTON ZENS SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Overview and History of Development of Nevada Justice Reinvestment Policies

Chair Pruty: All right this moves us to item 4. In item 4 we will have an overview and history of the development of the Nevada Justice Reinvestment policies. Director Gonzalez shared with me some background information about the policies that led to our council being established and how the creation of our council was inspired by what is being done in other states specifically by the Oregon Justice Commission. I asked her to share this historical background with you all so I will now turn the time over to her to do so.

Director Gonzalez: Good afternoon everyone. So, the historical background I'm going to provide is from 2017 when the most recent iteration of the Sentencing Commission was first established in the Legislative Branch. The first few meetings during that meeting cycle were dedicated to hearing presentations from sentencing commissions in other states. This included hearing from the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission; they made two presentations. First on February 16, 2018, the director of the time, Michael Schmidt, presented information about the history and duties of the commission. The duties included those related to the justice reinvestment act as it was enacted in Oregon. Among other things, the Nevada Sentencing Commission learned about how grants related to justice reinvestment were administered. We're going to hear more about this from our presenters in the next agenda item. The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission made a second presentation to

the Nevada Sentencing Commission April 27, 2018. This time the Commission heard from Ross Caldwell who presented more detailed information about how justice reinvestment was enacted and implemented in Oregon. The Commission was very interested in this topic. During that same interim, the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice was developing the justice reinvestment policies that led to the enactment of AB 236. The presentations from Oregon influenced the justice reinvestment policies that were developed which included creating this coordinating council. As the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission inspired the creation of this council, I recommended to the Chair we invite them to make a presentation to help provide some guidance and support to the development of this council and what you do. Additionally I've had the pleasure of working with the executive director of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission on the executive committee of the National Association of Sentencing Commissions. I'm grateful for that partnership with him and appreciate them accepting the invitation to make a presentation to this council. Thank you, I will now turn the time back over to the Chair.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you. Are there any questions for Director Gonzalez at this time based upon a little bit of the legislative history and our creation and what we were modeled after? All right, I'm not seeing any questions.

5. Presentation on the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission's Duties, Justice Reinvestment Initiatives, Grant Administration, and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

Chair Pruyt: That will take us to agenda item 5 which is our main presentation for the day. So this will be a presentation on the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission's duties, justice reinvestment initiative, grant administration, and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. We got a little bit of background from Director Gonzalez and this gives us a great opportunity to understand the framework that specifically Oregon has utilized to accomplish their goals, and certainly our council has many goals for the things that we want to do and I fully expect that this presentation will be very instructive on providing this with a framework to be successful. I will now pass the time over to the representatives of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to introduce themselves and proceed with their presentation.

Mr. Ken Sanchagrin: Thank you Chair Pruyt. Chair Pruyt, members of the Coordinating Council, my name is Ken Sanchagrin and I am the executive director of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission and I'm here with my colleagues Kelly Officer, who is our research director who just came on camera, and then also Ryan Keck who is our programs director and what we've prepared for you today is a presentation; each of us are going to take kind of our specialty areas in turn and discuss some of the you know historical background of justice reinvestment but then also come up through the current day. We're actually at a point where justice reinvestment in Oregon is now a decade old and so we're going to be doing a little bit of retrospective and then little bit of prospective discussion of how things have changed over the years. I think that we're all open to questions throughout the presentation at any point so feel free to interrupt us and now I'm going to try the really fun thing of you know sharing screens which I feel like always goes wrong but we'll make sure that I can get the presentation up and moving.

So just a little bit of background about who we are again, the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission. Our statutory mission is to improve the legitimacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of state and local criminal justice systems. We have a nine-member commission made up of two legislators and then various folks who are different actors within the criminal justice system. We have around 27 staff when we are fully staffed here at CJC and we perform a couple different duties mainly expressed by the different folks we have on the call today. So we have a programs team that oversees both federal pass-through grants in the public safety realm and then an additional number of state grants, justice reinvestment specialty courts, and some other specialty grants there and then we have our research division which has some statutorily mandated projects that it works on year after year but then also does other best practices, research, and evaluation across the state including with JRI like you'll hear in a few minutes.

The primary program that we're talking about today is justice reinvestment and as I mentioned Oregon's justice reinvestment is about a decade old. It was started by a house bill that was enacted in 2013 but laying the

groundwork for the enactment of that bill in 2013 similar to some of the stats that I saw for the state of Nevada, back in the early 2000's Oregon, its prison population was growing pretty rapidly. It had grown by 50% between 2000 and 2012 and it was topping out when we combined male and female offenders together at around 14,250 at that time. During the same period the Department of Corrections budget, the biannual budget, had grown by over 40% to \$1.3 billion for the 2011-2013 biennium and we knew that at that rate of growth, we were soon going to be faced with some very tough decisions as to how to house those additional individuals. We knew that from a male perspective as can be shown by the chart on the right that by around 2017-2018 we would have to have an entirely new male institution constructed to be able to house those additional individuals and we knew that the female prison population issue was actually little bit more acute. We have a single female institution here in the state and we knew that we would have to bring on you know shuttered institutions from the past to begin to house those female offenders as soon as 2013. So we were faced with this decision -- were we going to build new prisons or are we going to try something else -- and that's when the Legislature in 2013 decided to enact the house bill that created the justice reinvestment program. So, this house bill was HB 3194 and it created JRI and statutorily laid out four goals that we were supposed to follow as we go through the implementation of this program. The first, based on the stats that I just provided on the previous slide, was to reduce prison usage in order to avoid new prison construction but in addition to that we were also to focus on the reductions of recidivism due to the back door you know route that folks can take going back into prison through recidivating events, and we were supposed to do both of these things while protecting public safety but also holding offenders accountable. The bill set up a few ways that we were to do this. Primarily on the sentencing side there were changes to a number of property offenses and other types of offenses; I have those listed out in the little box on the right-hand side. In addition to that, there was we can say reinvigoration of what is known as the short-term transitional leave program in Oregon. It was a program that had existed for many years prior to 3194, but it was a program that really had not been maximized in how it could be used and I could go into more detail there if folks are interested but it's not necessarily directly tied into the grants themselves. Then the main thing that we administer at CJC or the main focus that we are discussing today was the creation of the justice reinvestment grant program which created additional oversight for local agencies but then also infused these local agencies with money to be able to you know assess and then monitor and then hopefully rehabilitate the folks who were experiencing the sentencing changes that we have on the right.

So the initial implementation of the JRI program took place during 2013 to 2015. Originally the legislature provided the commission with \$15 million which you can see has grown since then but our initial \$15 million in funding was provided to the commission and it really was you know an interesting time because you know this was a brand-new grant program. We had the expectation that it was coming in our door, but we really didn't have any infrastructure or program in place that was already built. So that initial biennium while we were planning and while we were implementing that first bucket of money that we had was essentially sent out the door without too many strings or without too much infrastructure built around it. So we were able to take those funds and in the statute of 3194 the main funding mechanism is actually laid out for us which was very helpful and that was that the funding was to be provided to our grantees based on a funding formula and the formula that was used in statute was essentially the same formula that is used for all of our community corrections' funding within the state. So what they do is they actually look at the share of the community corrections' population borne by each county and then that is how the funding is distributed. So for example Multnomah County where Portland is located oftentimes gets the largest if not the largest share across the state and then the other counties based on their community corrections' populations fall in line after those. So we were able to distribute according to the formula but we also at that point didn't really have too much oversight, or not oversight but, so we had some oversight but didn't have too many metrics that we had set up and so there were no formal prison targets; applicants really had to just provide a very basic plan, furnish us with letters of support, and then they were able to get those initial funds. The plan though was to use that intervening two year period however to develop all our program rules that are located in administrative rule and to develop a more structured grant program to be ready for that 2015 to 2017 funding cycle.

Real quick before I get into the notes on how all of that process worked between '13 and' 15, I do just want to note that at times you'll see some asterisks around some of our administrative rules or I'll kind of take a little you know disjuncture there to mention that there are many changes in our program that were not necessarily

initiated by the commission. This is a program that has had a lot of focus on it from our legislative partners here in the state and so over time the legislature has also refined this program and I think it's important to note here because it actually goes to one of our primary takeaways at the end of the presentation, which is that you know as you build this program at least in Oregon given the oversight that we have from the legislature, we always try to build our program or to make changes with our program in light of what we think the legislature might be doing to the program in the future because at times they bring changes down you know essentially upon us that would be better implemented or better written if we had a little bit of say in them. So, it's essentially a decision point as to you know do we try to make the changes and move in one direction or another or do we get told how to do it and so in some instances we've been told and others we've been able to head things off but you know this is little bit of a side note to show that you know sometimes it's a mix of both. So, I'll just mention that we had three different bills that have made changes to the justice reinvestment program over the past few years. The first was in 2017 and this one was a really necessary program change; it was something that really was able to improve the program overall and it was focused on the fact that we saw on one of our first slides the real you know immediate need for reductions in the female prison population. Unfortunately the sentencing changes that were put through in the original iteration of the program were changes that while they had a pretty immediate impact on the male population, they did not target the types of crimes for which our female offenders most commonly go to prison. So that was an oversight essentially in the first iteration and so 3078 in 2017 was an effort to try to right size that female population with a focus on the types of crimes that female offenders commit on the way to prison. It also created a new smaller downward departure grant that we administer so it's another piece of JRI but then it also lengthened that short term transitional leave time even further from 90 to 120 days. Later in 2019, HB 3064 made some adjustments to our grant review committee which we'll talk about in a few slides. It made some refinements to the grant-making process and then it also required us to examine JRI with an equity lens. Then, finally in 2022 based in part off of the examination that we had to conduct on JRI after 2019, the justice reinvestment equity program was created which seeks to fund community-based organizations.

So now we'll get into the nitty gritty a little bit of implementation of JRI. So, the governance structure in JRI is laid out in statute so it's nice sometimes when the legislature at least provides some of the foundation for the work that we do and the process that we utilize flowing from the locals up to the state is that we begin with our Local Public Safety Coordinating Councils. Each county has its own LPSCC and the LPSCC is the place where our local criminal justice stakeholders will set policy for the county and in this case they will also craft the JRI application and submit it to the Criminal Justice Commission. Now ideally most LPSCC's will craft this themselves; oftentimes staff or staff from a certain agency are given that responsibility but the LPSCC itself has to sign off and becomes the applicant to us at the CJC when all applications are submitted. Applications are then reviewed by a statutorily defined grant review committee and that grant review committee does the heavy lifting along with CJC staff. So CJC staff will review all the applications, the committee will meet and review them, and then they will make recommendations up to the Criminal Justice Commission and our nine commissioners will then review the recommendations of the grant review committee and actually make the awards. We have a couple details on the slides that follow but this is the basic process that we employ. So the focus on the LPSCCs for us is very, very important because we know and we've certainly learned over the years that the only way to make JRI successful is to really focus on that state to local partnership. And so you know as this primary body we know or as kind of like the primary focus area for us we know that while we at the state level whether by administrative rule statutorily or just by trying to set policy we kind of create the possibility for criminal justice change and criminal justice savings, but to actually maximize that potential or to realize that potential we really need to focus on the local decision makers because we can pour money out to counties, we can try to create programs in one section of you know in one aspect of a county but unless we have all of the players who are playing along together then it makes things really difficult. So, you know building on that just for a moment, you know we may have a parole and probation department who is fully on board with the goals of JRI, we may have the defense community on board, we may have the judges on board, but if the prosecutor is not willing to actually provide downward departures to clients then the whole process breaks down. You could kind of substitute through any of those different actors, again if the judge isn't on board it's not going to work, if parole and probation is not willing to accept and then work with these clients then certainly the prosecutors are not willing to provide downward departures again so if you don't have

everybody playing in tune, then it's not really going to proceed forward and so we really focus on those local LPSCC's.

But LPSCC's, they really existed before HB 3194 so we had to at the commission find out you know how could we actually leverage this pre-existing group which was highly functional in some counties, highly dysfunctional in some other counties, but then maybe nonexistent in some others. How could we actually utilize these LPSCC's, invigorate them, and get them to work together? One way we were able to do that was through grant funding that would fund local LPSCC coordinators that we received from the federal government; that always helps, money is definitely something that can get things moving. But we also began to try to bring our counties together so we wanted a focus on the local but that also bring them into regional partnerships wherever we could and so CJC one of the things that we utilized were what we call our RIC's, our regional implementation councils. So we have four regional implementation councils across the state. We tried to group counties that were similar to one another both geographically and in size or in history as much as possible. And the whole idea behind the RIC, or each RIC, was that we could first of all having means for disseminating JRI program information as we built up justice reinvestment. These were, we would go to these meetings that were held quarterly in person and we would deliver you know the latest news as you'll see in a little bit. We delivered a lot of data but we wanted to use this as a place where we can effectively message but then also we would have a forum where counties that you know were working with their peers would be able to interact with one another. They could troubleshoot, they could share information, they could see comparisons with each other as to how they were doing on different metrics, and then they could talk about you know and share program successes, ideas, and things like that. So the RIC's really became a central piece to the puzzle at least in the rollout of our justice reinvestment process. So what would we do at the RIC's? Again, we would go to all of these quarterly RIC meetings; we'd sent oftentimes multiple staff. We were much smaller back then so I can almost say the majority of our staff probably went to a many of these and our previous director whether, in his director position or the previous position he had been in before that, he would present state and local data on prison usages, prison usage by crime that would be information on average length of stay, sentence types, and different trends. Essentially and as you'll see some examples of later, he had a PowerPoint that would grow with every single RIC meeting that he went to. It was hundreds upon hundreds of slides because he was trying to anticipate what the local folks would want to know and what to really lay out for them and then would go around from place to place and have these conversations. What was really useful about this was that when our locals began to know how they were using overall state system resources and especially when they began to see those comparisons between how they were using and maybe how their neighbors were using those resources, it made it easier to have discussions about where we could make improvements along the way. We could also talk about data trends and outliers and just other pieces of information that could help bring folks at least to a more common table or a more common understanding of how we were utilizing those prison resources and it was through those repeated meetings, repeated in person attendance, and the relationships you create over those multiple days that we were able to begin to create really true partnerships and obtain buy in, not from everybody but from many of the counties that may have been a little skeptical in the beginning or for many of the folks who just weren't used to interacting with the state.

At the same time, we began to develop our program rules which I mentioned are contained at administrative rule. And as I was going through and digging through old PowerPoints because this does predate me, I was actually able to find the photos of the original whiteboarding that was done to make our program rules. So essentially what began was a brainstorming session on the part of staff and they sat around in our conference room. We had this one single whiteboard so they must have done it one time and then erased it and done some more work after that, but what they set out to do was for every identified issue whether it's recidivism, you know DOC prison usage, or these other goals, they really wanted to ask some questions. They said how can we be specific in what we're going to take from this goal and then bring down to our local partners, how can whatever this goal is or whatever we think it means, how can we make sure that it's measurable, and so how can that measurable goal then bring about accountability and what time periods are we talking about? So this initial brainstorming was done and it was brought together in a preamble which we'll see on the next slide and it was brought before our statutorily created grant review committee, so the grant review committee could then begin to help us craft those rules.

So real briefly, our grant review committee, just so we can think about who those folks were, as I mentioned, this is a statutorily created committee and the idea behind this grant review committee and all of the different grant review committees we utilize at the commission is that we want to have local experts who actually have experience in and are currently working in the systems that we're trying to award grants into so that they can assess their peers and they can help us craft the best awards that we possibly can have. So the original members of this committee back when 3194 was passed was a district attorney, county sheriff, chief of police, county commissioner, a county community corrections director, and then two members of the legislature one from each legislative house. Later on, we had some additional members added; you can see we have a judge that was added but then also some community-based organization reps who are providing services to underrepresented communities both of those were added in 2019 and via HB 3064, but when we're going back in time to the original rule creation of JRI we didn't have those additional members. So, we presented or you know our predecessors presented the brainstorming results to this group of you know sheriff, police chief, D.A, etc. and they were the ones who then began to go through with some of those suggestions to craft the language itself.

So here is the preamble that was essentially created through that work and I won't bore you by reading the entire thing but I will highlight just a couple areas that help us to lay out you know some of the themes that we've seen throughout our rules. One of the themes that we see here is that kind of halfway through it says these funds are not meant as an additional needs-based subsidy to counties. These funds are meant to incentivize innovation and results. This really begins to set you know kind of the tone that we tried to have throughout the program. Which is what we're trying to fund with JRI money are you know the nice to haves, the additions that we're not able to provide through our core or just normal services within community corrections or within other organizations. We're trying to do something above and beyond what we've done in the past but then also you can see that most of this is termed in a relatively positive way you know; these are a bonus paid to counties who demonstrate a willingness to look at their local system critically and do the hard work necessary. We did not include in this preamble some more punitive language which we've seen in other state JRI programs where if you don't meet a certain metric you're cut off or if you're not making this sort of progress continuously then your program eligibility is put at risk. It was very much a let's try to bring everybody along, let's try to bring everyone into our program and hopefully even if we don't make the same impact in every county, we're able to make a positive impact everywhere to a certain extent. So that's one thing that we've seen kind of throughout our program. It's you know brought both good things and maybe less than good things at times as far as our program oversight but that was really the beginning of what we viewed as our approach to grant-making, it can really be found in this old preamble here.

So now we'll go into some of the specifics of the rules for a few minutes before I kick it over to one of my colleagues. So each of these rules I can provide you know a link to these if folks are interested in really pouring through them but I've got the highlights on these next few slides. So of course, like any either statutory scheme or rule-based scheme we wanted to start out with our definitions. Of course, we had definitions of who is the commission, who are the grant review committee members, but at least what was laid out in the beginning that I think is just interesting or good to highlight for folks creating their own rules is that one of the first things we laid out was what was included in our list of appropriate programming. Some of this was tied back to statutory definitions that were provided in 3194 but then also it left us a little bit of room for play as well you know specialty courts could be included, evidence based policing strategies, you know evidence based programming, just you know more in general but then it also did lay out some very specific programming as well to give our grant review committee some guide posts. We also, because recidivism was and continues to be one of our easier to track and therefore most important metrics, recidivism was defined in our rules as well so that we would have a statewide kind of comparable data tracking approach that we could use to compare counties to each other.

Director Gonzalez: What is that definition?

Mr. Sanchagrin: So, the recidivism definition we use is we do look at three different types of recidivism; we both look at arrest, conviction, and imprisonment. For arrest and imprisonment, we look at essentially the commission of a new crime, for convictions we have had different standards of convictions over time but

essentially we're looking at new criminal behavior in addition to the offense that brought them under supervision or brought them into prison.

Mr. Erik Levin: Over what period of time?

Mr. Sanchagrin: I was about to say over a three-year period of time. On our data dashboards we'll provide one-year looks as well because they're highly predictive of three years, but three years is the standard set out in statute. The next set of rules that we have actually lay out the grant application information. As I said, we utilize that funding table that is provided within statute like I said the funding percentages are based off of the utilization of Department of Corrections' resources. But one thing that we have in Oregon that I think is very similar to some of the dynamics that you have in Nevada is that we have some pretty substantial differences in both size but then especially in population across our counties and because of this oftentimes or unsurprisingly you know the criminal justice impact in those smaller counties with very small populations is also very small. So when we look at just the straight up funding formula that's provided to our community corrections offices what that would result in in JRI is that some of our very small population counties may only be entitled to literally a couple tens of thousands of dollars and we know that that amount of money would be insufficient for those counties to actually do anything innovative. So what we set up in rule was that while we have the funding formula that we use for everybody, we ensure that all counties at least receive \$100,000 in funding. Now I mention that we've actually had discussions in the past few years to upping that to \$200,000 in funding because we have heard from our counties in the recent years that it's becoming increasingly difficult to find programming that they can fund for a simple 100k, and that's even just down to the cost of a position across a biennia, you know \$100,000 doesn't go very far. This section also lays out the rules on the grant application itself as I mentioned there's only one application that can be submitted per county; it must be submitted by the local LPSCC. Each application must be accompanied by statements commitment from the local stakeholders. So those ones, that I mentioned earlier that you have to have brought along and have committed to the program, DA, presiding judge, community corrections, they all need to sign on and to actually commit to the goals of justice reinvestment. Each county is limited to only 10% administrative cost. Then there are a couple different pieces that really focus on the process and then what we would, what we can, do depending on how awards are made so there's a 90-day award notification that's put into that process but then also we have rules that enable us at CJC to run supplemental grant awards because at times, and it's only happened you know very seldomly but at times, maybe not all counties will apply for justice reinvestment funding so we have that leftover money from the formula that will need to be doled out in some way and so this permits the commission to choose a couple different routes or from a couple different routes to make those awards or sometimes there's underspending throughout the biennium you know through the best efforts to plan to spend one way but you don't spend all of your money and we'll know that we have money left over at the end of the biennium that we either have to send back to the state coffers or we can try to award out to the counties if we know that that's happening. That was something that was especially acute through COVID you know hiring, maintaining some of these things through COVID was very, very difficult and so we would oftentimes have to do supplementals for our programs.

The next section of the rules deals with our grant review committee criteria. The primary assessment of applicants focuses on our four goals of justice reinvestment but what we did here was we did try to refine things a little bit. We created essentially an umbrella of what we call JRI crimes because we knew that when we talk about the types of crimes that are the ones that should be or probably are the easiest to have eligible for downward departures or other types of you know community supervision as opposed to imprisonment those usually are the crimes that fall outside person crimes or violent crimes. So JRI crimes were defined as property, drug, and driving crimes and we laid that out in our rules there. Then we decided we would look at an applicant's historical prison usage but then also what are their current proposals, how are they going to be looking forward and Kelly will be talking a lot more about that when she begins her section in a few minutes. The other goals are looked at prospectively not necessarily retroactively. It's difficult at times to measure what does it exactly mean to say that this county is protecting public safety or is holding offenders accountable. These are little bit more qualitative in nature and so we try to permit our applicants to look at it from that point of view as opposed to the prison usage which is something that's really easy to track. The grant application also has to utilize funding for victim services; there is a 10% floor so that all applicants for all programs have to spend at least 10% of their formula allocation on victim services. That's based on the premise that as we have

more individuals who are serving their sentences in the community there may be greater needs on the part of those victims who have those offenders you know possibly in the community with them.

As far as processing our applications, the CJC staff bears the brunt of that work. They perform an initial assessment of those applications. If they find that applications are deficient in one way or another, then it's their responsibility to reach out to applicants to try to remedy those deficiencies before they go before the grant review committee. The grant review committee itself, once it receives those recommendations and reviews those applications themselves, they may approve or reject portions of the applications in practice that more is a focus on programmatic votes up and down, you know, does this program meet the goals and do we think it's something that's going to continue to meet the goals going forward or does it not? Rarely or really never we've seen an entire application that is so deficient that the entire thing would not meet the standards that we set. The grant review committee is also empowered with the ability to create what we call provisional funding plans that would be the equivalent of placing an applicant on probation so a provisional funding plan funds that applicant for the first year of justice reinvestment funding with their second-year funding allocated but held back and that second-year funding is then contingent on meeting goals set by the GRC or set by the commission. When I say it's allocated, we still have that money earmarked so hopefully when they meet those goals, that money is unlocked for them but if the money was not unlocked it would go back into one of those supplemental funding rounds that we could have. Now I will mention that there was statutory changes that came about in 2019 that kind of forced our hand a little bit with our rules here. In this one is maybe an example of what I mentioned very briefly when I was talking about statutory changes earlier that sometimes they can be useful, sometimes they're a little bit less than useful, the types of things that we get so the process that was brought about in 2019 did create some administrative challenges for us because of the relationship it was created between the GRC and our commission. I could go into more detail but I think I'll keep moving for the moment but it is just to illustrate that again sometimes having your rules really set out very nicely and well in the beginning could prevent this type of statutory changes that can then bring little hiccups because as we know, you know, folks who are operating at the much higher level in the Legislature oftentimes they don't know all the nuances of how these programs work and so some of the changes they make may have unexpected consequences.

So the last couple sets of rules, we have our supplemental grant period information so those unallocated funds remain at the end of the grant period or become available through underspending as I mentioned midway through the grant cycle then we can make the supplemental awards. The commission has the power to either expand the scope of an existing award without the need for new solicitation; that's happened once, and it was one where it's a nice opportunity for the commission to maybe either make a county whole if they made an application, but we couldn't fund their entire application or to be creative essentially. The other route is the one that we take much more often and it's more formal so the commission and our staff will actually issue a supplemental grant solicitation. It may have the same goals or the same kind of approach as our initial solicitation but it's more formal in that it would require formal applications again from the LPSCC that would go through our GRC and then progress up to our commission.

To evaluate the efficacy of our program, we asked for data to be submitted quarterly from our grantees. We rely on this type of data probably less often than we might have in the very beginning of our program as our program and our agency have matured over time. We usually rely mostly on the administrative data that we get from the Department of Corrections or our court system or elsewhere as opposed to grantee-reported data but we still rely on narrative information and other types of reports from our grantees that come in quarterly. What we really focus on is if a county is not achieving the criteria that are set forward then we can give them an opportunity to improve their performance but if they don't then they could be terminated from the program, but I will note that's something that we have not done over the history of JRI. When we had counties that we could say needed some rehabilitation themselves, that has almost always been done through the provision process not through a mid-biennium termination of the grant agreement. One of the last things that I'll mention as well is that as far as evaluations are concerned there was also a rule that we put in place that 3% of program funds would be earmarked for evaluations of one type or another. So, the way that this was set up was that in that funding table what a county would see is they would see their overall allocation. There would be the 10% that has to be devoted to victim services so they can see you know what amount they would need to apply there, but then there is a research fund that the county can if they have a plan of their own can retain, and then they

can either hire or utilize their own staff through those funds to conduct research on justice reinvestment programs. However, again, a lot of our small counties don't have the staff capacity to do that work or their 3% of their award may be too small to engage like with a local university for example so in many cases that money is remitted back to CJC and we leverage that money together to then hire a university or to hire other consultants to do justice reinvestment evaluative work. Now I'll turn it over to Kelly. One of the nice things about Kelly is that she is our one staff person who has been around through the entire implementation of JRI so her encyclopedic knowledge is always very useful in this area so feel free to ask her questions on some of the things that I wasn't around for. I'll turn it over to her and Kelly I'll keep running the slide decks so just let me know when you want me to go from slide to slide.

Ms. Kelly Officer: Great, thank you Ken. Hello everybody. Yes I was around when we were getting this up and running off the ground and it has changed quite a bit as it's evolved. So evaluating and assessing JRI or how can we tell if we're meeting the goals of JRI using actual data. So Ken describes the four goals I've got listed here again. Prison use and recidivism we can measure those and slice and dice those in different ways in public safety and holding offenders accountable little harder to measure but still very important components of the program. There was a little interest in recidivism so I'm glad I have this chart here just as an example of, this is the state level recidivism chart for folks on probation in the state so as Ken mentioned the original bill did kind of create a statewide definition of recidivism. We actually did a lot of work to figure out how to measure and compile that definition and we do provide the data at the county level to the grant review committee. So here's just an example of a recidivism chart to show those rates over time. Most of this presentation is going to focus on the prison use information but you know all four goals are very important. The prison usage does get the most attention I would say. That's really how the program is funded over time is by avoiding the prison growth, so it does get a little more attention, but you know recidivism is also looked at by the GRC and is also a pretty important component. So then of course also for each of these measures were looking at it at the state level, is JRI meeting its goals statewide? We can break out at the county level and then some demographic breakouts have been added along the way too as we realized it was really important to look at that information as well. So we're going to start with state-level prison use. So, this is just a chart of the male prison population in Oregon so the red line is the capacity at which the new facility would need to be constructed for the male prison population so you can see it's right about mid-2017 was spending lots of money to build a new facility. So, this green line here is the forecast before the bill passed of the male prison population. So this is what the male population actually did and we have used these charts for 10 years and we're going to keep using them. I think Ken's got a presentation coming up where he's going to be showing this. You know at the state level, did JRI avoid constructing a new prison and avoid new prison growth? Yes, it did. And this slide you know shows that in a pretty nice visual of the line chart and just those population capacity numbers there. You can see that the male population did increase for a bit in about 2018 and I think the Department of Corrections was you know struggling with some temporary emergency beds at that time so that you know has been some times when things have been a little more challenging, but it did in fact meet the goals. Now this line stops in March 2020, I'm sure you all know why so we'll go ahead, Covid hits and this is our reality today. Now you know that makes a little challenge to look at some of our historical prison measures over time, but we'll show you some county-level examples here coming up. You know it's; these trends look different at the county level so we're still using this historical prison information to look at whether counties are meeting the goals of justice reinvestment as well. And then this next blue line here is the latest prison forecast. So, this is came out in October 2022, so this is the forecast of the male population of Oregon over the next 10 years. So well below that red line and so not anticipating any new prison capacity needs for the male prison population here. I will just mention too that the prison forecast is done in April and October every year and actually a separate organization in Oregon does that forecast. Ken's on the advisory committee for that so it is nice to have another group doing the actual forecast and then we, CJC, can build it in to the visuals and the measures here to see how things are going in terms of state-level prison population.

So we'll go to the next slide, this is the female population and so this is you know Ken showed a pretty similar chart to this previously. When the bill first passed a lot of the effort was on the overall prison population and the male population. Now the female population was not going to need additional prison construction but was going to need to open a currently closed facility so that's that red line there. 1,280 women is that red line and I know that number very, very well. So that was really the capacity of the one facility in Oregon that was the

capacity that that facility had 1280 and so anything above that the Department of Corrections would need to open a closed facility which is not as expensive as building a new one but still a pretty substantial investment in additional prison capacity. So you can see that black line of what actually happened in mid-2017; it was above the line. Now you can see I think it peaked at about 1,315 so over by 40 you know it's like, are we really going to spend all this money to open a new facility because of 40 extra women in the prison population? Really we're having some very tough conversations at the time about that reality that was faced. So as Ken mentioned that house bill that was passed in 2017 and then from there the female population did drop. I think too when the bill first passed in 2017 a lot of folks just assumed, hey we have these sentencing changes if it works for the overall population, if it works for men, it should work for women. Well the first couple years it didn't actually work all that well for women, those populations are quite different probably both in terms of the programming but also in terms of the types of convictions and sentences for certain convictions that came through as well. So then we'll see what happens when Covid hits. For women again a substantial drop here in the female population and then the most recent forecast does show some growth as the system kind of recovers from Covid but still well below that 1280 line so again not needing additional prison capacity for the female population as well, so these two charts are really, we show these a lot to show the impact of for JRI state-level prison use.

So next we'll look at some county-level prison use and so I actually found an old RIC and you can see here it's from probably in the fall of 2015 and like Ken said it was really long PowerPoint with lots and lots of bar charts and I look at this now and I think, oh my gosh why did we do it that way? It doesn't look that great but at the time it was very effective and so in the RIC meetings along with talking about the programs that are getting up and running and the updates, we also talked a lot about data which was great. Everybody was in the room. We could all, everybody could their questions answered about it. We could kind of try to understand why things looked good in one county and not so great in another county and those really were very valuable meetings and actually using data to drive some of those conversations as well. The reason the PowerPoint was so long was that we were looking at intake trends, length of stay trends, and then a combined measure of total prison month trends, changes over time for a particular county, comparing the counties to each other, other important measures. We had some short term trans leave measures in there so they did get to be quite long PowerPoint so I'm just going to give you a little preview of those for today but those did really, I mean they grew over time but they also, changed over time as we figured out what was really most helpful and kind of most important to look at. So this particular slide shows property intakes over a one-year period. These are the five largest counties. This was the Metro RIC so the Metro counties and then you know we have it broken into these two kind of important criteria. So there on the left-hand side is what we call first sentences so those are folks that receive a prison sentence right as a court case is disposed versus those that get a chance on supervision, a chance in the community and are unsuccessful, and then are then revoked to prison, and so we really want to track both of those separately to kind of see what is driving those. And you know we said, hey y'all are the five largest counties this is the Metro RIC; we're going to put you all right next to each other see what it looks like here. So Multnomah is by far the largest county so that's quite what we would expect to see. Marion and Lane are not too far behind and they're smaller counties compared to Multnomah so that led to some of those conversations about you know what's working and what's not; why does it look like that? Those two counties, Marion and Lane, they really had kind of a, at the time, a prison usage that was leaning on the high side and they really did a lot of work to get the program up and running and to keep a close eye on the data to improve things over time. So, you can see here that the prison intakes are not too far behind Multnomah. They also had a higher average length of stay for property crimes that were sentenced to prison.

So, let's go to the next slide. When you looked at the total prison months that were sentenced over the one-year time period, they were higher than Multnomah, so you know a couple counties that are smaller in overall population size have a higher prison use than the largest county in the state so that really created some digging into the data and kind of digging into these measures. Now the programs in those counties were actually pretty good. They had really done a lot of work to get programs up and running but what they were able to do was to increase the capacity for those and really work to improve these measures which they were able to do so. That was a good success for those counties specifically. So here this measure is looking at overall prison month sentence in a particular timeframe so we're combining intakes and length of stay which is really helpful and important because we see different trends for the counties across those measures and then,

as Ken mentioned as well, in our rules and then also the process of working through the RIC meetings, these prison measures are specific to property, drug, and driving offenses. So, on the data side we actually did quite a bit of work to create a process where you know if somebody has a violent crime say an assault and a theft that's not counted and your assault is the more serious offense. That counts as a person crime with the prison sentence and it's not included in this measure. So kind of figuring out what's the most serious, which county is it going to count for, all of that did take a good amount of work and we actually did in the beginning, we would actually just send the list. We'd say, okay we're showing you know 30 prison intakes over these four months. Here are those exact case numbers, here's the crimes, here's the length of stay, let us know if you see anything that doesn't look right here and so that really helped too. Some counties went through those line by line; I think one to check up on what was being done but also to inform their conversations just kind of say, hey this person went to a facility, went to a state facility, they were there for eight months, and then came back to the community, right? With a more robust program, could that person have stayed locally? And so I think that helped to kind of inform some of those conversations as the programs were getting up and running as well, to help build those programs and help make the hard decisions about who to give a shot at those particular programs and have a chance to stay locally so it was a change at that time. So, the baseline so we looked at the prison month over time there and so then we got to, okay well so then what, what are we comparing it to? So again, through the process of those RIC meetings we created the baseline measure which is the black bar here this chart. So we looked at a three year average from July 2012 to June 2015 of prison use for property, drug, and driving crimes and made that a one-year average and said, okay here's your baseline, here's what we're going to compare you to. Now justice reinvestment started in about mid-2013 so there was a period in that timeframe before justice reinvestment even was up and running, before the sentencing changes occurred and then sometime after that for the sentencing changes to come online and the programs to come online too then also the three-year average to give a little stability over that time period. So, then we were able to transition to say, okay we're going to compare each county, were going to compare you to yourself, what you've done historically, and see what that looks like. So again here's the five largest counties. The black line is the baseline measure for that county and then we have okay, what actually happened over the last year and how does that look? So, you can see Marion there's just a little bit above the baseline, Lane is just a little bit below, and then Multnomah shows a more dramatic drop compared to the baseline. So then every quarter we would update this and show it to the counties. Now some of the you know medium and smaller counties, their comparison to their baseline will really swing quite a bit as you might be expected; lower counts lower things happening. So then from there we started to look at this measure over time to see any changes happening there, also did a rolling sum to smooth it out. Also at about that time, we were able to start building dashboards. So this was not easy you know, we had staff person that was able to really do the deep dive into this. We were able to get software, called Tableau; there are other options as well, and so we started building dashboards, and so instead of a PowerPoint that's 100 slides long with lots and lots of bar charts, we have everything on the dashboard so folks can go to it from any website, check it out, everything is updated, everybody can see all the same measures, and so that became the substitute for the really long PowerPoint presentation. So what I would really like to do is show you the dashboard. Okay so this is our justice reinvestment prison use dashboard. It's gone through several iterations, and this is the newest one so we've taken a few different approaches to how to present this information. So we start at state level and so we have this redline, that's the baseline, that's that three-year average measure, and then below that is the prison use overtime and this is at the state level. So this is another way of showing the impact of the state-level prison use over time. Now this is not the prison population; this is the amount of prison months sentenced in these one-month time periods shown over the time period. So you know you can see the justice reinvestment started in 2013 and then there are, with a few variations, it's you know a gradual decline in the prison usage numbers. You can see the big drop there with Covid in 2020. Then looking over here on the right-hand side, it'll break these apart so that we can get a sense of what's driving it. So here on the bottom right it gives the actual prison intakes over time so you can see, hey is it a prison intake measure that's really driving it or this dot chart here gives the distribution of the length of stay. So you can see in 2015, 2016 some pretty high sentences coming through. They're both some outliers but then also just some in that 100 to 200-month range where the average is closer to 30 months and we can see the changes in sentence length over time as well and again this is specifically for property, drug, and driving crimes. So, I'm going to go ahead. I talked about Marion; Marion was not looking so good in about 2014, 2015 so they were above the baseline at that time and actually had close to

the you know they had a higher prison use than the largest county in the state and maybe got some pressure there, but again they expanded the capacity of that program and there's no denying the drop in that prison measure there over that time period. Then again you can see there in about mid-2018 it does start to peak up. Some folks were not successful in the program and were revoked to prison and so you do see it come up, but still well below the baseline that occurred there. So they were able to expand the capacity in that program and really focus on the treatment and accountability components and reduce their prison use while also keeping the other measures in a good place. So kind of looking here at the right, a lot of that was due to a drop in prison intakes is what really drove the difference there for Marion County. I'm going to go ahead and show another county. This is Jackson County down in southern Oregon; it's actually the sixth largest county in the state and so you can see they had some pretty steady growth over several years compared to the historical baseline that occurred, really peaking in April 2020 and so you know when Jackson County would apply to the grant review committee for justice reinvestment funds I had to do a lot of work to why does it look like this. Now they're not you know automatically denied, nothing like that, but they had to do the work to explain what was happening here and what this was looking like and then we CJC would do some actual work, some extra breakouts as well, to show from the data really what was driving some of this growth as well. So, then you can see the big drop for Jackson when Covid hits now kind of holding steady, still above the baseline but not as much as previously, holding steady there. Then I want to show one other County which is Crook County. My parents are actually residents of Crook County but that's not why I picked them. I picked them because it's a little smaller county here so you can see the scale here changes, right? Crook County population close to 25,000 folks so really kind of getting to be a smaller county and so you can see where the baseline is some ups and downs and that about mid-2018 to mid-2019 a pretty substantial increase in prison use at that time. So, we can see here that that's partly from prison intakes increasing at that time and then partly from the length of stay increasing at that time. Crook County did not have a drop when Covid hit. In fact, they had a little bit more of an increase kind of peaking in mid-2021 but then since 2021 have dropped dramatically down again, close to the baseline. So, this is all the information that our grant review committee gets to look through every time they meet too, and this helps to inform the decisions that they make from the data side along with the information that's in the application, and the information about the programs. Okay, thank you, I really wanted to show off the dashboards there for a few minutes. Thanks everyone.

Mr. Ryan Keck: That makes it my turn, everybody Ryan Keck, the programs director here at CJC. So what that means, I oversee the administration of all our grant programs to include justice reinvestment. I just got a couple slides to kind of talk you through maybe the how. How do we administer these grants and really to continue with the storytelling of the evolutions and the changes that we've made. I'm going to go back to something Ken said a little earlier about you know JRI's success is local and with that kind of understanding that we're really in a position to just create the conditions for the success. It does inherently require us to then be very communicative and adaptive in order to see that through. There's many of us that are on the call that have grant experience either as a receiver or administrator. There's the typical process that can be very cold, I'll use that descriptor. There's an application, there's an award, and there's monitoring. You get into the supply and comply model that doesn't have to have a relationship but that's not how CJC's approached it over the 10 years and it's not how we operate today in making sure that some of these results and these efforts that have been described by both Ken and Kelly continue and or improve. So that's where you see the yellow arrows here to say that these three components of grant-making really do connect together so that through a grant cycle and each grant cycle then each biennium that we've experienced, we're constantly improving both the efforts made at the county level but our own efforts as well. And the feedback that comes through each of those steps if you will or stages but also each cycle really help us in how we continue to provide flexibility at the county level but overall success. And so where we're at today, we've got that model maybe baked into how we work in each of these slices of pie on your screen. We have a two-stage interactive application process where we try to make it meaningful for the applicants, the counties, to evaluate what's going on within their local jurisdiction and then make the appropriate request to continue to work on those outcomes. Our award process has a tiered analysis where we'll use some of the data and the dashboards that Kelly just shared with you coupled with then your traditional GRC or committee stakeholder expertise to really prioritize the funding and/or support improvement in key areas. Then compliance or monitoring is more than just that for us; it's not just are you spending your money and are you meeting your goals but a lot of regular relationship building and interaction so that again the counties can grow and innovate just as much as we can within our own grant

program. So, diving into the application, so we currently have an application period that extends five months but there's an intermediate and a final deadline in that process. This was born out of some of the feedback out of an evaluation we did as it relates to equity but we found that there are benefits beyond just you know the specific intention of say that evaluation in doing so and as we've worked this process we continue to kind of find the happy medium of where this broader period can be utilized but I'll talk about that a little bit more in a second. In general, you've got an application but it's broken out where questions are asked on the front end and then we create an opportunity where the GRC, the review committee comes together to review their proposal and provide feedback before it's a final submission. So rather than just giving it one shot, what used to be in a two month period of time at the county level, to bring all of their local coordinating council partners together, come up with what they need to do and want to do, plug it into an application that was growing in terms of length and expectation over time with new criteria, and then cross your fingers and hope for the best as that committee meets together and decides the fate. This process that we're in now kind of again intersects an intermediate piece where that grant review committee can review and determine how they're doing in progress, looking at dashboards and other sources of information, look at how they've worked on things previously discussed, and then provide the feedback to the counties or via CJC to the counties on what they'd like to see. And that can kind of zero in on a couple of different areas that we try to tease out through the application of course what programs are they looking to fund, what goals have they set for themselves, and how do they measure it? Again the responsiveness to the dashboards and the data that we're monitoring in a statewide and county level, but also things like the statements of commitments and levels of supporter collaboration at the county level. Maybe the GRC picks up on a missing piece, the DA's not as involved as intended or perhaps there's maybe not enough community voice expressed in the process. The grant review committee can look at and identify some of those areas and provide that feedback again before a final submission is made. The statements of commitment, I want to add to that just a little bit. Ken mentioned through the rules the different types of collaboration or requirements that are in place; it is twofold. There are letters of support that we ask for that demonstrate the level of collaboration at the local level and then there are these statements of commitment that were included by way of statute that ask for explicit commitment to the goals of JRI. So again it's become in some ways a measure of effort at the county level that the grant review committee can respond to or provide feedback on. As I mentioned the mid-process or the mid-review, I'm sorry mid-process review, really does kind of bring the counties in. It becomes a conversation of the GRC level but then it opens up more conversation between staff and the county to really work through what is meant, what resource is available, and again with time build out an effort to meet those expectations. The initial intent of creating a longer period was to foster greater inclusion but we found that time as I mentioned allows for greater collaboration as well just throughout the county assuming they use that time and we've seen them doing so. It's opened our eyes and I think the county's eyes to just how much work can go into or needs to go into some of these efforts to collaborate. Again giving them the time allows them to at least start putting action plans in place and there's a couple ways in which we try to encourage that. Ken mentioned similar work that's been done to support LPSCC's and their coordination but more recently there's been focus on inclusion and equity and we've tried to open up opportunities and provide resources how to start doing or building county-level equity plans or even within say the community corrections' program, how to look at bringing invoice or looking to understand or even identify additional resources in the community that can be utilized and folded into the application. The word process, I want to kind of use a depiction here that if you think of that dashboards that Kelly shared with you and in some of the data that's been talked about here, we bring that to the Grant Review Committee initially during that mid-process review but primarily during that final process review in a package of buckets and those buckets are determined by triage tool that was built using two of these measures kind of to create this matrix. So if you think of the baselines as she mentioned how close they are above or below the baseline, on the X-axis going left to right, and then also the difference in their prison usage kind of over from the previous year on the Y-axis, axis up and down, we end up with these four kind of areas of the matrix that we can see how counties are doing as it relates to prison usage. What the grant review committee does each cycle before making final observations is decide how they'd like to analyze the counties that fall in any one of these four core quadrants. So down in the bottom left you'll see the green quadrant, these are counties that are doing well as it relates to these two measures; they've landed there as it relates to prison usage. The Grant Review Committee can decide then, of the listed types of analyzes you see on the screen, which ones they want to focus in on or apply to those counties you know or to what extent as opposed to say either of the

groups in the yellowish two quadrants where at least one of these measures is not quite where it's intended or where the goal has been set so maybe they need a little bit of the little more information. The GRC wants analysis from the staff that explains more factors as it relates to their performance with prison use and then as you see in the top right quadrant would be kind of marked with the red and the reddish orange it's where we tend to focus more of a deeper dive where maybe all of those analyses are provided or there's some kind of targeting questions that are sought by, for the county to answer and/or for staff to provide additional data analysis to explain before the grant review committee makes its decision. The cycle that we we're in, the last time we went through this process just to give you little bit of bearing, what the grant review committee decided is that in the green quadrant they really just wanted to make sure that the application still met all the eligibility requirements so it was that qualitative review, are they still doing the work that this program is intended to support and they did maintain a focus on efforts towards equity and/or the provision of culturally responsive services but that was it. The staff's analysis didn't have to go any further than what was already done by this triaging as it related to the prison usage. Whereas again in the other quadrants, they started adding to and looking for a little bit more deeper levels of explanation to make their decision around funding. Another piece of communication that is folded in here is that both the mid-review as well as the final review, the applicants are invited to attend. We ask that a representative be there on hand to answer questions at the request of the GRC and provide clarity when necessary. Staff can do their best and even at the deepest dive analyze the information provided to them or available to explain the application or the county's dynamic but sometimes you just need to hear it from them. So we do include them in that process and ask for them to be available so we can have them explain their application, their intent, their goals, or their measures. You know lastly I just want to tag on the point that Ken brought up about provisional funding because it is a strong motivator. We did have several counties in this last cycle who were put on provisional status and again it provides an opportunity to be direct with the feedback. It doesn't just cut you off and say, sorry no money to you. It allows the grant review committee to say, you know you've got a chance and so here's where we'd like you to focus and in the last round there were a number of different ways in which they asked for counties to show improvement over that first year of the grant cycle. Some are related to their inclusive practices and hearing voices from underserved communities in their jurisdiction. There was some directed feedback related to say the level in which the DA is involved in the program or other measures that, steps that they could take as well as then in some cases it was just directly related to maybe the performance on prison usage. What they made perspective, they had you know predicted that they were going to see improvement and set a goal to bring their numbers to a particular point, will they or won't they, you know there was feedback and direction given in that regard as well.

Like I mentioned, and I'll be brief, I look good on the time. Monitoring is like I said meant to be in relationship and through our eyes not just compliance and so we do a number of different things. We don't do the RIC's as it was described earlier and what it took to get this program off the ground but we do still try to stay in regular communication. We have a monthly roundtable meeting where we invite any and all parties related to the local coordinating councils and the partners involved to hear about not just what CJC is maybe working on say like new dashboards etc. but also showcase different programs and work that's going on in different counties as well as bringing educational presentations on new ideas and other opportunities. Of course there's regular reporting that is provided to us with the expenditures as well as performance but again it's these opportunities to communicate and engage so we do site visits regularly where we visited the different corners of the state to see and experience the programs for ourselves, hear from the grantees as to what factors are impacting their work. That can be very helpful in future grant cycles or in mid-grant cycle reviews to understand why the numbers look the way that they do, if there's a particular issue goes a long way to have an explanation in advance versus get an application or look at some data on the dashboard and then start to scratch your head or speculate. Then we are always available to provide local presentations so that we can help say the community corrections agency explain to or share with their local partners what's going on. Supplemental funding, I'll just add that Ken explained of course how that might come to be but one of the things we've used our grant review committee for is also help us prioritize how we might utilize it. So for example, this past grant cycle with the increased, our increased interest in counties making efforts towards equity and inclusion and recognizing that that's a challenge or some counties are still learning the best way in which to approach that in their jurisdiction, we focus one particular supplemental funding on exactly that building capacity to develop an equity plan. So instead of just skipping right to, you need to have an equity plan, tell us what it is or it affects

you, you know there may be consequences, we tried to lay a foundation for how they might get there in building partnerships, utilizing technical assistance, and then developing their plan moving forward.

So in a nutshell and you have these slides but I'll tell you some of the things we've learned and I think are working is these realistic expectations, meeting the counties where they're at. To include from a purely grant administrator perspective, recognizing they're not grant-writing experts, very few of our counties have that kind of expertise or capacity on hand, so again creating the time, affording them the support really has helped the relationship stay intact and help see the programs improve over time. The access to data and the visualization components to the dashboard again promote that performance accountability at the local level but they also make the grant review process go much quicker. The data is already there, kind of slick and easy way to look at it and respond to it through grant reporting or in an application process and also for the grant review committee to conduct their analysis. Then the dedicated staff is the key component. We've been fortunate to have staff assigned to do this work as well as build collaboration within the organization you know research staff and our program staff that really help broaden their own capacity to do not only the work of grant making and analysis but again to be able to reach out and build relationships that go beyond your traditional apply and comply model but we're not done. We are still conducting focus groups to build and understand more efficiencies and continued work on this so that it's a process that people want to engage in. We worry and at risk of some counties not saying that the money is worth it for them at this especially smaller chunks if the work is too hard in just applying and then working on more data tools and collaborative conversations around cultural responsiveness and just continuing to find the right resources to help promote the implementation. Maybe narrowing those guideposts or brightening them is another analogy you might use on the types of programs counties can be putting in place to achieve the goals of the program. That's it for me, I'll turn it back to you Ken.

Mr. Sanchagrin: Thanks Ryan, I did prepare a couple of slides with conclusions and take aways that showed some of the success that we've had. Those are pretty straight forward so I want to be respectful of everyone's time now that we've reached three o'clock hour and so I'm just going to stop sharing but if you have any questions on those, we also have our contact information on the final slide. So we'd like to thank you all for listening today. I know it was a long presentation but we'd be happy to take any questions either now or just feel free to reach out to us. Thank you for having us.

Chair Pruyt: Thank you so much for your presentation and all the information you provided us. That's a lot of information and I am actually very grateful for that as we have actually spent some time talking about the framework that we need and kind of grasping at where we're going to find a framework in order to effectively make our decisions; you have provided us with a great deal of information. So thank you very much, at this time I'd like to open it up to the group for any questions to any one of our presenters that they may have regarding what was presented today. I don't see any hands up or unmuted microphones. Go ahead Director.

Director Gonzalez: I have a couple if you don't mind? I have a lot, but I won't bog us down. So, my understanding was that you had an upfront appropriation to get all of this going, is it an ongoing funding that the state provides for the grant?

Mr. Sanchagrin: The simple answer is yes. I won't go into too much detail but we did have the initial funding infusion but there was a substantial amount of doubt, consternation, and worry about the next years' funding. There was one nugget that was buried pretty deeply in Ryan's discussion; it said, summits that we host at times. So we actually began to host justice reinvestment summits during each of our long sessions to remind legislators of the success of the program, of the progress we were making, because the funding did feel a bit tenuous in the beginning. The last few biennia it has been much more stable. It grows with current service level; it is baked into our budget but then actually this moment in time like I said justice reinvestment is 10 years old. Technically it was set as a pilot program in a sense that was going to sunset after a decade and so we're having funding discussions now. We're very excited that our new governor actually is proposing the increase in justice reinvestment dollars that just came out literally two days ago. So we're excited to have that support but it was something we had to fight for and it took all of those local partners and all of the interested parties coming to the legislature and talking about the good things we were doing. So it's not been something where we've been able to just lay back after implementation and watch the funding roll in.

Director Gonzalez: That's really helpful thank you. And then Chair if you don't mind, I have two more questions. Okay so and then you said you have your two, I can't remember if you called them divisions or sections of the programs and research and programs does the grants. How many staff do you have because you were talking about the support that staff provides in helping with applications and reviewing them? So how many staff do you have dedicated to the program section or division?

Mr. Sanchagrin: Well that's a little bit of a complicated question in that you know like I said we have about 27 staff across the agency. I'd say about seven of us are more in that kind of operations kind of just keeping the agency going then it's about half and half in between our two divisions. We've had different models over the years. For a little while we had a few dedicated staff that were only dedicated to JRI, we had our JRI program manager and then we also had another individual that worked, who essentially worked with him that was Ross that you mentioned earlier. Now we have kind of reconceptualized that division a bit to where we have teams and much more sharing across grant programs, across our entire team, and so we could say that we would usually have had maybe you the equivalent of about three dedicated staff maybe four if you included researcher just to JRI but now it's a little bit more of a team effort. Kelly is certainly from the research end been involved from just her first day at CJC all the way through to now she that she is the director of that division working on JRI so we've always had that dedicated research support too.

Director Gonzalez: No and this stuff like I agree it is complicated when you've got all these, the data and then the support and then our entities when you get into policy it all gets very muddy so thank you. And then the funding that you're getting ongoing, is that from the state general fund?

Mr. Sanchagrin: Yes, that is for this grant program; it is all state general fund dollars.

Director Gonzalez: Okay, yeah I just wanted to echo what the Chair said I just really appreciate this. I've got tons of ideas now and excited to get back to the Chair and come back to the Council next time with they're going to see inspired from this presentation absolutely so I just want to echo the Chair's comments.

Mr. Sanchagrin: Yeah, thank you very much. We'd be happy Victoria to talk also kind of like shop talk you know and we could do that as well whenever you'd like.

Mr. Erik Levin: Last one. Do you have the data comparing your recidivism metrics versus your reduction in prison hours?

Ms. Officer: I could go ahead and take that one. Yeah I mean we usually keep them separate but sure we could kind of line them up you know on the same. I think that the challenge with recidivism has been you know prison use we're a little more confident saying, hey the program has done this particular thing and then we see that change in the prison use information. On the recidivism component it's not quite so clear right? Your group of probationers is this big, your group of folks in your JRI program is this big, and so what was the impact specifically of JRI on recidivism? That one can be a little harder question to answer right, especially if you're focusing your program on higher risk, higher need folks, they're going to have a little higher recidivism rate and so kind of tying those directly hasn't been quite as easy but you know they're both line charts we could line them up on the same chart I think just the interpretation, what to pull from it, would be a little bit of a challenging piece. We didn't talk too much about recidivism also but Covid has really made those rates drop pretty substantially and so it'd be even harder right now too with that kind of extra wrinkle.

Mr. Levin: Okay thanks.

Chair Pruyt: I actually had another question from you. You had mentioned some of the information you had about definitions and rules and guidelines forms; would you be willing to send us a lot of the forms that you've used, the definitions that you've used, and the guidelines you have as far as the grants go -- the definitions all those things so that we can at least have a benchmark in which to decide do we want to go this route do we not want to -- so that we're not missing what we don't know.

Mr. Sanchagrin: Yes, we can provide yeah our solicitation materials we've been working on a revised grant you know like a grant administration manual; we can send all those resources to you all and you dive in as deeply as you'd like and like I said feel free to ask us any questions follow up.

Chair Pruyt: Any other question or comments? All right, I think we don't have any other questions or comments this time. Again, thank you all so much for the presentation. This was absolutely fantastic, and we're excited to take what we've learned and we're definitely going to be addressing some things at our next meeting. That will bring section five of our meeting to a close and that will take us to section six.

6. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Pruyt: Item 6 is the future dates of our next meetings. The dates for the meetings for the rest of the year are provided in the agenda. Our next meeting will be May 10, 2023, at 1:30 PM then we will meet again on August 2, 2023, at 1:30 PM and ultimately November 1, 2023, at 1:30 PM. As always staff is continuing to work on topics and based upon the presentation we have here I expect a lot of things that we'll be discussing at our next meeting regarding guidelines and where we're going to go and what we want to accomplish but as always if you have topics you would like to have discussed or presentations that you would like to have before this body please let us know at any time by contacting Director Gonzalez or myself by email, by phone, whatever manner is the easiest to get there, and we will make sure to address those items before this group. So at this point I will ask the group as I generally do if anyone has any specific items that they know of right now that they would like addressed at our next meetings. All right, I see no hands up and everybody's still muted so I think that will close out agenda item six.

7. Public Comment

Chair Pruyt: That will take us on to our last period of public comment. Just as we did during the first period of public comment, those who wish to do so might testify by telephone; due to the time constraints that we have, public comment is limited to two minutes per person. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit their testimony in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@NDSP.nv.gov. At this time, I will ask staff to manage any of those persons who wish to testify. Mr. Sepulveda.

Mr. Sepulveda: Thank you Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone press star nine to raise your hand. When it's your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name. We have no callers Chair.

Chair Pruyt: All right, thank you. That will conclude our second period of public comment.

8. Adjournment

Chair Pruyt: This will take us to our eighth item which will be adjournment. Again, I wanted to thank everybody for spending time with us today. I think there was a lot of information there. I invite everyone to peruse the PowerPoint that you should have all received in advance. Jot down any notes that you have and certainly send of any emails to myself or Director Gonzalez to make sure that we can address any concerns, ideas, and things that we can do moving forward to ensure that we're able to actually accomplish the mission that the Legislature set out for us. So I look forward to all seeing you in May and that will adjourn our meeting for today, thank you.