



**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:

March 13, 2024 1:30 PM

Location:

VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brenda Ingram
Chelsea Mazza
Julia Murray
Garrit Pruyt
Dorothy Rowley
Stephen Rye
Clinton Zens
Denni Byrd -- Chair

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Michael Chopp
Demar Dahl
Bill Ferguson
Dylan Frehner
McKinzie Hilton
Eric Kern
William McCurdy II
Bryce Shields
Elliott Sattler

STAFF

Executive Director Jorja Powers
Deputy Director Jenna Buonacorsi
Management Analyst III, Marie Bledsoe
Management Analyst II, Erasmo Cosio
Management Analyst I, Jose Sepulveda
Administrative Assistant III, Hunter Jones

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Denni Byrd: Okay. I will now call to order the March 13, 2024, meeting of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. Good afternoon, it's good to see you and welcome to those who are viewing the meeting on the Department of Sentencing Policy's YouTube channel. This is the second meeting of our 2023 to 2025 meeting cycle. I am Denni Byrd, and I am the Council Chair for the 23 through 25 meeting cycle. I will now ask Director Powers to take the roll.

Executive Director Jorja Powers: Thank you, Chair.

(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DIRECTOR POWERS; QUORUM IN NOT MET)

2. Public Comment

Chair Byrd: Thank you. I'll now open agenda item number two for the first period of public comment. There are 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 of the public 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. There were two public comments that were attached to the packets for your reference. Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any member of the public who exceeds the two-minute limit may submit your comments in writing to the Department of Sentencing. At this time, I will ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify by phone. Ms. Jones?

Ms. Hunter Jones: 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. Caller with the last three digits 556, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You will have two minutes; you may now begin. Caller with the last three digits 556, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You will have two minutes; you may now begin.

Anne Marie Grant: Good afternoon, Anne Marie Grant on behalf of Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent, we are respectfully submitting four documents for agenda item six today. It appears that currently accepted prosecution practice related to Nevada's use of deadly weapon statute is to attach the averment of fact to the actual crime creating the appearance of a greater crime. For example, murder appears to become a greater crime of murder with the use of a deadly weapon; under this practice the sentencing court imposes multiple consecutive sentences for the single count. Once the conviction and related first sentence is discharged, a second consecutive sentence for use of a deadly weapon does not provide a basis for confinement to a state prison and does not work to prevent the restoration of civil rights, this is due to the fact that there was only one conviction. This is precisely why the Secretary of State was compelled to restore Michael Adkisson's right to vote despite the fact that NDOC continues to confine Mr. Michael Adkisson to a state prison under the described circumstances without a conviction. Please review the attached court order in support of a further review and analysis of this practice. In the related case, the court acknowledges there is no statutory authority for the stated crime murder with the use of a deadly weapon. We ask that you please review these documents that we have submitted which is a court order State of Nevada V. Stephen Frederick, two election integrity violation report, three First Judicial Court James Valdez Board of Prisoner Commissioners, and four is a letter to Governor Joe Lombardo that we have submitted asking for possible solutions to correct this. Thank you very much.

Ms. Jones: Thank you. Caller with the last three digits 861, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You will have two minutes; you may now begin. Caller with the last three digits 861.

Patricia Adkisson: I'm so sorry, good afternoon. My name is Patricia Adkisson from Las Vegas, Nevada. Nevada faces an imminent constitutional crisis; citizens are confined to State Prison without any conviction.

This condition is a direct consequence of the Nevada Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the United States Supreme Court decision in Missouri versus Hunter, where Nevada courts impose multiple consecutive sentences for a single count, each time a consecutive sentence is imposed for use of a deadly weapon. This consecutive sentence is treated separately and distinct for all purposes and does not augment or enhance the single sentence imposed for the actual crime. A review and analysis of the actual character of the separate sentence for Use of a Deadly Weapon reveals the following defects implicating them invalid. Number one, the consecutive sentence does not begin until the expiration or discharge of the conviction, number two, the consecutive sentence is not the result of a separate conviction, and number three, the consecutive sentence does not provide a reference to sufficient statutory authority that would allow for either confinement to a state prison, parole eligibility, or consideration of parole, simply put the character of the consecutive sentence does not provide the basis for any infirmity related to the deprivation or restoration of civil rights. As such, the Department of Corrections does not have sufficient statutory authority in order to carry out the command of restraint or imprisonment. In consideration of the foregoing where my husband, Michael Adkisson is confined to a state prison without a conviction, the Chief Elections Officer conducted a review and evaluation of the character of the consecutive sentence and did restore my husband's voting privileges as contemplated by NRS 213.157, which also requires release from prison, however the Nevada Department of Corrections continues to restrain my husband admittedly without conviction. Finally, I would like to invite Mr. Jon Ponder to meet with my husband or take a phone call with him. I think this would help to advance the collective understanding of the current crisis of the board's next meeting, where I hope a thoughtful analysis of the character of the consecutive sentence may be evaluated. Thank you very much.

Ms. Jones: Thank you. Chair we have no more callers who wish to testify.

Chair Byrd: Thank you, Hunter. I will close the first period of public comment.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council held on August 2, 2023

Chair Byrd: Moving onto agenda item three. Members of the Council have been provided copies of the minutes from the August 2, 2023, meeting. Are there any edits, comments, or corrections? Hearing none, I do not believe we can vote yet, is that still correct Jorja?

Director Powers: Yes, that's correct. We will have to put that off until the end hoping that we receive more members.

Chair Byrd: Alrighty. I will close that and temporarily put it on hold, we'll revisit at the end of our meeting.

4. Re-Entry Presentation

Chair Byrd: I will now open agenda number four, we have a re-entry presentation by Dr. Carolyn Willis from the Hope for Prisoners, who is with us to present regarding barriers to re-entry for returning citizens, and the gaps, and needs in program areas. Dr. Willis, thank you for being here and I will turn it over to you for your presentation.

Dr. Carolyn Willis: Thank you. Good afternoon. So, with regards to re-entry and the challenges that individuals face, I want to cover in my presentation that the number of individuals that are released yearly from either state, federal, or local jails is over 2.2 million individuals. Once they get released into the community it creates a myriad of challenges when it comes to re-acclimating into the community and getting their lives back. In Nevada itself, from the prisons, we have approximately 6,000 people being released yearly and over 200 daily from either Clark County or the local jails that we have within the community. As individuals return back to the community they're faced with a number of complex structural challenges that are not just limited to housing and employment, they're varied as I mentioned before, and these challenges contribute to their risk of re-offending and going back to prison. We know national data has shown that 68% of individuals that are released into the community are reincarcerated within three years of their release and it's important to understand how

these challenges affect the reintegration process in order for us to be able to find solutions and provide services that clients or individuals coming home may need. Research has also shown that individuals with a background face more than 40,000 collateral consequences, I'm going to say it again, more than 40,000 collateral consequences that are associated with having a background, being convicted, or spending time in prison. These collateral consequences are multi-layered and multifaceted. So, in order for an individual to be able to re-acclimate into the community, they have to be able to address these challenges, as well as navigate finding employment, find housing. So, I will touch on some – not all, of course because it's really 40,000, it's a lot – so, I will touch on some of the prevalent barriers and challenges that we've seen, and I will provide some examples from those.

So, within Nevada, Hope for Prisoners works with individuals that have been incarcerated or have been touched by the criminal justice system. Within our organization we have completed and conducted numerous research. We have also published several textbook chapters to shed light on re-entry as we know that it's somewhat of a novel topic, we know more about corrections than we know about re-entry and in doing so, we've been able to unearth some of the challenges that other researchers have noted as well. So, some of those challenges are linked really to maybe, statutory or requirements within the community, especially when it comes to housing. For instance, some individuals they may find it difficult to secure housing for several reasons, maybe it would be what's under their background so, the local legislative laws and housing restrictions might prevent them from living in certain areas, especially individuals that are under registry that have been convicted of, per se sexual offences, they're not able to live in certain areas near schools so, that in itself creates a lot of challenges for those individuals. We also have many of the individuals that have been incarcerated, once they're released into the community, they do face increased housing instability and insecurity. So, if they're on parole or probation they may not be able to parole to their family's home, even if they would have that opportunity to do so, simply because someone in the household may have a background, or may be on parole, or may be on probation so that prevents them from being able to parole to that residence. So, in essence, what it does, it lets them have some level of housing insecurity, meaning that they may at times be homeless, which that in itself, creates a lot of challenges for clients. Another issue with housing may be the lack of employment, if they are not employed that creates a challenge because they will not have the necessary prerequisites to even apply for housing or if they have been evicted. So, those are some of the challenges that many individuals with a background face as they are re-integrating into the community when it comes to finding housing and we know that stable housing provides an opportunity for a client to be successful, that's the foundational piece of stability when it comes to reintegrating back into the community. One of our previous research that we did, many of the clients said that what they described success in their own words and for them, success was being able to secure housing because many of them came through our organization and they were homeless at the time when they were seeking services. So, as we worked with them, they were able to get housing, they were able to get employment, and they were able to get stability.

Another barrier or challenge that many individuals that are justice impacted face is that of securing employment. Many individuals in the re-entry space either have a skill gap that prevents them from securing viable employment. Majority of our clients don't have a high school diploma, so that in itself creates a challenge. So, the lack of education or the deficit in having a skill gap prevents them from finding employment. So, employment in itself, securing employment is multifaceted as well because if you don't have the skill set you can't find employment. One of the ways that we can bridge that gap is ensuring that individuals are able to receive vocational training, they're able to go back to school, and get a GED if needed, or their high school diploma, or a certification, some type of vocational certification, which changes the game because at that point that individual is now able to make a sustainable wage of at least 20 dollars an hour. Another challenge that we've seen within the re-entry space that many individuals face is, even after they've gotten training, depending on the job opportunity, some professions require you to have not just specific certifications, but you have to be licensed for it. Many times, being a felon – sorry – prevents you from being able to get some of these licensing. So, I know within the State of Nevada, we've worked a lot with the licensing board for individuals that want to be barbers, or they want to do cosmetology, where we're able to write a letter on their behalf to ensure that they can get those licensing prior to them going into training. The fact that some professions requires licensing, it just limits the opportunities that most individuals with a background would

normally have because those that are still stringent when it comes to licensing, we're not able to overcome those hurdles.

Another issue that many individuals have when they're returning back to the community, especially women, is access to childcare. So, access to childcare prevents them from being able to find a job, participate in programming, and even going to school, so it is important that we provide the resources that each individual needs in order for them to be successful.

Transportation is also a huge barrier when navigating the re-entry space, many of our clients either don't have a driver's license, or they don't have access to a vehicle, so they rely on public transportation. Depending on where they live, depending on where they need to go, there might be challenges with accessing transportation. For instance, if someone lives in North Las Vegas, the challenge in itself is getting from home to work or accessing whatever programs are available within the community. If an individual lives in Henderson and they have to go work in North Las Vegas, to commute on the bus is one of the things that we've seen that is in itself cumbersome for individuals as they're navigating this space.

Another challenge or barrier that is imminent with individuals with a background is the fact that they've experienced a lot of trauma or they may have mental health issues. So, it is important to provide programs and services that address those specific needs as well, because if those needs aren't addressed then it becomes difficult for an individual to be able to navigate the re-entry space. Justice-impacted individuals also have challenges when it comes to social bonds so, because of the process of being incarcerated, and convicted, and probably being in and out of prison, they've kind of as the saying goes, burned all their bridges so, as they reintegrate back into the community and acclimate back into the workplace they find it difficult because they may not have social bonds. So, one way to alleviate that is ensuring that the client or the individual that's navigating this space has the social support or the re-entry capital within the community in order for them to be successful. Within many programs, one of the things that I have seen especially, in research, being utilized to establish a social bond is actually mentoring. So, mentoring provides an opportunity for individuals to build their social network, if we're asking them to change the path that they're on, and have this transformative life, sometimes it might mean leaving the places and the things that they're used to, which keeps them going back into this perpetual cycle of going back into prison. So, if we're asking them to get rid of the antisocial friends, we got to be responsible and provide them with pro-social friends as well.

Another barrier that research has brought up when it comes to individuals navigating the re-entry space is that of human agency, many clients, or the clients that we serve, or the individuals that are navigating this space, they've been incarcerated for a long period of time, and they've lost what we consider to be their ability to choose. So, they've lost that choice and in re-acclimating back into the community and coming home, it takes time for them to realize or recognize that they can make choices on their own. So, it is important that we surround individuals as they're navigating this space and ensure that they are getting the support that they need. They're getting the personal development classes that they need to be able to navigate this space, and get the support, and build that social agency as well as a social network as well.

So, like mentioned there's so many challenges that re-entry individuals in the re-entry space face on a daily basis. I often equate it to, imagine you as an individual without a background all the challenges that you have to face, now imagine, 40,000 more challenges are being placed on you and you have to navigate it. So, it is important within this space to ensure that every single person that's being released from prison, or jail, or has an arrest, has been touched by the criminal justice system, has the complete support that they need in order to navigate all these challenges. As I've mentioned, I just touched on a couple of the most important ones that are like basically surface level, but they are multi-layered and multifaceted, so in every single step that an individual takes as they try to re-acclimate it is important that we provide the support. What I have found in my experience is that majority of the people that get released from prison, they do want to change, the biggest challenge is they don't know how, or they don't know how to access the service, or the service is not enough. So, I believe that it needs to be a comprehensive approach when addressing re-entry or any individual that's trying to re-acclimate into the community, simply because it's multifaceted so, if we don't address the individual then we are not doing justice.

Another challenge that we've seen and that has been studied tremendously is the family reintegration piece when it comes to individuals being released from prison, and coming home, and trying to find what their role is in the community. It's hard and difficult at times because as you are incarcerated as we know, life goes on in the community and a lot of times even though an individual is incarcerated, the person or the family that's out in the community is in essence is doing time with that person. So, life for them has stopped and life for that person while they're incarcerated has stopped, and we've seen where individuals may be incarcerated and may be rehabilitated. When they come home, they don't know how to find their role because their children have probably grown up, they're older now, the spouse that they probably left has gone on with life. So, now they're coming back into the community finding it challenging to figure out what their roles are in the community.

So, for me I do believe that ensuring that we have support, what I consider to be re-entry capital in the community is extremely important and that's one of the things that our research through the years have shown. As I've said, we've done tremendous research within the organization, we've looked at what success is for an individual and as well as staff, what consider success to be and for some people success is one day being sober. So, they do have challenges with sobriety when they're coming home, they do have challenges with mental health, so those are barriers, and this is a population where individuals are not necessarily receptive to getting mental health counseling. So, it's important as practitioners that we explain to them the need for mental health counseling and well and then, also ensure that we provide them with mental health classes, relapse prevention classes. So, as a practitioner, in addressing an individual we need to make sure that we're doing assessments and in doing those assessments, we need to make sure that we're recognizing the need that person has and we're ensuring that we're addressing those needs, because if we address the needs then we will reduce the risk, if we don't address the need we will just augment the risk, and individuals will just reoffend. So, it is important to look at the individuals from a holistic perspective and then do the assessments that are needed, and every single person is different. So, what my needs might be, might be someone else's needs, but when we recognize that there needs to be a foundation for how we work with individuals and the service that we provide then, we're going to be able to use the what works approach, we'll be able to see what works for this individual, what works for this other person. But in general, every single person that does have a background they do share the similar challenges and barriers, it's just how do we address them and how do we assist them to overcome because someone with mental health challenges, as compared to someone that doesn't have mental health challenges, may have the same barriers, but it will be a different approach for each individual to ensure that they can overcome those barriers. It might mean addressing the mental health prior to and then addressing the barriers but all in all it is important as I mentioned before, to address re-entry barriers in order for clients or individuals to be successful in the community. That's my presentation.

Chair Byrd: Thank you very much Dr. Willis for sharing that with us. What questions do Council members have? I'll start, I actually have a question. You said there was 40,000 collateral consequences and those of us in this field dealing with it day to day can think of the most common ones and you talked about some of the most common barriers today, what would you say, just to give us, what are some of the ones that we wouldn't think of that are out there?

Dr. Willis: So, I'll give an example. So, for instance, there's several barriers that have to do with institutional barriers, so that would be individuals that are on parole or probation. So, if you're on parole or probation depending on what your charges are you can't get certain jobs. If you're on parole or probation, it might restrict you from doing certain things. So, I'll give a personal example, I gave personal example before because when I first heard, when I first started doing research and I heard about the 40,000 collateral consequences, I was like, that's a lot! That's too much! I don't think that's possible and then, like you mentioned, there are the ones that everyone thinks about, but there was this one specific incident that made me think like whoa this is really real. So, there was an incident where someone was on probation and they were in school, they were paying their own tuition and the probation officer – of course, when you do your probation check in they want to see your bank account, you know they want to see your statement and all that – so, the probation officer saw the and said, "Oh, you spent like 1,000 dollars at UNLV, what was that for?", the individual explained what it was for and the probation officer said, "Well, you have extra money so you can pay more restitution". So, a collateral consequence for that person was it prolonged their education because the next semester when they could have enrolled and save the 1,000 dollars to finish up, they decided not to enroll because they did not

want their restitution to be increased. So, that was a collateral consequence that I never thought about, but when it happened, I was like, whoa this is really, really deep. So, there's a lot that individuals face and a lot of them do encircle around the general ones that we know, like the housing instability, finding a job, educational attainment, transportation, they do surface around those, but it's just so intricate, it's like layers upon layers, so I might have transportation issues, but guess what? It's not just getting on the bus or having a bus pass, right? It's not just that, it might be the location that I live, it might be access to a bus stop, it might be how far I have to travel, so that's one that came to my mind that I never thought about as well. Hope that helps.

Chair Byrd: Yes. Thank you. Do any other council members have questions? Any other comments for Dr. Willis? Hearing no more, I will close this agenda item, and again we're thankful and grateful that you were able to present for us today, Dr. Willis.

Dr. Willis: You're welcome.

Mr. Stephen Rye: Yeah, we appreciate that, Dr. Willis. Thank you.

5. NLJRCC Grant Presentation

Chair Byrd: I will now open agenda item five, a grant presentation. As we know AB 388 appropriated 3 million for this Council to grant out to help reduce recidivism in Nevada. We will now hear from NDSP staff regarding the status of this project. Director Powers?

Director Powers: Good afternoon, Council. I wanted to introduce our newest employee, she is our new Management Analyst III, she's working with our data and also, she comes with a plethora of grant experience, so it's been great for us. So, I will introduce you to Marie Bledsoe and let her do the presentation. She's going to talk about some minor changes in verbiage that we made for clarification to the application and to the guide, to clarify for applicants and to help meet best practices in the grant community. Marie?

Ms. Marie Bledsoe: Thank you, Jorja and thank you, Chair Byrd. Let me share my screen here, I got a little PowerPoint. So, my name is Marie Bledsoe, and I will be talking about the NLJRCC Grant.

I'm going to give you a little bit of background on myself and my grant experience, and then, we are going to be providing some updates as Jorja mentioned about the grant. We've created an announcement, we made a couple of changes to the administrative guide and application and then, we have added a timeline.

So, just a little bit about me. I've spent nine years with the State of Nevada and all of them were at the Department of Public Safety, I worked for Highway Patrol at the Purchasing desk there and managed six million dollars in annual purchases so, it was buying everything from pens to patrol cars. So, I have a lot of experience with just the flow of money through the state system. When I worked at the Office of Criminal Justice Assistance, I was administering a number of grants there within the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant, I was handling transition housing and we primarily had housing opportunities in Reno. So, I've worked with Ridge House, Step One, Quest Counseling, and the Empowerment Center for individuals getting out of prison and going into transition housing. I also managed the Resident Substance Abuse Treatment Grant or RSAT Grant and that was primarily those funds were going to the Department of Corrections, and they were using it for a very specific residential-based program and then, I also managed the Prison Rape Elimination Act. From there I started working for Records, Communications and Compliance with their Civil Name Check program and I should mention that prior to working with the state, I worked for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for five years, managing a program that was completely grant funded called, The Tahoe Integrated Information Management System. So, I have experience with both writing grants in order to keep a program going, as well as managing grants for state agencies.

So, some updates that we made to the NLJRCC Grant, we've added an announcement or a notice of funding opportunity and so, that was provided to you in your packet. Some of the things in there, we pulled straight out of the documents that had already been created. So, the grant purpose and the funding formula are straight out of the existing documents, this announcement now has though a due date, which is April 12th of 2024. So, the grant will be released this Friday, it'll be opened up for applicants to start submitting in their applications

and then, those applications are due Friday, April 12th. We've also, put in a section for required formatting and if you don't have a lot of experience with grants, this section seems awfully picky I know, but it's a way to make everything streamlined, so that every grant application is fair. So, we've put in some restrictions on the formatting that people need to adhere to when they're submitting their application. We have a sentence in there now regarding partnerships, where partnerships are encouraged, but not necessarily required for this grant. And then, we have an award date, which we are projecting right now to be May 20th and we've also added into this contact information for myself and for Jorja.

So, a little bit more on the updates that we made, again, this administrative guide is part of the packet that we provided for the meeting today. We've moved the word scope of work to be line with the word application, the way it was written previously it looked like the scope of work was going to be a separate document, and we wanted it to be part of the application itself, and just be in the flow of the application. So, we've added an application timeline -- and I'll get to that in just a minute -- and then, we also changed on page five of the Grant Administrative Guide, we've changed it from saying "grant recipients will receive disbursements" to "grant recipients will receive reimbursements" so, this will be a reimbursable grant.

On this one, we've got the 10% requirement for victim services, we're going to be removing information about this on page two and page three, but we've had some updates to this. So, I'm going to pass this back Jorja and she's going to talk a little bit more about this requirement. Oops, you need to unmute.

Director Powers: I need to share my screen quickly, so if you could un-share.

Ms. Bledsoe: Yes.

Director Powers: There we go. Okay. All right. So, can you see starting with Grants are distributed.

Chair Byrd: Not yet. Your screen is not shared yet.

Director Powers: Now?

Chair Byrd: There it's coming. Yep.

Director Powers: Okay, so I wanted you to see the red line, we're not changing anything greatly, it will now say, "no less than 10% of funds awarded will be used to support a nonprofit -- I mean -- to support nonprofit organizations, faith-based organizations, or local agencies which provide services to victims of crime". So, I wanted you to see the verbiage there and I need to stop that share and share again. And then, for the Grant Application, instead of having the grantees choose where the money goes, it has been suggested that we have a little more oversight. So, we're going to have them provide names of at least three victim service providers with whom they partner or who work within that community and then, we will disperse the money from there, that way 10% still goes out to victim services, however we don't have to leave that up to the applicants because that is a whole another difficulty for them. So, those are those two changes and I'll give it back to Marie to finish her presentation.

Ms. Bledsoe: All right. Hopefully I'm back in business here. So, thank you for that Jorja. So, the next screen, is everybody able to see everything? There we go. Okay. So, we did make a couple minor changes -- I think I am sharing the wrong screen, I'm sorry -- so, we did make a couple minor changes to the application. On page two, we changed where it says briefly describe the proposed program and its purpose, we changed that to program or project's scope of work, so we're connecting that back together. Applicants are able to use the document that we're sending out or they can send in their own application on their own letterhead, but of course, have to follow the formatting guide that we're providing. All of the sections now have page limits, again, we've got a situation where some nonprofits especially have a grant application that's in their back pocket, and they may whip that grant application out, and send it to us, but it might be 50 pages long and so, in order to keep things fair, we're adding in page limits to make sure that every application that comes in is equal. And then, we're also providing a budget spreadsheet so that folks can use that as well, to let us know what their budget requirements are going to be for the grant.

We're now looking at the timeline. So, this Friday, March 15th, we will be releasing the solicitation and inviting people to apply for the grant. Then, April 12th as mentioned, that's going to be where Grant Applications are due. Then, by April 24th we are going to be forming Grant Review Committees and those committees are going to be from members of the re-entry community, who are going to read through the grant, applications, and score them, and then, we'll begin to prioritize them a bit. What those committees develop will be handed over to the NLJRCC, so that folks on this Council can develop those recommendations and then, those recommendations will be going to the NSC for final award decisions. So, that's happening, the recommendations are happening by May 8th and then, the final award decisions on May 17th with the goal of opening the grant period and awarding those grants starting Monday, May 20th. The rest of the deadlines that are in here come straight out of the Legislation. So, the first of December is our first reporting cut off date. Then, we have to have our first report to the Interim Finance Committee by December 20th. Then, June 6th of 2025 will be the second reporting cut off date, this will also be the day where all grant funds must be committed and then, by September 19th, that's when the grant ends and no more grant funding will go on beyond that date.

And that was what we've got for our presentation, and we welcome questions.

Chair Byrd: Thank you, Marie and Jorja. What questions does the Council have?

Ms. Dorothy Rowley: I have a question. I'm just curious about the timeline, that last page you just showed, it says that May 8th, the NLJRCC will make the final recommendations or decisions in that sense, is that the committee as a whole or is that the subcommittee, those individuals that are on the Grant Review Committee? Because I guess our next scheduled meeting for this board would be after that date, I think it's May 20th or something. So, I don't know how it fits into the timeline for review of that.

Director Powers: I think that, it was actually the review committee, not the Council. We don't have a meeting until the 29th. So, the review committee will announce at our next meeting on the 29th who the recommendations are or were and the Sentencing Commission themselves will make that decision. So, you will know who was chosen, but only the people on the review committee will do the choosing.

Ms. Rowley: All right, perfect. Thanks.

Chair Byrd: Do we have any other questions or discussions?

Mr. Clinton Zens: Yeah, I've got a quick question perhaps of curiosity, but I just wondered what the determining factor was to change the verbiage or at least the style of the grant from disbursement to reimbursement.

Director Powers: Marie, I will let you take that one.

Ms. Bledsoe: And I'm not sure if I'm following your question, could you please re-ask it?

Mr. Zens: Yeah, you mentioned some of the language changes regarding the grant application itself and you noted that the award of the grant would come by way it was changed to reimbursement instead of disbursement. So, it's not a dispersible grant, it's reimbursable. I'm just curious as to what the reasoning behind that was.

Ms. Bledsoe: Oh thanks. It is more customary to do reimbursements, in fact all the grants I've worked on have done that. What you're doing is making sure that the work is being done. So, whatever they're doing, if they're buying some equipment, or they're hiring somebody, you want to make sure that that's happening before you give them the money. Giving them the money upfront often leads to people saying, "Oh, it didn't happen and now the money's gone" and it gets very sticky with them explaining where the money went. So, if they're giving us invoices or they're being able to track somebody's time then, we're just going to be reimbursing them for that. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Zens: No, it does. Sorry to say you know, I have limited experience with grants myself, so I always kind of wondered what would be some of the hurdles put in place from preventing that from happening, so it makes sense to require a certain level of investment from their part to get it going, so I appreciate that explanation.

Ms. Bledsoe: Thank you.

Chair Byrd: And might I add, I think we had a discussion, I believe -- I hope I'm not confusing meetings -- about it being a draw type and when you do a draw, you have to have your backing to go with that, the receipts and stuff to show why you're drawing that amount.

Ms. Bledsoe: That's correct. We'll have a sheet that folks can fill out, so it'll be a request for reimbursement, and they'll be able to detail what they've spent the money on and then, show receipts or time spent, that kind of thing, if it's somebody who's been hired or something that's been purchased.

Chair Byrd: Do we have any other questions or discussions regarding this agenda item?

Mr. Garrit Pruyt: I do. I'm thinking back a little bit, the reimbursement versus disbursement, if I recall it was probably 18 months ago or so, we had noted that there are many counties that wouldn't have the money to spend on the forefront. So, I'm wondering what we'll do to address that, so if it is a reimbursement system now, how are we going to address it where people don't have an extra to even allocate to something to then ask for, they won't have the ability to ask for reimbursement because all their dollars are currently spent on the bare necessities that they have for their county.

Director Powers: I think in that case it will be a case-by case basis. If they can show where the money is going to come from and that they will be able to make that purchase or pay that person, then we will definitely work with them on a case-by-case basis. The other thing we talked about with the governmental agencies was that it was an in-kind match and so, basically, they're just going to have to show us that they have paid for those services and then, we can match that.

Chair Byrd: Other comments to that or questions? Okay, hearing none. We are one shy of a quorum, but these changes are minor that were suggested in here so they will be adopted as presented. All right.

Director Powers: And Chair, we will then table the other vote which would be the approval of minutes until next meeting.

Chair Byrd: Correct. Yes, thank you. I will close that agenda item.

6. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Byrd: And move onto agenda item six, the dates for the meetings for the rest of the year are provided in the agenda. Our next meeting as referenced earlier will be May 29th of 2024 and then, we will meet on August 28, 2024, and October 16, 2024. Our staff has already worked on more topics and items for discussion in future meetings, but does anyone have anything to be considered for future meetings or presentations that you would like to hear from, like we had today on the re-entry.

Mr. Pruyt: Will there be, so at our next meeting obviously the Review Committee will have made its decision, apart from just announcing their decisions will they go through, I would be curious as to what led to decisions they had, I mean if there's not a lot of applications obviously, that could be a very short determination, but if there were a lot, what let led one to stand out one from another because I expect in many of our counties, we may get those questions from people who do get declined versus those who didn't, as to what they could do in the future to better their either application, their process, whatever they're going for so we could have some baseline to provide feedback to them.

Director Powers: Absolutely. The Review Committee will use the rubric that is there and provided, and we can absolutely make all the applications available in the packets at the meeting after.

Mr. Pruyt: Thank you.

Chair Byrd: I might I suggest, that maybe at our meeting, maybe our presentation that day, would somebody from the Sentencing Commission be willing to talk about the process, and how they went through it, and answer questions to us.

Director Powers: Oh, from the Review Committee?

Chair Byrd: Yes.

Director Powers: Absolutely. We can get people from the Review Committee. I will absolutely see if they are available that day to speak with us.

Chair Byrd: Thank you. Any other thoughts, comments, questions at this point on future agenda items? If you think of anything that you would like to be considered for future agenda, please contact myself or Director Powers and we'll consider it and get it added. All right, I will close that agenda item.

7. Public Comment

Chair Byrd: And move to our agenda item seven, our second option for public comment. Just as we did earlier with the first period of public comment, those who wish testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit the additional comments and writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy at sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. At this time, I'll ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify. Ms. Jones?

Ms. Jones: 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. And it looks like we do not have anyone who wants to testify for public comment.

Chair Byrd: Thank you. That concludes our second period of public comment.

8. Adjournment

Chair Byrd: Well great work. Thank you to the staff, the members of the Council, and our presenters, we have accomplished a lot today and I look forward to seeing you on May 29, 2024, to continue our efforts. This meeting is now adjourned.