

Steve Sisolak
Governor

Victoria Gonzalez
Executive Director



Justice Lidia Stiglich
Chair, Nevada Sentencing Commission

Christine Jones Brady
Vice Chair, Nevada Sentencing Commission

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF SENTENCING POLICY

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

NEVADA SENTENCING COMMISSION

MINUTES-FINAL

Date and Time: November 9, 2021, 9:00 AM

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Michelle Bays
Christine Jones Brady – Vice Chair
Director Elisa Cafferata
Director Charles Daniels
Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Judge Scott Freeman
Christopher Hicks
Judge Tierra Jones
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
Chief Thomas Lawson
Julia Murray
John McCormick
Kimberly Mull
Dr. Elizabeth Neighbors
Jon Ponder
Justice Lidia Stiglich – Chair
Holly Welborn
Assemblyman David Orentlicher
Senator Keith Pickard
Jim Hoffman

MEMBERS EXCUSED

John Arrascada
Chuck Callaway

STAFF

Executive Director Victoria Gonzalez,
Monica Chiazza, Business Professional
Trainee, NDSP

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Stiglich: I'll now call to order the November meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. And good morning. It's good to see you all, and welcome to those who are viewing the meeting on the Department of Sentencing Policies YouTube channel. This is the second meeting of our 2021, 2023 meeting cycle. I will now ask Director Gonzalez to take the role.

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

2. Public Comment

Chair Stiglich: I'll now open agenda item number two. 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 e-mailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comment received in writing will be provided to the commission and be included by reference in the minutes of the meeting. Members of the public who wish to testify may also do so by telephone. Due to time constraints, public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any member of the public that exceeds a two-minute limit may submit your 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. Ms. Chiazza?

Ms. Chiazza: Thank you, Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone, press star nine to raise your hand. When it is your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name. Chair, we have no public callers at this time.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you. I'll now close agenda item number two.

3. Report from the Executive Director of the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy

Chair Stiglich: And I will open agenda item number three. A report from the Director of the Department of Sentencing Policy. As we know, our staff stays very busy assisting us in carrying out our statutory mandates. At each meeting she'll provide the commission an update on their recent activities and what they've been working on. I'll now turn the time over to Director Gonzalez to present her report.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair. Good morning members of the commission. We are really excited to see everybody here this morning. I will keep my report brief as I know we have a very full agenda today to get through, but of course I'd be happy to answer any questions and assist the commission with things they need in regards to what we've been working on.

After our last meeting, a couple weeks after that, we assisted the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council in holding their first meeting. We will hear an update about that in the next agenda item.

In the last couple of months, we've been able to move to another office space. With that comes a lot of administrative activities that has kept us very busy and trying to move our I.T. and move everything technically. We're excited to be able to have this extra space to be working out of. And then, related to that, we are currently in the process in various stages of recruitment to try and get our staff up to what we need and that we've been appropriated for.

I will note that when it comes to those administrative activities those keep us very busy. We are a small agency, and we have a vast statutory mandate as this commission knows, but there's a lot needs to be done to make sure that we keep our office running. I just wanted to make note of that.

In the coming meetings I'm going to be working on some recommendations on how we can reorganize our staff a little bit and alleviate some of that in order to make sure that we can do the administrative things to keep the day-to-day operations of an agency, but also provide and then also meet those statutory mandates.

As you know, we've been working very hard on this new report that has also kept us very busy. We have been conducting our research and meeting with stakeholders in order to work out this approach for the commission which we'll discuss in the next agenda and then later agenda item.

And then I wanted to mention that right now with our budget we are currently on track with everything that we've been doing and working within the budget we've been provided and able to, again, make these moves and hopefully work to getting our administrative activities up to what we need them to be.

I wanted to touch base and follow up on what we've been doing with helping the commission meet their statutory mandate. In our last meeting, I reviewed the legislative findings and went through how to align the statutory duties with those legislative findings. Since then, I just wanted to let you know with this report that we put together to evaluate the fiscal impacts. We're looking to assist the commission in fulfilling its duty to evaluate the fiscal impacts of sentencing corrections in general. And we're trying to figure out what is the best methodology for doing that.

The other piece to helping this commission develop its recommendations is that data piece. We know that the overarching mandate of the commission and our department is to develop data-driven recommendations.

One of the things that we're going to be working on in a few months is our strategic plan for what that looks like. As we all know, we do not have a centralized data criminal justice data system in order to conduct this analysis.

As we'll talk about with the history of what's been happening with criminal justice reform, there have been different efforts to try and get data snapshots and doing research within a span of time. And what we're looking too, is help this commission provide sustainability and reliability when it comes to criminal justice data. And so, one of my ideas is that while we do not have a centralized system for criminal justice data, I think our agency could function as such. That could look different ways. It could be that we have agencies sending data directly to us. It could be that we have read-only access to data systems. It could be that we have documentation sent to us. It could be that we have PSI sent directly to us or JOCs or we make specific requests for those.

Again, our intent is to figure out how do we centralize our criminal justice data when we don't have a centralized system. And I really think this can be done without just one computer system. We are looking to other states and similar sentencing commissions and sister agencies like ours who have tried to approach us in a similar manner where there isn't that criminal justice data system centralized.

We're trying to figure out how can we really look, like I said, look towards a sustainable and reliable

system for collecting this data and have it all in one place not only for this commission, but for our other stakeholders and the lawmakers when it comes to making this criminal justice reform, rather than trying to piecemeal reports that are able to be conducted by various entities. We will have a very detailed proposed strategic plan for that at our next meeting.

We'll also be meeting with members of the commission until that time and getting your ideas and your feedback about how what this would actually look like. And my hope is to develop and build the record so when it comes time to getting a recommendation or getting some support, we have something to show about where we're trying to go with criminal justice data, and how our agency really could function as that centralized system almost like a pipeline of criminal justice data that would help develop recommendations.

With that very brief report and just quick information about what we've been working on, I'd be happy to answer any questions, and or take any recommendations from the commission in regards to those.

Director Cafferata: In reference to the data system, I would like to offer to sort of set up a conversation between you and our research and analysis division. We're one of the players in the empower data tracking system, which is a longitudinal system between the Department of Education, NSHE, DETR and some other state agencies that has sort of, set up a system to track folks longitudinally, to see how investments early in the system for them translate into outcomes in the workforce. Not that you would connect to that but just sort of lessons learned setting up interagency databases and maybe, ways to simplify or streamline that process. So, we'd be happy to share those insights with you.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Director. Yes, that would be very much appreciated. I know that there have been other agencies who need to collect and gather and analyze data in a similar fashion from various agencies and sources, so I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Ponder: Director Gonzalez, I'd like to be brought in on that conversation and share with you. Because we have a very robust system for data tracking. So. anything that we might be able to lend to that, we'd be more than happy to participate in that.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Mr. Ponder. That's fantastic.

Mr. Hoffman: I don't have access to any data, but I think that's a really good idea and I think this is something that the commission should pursue.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.

Chair Stiglich: Well, thank you. It's the season of sharing, so for those of you who are up to share, that's wonderful and let's kind of think outside the box about ways we can certainly get more input, more data so we can come up with better solutions. Any further questions or comments? Thank you, Director. I'll close that particular agenda item.

4. Update from the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council

Chair Stiglich: I'll open agenda item four. This is an update from the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. The Coordinating Council was established in AB 236 as a public body who tracks and assesses outcomes at the local level and then makes recommendations to this Commission. Since our last meeting, Garrit Pruyt from Carson City was appointed as the chair of the Coordinating Council. So, congratulations. And they held their first meeting on September 27th. Chair Pruyt is here to provide us an update about what the Council did at their first meeting and what they will be working on next. If you please proceed, Chair.

Mr. Pruyt: Thank you, Chair Stiglich. As was mentioned, we had our first meeting on September 27th of this year. It was quite a good meeting. We covered a number of topics. One of the first things that we did was, we were fortunate enough to have Director Gonzalez conduct more or less a training on our purpose and what we would be doing as part of the Local Justice Reinvestment Council. We've gone through NRS 176014, which basically sets forth the mandate that we have to assist and advise this Commission on some of the tasks that each of you have as part of your service there.

Another aspect that we looked at is, as was mentioned previously by Director Gonzalez is data. And a lot of what we were looking at is where to get some of that data. Recognizing that, obviously at this point, we don't have that centralized system as was mentioned, but each county tracks a great number of items that are relevant to this group in order to propose for the legislation. What we've done is we created an inventory that we were able to send out to each of our members. We recognize that each of the members that were appointed in the separate counties obviously didn't necessarily have access to all the data that would be available within their counties, but most of them knew where it could be found. They would have the contact information so that we could get that data which often could be the biggest hurdle, as I imagine, everyone has had when they're trying to find something knowing the right person makes things go a lot smoother and a lot faster.

We started looking at a few different things. One of the things that we requested information on was jail population data. Now, with each of the data points that we were looking at, we also recognized that we're going to have to eventually differentiate once we get this data and the differences between the effects of bills like AB 236 or other criminal justice reform bills, and other issues that have happened in the meantime. Since now, we've had COVID-19 pass through which happened just after the implementation of AB 236. We will have to obviously parse out the differences and what are the effects of that versus what are the effects of the actual bill so we can provide you with all the adequate information that you need.

Apart from jail population data, we were looking at also mental health services available in each county. This was one of the areas where, as we discussed the matter as a group it became readily apparent that there are some deficiencies in some counties, some counties have more, some have less, but simply knowing what was available and what was not available, or what might be available in the county right beside would certainly provide better assistance.

So, we asked for a number of points on there that -- that covered whether there's mental health services involved as part of an integrated part of the criminal justice system, the types of mental health providers available, the scope of treatment to those available. And so, we'd ask for contact information names and all sorts of areas in there so we can start collecting that type of information.

One of the other areas that we looked at was alternatives to sentencing, specifically if counties were utilizing alternative sentence departments or essentially, pre-trial supervision or misdemeanor supervision and probationary type departments. We recognize that some counties had those and did not, so we were looking for the names and contact information of those. And

also, the use of pre-trial risk assessments.

One of the last points that we'd also discussed in the scenario request for information on this the number of drug endangered children that we're finding in each county. Now with each of the requests for information that we were sending out, they're kind of broken up in time frames so that we can hopefully best address how it is that they're being affected, either by changes in legislation, or just changes in lifestyle and enforcement of law due to the pandemic so that we can provide this group with more information.

Each of those inventories was sent out there. We were discussed by all the members who were present that day. And I can say, as of now, we've received completed inventories from Carson City, Churchill, Clark, Elko County, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lincoln and Washoe. We're well on our way to having our first round of completed information that is going to be provided to the Department of Sentencing Policy. Obviously, once that information is provided, unfortunately it's just the start of finding where that information is, and then I think the Department of Sentencing Policy has the huge job of actually obtaining all of that information so that we can provide that data not only to the Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council but this group as well.

We are well on our way to having a good start. That is essentially what we did at our first meeting. We expect to have another meeting here within the next few weeks. Once we have, I guess more information that we're going to be able to discuss, and also, we're going to discuss additional data points that we're going to start requesting so that we can start to meet, I guess each of the statutory requirements that we have in order to be able to provide all the necessary information to this group. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Dr. Lanterman: I would recommend that when you are establishing what the baseline populations are in the county jails, that you use a three-year average as your baseline, instead of working from like the previous year. Because we always have to account for historical effects in the data, and of course COVID is a really significant example of that. And how that might have reduced certain populations, how there might be a snapback, kind of depending on how the system operates from county to county so it would be more reliable for you if you're going to do a three-year average or even a five-year average if counties are willing to work with you because that's going to give you a more realistic understanding of what your baseline is from which to judge the effects of efforts from moving forward.

Mr. Pruyt: Thank you. We will most definitely implement that.

Chair Stiglich: Any other questions or comments for Chair Pruyt? Hearing none. Thank you, Mr. Pruyt. I'm going to close this agenda item.

5. Presentation of Fiscal Impacts Report of Sentencing and Corrections Policies in Nevada and Approval of the Statement of Costs Avoided Required Pursuant to NRS 176.01347

Chair Stiglich: That brings us to agenda item number five. Recently, the NDSP has been working on developing a methodology to analyze the fiscal impacts of sentencing and corrections policies to assist this Commission in carrying out its statutory duties.

These efforts include assisting the Commission in developing a formula to identify the costs

avoided resulting from the enactment of AB 236 and from the 2019 legislative session.

The next, submission related to the costs avoided is due December 1st. To this end, staff has developed a report about evaluating the fiscal impacts which includes a proposed submission for the next statement of costs avoided. I know that many members of the Commission have had the opportunity to meet with staff to discuss the draft of this report. In response to the meetings between members of the Commission and staff, the NDSP developed a revised version of the report. The director e-mailed this new version to the Commission members in advance of the meeting, I hope you've all had a chance to review it, and that report is also available to the public with the meeting materials. At this time, I'm going to ask Director Gonzalez to walk us through this new version of the report.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair. And good morning again, members of the Commission. First of all, I wanted to thank everyone who we were able to meet with in advance of that, for while we were working on that first draft of the report. Our conversations were very helpful. You can see that in this new version some of those things we discussed were immediately incorporated into the new version. There are some things that are not in this version only because part of our discussions pointed out that we needed some more analysis. However, because we did discuss that I'm happy to discuss any of those things we previously discussed in that draft as we're able to work through this.

And you can see that that we really appreciated the efforts. We really saw our participation with the Commission as our co-workers. I know everyone on this Commission knows how much we struggle with staffing. And so, being able to have this Commission full of experts is incredibly helpful. We are all on this new adventure of trying to figure out how do we really build something that is data-driven and consistent and reliable and sustainable for making criminal justice reform, and we just appreciate these conversations, and invite more and more feedback. We're looking to grow and definitely don't want to turn down any sort of ideas or recommendations because there's a lot more than we do, and we appreciate that.

One of the most significant changes you'll notice in this version of the report is we divided it up into two sections. The first section and rather than write that first section in the voice of the Commission, we are taking the perspective of the department. The department, the first section of this report is from the perspective of our research and analysis and findings and put it from that perspective, with the idea that then the Commission will review those and make recommendations.

I will emphasize this is a draft. We, this is a brand-new endeavor that we're trying to figure out, especially when it comes to measuring the fiscal impacts. And so, what I put together on that last page that does say recommendations from the Commission, our intent is just to have something put together and would be at the end of this discussion. To have an official recommendation from the Commission that you all agree on, that should be included in the statement of costs avoided, which could include pieces from this report, that could be part of that, or we could include some of the information we discussed previously, or anything else we you would like us to incorporate. We have until December 1st to turn in the statement of costs avoided, and so, I think a response or submission for that. With that being said, I really want to help figure out how we can gather information that can help this Commission develop recommendations.

Then I'll say one more thing before I get into walking through the report is, we will develop similar reports for data. When we have that strategic plan, it'll start with a report like this, but more about the criminal justice data piece. And then we'll get these reports together on a regular basis for

the Commission so that then you can use to make recommendations.

Starting off the report, as you can see, I put in just an outline of what the contents were and the purpose of this. It's tied to those statutory mandates for the Commission and then tied to our statutory mandate to assist this Commission.

The first couple pages of the report you can see we put together a historical review. I thought this was really important, thinking about what Dr. Lanterman just said about having a baseline. I think trying to figure out a baseline for anything is really important. And as you can see here, the historical review that we conducted found that there is a baseline for different commissions being set up and laid dormant and then started up again over time. I'm trying to take on the same challenges that we're trying to do today. And so, one of our findings from this historical review is that we want to figure out what do we need to do differently so that we truly can have a sustainable reliable approach to developing data-driven recommendations.

The other thing we noticed here, too, was the trend of the need to reach out to other organizations from outside the state. The state has never had an organization like ours where we can gather the data, put together reports and have everything in one place. And what's really interesting to me, is we have a great starting point now from where we can build and really deliver on what Nevada has been trying to accomplish over the last 25, 30 years.

And as I mentioned in my report, really work to having a centralized place for information, so that no matter who it is, whether it's this Commission, whether it's lawmakers, whether it's our stakeholders, you will always have one place to find the data and the analysis to work up your recommendations. And this report is representative of what we're hoping to offer to be that local Nevada focused consultant for this Commission and for our stakeholders and for the lawmakers.

As we work through this too, I want to invite not only the Commission but those of the fellow agencies. And as we start working towards-I know it's early yet, but the next session will be here before we know it. And it is those ideas for reforms or BDRs in general, we're going to do we can to offer what our research is in our analysis is, but start working together on developing those reforms before we get to sessions so that we can help collect the data, do the analysis that would be needed to figure out what legislation you're the lawmakers are just pursuing and what the agencies and our stakeholders are interested in.

With that, I'm going to the historical review which ends on page four. And as you can see, we started as part of the historical reform, we noticed also an ongoing discussion of concerns about corrections costs in general and aligning that to trends in the prison population. You can see over time different efforts have been made to lower the prison population with the intent to then decrease corrections costs. We wanted to know is there really a correlation between those. Depending on how we look at it, as we know with data, will depend on what our findings are, but our initial findings are it's possibly not directly related.

As you can see on page four, we put together an analysis of the trends in the corrections costs and the trends in the prison population. And we have highlighted where there were some increases in 2018, and then we can see the increases in 2020 as well. And we are curious about what this means. Again, as we're looking towards sustainability and reliability for developing reforms or changes or whatever, it is you're looking to change in policies that are related to corrections and sentencing, it's really trying to understand what is happening and what the priorities are.

And so, what we can see is we don't know everything, right? But looking at this analysis it does raise some questions about how we want to approach it. What our conclusion is, is on page five that I state, is that it's possible that when we're analyzing the fiscal impacts of corrections it actually might be more informative and more outcome-focused if we focus on what the services are being provided. And analyze the services that are being provided and then analyze the cost associated with those services. And not completely disconnected from the trends in the population, we're just not quite sure yet how to incorporate that. I think if the intent is to make changes to the prison population, it's possible that might have to be attached to a specific policy and not just to costs. But our point in this analysis is that it needs to be multifaceted to realize the outcome that we're hoping. That's what I'm wondering about the historical review shows us these attempts to make different changes and maybe the outcomes aren't aligned with the methodologies, and so we're looking to question that and just wondering what the outcome is going to be.

As you see throughout this report, we realize a lot more analysis is needed but we see a need to really think about what are we talking about with costs. For now, our recommendation and our findings for the methodology to approach a cost is about services. In order to evaluate whether the services are being provided, look at an outcome. For now, we're looking at the mission statement of an agency to determine if those services are being met. You can see what we did here in this report was just focused on DOC. We're going to continue to develop this methodology and we're going to apply this to other agencies. When we're trying to evaluate, are we getting the cost, are we getting a return for what we're investing.

What we did here specific to DOC, because we analyzed those corrections cost and the population was now think about this methodology in a service-focused manner. And then tying that to the mission would be our approach.

The other thing I know on page five is that we use what's called base years which are the actual expenditures of an agency. There's many different ways to look at the cost and different ways to evaluate appropriations and what budgets are and so we're trying to figure out a more sustainable reliable way to talk about cost and what our approach is going to be is use those base years.

A base year is an even numbered fiscal year and are the actual expenditures of an agency that are then used to build an at the budget for the agency and the coming biennium. They look at those actual costs. And so, similar to trying to build a baseline, we think looking at actual costs is going to be the way to go. And just focusing on the base years will be those years that actually build the budget will also help us zero in on how we think about budgeting and how we think about the cost of an agency.

On page six, we identify what the mission could be in the services. We identify what are the services that are being provided by DOC and what is the mission. In general, we've identified the services as housing inmates based on custody level, providing food and clothing for the inmates, providing medical care for the inmates, and providing programming, and then of course all the administration and operation costs that come with trying to deliver all of those services.

We have paraphrased the mission of DOC as it stayed on their web site and align that with their statutory duties, which is to provide a safe and humane housing while preparing them for re-entry. If we take the services of DOC and align it to this, this is how we will decide are the services being provided aligning to the mission. And I think what we're going to find here looking at the budget this way is going to show us a lot more about what we are expecting from this agency and what we're expecting from corrections, and then evaluating the cost from that perspective, rather than

just focusing on trends in the population. Again, I think looking at trends in the population is going to inform this methodology, but we'd like to try this approach first and see if this might be the way to approach, how we evaluate, and then how the Commission can then make recommendations to achieve a certain outcome.

From there, we wanted to explain what how the budgets are set up for DOC. There's two sets of budgets. There are the self-funded budgets and there are the general funded budgets. In this report, we've just focused on the general funded budgets but in the future, we will do an analysis of the self-funded budgets, as well, as that still contributes to the services and the mission of the agency.

And then what you can see here is we listed those general funded budgets and we categorize them and characterize them based on the type of service that they provide. I also highlighted what kind of custody is provided at each facility generally. We just generalize based on the majority of the number of beds they had in that facility. Again, as those of you that have gone through the report and see costs vary depending on the service being provided, meaning maximum security service custody is more expensive than the minimum custody. If we think about the cost that way, we can see already how not talking about this in a lumped sum is going to help us understand what we're spending our money on and are we getting the outcome that we're hoping to achieve.

Again, this is just a cursory analysis just to get us started. Starting on page seven, and going to page eight, we put together what the actual expenditures were for fiscal year 2020, and then included what percentage of the DOC's budgets aggregated that comprised of, and then categorized what the service was that was being provided. This is a way to again get a quick analysis of, if we look at how much we're spending on corrections services, what percentage of the budget is that will just help us get our hands around understanding what these expenditures look like.

We also included the average cost per day in that last column of the table. The average cost per day is calculated by taking the appropriated funding for each account and then dividing it by the number of appropriated populations they have. Population does factor in there but what I think is important to note with the average cost per day is it's just a way to distribute how much it's costing. It may or may not actually inform us about what the cost is, right, because we don't have the individual level of services that's being provided to each inmate, that's going to vary. That average cost per day merely tells us how those costs are spread among the population. And we just want to keep that in mind. Like I said, we figure out how do we want to use these numbers to accomplish a certain outcome.

The other thing I want to point out again with thinking about these costs and thinking about the challenges when we're talking about what to do with populations. One of the things is that, you can see here, is that maximum security inmates again are more expensive to house than minimum custody inmates. For example, if you were to look at making a change in the prison population that's focused on those minimum custody inmates those are not going to impact the budget as much as it would if you were -- and if it was specific to a different kind of service. And I just say that not for advancing a policy but just when you think about the policy you want to advance align it to the outcome you're hoping to accomplish. Because those maximum custody inmates are our most expensive inmates, not only because they're going to be there longer and they require more supervision depending on their danger level but they're going to age in the system. And so, we're going to do an analysis in the future that looks at the health costs associated with that, just so the state can be prepared for what may be coming down the line. If you have a better understanding of who's incarcerated and how long they're going to be there, we might be able to assist in better

figuring out how much is that going to cost. That's a great example of taking out trends in the prison population and looking at the services you're trying to advance in the agency and figuring out what are the priorities so that funding and support can be decided from there. And then separately, if a policy was to be advanced that was population-focused it would be a different outcome that you would align that to if you were to go down that path. But again, we're just talking about how we want to think about costs of the Department of Corrections.

On page nine, we just pointed out a couple of trends in some of the budget accounts. We will do trends like this for everything. The table you saw on the previous page and the trends we see here we will do a full analysis of all of these so we can see the trends over time. We just wanted to show you where we started and where we're curious about learning more about this. But as you can see on page nine, if we look at prison medical care account, the correctional programs account and Northern Nevada Correctional Center, those accounts stay pretty -- well you can see the correctional programs and Northern Nevada gradually incline. We can see prison medical care experiences more fluctuation. Again, we're going to do some more analysis to understand those more because I think that will help the state when it comes to figuring out how to make appropriations, and where is it you want to focus the effort as far as costs.

Then the other thing we want to think about is one of the services that's required to provide services is administrative and operational costs. At the bottom of page nine we looked at the trends in FTEs and then the trends in the population. And our point in doing this analysis is again, not limiting ourselves to just looking at trends in the population. The paragraph that comes after that analysis explains that we can see how the FTEs have went down a little bit and now they're back up to what the numbers were back in 2008. But the population was going up and then coming down. We can see that there are other factors that are going to impact budgetary issues like FTEs that are with outside of the population changes and outside possibly of the department's control. We speculate, and we will analyze this further, but we speculate a lot of those decreased FTEs after 2008 were due to budget cuts. As we know would have been a response to the recession. That's just interesting to understand, we're trying to analyze all these different pieces to figuring out what is this costing us and what do we want to spend our money on.

On page 10, I have listed a number of next steps we're going to investigate and look into in research for this Commission. A lot of this came out of our discussions with those of you we were able to meet with. I know we want to understand medical costs better. Because like I said, we need to understand who's incarcerated right now so that we can figure out what those medical costs are going to be. The discussion came up too of analyzing the legal costs, of that are not going to be tied to the population but tied to a need that the department has to defend cases and litigate those cases that are coming up.

We want to look at ongoing costs with inflation, and possible increases if that's budgeted as part of personnel. And then, as I mentioned we'll look at self-funded accounts.

That is just our approach right now to what we recommend for this methodology to as a different approach to how we think about budgeting and the population. As I said, I think the population is going to be a factor in this, but our historical review shows just focusing on that may not get anybody the outcome they want. What we're hoping is to develop this methodology that ties it to services and no matter what policy you're trying to look for, if you apply this methodology, you'll be able to analyze and figure out what do you want to accomplish and be able to understand the outcome you're going to get by investing or prioritize certain services rather than other services.

Most importantly that's coming up next, is the statement of costs avoided. As we know, the

statement of cost avoided is the statutory requirement of this Commission to measure out some outcomes from AB 236. When AB 236 was enacted, it promised savings if those policies were enacted, and promised a certain amount of savings over the next 10 years back in 2018. The statute provides some minimum requirements for the formula. Last year, this Sentencing Commission with our assistance and assistance from a technical provider developed a formula. Generally, that formula is taking the prison population projections from 2018 subtracting the actual inmate population, taking the difference and then multiplying that by the average daily cost of incarcerating an offender. Last year, we didn't submit a statement of cost avoided because it was too soon. AB 236 had only gone into effect July 1 so there wasn't anything to calculate and apply to. This would be the first time that there would be something to calculate after AB 236 was enacted. If this formula as it was previously adopted was kept its general framework, we recommend some changes.

As you can see on page 11, we talk about the prison populations that are used to develop the budgets of DOC parole and probation and the parole board. These prison population projections are put together by an outside consultant. Three of these reports are generated each biennium to help inform the budgeting process at different phases. The statute requires projections from 2018. We took the August 2018 projections. But as we've gotten to understand how these projections work, we thought it might be helpful to use projections at a different stage of the budgeting process. These projections are put together to, at one stage, to inform the agency when they develop their budget, and then later on in the process when the agency is finalizing their budget and it's at the governor's recommended phase. There's another set of projections that are published. And then the final set of projections comes out during the legislative session so the legislators can use projections to finalize the budgets of these agencies.

Thinking about it that way, we think it might be more informative or helpful to use actual prison population projections that were used for the DOC's budget if we're trying to measure these costs avoided. That means we would recommend the February 2017 report which is the report that would have been used by the legislature to finalize the budgets, rather than the August 2018 projections. Those projections would have been used for the following biennium and they can still be useful but right now our approach would be to not use those because those also would have been the projections that were being in the development phase of budgets and not part of the final adoption of a budget. One of the things that we've seen with the projections that they can change throughout the biennium. Trying to understand how to use those, we're trying to calculate something like this, it's helpful for the Commission to have that full information so we can decide which is the best to use.

The other thing I want to comment on is if the framework of the formula were kept that was adopted last year, also using a different average cost per day. Last year we adopted an adjusted average cost per day that didn't include all of the accounts. But because of the potential limitations of using the average cost per day, we'd recommend using just the straight average cost per day for all the accounts, and then provide information about just an additional context and breakdown separate from that. What that formula would look like is on page 12. It would be the February 2017 prison population projections, and subtracting the inmate population as of June 30th, take that difference and multiply it by the average daily operating cost total for incarceration. If that formula were to be applied, we have provided those calculations here.

Ultimately, we think it might be best for the Commission to keep figuring out and working on this formula. There are, as I discussed, limitations to using the projections. They are statutorily required, but I think understanding how they are part of the budget building process and what we're trying to measure would be helpful to understand. We don't have all that information today.

I'd be happy to, when we get to that point, answer questions or comment more about how to use these. I just see potential limitations and want to make sure the Commission has all the information, as you decide what is important to measure here and how do you want to measure it.

The other thing I wanted to mention. As we show on page 13, we just showed like how the projections correlate to the actual population. And again, we're not quite sure how best the Commission should be using these projections yet, but we will keep developing our and analyzing what we see in the trends and make some recommendations. And of course, as we get questions and input from the Commission figure out what's important to you with understanding these projections and how you want to use them.

Obviously, the other limitation to the formula is using an actual population. Again, if we just use a straight formula that just calculates without adding any context, I just see limitations with that. As we can see from the previous year, there was a huge impact of the prison population for the COVID-19 pandemic. When you look at the way that formula was calculated and you see the projections that were developed back in 2018, and what they predicted we would be at for our prison population, and then what we're at now, it's a big difference. We know that the prison population was already trending down a little bit in 2018. We will do some analysis to understand that more, and then we see of course it can continue to trend down further because of COVID-19 and then it's also possible it was trending down even more because of AB 236. Again, these are all things that we're not quite sure how it all factors into this, but I think just using the actual population to do a straight calculation could have its limitations without adding any additional context.

When we discussed this last year, this issue was brought to our attention by members of the Commission, and even by the Director himself pointing out the variable costs that can be experienced at different facilities and different accounts and wanting to do a breakdown. We had already talked about adding a breakdown of either an average cost per day or looking at population trends. But I want to let this Commission know we're open to that. We are clearly engaged in this process and want to help you figure out what is, again, the most sustainable and reliable way to figure this out. I'm just offering that we are willing to not be limited by a formula and willing to engage in, let's figure out what these costs are and add that context when it comes to submitting the statement of cost avoided. As you can see here on the bottom of page 13, we ultimately recommend the development of a new formula. That still obviously includes the statutorily required components, but I think you need more time to really figure out what is it we're trying to measure and what does it look like.

With that, as I said this is a draft, at the last page of the report, we put together recommendations that the Commission could have as a starting point to adopt. So, if the Commission were to take a lot of the findings of this report, and then incorporate that into a recommendation for the statement of costs avoided, ultimately, that would look like just taking a pause. Because we're learning more about the fiscal analysis of how to figure out the trends in the population, the trends and expenditures, and figuring out what are those desired outcomes. You can see I put together here, that it's too soon. There are many limitations going on right now, obviously there's the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the population the way we still aren't quite sure of. And if the intent is to measure outcomes from AB 236, I don't think there's any reason to rush that right now, especially as this Commission is trying to figure out what formula you would like to really use in the long term.

You can see I included here information related to Virginia. Virginia recently passed some criminal

justice reforms with the intent to lower the prison population hoping to realize cost savings. They develop their own prison population projections. They have a committee of individuals who are their state local and in-house for their state to develop their prison population projections. They've decided, because it's hard to tell what's going to happen with the prison population, they've experienced similar to us where the prison population has decreased significantly. They've also enacted these reforms. Rather than trying to tease those out and trying to predict how and when we're going to recover population-wise from the pandemic or what that even looks like in terms of the prison population, they're taking a pause. They're actually going to use a flat rate prison population projection for the next six years. Our recommendation that we developed here is the Commission could take a similar approach and just wait a biennium for submitting a statement of costs avoided. And in submitting the statement of cost avoided, report to the governor's office and the legislature and the Supreme Court that this Commission is still developing a formula, sees limitations in trying to use a formula right now because of the pandemic and because of trying to develop a formula that is more sustainable, and possibly take a pause. Of course, what I said, we could take this framework or whatever this Commission decides to adopt, and we have the calculations here. We've shown you what the calculations look like if we apply the formula. That could be incorporated here into the recommendation.

And then, what I didn't include here which we would include in the final recommendation would be those specific areas, that if there were funds to invest where they would go and those go to programs for DOC, programs to promote probation, programs for behavioral health, and to the Coordinating Council. It's also possible the Commission could separately just recommend in general that these areas be looked at as opportunities for investment. That's something we can include as well. As you can see there's a lot here, we need to figure out and you can see that we're engaged in that and we're very curious. And we think to really get this Commission set up properly is to do this type of analysis and have this all set in one place. Our intent would be to put these reports out, to develop these reports on a quarterly basis and present them to you at the Commission. As I said, we would do something similar for data reports. And then information that's presented to the Commission if the Commission were to adopt recommendations could then be applied at the appropriate time for budgeting. The budget building process is going to start here soon but we can still keep developing this. And I think when it really gets time to making recommendations, that time will help throughout the process, but also be the most effective or the most opportunity could be taken when it's time for the legislature to finalize on what's happening in the budget.

Again, next steps. We have lots of things we promise to bring you next time. We want to do a comparison to other states. I know I mentioned some cursory information done we're doing some more research, but we're really curious about what budgets look like in other states and then comparing, corrections budgets, and then comparing that to their population. Our thinking and doing that is, will show us that it really is what's important to the state. There isn't necessarily a baseline for what corrections cost. And just like I said, our cursory, and if you Google it though some charts will come up immediately and you'll see it runs the gamut with what expenditures are. I think that's a great opportunity for Nevada to decide what's important for this state and how do we want to look at that. But we will have a full analysis of that of what other states are spending and what their populations look like, so that you can get a sense of where do we fit in that. And help you decide what's important when it comes to looking at costs.

We're thinking about developing ratios. We think that might be another way to evaluate the services ratios of COs to inmates, caseworkers, any of those services being provided. I know there are some federal minimums and other best practices but that might also help if we have a baseline of something like that when stakeholders and lawmakers are trying to decide how do

you want to evaluate what the costs are.

Our intent too, would be, as we developed this methodology to meet with legislators and the stakeholders throughout the next year and a half to get their feedback, I mean, luckily, we have some on this Commission. And so, curious to hear what's important when it comes to that aspect of wondering what the costs are and what's important. We think if we could start having those conversations now, we can really figure out what's best for the state when it comes to talking about this instead of trying to figure it out when bills are coming across and we're just trying to react and really figure out what is it we're trying to measure.

And then, of course, the judiciary interim can be meeting soon too as well, and we think that's going to be a great opportunity to take recommendations from the Commission and introduce the Commission and the department to that interim committee as being a resource for data analysis and developing recommendations. With that, I am ready for questions and discussion, anything else we want to pursue in terms of where to go next with this.

Director Cafferata: Thank you, Director Gonzalez. From the time you've briefed me on this report to today, I think you know there's been a lot of excellent improvements. I think you highlight some of the challenges, which is that we need to clarify really what the mission is. And early in the report I think the really sort of, key data point is that, you know, we can have the population and the prisons dropping pretty significantly and yet costs still going up. There's an underlying assumption in some of the work in the past that if we could sort of reduce the length of sentences, we could reduce the cost. But it's clear that that's not a direct correlation. I think you've done a great job of starting to set up the questions we need to consider in terms of what really is our charge, what really is our goal, and maybe it's sort of at an overarching level just being better able to give legislators information about what policy changes will accomplish. And I think we certainly need to help folks focus on there are a lot of other goals we may be trying to accomplish other than just changing the budget. I think we've gotten a really good start on some of the questions. I think it's sort of interesting what Virginia's doing which is sort of holding the population consistent in their statistics. I'm not sure exactly in terms of next steps because we really need sort of some data expertise as well, but I think this has come a long way so far and I think it's very helpful. So, thank you.

Dr. Lanterman: I second Director Cafferata's comments. I think it's really important for us to explore the relationship between the methods of reducing the prison population and the outcomes of interest which are primarily the costs associated with incarceration and recidivism rates.

There are two primary ways or approaches to reducing prison population. One is to find ways to release people who are at the lowest risk of reoffending, particularly intra or same offense recidivism. In that case, people who have been convicted of homicide or the people you would release from prison first.

The second strategy to reducing prison population is to find ways to release people who have been convicted of the lowest severity offenses. Those would be people who have been convicted of property and drug offenses. However, people who've been convicted of property and drug offenses have the highest risk of reoffending. And especially if they have not had sufficient access to effective evidence-based practices to address their criminogenic needs while in Department of Corrections custody.

What most states do is they find ways to release people who've been convicted of the lowest severity offenses of property and drug offenses. What that has the effect of doing is increasing

the average age of people in Department of Corrections custody. That becomes really important in terms of your outcomes of interest especially with respect to costs. Because per National Institute of Corrections analysis, people who are justice-involved and who are incarcerated age at an accelerated rate relative to their same age peers in the community.

When we are examining a free community population, we think of like senior citizens starting in mid-60s. But data indicate that the accelerated aging of people who are justice involved means that a 50-year-old may be in the same health condition as like someone who's in their 60s in a free community. And that on average older inmates have three chronic health conditions and they all those chronic health conditions require medical care.

Furthermore, ADA applies to prisons. If you have a population that is on average older, you're going to have more ADA compliance costs associated with that population. That's going to be things like retrofitting facilities, it will be things like even if you significantly reduce the actual size of the prison population you can't necessarily close at many facilities because there might be ADA compliance issues like people not being able to sleep in bunk beds. You reduce the number of inmates you can house in any particular space. You're going to have increase in cost associated with durable medical equipment. And if you want to reduce the likelihood that people have been convicted of relatively low severity offenses like property and drug offenses from coming back, you'll have to invest resources in programming for their criminogenic needs.

My concern with the focus on, it's important to monitor costs always, but my concern with the focus on significantly reducing Department of Corrections budget is that it is disconnected from the likely methods of reducing the prison population. And what is more likely to occur is if you're going to effectively address not only the legal obligations for basic care for people who are incarcerated but you want to also allocate resources to reduce the likelihood that people return to Department of Corrections custody. What you're more likely to be doing is reallocating or redistributing funds in a Department of Corrections budget rather than substantially reducing it.

Your outcome of interest is really the likelihood of reoffending but you're only going to be able to do that, if you have the sufficient programming resources for people when they are incarcerated, and then when they transition to the community ongoing resources, whether that is when they are under parole and probation supervision, whether they engage in community resources, as well as, you know, providing the legally necessary resources for people while they remain in Department of Corrections custody particularly this aging population. My overall concern has been that if the goal is to really substantially reduce costs, you know, we are sending some mixed messages to Department of Corrections about what we're asking them to do.

Ms. Mull: Just to piggyback off what she was saying, when she was speaking about programming, I know that the Director and I spoke about this yesterday, I feel the importance of us analyzing or acknowledging what programming individuals are receiving within the prison system, and then how that transitions, once they get out, also for not only their success once they're out back into the world, but also recidivism. But also, we need a way to analyze or to look at making sure people are not further traumatized or harmed within the prison system because we can't expect people to go into a system and become further harmed with it in it. Just speaking with pre and sexual assaults or other things that might be traumatizing to them, and then expect them to go back into the real world further harmed, further traumatized than they were originally but then the function at a high level and function at a successful rate back into the real world. I don't know how to analyze that but I definitely think it's something that, you know, we have to look at as a bigger picture because if we're putting people back into the real world not prepared or not ready or further harm than they were when they came into the system, then how can we expect

them not to end up back to where they're coming back in, or worse off than they were originally back in society which is you know, just another additional costs, just another part of the state going to end up paying for it. I definitely think we need to look at the programming that's being provided, and then how that transition to programs like Mr. Ponder's programs and things to that extent once they're out. But definitely making sure that people have access to trauma-informed programming and accessible programming within the system that is preparing them to have an easier transition and that they're in a better place when they leave the system so that we are less likely to see them come back into the system. And I think that's important not only for financial reasons for the state, but I think that's important for from a victim's standpoint. Just because you know as victims and as survivors, you know, we're more than likely going to see our perpetrators get out of jail at some time. And we would hope that they're not, the last thing we want to do is see them reoffend. We don't want to see any anybody else get hurt, we don't want to see them end up in a worse place, so I think that's important for everybody all around.

Chair Stiglich: I'd echo Ms. Mull's comments. Just about we want people to be coming out better, not worse, and we can't expect to take people out and then just parachute them back into their lives in progress and expect them to be successful. I think this is such a really important conversation about what are we trying to accomplish when we incarcerate people and how are we setting them up for success. And that means setting the whole community, all of us up for success when they're released. And that's why I think it's so important that we're having this conversation. I encourage people to jump in. I neglected to say it during the last reporting, but for those of you who provided feedback and input, thank you. That's exactly what we need here, I think to come up with recommendations that are going to make a difference. Our next agenda item about re-entry programs kind of goes hand in hand with that discussion we're having right now. Because it's as much about what we're doing while people are incarcerated, as how we're treating them when they're in is how we're treating them when they're out. And giving them that warm hand off into the community with some tools for success. And hopefully some hope to utilize those tools in a way that benefits them and does not cycle them right back into incarceration. Are there other comments or questions, thoughts or impressions? Mr. Hicks.

D.A. Hicks: Thank you, Chair Stiglich, and well said from you, as well. I just want to, first off, Director Gonzalez, I want to give you and your key, your team kudos for what you're doing here and for this report. You know, I think that original formula that this Commission put together was by necessity and it really barely scratched the surface. And I think what you're pointing out in this report is the very real complexities that exist and drilling down into this data, but I can see that you guys are digging down into it. I think that unlike that what the historical data shows I think with your leadership and with the makeup of this Commission, we're going to be successful in accomplishing these goals. I'm very excited about it, and so I want to give you guys kudos for that.

Just a couple comments, one has to do with your initial report and it's kind of intertwined with this one. And that is, moving forward, I think your point is well made that we need to have a Nevada focused basis here. I realize historically, we've used outside entities, JFA, CJI it and they've done fine. I'm not detracting from their efforts at all. But I really think this is the Nevada Sentencing Commission and we're fortunate enough to have the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy, your department, and I think as we move forward, you, your department needs to be the data hub, your department, if it's able, which I think it will be, needs to be the one that is doing these projections, that are doing this analysis for the state because you're from the state and you represent the state. That's just something I want to plant in the air of everybody, I think that that's something that is important that we have a Nevada focused entity. The last thing I wanted to say is, I also think your point is well made. It's very difficult for us to analyze the prison population

under the constraints that exist right now, namely COVID. The population is so immensely down. I'd be very interested to hear what it is today, but it's less than half of what some of the JFA projections were a decade ago. I mean, there was suggestions that we were going to be over 22,000 now and I believe we're around 10. I think that we, that your suggestion of maybe just taking a pause and drilling down as to into some of these recommendations you have in your report is a very good one. My question to you is, is I don't know if this is an action item, I think it is, but if there is a motion that you would like to be to hear that we could have the Commission vote on as to moving forward with the recommendations in this particular report. I'd ask that of you if that is something you're looking for.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, D.A. Hicks, for that. Yes, because of the December 1 deadline, we want to make sure that the Commission is in compliance with that. Yes, so that last page would be the general proposal for what would be submitted for the statement of cost avoided.

And so, yeah, at the end of this discussion we would be looking for a motion from this Commission which would be the recommendation of what you would like us to submit. This could be the framework of it. We could, whatever motion is adopted could be a general sort of, make sure it includes this and certain elements if there are additions to what we've got proposed here, and then we would send out a final version to the Commission to get one last round of feedback before it's submitted before the December 1 deadline. But, yeah, ultimately, we do need something from the Commission about what you would like us to submit for the December 1 deadline and, yes, thanks.

D.A. Hicks: Well, I certainly don't want to cut off any further discussion, but I'm prepared to make that motion whenever the chair would like it made.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Mr. Hicks. Is there further feedback or any comments?

Vice Chair Brady: I have some comments, Ms. Chair. Thank you. One of the things that Ms. Gonzalez mentioned was priorities and looking at priorities. I think it's also important when we think of where the sentencing and what sentencing is. We're not just looking at who's sent to prison and reducing recidivism going back to prison and the re-entry programs, but I think it's important also for us to look on the front end at PNP and Nevada mental health services. I know that that's on the list of things to look at in the future. But looking at what services and what resources those entities have on the front end in preventing people from going to prison in the first place. You know, people who are sentenced to probation, who are sentenced to a specialty court, those sorts of things. I think that goes to the resources. Look at the kinds of resources they have. I'm particularly interested in PNP's resources. I know that they've had some day reporting centers and different things and I don't know how they've been impacted by COVID if their numbers have gone up instead of down since fewer people are going into to prison. So that's just one thing to think of is looking at the front end, also making sure we drill down there as well as the back end.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Ms. Brady.
into to prison. So that's just one thing to think of is looking at the front end, also making sure we drill down there as well as the back end.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Ms. Brady.

Director Gonzalez: If I could just comment on that, Chair. That's exactly one of the things we're hoping to get out of the Coordinating Council, as well is, that first inventory, collection of

information will give us a, we're hoping, handle on what is currently provided at the local level. We're looking forward to that, but, yes, as we discussed too looking to analyze more even at the PNP level and what those services are. Because it's definitely been part of what's driving just what's happening in the state in general what those services are. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you. Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Hoffman: I have a question and then I have a statement. The question is, the draft for or the final version of this report will it contain both the old formula that says we're saving an x amount of money and then this like new statement that but we don't really know the formula is still kind of wonky and we're figuring that out. That's my understanding but I want to make sure that's correct.

Director Gonzalez: That would be up to the Commission. We could include all those pieces. Our plan would be for the statement of cost avoided to submit this report in its entirety. With the NDSP findings and analysis, plus the recommendations from the Commission. If the Commission would like that formula put into the recommendation part or just leave it in the NDSP analysis part. It would be up to this Commission which pieces you actually want as part of the recommendation piece, versus just what's included in the findings that will be part of the final report submitted with the statement.

Mr. Hoffman: Thank you. And then, so my statement is that, to me, it seems like, on the one hand, I really agree with what Dr. Lanterman and Ms. Mull, and like other people like, that were saying that there are a lot of costs here. And I think that maybe just looking at the budget doesn't capture some of those costs. I think it's important to be open to different ways of calculating this. But I also think that there's a statutory obligation of the legislature said do this, so we got to put this in the report. And I think maybe a good way to address that would be to make it just have both of those things in the report. And then it'll save this much money but there's an asterisk and we're working on a better way of figuring out how much money it'll save. That way the legislature and other stakeholders know that they can rely on this but we're working to make it better, so don't rely on it too much because it's still a new methodology. That might be a way to sort of, address all of these concerns together.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. I understand your point on that and some of this is just going to be how are we framing the information. Because to some extent, if no costs are avoided and people are going to prison and never coming back, have we been successful? It's kind of looking at what's the ultimate mission here? Cost avoided being one metric for sure. We have to make sure we're certainly abiding by our statutory mandates, and also using all the expertise on this panel to kind of think outside the box in what we're framing up for them. Are there any other comments or thoughts anyone would like to add on this topic? If not, Mr. Hicks, are you prepared to make a motion?

Assemblyman Orentlicher: This is Assemblyman David Orentlicher. This has been very helpful, and I'm concerned too about the focus on cost. But one thing I liked about the formula whichever version we end up, is that the number looks better the more we spend on appropriate services for inmates. Because that multiple of cost saved is going to be the higher that is, the better the bottom line. So at least to the extent that this measurement of costs avoided is going to drive policy, it's going to drive it in the right way, so I like that part of it.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you. Any other comments? I'm looking for hands. Mr. Hicks?

CHRISTOPHER HICKS MOVED TO ADOPT THE FULL REPORT SUBJECT TO ANY

EDITS BASED ON THIS MEETING AND THE PROPOSAL MOVING FORWARD.

SENATOR PICKARD SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED.

6. Presentation on Certain Reentry Programs in Nevada

Chair Stiglich: I'll now open agenda item number six. Presentations regarding re-entry programs in Nevada.

The Commission is tasked with evaluating various aspects related to sentencing and corrections policy and making recommendations concerning those policies. Our process for making recommendations will begin with a review of what's currently happening in our state. After review we can evaluate and then make appropriate recommendations. We just applied this approach to our fiscal discussion. The previous agenda item, the next area we'll explore is re-entry, and specifically, the provision of re-entry programs and their partnerships with the Nevada Department of Corrections. We have the privilege of hearing from Ridge House who provides re-entry services in the north and we'll hear from Hope for Prisoners, a provider of re-entry services primarily in the south. We'll hear from the Nevada Department of Corrections regarding the re-entry programs and services they provide and any partnerships they may have. And I may add my comment about the privilege of hearing applies to all of those entities. I'll now turn this time over to the representatives from Ridge House.

Ms. Tillman: Thank you, Chair Stiglich. My name is Dani Tillman. I am the Executive Director for Ridge House. First, I'd like to thank the Commission for the invitation to speak today and the opportunity to share what Ridge House is, who we are and what we do. It is absolutely my honor to do that. I'm going to give you a little bit of the history of Ridge House and I'll talk about how I became involved with Ridge House and then we'll move into partnerships that we've had in the state. First of all, Ridge House has a long and rich history for the state of Nevada. We were actually formed in 1981 by the prison ministry Kairos, a national movement that takes the message of Christianity into the prison systems. And we were actually started by a local chapter of Kairos here in Northern Nevada. This group of people would go into primarily Northern Nevada Correctional Center. They would do what they call weekend retreats, they would literally camp out for 48 hours inside the prison system and have a faith-based retreat with the gentleman there and they did this pretty frequently. What they noticed rather quickly was a rapid in and out. The men that they would see leaving were returning in really quick succession.

This lovely group of very kind-hearted and compassionate individuals started asking questions. What is going on? Why do you keep returning? What's lacking in the community? What they heard time and time again was a significant lack of re-entry resources in the entire state of Nevada but with a big emphasis on the North.

This group of people said we're going to get together and we can solve this. And in the beginning, they actually were helping men parole into their private homes. As you can imagine, that didn't always work out well, they had some success. They had some challenges there and so they decided that they needed to get some backup. They went out, they did some research, they gathered some people together that had like-minded interests who had some experience in these

matters. They wrote a few grants. They raised some money and they purchased the first Ridge House. Our first Ridge House sat on Ridge Street in downtown Reno which ironically sits between court and Liberty Streets.

Our very first production of Ridge House was a single house entirely volunteer-based, not a lot of technical influence. We didn't have volunteer counselors or case managers or anything like that. In the very beginning it was really just a bunch of people that wanted to do something good for the people who were re-entering the Northern Nevada community.

Fast forward just a little bit, that was our first introduction and our first relationship with the Nevada Department of Corrections was the ability to take these meetings into the prison system prior to release and work on a coordinated re-entry as bare-boned as it was in 1981. In 1982, Ridge House incorporated as a 501C3 nonprofit here in Northern Nevada located in Reno but serving all of the state of Nevada, both the South and the North including all of the Rurals. We started at that point in time developing a very close relationship with the Nevada Department of Corrections as they became our first and primary referral source. I will mention that they've been our primary referral source for the last 40 years, but in the very beginning in 1982, we only served individuals who were seeking re-entry into Northern Nevada as coming to us directly out of the prison system. People were paroling directly to us. That was our very first relationship with the Nevada Department of Corrections.

Over time, like many entities do, we evolved. We started to understand that re-entry was more than just providing someone a place to live and some assistance building a resume. We understood that there were behavioral health challenges that lots of individuals coming out of the prison system experience, including the substance use disorders, habilitative efforts including understanding financial management, learning how to obtain and maintain employment, creating lasting relationships with not just the community around them but their families whether those are nuclear families of statement. And really helping people to establish roots as a means of going forward.

Throughout time, Ridge House started to evolve a little bit and take on some of those trained facilitators. We then began to hire clinically trained and licensed professionals to provide behavioral health services in-house. We developed relationships with partners such as DETR, JOIN which is the workforce development programming up here. We start in case management services. We developed relationships with those folks too in the very beginning.

Fast forward to 2008. Between 1981 and 2008 Ridge House grew to five residential treatment homes. So in 2008 we had five single family dwellings that were converted to statewide licensed and funded treatment programs. We delivered substance use disorder treatment within those facilities. They all served adult men and women 18 and over. Of the five homes one house specifically served adult male veterans. One house specifically served adult females. And the other three houses specifically served the reentry population adult males. Of those last three houses one was very specific to court services, so they oversaw folks from drug court, diversion court, youth parole, felony diversion court or a felony DUI court, excuse me, 184 house arrest and 305 house arrests. That house was very, very specific and had a really close engagement with the court system not just the NDOC.

That was also my first exposure to Ridge House. In 2006, I had been convicted of a low-level felony drug crime. I was convicted of possession with intent to sell narcotics single felony. I had been offered probation and didn't do real well on probation but was never offered any kind of alternative sentencing drug court, division court or anything like that. I was sent to prison in

February of 2008, and I served roughly nine months in prison. I was released to Ridge House towards the end of October of 2008, and I was released to Ridge House because Ridge House had formally developed a contract with the NDOC to provide targeted re-entry services in the North to include lots of other things not just substance use treatment, but to include some of those things that Director Gonzalez, Dr. Lanterman, and some of the others including Chair Stiglich had referenced evidence-based practices that target criminogenic behavior. That was the sole purpose of the development of a contract with the NDOC at that point in time, and so I was lucky enough to be released to Ridge House. As one of the first participating members under this contract to receive intensive case management, substance use disorder treatment. That contract also facilitated evaluation and treatment for co-occurring mental health disorders should they be present.

I came to Ridge House in October of 2008 and I successfully completed the program and I did honorably discharge my parole in May of 2009. During that time, I think it's important to tell you that I was 37 years old. I had a rich history of substance use, I took my first alcoholic drink when I was eight, I was a consistent alcoholic drinker by the age of 12 as many of our clients are. It's well-documented that folks who have substance use disorders often start with a history of childhood trauma that led them to juvenile addiction. And I was exactly one of those individuals. So, when I came to Ridge House at the age of 37, I barely had a GED. I had no idea what I wanted to do with my life. I had children that I had abandoned due to my addiction. I was geographical. By the time I was released, I had lived in 14 states and I had been asked to leave three states and not return. Needless to say, I left a tornado of chaos in my wake through my journey of addiction. I hadn't talked to my mother in 16 years and my dad got a phone call from me after nine years of estrangement saying, hey, I'm in prison, could you send me some money? I've laid the picture there that I was a textbook alcoholic and with challenges of drug addiction.

Ridge House actually laid that foundation of I don't have to live like this, one, that life can be better and that I was worth investing in. Ridge House was the first group of people that ever looked me in my eye and said I'm going to invest in you because I think you're worth it. I'd never heard that before and I didn't know what it meant. It was really uncomfortable, and I was terrified because all I had known my whole life was substance use. But I decided that if they were willing to believe in me, that I would be willing to believe in me, so I enrolled in school. I decided to go to college. I enrolled in the community college here. I started out seeking a degree in psychology and I really wasn't sure what I was going to do with it. I just knew that if I wanted to sustain this idea that I could be better, that I could do better, then I needed to do something. I got in school. I want to just mention that Ridge House in 2009 was one of the original founding members of the reentry task force along with the Department of Education Training and Rehabilitation, the NDOC, federal U.S. probation pre-trial, probation and parole services and other services. Both in Las Vegas and Reno including Casa Grande and a couple of others. Ridge House was fundamental in starting the re-entry task force. And my former Executive Director, Steve Burt sat on that task force for a number of years while I was here.

In 2011, the lady who had been my house manager when I was living at Ridge House called me up and said, you know, we got this new grant from DETR and we're going to start a workforce development program and would you like to come back as a volunteer and help us build a curriculum that teaches people how to find and maintain employment post-conviction, and post-release. And I said, I have no idea what that means, but of course I will. I was having some success in school and I was starting to gain some traction with this newfound thing called recovery, and I wanted to be a part of the organization that had had started me on this journey. I came back as a volunteer in January of 2011. I created a workforce development, a 16-week workforce development curriculum that utilizes many evidence-based practices including mock

interviews, financial wellness topics like civic engagement and the restoration of civil rights. And I created and implemented a 16-week curriculum that I volunteered every Thursday night I showed up and I ran a two-hour group to the residence of Ridge House. And that was the beginning of our workforce development program. It's interesting to note that we still utilize many parts of that curriculum today although it's on like its fourth iteration now.

In July of 2011, I was asked to join the Ridge House staff as a full-time case manager working in the workforce development department facilitating the grant that we had received through the Workforce Investment Act through Governor Sandoval's direction. And I did. I became the driver. I was the person who was responsible for driving residents eight hours a day, five days a week in a van, seven-passenger van, if you guys can imagine driving around for 40, literally 40 hours a week taking people to interviews, teaching them how to fill out applications. I would sometimes go into interviews with them and coach them through the process. I would teach them how to answer those direct questions about being convicted of a felony, et cetera, et cetera. Even then, I knew that I was really enjoying this part of my job, but I didn't understand really where I was going to fit in this world. I'll tell you that the pivotal moment that changed me forever and the moment that I knew that I would be with Ridge House until I die, they'll probably peel me off of my desk, is I had a gentleman who had gone to prison when he was 24 years old. He had been convicted of a murder he committed while he was under the influence, and he was 62 years old on the day that he sat in my van. He was a cobbler. He made shoes. It was a skill he had learned in prison and I was taking him to an interview and he said to me that day. It was a really hot summer day and he says, I'm warm, I'm really hot. Can we roll down the window? And I said, sure. Go ahead, you don't have to ask, just roll it down. And he looked at me and I saw this like very perplexed look on my face and he was like, I don't know, he didn't see the window handle, and I said, oh, my gosh. In my head I said, this man has never seen an automatic window. And so, I showed him, I said it's this button right here you just push it down and the window will go down and you can pull it and the window will come back up. And that man pushed the button, pulled the button, pushed the button, pulled the button, and when he looked at me, he had tears just pouring down his eyes out of his eyes down his face. And it was in that moment that I realized that not only were these my people but I needed to be a part of something that changed the absolute disenfranchisement and dehumanization of a system that took away the simple right to feel the air on your face. And I knew that I would never ever leave Ridge House.

And so, I kept plugging along. And a little bit later on that year one of the kids that I had abandoned due to my addiction, she found me, and she reached out to me and she was my firstborn child. Her name was Britney. She was, at the time, 21 years old, right around November of 2011 she called me. And she said, mom, I'm living up in Seattle, Washington and I'm shooting coke and heroin and I need help and I want to stop. And I said, I'm on my way. And the entire collective wisdom of Ridge House was behind me. I jumped in the car, I went to Seattle and I picked her up and I brought her back to Ridge House and we all did our very absolute best to save her. At the time, Ridge House was providing substance use treatment services. While an evidence-based model, we also employed the 12-step abstinence-based model. We were very 12-step oriented. The only pathway to recovery was abstinence, medication assisted therapy was not a viable option, it was a substitution. You needed to just kind of pull up your bootstraps, get stuck, get sober and stay sober. The result of that style of intervention with my then 22-year-old daughter was that on Mother's Day weekend of 2012, I received a knock on my door at 5:30 in the morning that she had overdosed on heroin and died on the bathroom floor alone. And that was the second pivotal moment in my life, in my journey through Ridge House. At that moment, I went to my executive director who was at the time Steve Burt. Some of you may know him. I said we need to do something different because what we're doing didn't work. And if we don't do what do something different, more kids are going to die. And that was evident as across the nation and

across the state we saw an increase that was labeled an epidemic as more and more 18 to 26-year-old young children were dying of heroin overdose. So, we did. We changed. And I changed. I went back to school. I changed my major to social work and I obtained a clinical alcohol and drug counseling license so that I could start to make a one-on-one impact with those who were seeking recovery from substance use disorders.

Ridge House has changed a lot of things in the two years after my daughter's death, most noticeably, we leaned into the evidence-based practice of medication-assisted therapy and we opened three houses that at the time were specific to the 18 to 26-year-old opioid addicted population. We expanded to include co-occurring disorder treatment, which I'm sure that I preach into the choir I don't have to tell you guys how prevalent mental health symptomology whether it be a true mental health disorder or symptoms related to the substance use. Co-occurring disorders are incredibly prevalent when you look at individuals who are diagnosed with substance use disorder. It was a key component to bring in-house dually licensed clinicians that could treat both the mental health and the substance use disorder simultaneously.

We also expanded our workforce development department to include in intensive case management and service coordination. More than employment and workforce development services we started a referral and linkage process to the FQHCs, here in town the Federally Qualified Health Centers. We have direct lines to primary care, as well as dental and vision. We also have direct lines through contract with psychiatrists here who will provide psychiatric medications as needed, which in the past under our 12-step abstinence place model was not allowed at Ridge House. And then we also developed relationships with the medication assisted treatment providers so that we could provide direct referrals. If someone comes in with an opioid use disorder and they need access to medication assisted treatment, we can have them in the induction process within 48 hours. We changed the way that we looked at opioid use disorder and we realized that the way opiates attacked most specifically young minds, the minds of those 18 to 26-year-old kids was different than anything else we had ever treated. And that we need to respond differently. So, we leaned hard into the evidence-based care, we leaned hard into trauma-informed framework, and we developed an entire program related to that specific topic.

Over time, that has changed a little bit as we've started to see a slight decrease in the opioid epidemic. We also recognized that Ridge House's primary reported drug of choice remained alcohol and second was methamphetamine. We did recognize that while we had leaned super heavy into the treatment of opioid use disorder that we still had these very base factions of individuals that we needed to pay attention to. The folks that were coming to us from the NDOC still had significant issues with alcohol and methamphetamine opiates and heroin, while on the rise, you know, in that particular time frame we really started to see increases in alcohol and methamphetamine again.

We also expanded our workforce development department over the next few years, and we obtained grants, larger grants through WIOA and workforce investment and DETR that includes job search training education and placement. Looking at Ridge House today, we have eight residential facilities providing substance use and co-occurring care in-house. We have a comprehensive workforce development department that provides all of the services, the workforce training education and placement. We can literally put people through school, through training, through higher education. We have people in CDL schools. We have people in cosmetology school. We have people going and learning the trades, welding, HVAC. We have people who are engaging in the University of Nevada Reno's peer support and community health worker classes. We are giving individuals pathways to long-term sustainable recovery. You guys have done lots of lots of studies, there's lots of knowledge on this panel today, and I think we all understand that

the number one protective factor against recidivism is employment. You give people a purpose. You give them something to get up for in the morning, go to work, not stop gap employment but sustainable employment and a way to support themselves and they are less likely to reoffend. You couple that with substance use co-occurring mental health treatment and you then decrease the risk factors for continued recidivism or substance use or worse death through evidence-based treatment.

And so, that's what Ridge House learned over those years and we leaned into the development and the provision of these services. Over time, I was able to continue my education with the University of Nevada Reno. Today, I hold a master's degree in social work, awarded from that university. I'm also a licensed alcohol and drug counselor through the state of Nevada, and I'm a licensed independent social worker from the state of Nevada. In March of 2018, right before the pandemic started, I was honored with the opportunity to become the Executive Director of the organization that saved my life. And I accepted with a lot of fear and trepidation. Some of those old habits of fear of failure perk up, but Ridge House saved me then and it continues to save me every day. If you ask anybody who's in the world of treatment, why we do what we do, they're going to tell you that that there's a why. And my daughter is my why. Britney is my why. I had to tell her story. I had to stick around because I went through a period of time after her death where I was incredibly suicidal. Just the absolute guilt of not being able to save her. I sat up one day, and I said if I don't go down this path, nobody's going to remember her. They're not going to tell her story, and nothing is going to happen, nothing is going to change and we're going to lose more people. And so, every single day that's her, you can't see her, she's on the wall behind me. Every day I get up and I remember my daughter and I say today we're going to save another life kid. We're going to save another life today, and she has changed a lot of people since 2012.

That's kind of the history of Ridge House and the services that we provide. Some of the things that I'd really like to be able to talk to you about today is that the last few years, specifically since December of 2018 have been incredibly challenging for Ridge House when we talk about coordinated re-entry. Ridge House maintained that contract with the Nevada Department of Corrections through the end of 2018. Our contract was set to expire September 30, 2018, and, you know, the NDOC was going through some reallocation and they had some changes going on their side, and they asked us to provide services through the end of December of 2018 while they kind of, you know, figured out those pathways and assured us that a new contract would be forthcoming. As of December 31, 2018, Ridge House's contract with the Nevada Department of Corrections terminated and did not come up for reauthorization. Why that's impactful is for the Sentencing Commission to understand the types of services that were provided under that contract. The RISE program which was a substance use disorder treatment program that was provided in-house at Warm Springs, and I believe Northern Nevada Correctional Center, I may be wrong on that, but for sure Ridge House had a therapist that worked inside the prison providing coordinated re-entry services including substance use treatment with the consistent language that was then being conducted in Ridge House. That led into staff at Ridge House being trained in the NRAS, EPICS training. The idea was to present, not just coordinated entry but coordinated language. We wanted to speak the same language so that as people were leaving the prison system and coming into the community that we were all on the same page. We continued with the manualized care that had been provided in NDOC. We continued that care when an individual came to us in through re-entry and we worked simultaneously. We also provided intensive case management services. We provided open door services within the prison. And in fact, I have a letter here from then statewide re-entry administrator Gary Rosenfeld that I'd like to just read two sentences from. It says, Ridge House is a current community partner. This was dated in April of 2013. This was when Ridge House was attempting to receive a grant from SAMHSA for treatment for ex-offenders. Ridge House is a current community partner with the NDOC and provides a

valuable service to ex-offenders and the community. Through their programming, counseling services, job development, and case management, the Ridge House aids in the reduction of recidivism within the State of Nevada.

I also want to let you know that Ridge House is a nationally recognized model of care in 2009. We were written up in the re-entry policy council. In 2010, there was a report through the National Institute of Justice that supported Ridge House as an evidence-based model or as a nationally recognized model for evidence-based practices that specifically target criminogenic needs through a trauma-informed framework. Basically, we do what we do really well. We are good at what we do. We've been doing it for 40 years. I've already talked a little bit about when that contract ended, we also saw the end of coordinated re-entry in the North as we had known it for 10 years. There were no re-entry supported systems up here. There were no warm handoffs. There were no coordinated referrals. Gone was the consistency in language. Gone was the sharing of information. It just stopped. And the people that we were seeing coming out of the system because NDOC to this day remains our number one referral source but it's not because the case management being referred to us, it's because if you walk into any prison yard in the state of Nevada and ask an inmate who Ridge House is, they know. Because as anybody who's ever set foot on a prison yard knows inmates have their own hierarchy. They have their own communication. They know who Ridge House is. And we get lots of folks. We process more than 50 applications a week. A week. And we have a residential capacity of 61. On November 1st, due to the high backlog in men who are currently incarcerated with no viable parole option, Ridge House converted its female residential house into a male residential house and an increased licensure by two beds so that we could get nine more men out of prison before Christmas. It's our goal. This is what we do. They know who we are, but we haven't been able to re-engage with the NDOC and I'm disheartened and I'm here in front of the Commission today in the hopes that we can start a conversation to renew that relationship.

I want you to know that Northern Nevada Transitional Housing, Ridge House continues to offer services to Northern Nevada Transitional Housing free of charge because the men up here deserve a chance. We hold granted through COVID. It's over the phone but we hold open door and intensive case management services that anybody at NNTH can get on the phone and ask our case managers for assistance. They might not even be coming to Ridge House and we still offer that service because these guys deserve a chance. Last month the associate warden for Northern Nevada Correctional Center reached out to me and asked if we would provide treatment and case management inside an NCC. And I said of course we will. Because we're not contracted with NDOC, the answer is money, what's the question? We all know that sustainability wise, how do I continue to provide services? I located the money through another grant through the justice administration that would allow us to go into Northern Nevada Correctional Center and provide case management and treatment through the end of the year. And we did get an approved curriculum but we cannot get past the process to actually get through the visitation process to actually get into the building even though the person who would be facilitating the treatment is a former employee of the NDOC and resigned from there in good standing. She has visitation status has for a very long time. I feel like I'm at a standstill again that we're here, we want to provide the services. We can't get in the building. We can't get access, and at this point, we can't get people to communicate. The re-entry task force hasn't met in since 2018 that I'm aware of. I've sent several e-mails. I've requested. I've asked and I can't get answers as to where the re-entry task force is. Ridge House is here. We want to be at the table. We want to be a part of the conversation. We've been doing this for 40 years. And you know, I'm reaching a point where I have to look at the sustainability option of providing services a, for free, and b, without coordinated re-entry, there's a gap in messaging and those gaps are where people die. This isn't a matter of we'll catch them as they come out. This is a matter of we need to talk to them before they leave.

You know, Ridge House has other grants that allow us to go into the prison systems and do on the spot applications intakes and interviews to where people have coordinated reentry. We just need to get in the door.

I do want to point out one last thing, and that is that it is not just Ridge House, it is the entire Northern community that has decreased access to re-entry, re-entry dollars, coordinated re-entry through communication. I have not spoken to a provider up here in the North that has the collaboration that we did in 2017.

With that, I want to tell you one more thing before I end and thank you for your time. Ridge House is still doing the work. People come to us, like I said, we process more than 50 applications a week. And those are the applications from the prisons. That's not the applications from people that walk in for services. That's just from the prisons. We are holding our graduation ceremony. It's called the Capstone ceremony and it's a ceremony that we present every six months, and we honor the individuals who have successfully completed our program. It's a big deal. The residential component of our program is anywhere from four to five months. So that's four to five months that a person lives with us, programs, goes to work, learns how to live in the community. It's hard. Take it from me, it's not an easy program to complete. And then we asked them to complete nine to 12 months of outpatient treatment. So, our Capstone celebration honors the time and effort and the changes that they have accomplished over the course of that 18 months. There are typically about 20 graduates that come back to participate sometimes it can be really scary to get up on stage, but they are honored with certificates of completion from both state senators' offices. The closing remarks are delivered by a federal magistrate. And I believe this year we have representation from a couple other elected officials. I am formally inviting everyone on this Sentencing Commission to come and attend the capstone celebration, it is Friday the 12th. I realized that short notice, Friday the 12th, up here in Reno. If anybody is interested in where that is, I have sent a flyer of the event to Director Gonzalez, or she can give you my e-mail address I'm happy to send it to anybody that is inclined.

With that, I really want to thank you for your time and your attention today and for the opportunity to tell you about Ridge House. I am walking, talking, living, breathing proof that second chance programming works. Ridge House works. Re coordinated re-entry works. What you guys are doing is so, so important when we start looking at how do we decrease prison population, how do we increase access to re-entry services, how do we close that gap and build a bridge so that these folks who truly, you know, I won't get into whether or not they deserve to be in prison or not, but people with behavioral health conditions need treatment. And if we can do it before they get out and continue it post-release, they exponentially increase their chances of success. Thank you for your time.

Chair Stiglich: Ms. Tillman, I want to thank you for your excellent presentation, certainly all the work Ridge House does, but also for sharing your personal story. I'm someone who often, I don't say chafes, but I don't like to operate anecdotally because my data drives it and having these policy goals and those type of things. But it's always the reminder that what does drive us is this is a human business. It's not widgets, it's not numbers, and stories such as your own and your courage and sharing it here both inspire me and put on those lenses on how I'm viewing all that information that I get. So, I want to personally thank you for sharing that. Ridge House is an excellent program, one that when I was in Washoe, certainly was utilized and respected. I want to open it up. Are there questions or comments for Ms. Tillman or about her presentation?

Judge Freeman: Just decided to indicate that in the second judicial district, we utilize Ridge House all the time. Everything she said I totally support and would confirm that it works for us and

it is a very, very valuable resource. And what Ms. Tillman does for the second judicial district is outstanding. It's a resource that we need for our specialty courts and we continue to use her. I want the record to reflect.

Chief Lawson: I believe some of the timing that was presented there in 2018, that was about the time that some of those re-entry, I guess, type coordination shifted from Department of Corrections to the Division of Parole Probation like with the movement of the Going Home Prepared, Money Source and some things like that. I think maybe NDOC is still very involved in that planning process with their caseworkers and our embedded specialists in those facilities are diligently working on all those and those applications that they're seeing to Ridge House are really the people incarcerated now, are a partnership between our agency and NDOC. So, I just want to make sure that NDOC gets the credit for the work they're doing and staying involved in that program, and they may not be the face of some of those reentry services and reintegration and release planning, but they're still integrally very involved in that planning process and I just want to make sure that everybody understands that as well.

Ms. Tillman: Before I answer, Chair Stiglich, Judge Freeman, thank you so much for your comments and your support. We are proud partners up here in the North. Chair Stiglich, I know that the NDOC is working on setting up reopening the doors to the volunteer class, I believe. We've offered to do Zoom services, we've offered, like I said, the person that's coming in has volunteer status and has for a number of years -- even post-employment through the NDOC. I think really what I'm asking for is communication, more than anything is e-mails. E-mails go unresponded to and phone calls go unanswered. I really would like to be able to open the doors of communication to figure out what do we need to do. Is there's something more on our part that we need to do because we'll do it. Ridge House is here ready, willing and able, we will do what is necessary.

Dr. Naughton: I'm the acting medical director. If you will get in touch with me, I'll see what we can do to facilitate this. My e-mail is mnaughton.doc.nv.gov.

Ms. Tillman: Thank you, Dr. Naughton.

Mr. Franklin: This is Chris Franklin from the Nevada Department of Corrections. We've been working with Ridge House. As a matter of fact, we recommended NNCC to reach out to Ridge House because of our long relationship with them. I can tell you, that part of the delay is because we go on a contract system now. So, if you have somebody's coming in to providing services, you'd have to do a zero-dollar contract that provides what we will provide, what they will provide to ensure that everybody keeps up their end of the bargain. You know, I think anybody who's worked in corrections before knows, and this is not towards Ridge House but in a general fashion that, you have programs that come into prison, they only last for a short period of time and then they're gone, and so you need to make sure that everybody's held accountable, and that everybody is adhering to their requirements. With Ms. Tillman, we'll reach out to her after those conferences, shoot her an e-mail and find out what's going on at that facility that may just be an issue up at NNCC right now.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you. Any further comments or questions with regards to Ms. Tillman's report?

Dr. Naughton: I'll make one more statement. Part of the issue has been the COVID. We had to shut down all visitors coming in, but we can maybe find a way to reopen it, but we have to start with square one.

Vice Chair Brady: I just want to echo what Chair Stiglich and Judge Freeman said about Ridge House and the second judicial district. When I was a deputy public defender out of Washoe, I had a lot of clients that were helped by Ridge House, and it is a beautiful feeling to see a person overcome. And I just want to thank Ridge House for their continued work in this area.

Mr. Franklin: We understand where you're coming from, Dr. Lanterman. As you know, some of those services as the chief said from PNP were transitioned over to parole and probation out of our hands, and also at that same time, one of our major grants that helped fund Ridge House, that funding for that particular portion of it came to a conclusion. So, that contract was part of that grant and hence, why it went into expiration when the funding ran out.

Ms. Welborn: Chair Stiglich, this is Holly Welborn with the ACLU. Just to pose a quick question. Are there contracts throughout the state and where are those contracts located, what service providers are contracted with, some perhaps the NDOC can maybe give us a breakdown of where those services are currently located, and perhaps that's a good starting point on reallocation of some of these grants for the future.

Mr. Franklin: Chris Franklin of the Nevada Department of Corrections. I guess that would all depend, we have contracts for everything in anything that the NDOC works with, in particular with these grants. I don't know if they're posted publicly. I know that many of them go through the IFC, go through the GFO's office and the IFC for approval, but I look into what specific contracts you're looking to have access to and see if that's something that's --

Ms. Welborn: Thank you. I think that would be helpful for the Commission to kind of understand how this is set up and what service providers the DOC is working with, I'd really appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Franklin: You're very welcome.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you all for those comments. If there is nothing further on Ridge House, again, thank you Ms. Tillman.

Chair Stiglich: We would turn on two representatives from Hope for Prisoners to proceed with their presentation. Mr. Ponder?

Mr. Ponder: Chair Stiglich, thank you very, very much. I appreciate the questions and comments from Dr. Lanterman, and also Ms. Mull. I also want to thank Ms. Tillman and the great work that you guys are doing up at the Ridge House, phenomenal, phenomenal work. Again, I appreciate you working with Kairos because Kairos had a huge impact on my life many, many years ago before I was released from prison. I know that we have a referral up North to people who are releasing here in the South and we quite frequently refer people up to the Ridge House because of the great work that you guys do there.

I'm going to try to share with you guys in a PowerPoint presentation. You got to forgive me, I won't follow along with it, but I'll do it the absolute best that I can. And thank you members of this Commission for giving me the opportunity to be able to share. Jon Ponder, founder and CEO of Hope for Prisoners. And what our organization does is we work with men, women and young adults that are exiting different arenas of our judicial system. We work with people coming out of state or federal prisons, city county jails, drug rehabs, halfway houses, transitional facilities and the likes. And what we do is provide the supportive services to help the men and women that are

returning back to our community not only get acclimated back into workplaces, but we make sure there's mechanisms in place through partnerships that we built up with employers, that once they get inside these workplaces, they're going to be afforded every opportunity to thrive, and be able to grow and afford it every opportunity to succeed. We address the needs for them to get acclimated back into their family because that has been a somewhat of mismatch of re-entry since forever it's like no one's ever given a particular close attention to the men and women that return in home, understanding they have to go back home to wives and husbands, and particularly to get reintegrated with their children. We work to make sure there's a mechanism in place to help with that family reunification component. Because if that piece is not right, if the home life is not right, then everything else in the world is the tendency to fall apart. And then on the back end of the process because there's a long-term 18-month journey where we walk with people, we want to do everything we possibly can to ensure that we're helping them be stand-up leaders in the community, with an overall goal of them never ever, ever reoffended again.

Hope for Prisoners have found it back in 2009, and since that time we've had the great privilege to serve over 4,000 men and women have been through our mechanism. Of those 4,000 individuals that we've had the great privilege to work with, according to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas who came in and wanted to take a look at the work that we were doing. What they determined was that more than 80 percent of those folks were successful and gaining full-time employment in sustainable wage jobs. Twenty Five percent of those were full-time employed within 17 days of graduation. And of those individuals that we've had a chance to work with, according to University of Nevada, Las Vegas only six percent of those folks return back to the prison system. It is something that we are extremely proud of but it's something that we're not satisfied with because our desire is not to lose anybody, and we're always looking at ways to improve the efficiency of what it is that we do. So how do we do that, how do we get to having that level of success? Well, everything that we do it starts out with what we call a pre-vocational leadership workshop. Because the things that we found when we're dealing with people from this segment of the population, is that the majority of people they really want to change, they have no idea how to do it. For so long, we've been telling people from this segment of population to get back out into the community and become productive members of the community. They have no idea what that looks like. Or we tell people to come home and get a good job and maintain that job. Some of the men and women from this segment of the population have never worked a legitimate job a day before in their life. Or we tell people to take their rightful positions in their home as the husbands and fathers that they're supposed to be or moms and wives that that need to be but they have no healthy reference point in here (points to his head) of what that might look like.

What it is that we do is come alongside them through various training and help to create reference points in them where reference points may have never existed before. The success of our organization is due to a partnership with Nevada Department of Corrections where we begin to work with them up to 18 months prior to them being released. And go in and provide them with the training, leadership training, of substance use training, the trauma, which is very, very important, I'm so glad that Ms. Mull had pointed that out, but also going in and providing them with the vocational training that they need that we'd be able to tie that directly with employment once they get released. And then once they get released. It's not enough for us to be able to give them all those incredible things while they're inside the institution, but if we release them back into the community by themselves without the support system that is needed and expect them to navigate the different challenges they're going to be facing during the reintegration process, then we're going to be wasting time, effort, energy and resources.

We do that through a very comprehensive case management and mentoring process to where

we have 16 case managers on staff, but we've trained up well over 550 men and women here in Southern Nevada that serve as mentors. Now these mentors are pastors and leaders from churches across Southern Nevada, other leaders in other houses of faith. These are business owners and business leaders, schoolteachers from the Clark County school district, students over at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the College of Southern Nevada, right down to the Las Vegas metropolitan Police Department to where the sheriff has given us an army of volunteer police officers that serve as mentors. I have to put a pen in that and stay right there to talk about the value in that, is because never before in the history of re-entry nowhere on this planet to this magnitude has law enforcement got this involved in mentoring and training people coming home from the prison system. And that there is causing such a win-win on both sides of equation. Because you think about it, our goal is to help men and women return into the community, get out into the community and never reoffend again. In order for us to be able to do that pre-release, we got to make sure that we're instilling in them character, integrity and an appreciation for the rules and regulations of our land. We found that that got enhanced when we brought them into relationship with the men and women who are upholding the law. And if you turn the coin over to the other side what this level of partnership is doing is forcing men and women from law enforcement to do the things they said around and talked about for years and helped view people that are returning back to our community who are truly, truly fighting for the second chance. It helps them to view this segment of the population from a whole another set of lenses. It is the training that has become our level of success getting into the prison system early on before they get released is hands down the best possible way to be able to do that.

Because if you look across our country and you see where we have missed the mark in reentry and dealing with prisons, is that, you know, they, you know, sometimes the prison system provides these services whatever they that might be. But again, then launch them out in the community by themselves. There's no support, there is no follow-up and the benefit of us going into the prison system and bringing case managers and then bringing the substance use disorder counselors, the LADC's and the CABC's in there to begin that treatment early on, then that creates a continuum of care once they get released. They don't have to find another substance abuse, substance misuse counsel. They don't need to find another case manager and they can have that continual care with that same case manager.

We're very proud of the work and our ability to be able to help folks find sustainable wage employment, and again, it is the training post-release. So, we're looking at HVAC, plumbing, air conditioning, culinary, horticulture, and CDL training. But the beauty in it is we're able to tie that directly with employment once those individuals get released. We do that through a partnership that we built up with the Las Vegas chamber where the almost 6,000 businesses that are underneath the umbrella of the chamber has come on as second chance employers hiring people that have gone through our mechanism. We do not believe in job placement. That is not our model that we have. We believe in job partnership. And what that looks like is we let the employers know that they're not just hiring John or Jane Doe, the formerly incarcerated person, they're hiring this entire army of people that are going to be there with them over the next 18 months, and to help them to navigate those challenges. Any challenges that an employer has with one of our folks they simply have the ability to pick up the phone call their mentor, call their case manager so we can have the opportunity to help them work through that. It is something that the employers have absolutely fallen in love with and that as a result of that, that's why our organization right now we're sitting on more jobs than we can fill. These are not minimum wage jobs. We know that we have to help the men and women that are coming home earn sustainable wages where they can take care of themselves and more importantly, be able to take care of their family. That model of mentoring as I traveled all over the country and I shared with them, you have to have a mentoring component with formerly incarcerated people. This is why we pride ourselves on the

550 people that we have. Because if you think about it, if you ask anyone who has ever achieved any significant level of success in life, how'd you do it? How did you get to where you are in life? If that person is completely honest with you, they are going to admit that they did not get there on their own. They had people that were in their lives that were guiding, directing, coaching, push, pulling, dragging and sometimes kicking in the rear in every single step of the way.

That mentoring model and that law enforcement component that we have is something that other jurisdictions across our nation are looking for us to replicate. I have so much pride that we built that right here, built up right here in the state of Nevada. Our success comes from the unprecedented partnerships that we're able to develop over the last 11 years in this space. Our partnerships with all of our law enforcement partners not only the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department but we have a partnership with PNP to where parole and probation has an embedded officer who is in the Hope for Prison's location, that is the parole officer for the clients that are coming through. The benefit of that, is that parole officer has the ability now to sit down in that case management meeting with the case manager, with the mentor, with the job coordinator and his parole officer. We feel that that model there is just absolutely phenomenal. I think that that's going to reduce the parole violations. Because if it was something that the person did, that is not recommitted a new crime, that gives us an opportunity to be able to address those things upfront and that is working phenomenal. We could not do that without our partnerships with workforce connections that provides funding for our folks to go through training. We could not do that without our partners at the Department of Employment and Training and Rehabilitation who provides some funding and on-the-job training money through the Silver State works program. We could not do that without our partnership with the College of Southern Nevada. That we have a partnership with them so we can make sure that we have the prison education going into the system prior to them getting released.

We have a partnership with the Clark County District Attorney's Office where we created a hope for second chances court, which is an alternative to folks that are going to prison have the privilege of working with them. For about a hundred of participants in this pilot program and have just seen absolutely phenomenal success in working with that partnership. We are physically inside Nevada Department of Corrections, specifically inside Casa Grande where I have a team of case managers and their job is to get up and go into the Casa Grande facility every single day to provide that case management. We're bringing in job developers inside Casa Grande, so again, them working together with them prior to them being released. We have just experienced phenomenal success in that. So where do we go from here? We're looking to scale our model here in Southern Nevada. When things open back up, we're looking to be physically planted inside Florence women's facility to again to provide that same structure that we have inside Casa Grande, bringing in case management, bringing in training, bringing in job developers so that we can again, tie that to successful re-entry. We're also going to be moving in and housed physically in Southern Desert Correctional Facilities, as well as Three Lakes Conservation Camp. We're currently inside the Clark County Detention Center, again provide those same levels of service.

Our model has been extremely successful because of the wrap around services and bringing the entire community together to provide those resources and the supportive services that the men and women that are returning back to our community so desperately need.

Again, very happy at the success that we have had, but again, we could not do that by ourselves. There are things that Hope for Prisons does that is absolutely phenomenal, but bringing the community together when you have corrections, have parole information, have CSN, have Nevada Highway Patrol - I'm sorry, forgot to mention them because they become part of our mentoring program as well - when you bring people together in unprecedented ways, that's the

way that we will continue this level of success.

One of the things I'd like to make mention to you as we scale our model here in the state of Nevada, so we could have an opportunity to impact the lives of as many incarcerated people as we possibly can. Some of the things that's happened across the country is going into that tablet model. And we are working with some folks so we can drop all of our curriculum, all of our case management, the substance misuse disorders on tablets, the vocational training on tablets so that we can get that in as many hands of inmates as we possibly can so we can start that as early as we possibly can. I know that it was said on this Commission that re-entry needs to begin day one. So as early as we possibly can have contact where people are going to return them back to our community so we could help them to begin to exhaust every avenue to spend every waking moment of their time to prepare them for the day that they walk outside the gate. And as long as we have that mechanism, to provide that wraparound services, to not leave them by themselves, to be there for them, to attach them to our belt loops, to help them to again navigate those challenges, make sure that we're providing them with some go-to people in the event that they have challenges and they certainly do have challenges. Are they going to experience challenges six weeks out of prison? Absolutely, they will. A month out, absolutely they will. Six months out, absolutely they will. A year down the line, are they going to experience challenges? One hundred percent. We see it all day long. But this is why we have to have that mechanism to help them through that process over the next 18 months.

We are going to be bringing in a whole coaching model into the prison which is going to give us an opportunity to train the trainer with some of the lifers that are aren't ever coming home so that we can train them to be facilitators, to be our boots on the ground while they're inside the system to work with people to pour into their lives, and then we'll catch them in our mechanism pre and post release. I'm going to yield the floor to any question's you guys might have. And again, thank you for this opportunity and I just look forward to seeing what we can do to better the way we do re-entry, the better the way that we do prisons in our state. I'll put a pin in it right there.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Mr. Ponder. That's amazing and Hope for Prisoners certainly is just amazing, as well. Anyone have any comments?

Deputy Director Wickham: Deputy Director for programs for the NDOC. I just want to thank Jon for all that he and Hope does. It's obvious and so apparent what a difference Hope makes. I'm very fortunate to attend the huddles and several other functions with Hope for Prisoners and I get to see firsthand the difference that the huddle makes. That's a coin phrase Jon started, but also the difference that Hope for Prisoners makes. It's phenomenal. And I really appreciate what he brings. I'm always appreciative of our community partners, our community partnerships. And I hope that we can continue a partnership with Ridge House, we just have to work out the contract issues and stuff like that but that's for another day. But I just want to say thank you, and I certainly appreciate Jon bringing up the issue with the tablets. This is something we are in critical need of. If we intend to advance the cause of programming and what we do, we have to modernize. So, I appreciate the commission's support on that as well. But again, I just wanted mostly to say thank you to Jon for all that he's brought to our agency because without him, we would be at a critical loss as a phenomenal community partner, so thank you, Jon.

Mr. Ponder: Thank you, sir.

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you, Chair Stiglich. I was just going to say you mentioned about giving services to lifers, too. I'd like you to say a little bit more about that. Because here at the A.G.'s office we are responsible for prosecuting prison crimes, and it's always a challenge when you

have a lifer that commits a serious crime or even minor crimes. But you know, a violent crime in prison causing more trauma as Ms. Mull mentioned earlier, you don't want to traumatize the prisoners before they come out but causing more trauma. And we always figure like well, they don't get programming sometimes. What do we do? More years in prison? They already have life. I'd like you to say a little bit more, if you could, about any improvements in their behavior or their level of hope of the lifers.

Mr. Ponder: Thank you so very much for your question. It's something that we're, you know, I'm personally very passionate about and not just from my personal story. Had it not been for the lifers that were imprisoned, men and women who aren't ever coming home, judge give them a thousand years, had it not been for them pouring into me, I would not be who I am today doing the work that we're doing. One of the challenges that we have in prisons across the country, it's a culture problem. And we know that people who are doing life, they run the prison systems. This gives them an opportunity now to, number one, get trained up and equipped. And despite what some people say, people have been in prison for you know, 15, 20, 30 years, they've had a chance to bake in here, they're looking for an outlet, they're looking for ways to be able to give back, but they won't be able to do that without being properly trained.

This whole coaching model gives us an opportunity to go in, get a group of people who are doing life, and train them up, provide them with the tools that they need in order for them to be able to be effective. It is something that we would be monitoring closely, and making sure that they're, you know, they're doing what it is that they are supposed to be doing. But I think that once you get to the lifers, then they have an opportunity to change the culture inside the prison system, and I think that that is what our what our goal is.

Mr. Hoffman: Thank you. I wanted to ask about, I know in your presentation you talked about a lot of partnerships that Hope has, and it seemed like a lot of those were with Southern agencies like Metro, and the Clark County D.A.'s office. I'm just trying to understand how that fits together with the presentation that Ms. Tillman made, and that other members of the commission from Washoe seem to agree with, that like there's a problem with the continuity of care up there, there's a problem with the way that NDOC is handling things maybe, I don't know. And I'm wondering like, what is your perspective on what's up with that. You work in this field; I figure you would know.

Mr. Ponder: Absolutely. Excellent question and again, I want to just echo what I said before. I think that Ridge House is doing a phenomenal job up in the North. We are having conversations to see how we might be able to expand our services and a partnership with Ridge House and some of the facilities that are working up North. And again, I think that one of the key elements of that, as Deputy Director Wickham had alluded to, us being able to put our curriculum, our vocational training, and all those things on tablets, and get that into the hands of as many inmates as we possibly can to begin that process up North, and then working to identify some of those counterpart partnerships that we have in the North, and see how we might be able to work together in a statewide initiative very, very open to those collaborations, and what we can do here in the state of Nevada.

Dr. Lanterman: Thank you, Chair Stiglich. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Ponder. Just following up on Mr. Hoffman's question on you have a lot of working relationships in the southern part of the state, I have a question about your work at Casa Grande specifically. Is that work supported through a contract with the Department of Corrections, is it supported through some other funding source, or are you doing that work on a pro bono basis?

Mr. Ponder: And that's a great question. We do have a zero-dollar contract with Nevada Department of Corrections. The funding that comes through that, a lot of it comes off of personal and foundational opportunities. We do have a Department of Justice grant that helps just to provide that's those services, and then in our partnership with the local workforce board, we receive the grants for some of the training that we do.

And that's how we're able to operate inside Nevada Department of Corrections here in the South, so there's several different funding sources for us to be able to do that.

Dr. Lanterman: I just want to follow up because, on my end, there was like a little bit of a glitch and I missed a part of what you were saying about a Bureau of Justice assistance grant. Is that a grant that was made to Hope for Prisoners? Or is it a grant from some other source and you are receiving like a subcontract on that BGA grant.

Mr. Ponder: Thank you very much for your follow-up question. It's a Department of Justice grant that we received directly from the DOJ.

Dr. Lanterman: Okay, thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Mr. Ponder. I know I certainly share your passion. I appreciate your comments regarding lifers and programming people who are in prison. And I think often, it's not just that they get left behind, they're there. It's such a missed opportunity for ambassadorships and to help reinforce a positive culture. And they're still human beings, they want to contribute and when we program everyone or we allow them to grow and change, I think they become, you know, some of the most valuable players in making us an institution more positive, more secure, because they've now invested, because somebody's invested in them. I sincerely share your observations in that regard.

Mr. Ponder: Thank you so very much for that.

Chair Stiglich: Does anyone else have any further comments for Mr. Ponder? Thank you.

Mr. Ponder: Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Then we will move on to representatives from the Nevada Department of Corrections and we will have them proceed with their presentations.

Mr. Franklin: Good morning, Chair Stiglich and commission members. I'm Chris Franklin, management analyst for the Nevada Department of Corrections. I'm here with Elizabeth Dixon-Coleman, who's the statewide re-entry administrator for the Nevada Department of Corrections. We put together a brief PowerPoint for you that I would like to share. We promise we will make it as brief as possible for you.

The Nevada Department of Corrections, the mission of our Nevada Department of Corrections primary mission is to maintain the offenders in safe and humane conditions while preparing them for successful re-entry back into society. I won't read the rest of it, but again, our staff will utilize innovative programming that will focus on education, mental health, substance abuse treatment, and vocational training as the cornerstone to an offender's rehabilitation. I can tell you anybody who has looked at the NDOC's budget knows that there's no way for us to do this to function in the North and in the South without engaging in a public-private partnerships, working with collaborative partners on the outside.

I want to take this opportunity to thank not only Ridge House in the North. We've had a long relationship with them. We appreciate them and we definitely appreciate the assistance they're providing to NNCC, but also for the help for Hope for Prisoners, there are certain things that we just cannot do by ourselves and without their help, Nevada would be a much worse place. I also want to thank Director Gonzalez for her assistance and reviewing and actually incorporating some feedback from us into her presentation. It was good to see it ahead of time and to understand her perspectives and other committee members' perspectives, it's very advantageous to the department.

The next listing that we have, I just wanted to put up there because actually, we almost shed a tear when Dr. Lanterman was talking about facilities and ADA compliance. Because we have had the opportunity to look over some of our facilities during some of our administrative regulation audits, and it came to pass that, out of the 18 facilities, you know you look at Ely, it's 33 years old, High Desert is 22 years old, NNCC, 58, Southern Desert 40, Warm Springs almost 60 years old. We tried to think about the functionality of a building that is operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week for that period of time and how that would relate into something that others could understand. So, we looked at the Las Vegas strip, believe it or not, and looked at the casinos because they operate very much like we do 24/7. Some of the casinos that are no longer there because they of their length of time and use, the Dunes which was 38 years old when it was taken down, the Landmark was 26 years old, the Sands was 44 years old, the Hacienda was 38 years old, the Aladdin was 35. And as you can see, the average age of most of our facilities in this state is 37 years old. Right here, one of the big things that we talk about in the Nevada Department of Corrections is that we start re-entry at intake. Right now, we have three intake facilities. We have one at High Desert State Prison. We have one at Northern Nevada Correctional Center. We have one at Florence McClure Correctional Center. These are our primary avenues for inmates to enter into our system, and this is exactly where our re-entry coordinators start their job. I will now pass the presentation over to Elizabeth Dixon-Coleman.

Ms. Dixon-Coleman: I thank you all for standing on this committee today and many thanks for ground to light, not only our facilities, the usage programming, et cetera, and having this commission actually coming forward as was previously mentioned that the re-entry task force has not been reconstituted because that's done through the Governor's office. I think that committees like this with sustainability, as well as Director. Gonzalez and her department's support will help lead us in the next steps for what we do in the future. And looking at our populations, we're showing you what the population is as they come in and going out but what we have to look at this is that, as someone comes into the prison system, we not only touch them and intake, we carry them through their sustainability of their sentencing, as well as touch them, again, before they release to make sure they have those cooperative services and wrap around services throughout the community. Through the 2015 to 2018 season of the SRR grant that was granted to us through the Bureau of Justice, we realized that those sustainability of services needed to be continued through. Reaching out to partnerships such as Ridge House, Freedom House and especially Hope for Prisoners, through some of those components where they sat on our working committees and sustainability committees had led us to some of these pieces.

When we look at the number of, let's say in 2021, really what we need to do is double the exiting population instead of it being 3,043 and 3,055, we need to say that when they're exiting, we need to double that because we're doing the sustainability throughout the entire piece. With that, beginning of intake, there's been much support through the past, actually three legislative sessions. Starting in the 79th session and then ending in this last with the 81st session where we've had tremendous growth within our legislative support to actually do more rehabilitative services, to make sure that those wrap around services and coordinated services are continuing

forward. Through the years from 2015 to the present, we've instituted the NRAS, which has actually given us a base result as to look through how are we actually classifying offenders, how are we classifying them not only for residential components, but also how are we looking at those criminogenic needs to actually treat what the offenders are looking at. With that, in coordinated care, with our mental health review and classification, it has been completed and it has now been beginning to be instituted throughout all of our institutions, making sure that they also have the documentation that they need to carry them through sustainable employment, wrap-around services, and applying for services as came out of 358 in the last legislative session for Medicaid. And making sure that they have the documentation so that residents can apply pre-release, as Mr. Ponder said, and not just wait until we send them out, and this begins at intake. With this, a comprehensive case planning and weightless population in our notice system, which is our internal system for tracking has been in the works now. Over the past five years where we've done some transitioning of the electronic component and have went through, and now have started to make sure that we are doing comprehensive case planning.

With our case planners where we're actually training them and we've done that in the past COVID pause, would I say, it actually benefited us so that we could start some of these next pieces for our next growth out.

With that, some of the things that I've just touched on in the 81st session, we saw some traumatic gains actually for support for us. One of which was working with collaborative resourcing agencies throughout the entire state, working with the final records department for Nevada, DHHS, DMV, as well as many legislators to make sure that birth certificates, social security cards are actually obtained and actually go to our offenders in component. Assembly bill 16 and Senate bill 32 actually helped us go forward with some of those pieces. Also making sure that we're looking to make sure that the continuum of treatment which needs to be backed up as we had said in that continuum of care when they're released into the community, to ensure that they have those wraparound services that should they get, services for mental health servicing, counseling and any of those components that may help them through not coming back, is that they are continued out through our components within our community.

Looking at potential legislation for the 82nd legislative session, as Director Gonzalez had already said that we're starting now, again, we're not waiting till the end. So, looking at some of the laws that have been implemented years prior, may be implemented in years prior where it was sustainable for the time but not sustainable for the time in which we are having change both federally, nationally and locally.

With that, NDOC's educational, vocational, re-entry, mental health and substance abuse programming have all joined forces through finishing out our SRR grant and sustainability and looking to more sustainable resourcing and components to help us go forward with our budget. As you can see, our budget actually totals less than 200, that actually less than 230,000. It's \$201,973 dollars annually, which works out to be a little bit less than two dollars a day per offender for those training components. So, we could not do this alone. And with this, we've had a combined reduction over the past two legislative sessions of 30,000 dollars in those resources in which we did have, where they didn't necessarily leave us, but as already was mentioned, they went out to PNP for some embedded servicing, embedded service supply providers, as well as with indigent funding. So, with this, on our small budget, it's imperative to know that we have in the next couple slides, I'm going to kind of go through a couple of this quickly, we've continued to provide programming with meritorious credits, with vocational programming and without source resources through the COVID period within all of our facilities, making sure that in all of the areas of re-entry, including the educational, vocational, re-entry, mental health and substance abuse

programming, that we've offered credits and progress towards things. Though we were at lockdown on periods of time, we learned to scramble like the rest of the world where we had to figure out what we needed to do. And I will say on the behalf of NDOC, a hundred percent, Jon Ponder was able to, with his funding and his sustainability through Hope for Prisoners, with some of his outside partner support, to be able to start to help stand up with some of the resources for us to reach in and reach out with looking at updating some of our components for our computer programming, as well as our networking capabilities.

But as you saw in Mr. Franklin's slides, we're looking at facilities that it isn't just a matter of running a new cord or putting in a new plug somewhere or just bringing in new computers, we're systematically looking at change for our technology and making sure that we can have sustainability for that. And so, with that, our pilot program that was run here at Casa Grande, actually ran through COVID, we were blessed by the fact that Mr. Ponder was able to ask and to remediate with his funding sources as we had to pivot several times during COVID starting in 2020 and still continuing on until now with those pieces. But what we are looking for are the reputable, and as well as sustainable resources that we can continue out through all of our pieces.

With that, that public-private partnership which we need to sustain us which Deputy Director has previously mentioned, as well as Mr. Ponder as well as Ridge House in those components, we have to have those things to go forward. We are continuing to work on resources as we move, looking with a new management variable classification model, as we've gotten a new director over the period of COVID, etcetera. He's working very closely to see if there's a way that we can reach programming for all levels of offenders, as well as make sure that we have comprehensive case planning including NRAS. And with our NRAS, we have actually started to work with our other law enforcement community partners in which we've done training with them. So, we're all looking at, unilaterally looking at the same type of models to make sure that we're going forward to help with that cross-collaboration between agencies and state stakeholders. As you do go forward to look for some quality assurance and sustainability, that we have actual similar levels to utilize throughout the different pieces in which we do.

We've also been continuing work and our extensive work in reaching out to the 8th judicial court and recovery court and making sure that we, inside, have continued with our program review committee, to make sure that evidence-based programming based upon best practices is going forward. To ensure that as we are being sponsored and as we are working with our public and private partnerships, as you heard with Mr. Ponder bringing in all the resources that he has available through his agency, workforce connections, as well as all of his other partnerships throughout the community, and making sure that we are offering the best servicing and programming to those that are actually incarcerated with us.

And then lastly, making sure that we are continuing to go forward in the future to build on with quality assurance infrastructure, and to make sure that we can continue with family reunification and go forward with making sure that we can reach in with all the things that we need to do that have been given to us through 236 and other legislative actions that have come to us in mandate. And with that, I will say to you Hope for Prisoners has been named our primary partner and has been on the inside, but we could not have done that as over the past years from 2015 to the present without our relationship with these many agencies. And with these many agencies, we started out with small task force, moved up to the re-entry task force which was led underneath Governor Sandoval. With that, when that was not reconstituted under Governor Sisolak due to the many other things he was dealing with through COVID, we still maintained many of these relationships where we are collaboratively working with all of our partners in the North and the South.

With this, I will say to you through some of our staffing structures, we've reduced our staff because actually people have articulated and left out of our staff, but then also in the re-hiring of staff through COVID times we're looking to make sure we grow those pieces out.

With that, some of the reduction in which was mentioned with Ridge House has been because we've had staff come with us, we've had staff leave with us and we're actually in the current process of actually hiring staff for Northern Nevada, but we've continued to work through with what we could with the wardens, etcetera, as our sustainability structure. I will also say to you that in our discussions and in our embedded partnership of which we've worked very closely with trying to make sure that Hope for Prisoners resources can be utilized but also to have a sustainability structure is making sure that we have a grow out structure. We've been talking with Hope for Prisoners with workforce connections, as well as the Bureau of Justice, etcetera, on how those pieces can be grown out to be a statewide model. But I will say, and Mr. Ponder may want to chime in on this also, he wanted to make sure that it could be sustainable, he didn't want to offer more services or over promise and as he could not produce. And so, with that, there's some sustainability structures as we go forward.

In reaching out to our community partners and reconstituting since COVID has hit and Dr. Naughton with NDOC may be able to talk to you about this also. We've just restarted since September in small amounts retraining our volunteer core services where the volunteers have to not only be re-trained for our volunteer process, but also for any COVID policies or protocols that must be followed for safety and security of all that are here with us and that reside with us. We actually have had three scheduled classes, one of which is going to happen in the North in December and in January in their grow out component. We just finished one last week which actually Mr. Ponder had to participate in because he couldn't physically come into the facilities without making sure that he goes through our trainings and those components to make sure that each and every one of our community partners, our educators and our facilitators of outside programming are able to come in.

I will say to you I know that I did not read off of every slide. There was a lot of information in the slides that was provided by myself and Mr. Franklin, but we will be available for questions now and at future dates as we grow out. And please know that we are working very closely with Director Gonzalez in making sure that we have accurate sustainable data because we want to go forward to make sure that we have sustainable change within our correctional system to carry out the mission and the vision of Director Daniels. This concludes our presentation. Is there any questions for us? Or comments?

Deputy Director Wickham: I'll keep my remarks short and this meeting has been lengthy. But I want to say on behalf of Director Daniels, who frankly is on an airplane on his way up here, I want to say thank you to Chris and Elizabeth for the presentation, for showcasing what the NDOC really is attempting to accomplish. Re-entry and programming is the most significant part of what we do in corrections. Now this has been a very, very long time in coming, you know, in years past when we were a Department of Prisons. Our primary goal was incarcerate safely and humanely. Well now it's about returning citizens back to the community, and the only way that we can return them successfully is through programs like this, community partnerships like with Hope and Ridge House and the vast many agencies you saw and the different educational partnerships we have. These are the things that will reduce recidivism. It's the only things that will reduce recidivism and it requires a great deal of community support. And when I say community, I'm talking the law enforcement community, the re-entry community, the Commission support, and all the people

involved in this. This is the only way that we can provide public safety and to keep from victimizing our communities, is providing these resources, these vital resources to our offenders so that hopefully when they return to the communities, they can be successful. They're not going to do it if we don't provide these resources. So again, I just say thank you to Elizabeth and Chris, and thank you to the Commission.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you for those comments. Any other comments or questions? Hearing none, and thank you, that was a wonderful presentation for all the good work all of you are doing on behalf of Nevada. It's just amazing work and it doesn't surprise me because we have wonderful people here. Seeing no more questions, I'm going to now close agenda item six.

7. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meeting

Chair Stiglich: We'll open agenda item seven. Is there anyone that has anything to be considered for any future meetings, and I know if there's something you think about later, or don't want to share now, please contact myself or the Director and we will make sure that we get that on the next meeting and coordinate that date with staff. So, any items to consider? Hearing none at this time, I'll coordinate with staff to schedule the next meeting. We'll look forward to getting input from you.

8. Public Comment

Chair Stiglich: We will open our second period of public comment. That's item eight. Just as we did with the first period of public comment, those 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 that exceeds a two-minute time limit may submit your testimony in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. At this time, I'm going to ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify. Ms. Chiazza?

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

Ms. Dixon-Coleman: This is Elizabeth Dixon-Coleman with Nevada Department of Corrections. Chair Stiglich, I do want to come back with one question. I didn't click fast enough as I'm not close to the mouse, but in public comment I will say to you, and anyone sitting on the Commission. On behalf of myself and I'm sure Mr. Ponder will stand with us, if you would like to see what we are doing in the Department of Corrections, we welcome you all to, as we do need to follow COVID protocols based within our agency, to come see the great work that we're doing, to come see our policies and come see our programs, and to have a firsthand look at how these things are implemented in each of our institutions. I'd welcome that at any time. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you. For myself, I'll say invitation accepted. And we'll work out the details and I hope other members of the Commission also take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. Ponder: Chair Stiglich, if I may? I'd like to also extend an invitation out to the Commission to our annual Christmas event that we put on for the children of incarcerated parents. What we're going to be doing, this is our seventh year of doing this, we are going to or in partnership with Nevada Department of Corrections, and we're trying to bring Clark County Detention Center

online, but we're going to take 100 men and women that we are currently working with inside those facilities. And we're going to put them on the bus, we're going to bring them to a big, gigantic place and we're going to create a Christmas morning experience for the men and women who we are working with. So, it's going to be 100 people. There's going to be 100 living room sets, 100 couch, couches, loveseat, coffee tables, with not 100 Christmas trees and all the gifts, the Christmas meal. And we're going to bring the family in to sit on that couch and create that Christmas morning experience for them. You know that there's a lot of reasons why we do that, to make sure that we're ensuring the connectivity with the family. But this gives us an opportunity through this initiative, to put our tentacles into the family members, the loved ones, the folks that are raising folks' kids. And what we have found in years past, is that sometimes there are moms or dads who are raising the kids and they're struggling. But we raise up some funding to find that other significant other, find out what's going on in their life and be able to provide resources for them. Sometimes those resources might look like that significant other may need some training so we can send them to vocational schools. As we're working with mom and or dad while they're incarcerated, we're also working with that loved one who is at home that may be struggling, and help them to find employment, get them up off of public assistance so then we can create a two-income household when they come home. That's going to be on December the 15th, the location has not yet been determined, but I'd love to have an opportunity for this Commission to come out, have a Christmas meal with them, it'll be a Christmas meal fit for a king, it's going to be evening that is going to be very special for the folks that we work with.

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

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

9. Adjournment

Chair Stiglich: We'll turn to item nine, adjournment. We've come to the end of another, I believe productive meeting. And I want to thank you to everyone for your attendance and participation and a huge thank you to our staff. I'll work with staff to schedule the next meeting which will take place sometime in February. Once we've confirmed that date, staff will e-mail you that information. Thank you again. I hope you all have happy, safe and healthy holidays. Be well. Be kind yourselves and be kind to others. This meeting is now adjourned.

Meeting ended at 12:07 p.m