

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: September 3, 2021, 9:00 AM

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

Senator Cannizzaro

STAFF

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Director Gonzalez: Good morning, everyone. We are live now for the Nevada Sentencing Commission. Welcome to the 2021-2023 Nevada Sentencing Commission. I am Victoria Gonzalez, the executive director for the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. This commission is housed in our department and we assist the commission in carrying out its activities and duties.

Since there is officially no Chair elected yet for the 2021-2023 commission, I'll be presiding until the Chair is elected. As the executive secretary of the commission, I will now take the role.

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

2. Public Comment

Director Gonzalez: I will now open the first period of public comment. Moving on to agenda item two. There are two periods of public comment, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end. Members of -- members of the public have two options for submitting public comments. First, members of the public may do so in reading -- in writing by emailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comment received in writing will be provided to the commission and included by reference in the minutes of the meeting.

Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints, public comment will be limited to two minutes. To any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit, you 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. Ms. Chiazza?

Ms. Chiazza: Thank you, Director Gonzalez. 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. Caller with the last three digits 900, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You will have two minutes. Caller with the last three digits 900.

It seems at this time there are no public comments.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you Ms. Chiazza. I will now close agenda item two.

3. Approval of May 21, 2021 Minutes

Director Gonzalez: Moving on to agenda item three. Members of the commission have been provided approval of the minutes. Members of the commission have been provided copies of the minutes from the May 21, 2021 meeting. Are there any comments, edits or corrections that members of the commission would like to make to the minutes?

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 21, 2021 MEETING.

DR. JENNIFER LANTERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Director Gonzalez: Onto agenda item four, the election of the Chair and Vice Chair. I will now entertain a motion to elect a Chair of the commission.

4. Election of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission

JOHN ARRASCADA MOVED TO NOMINATE JUSTICE STIGLICH FOR THE POSITION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Director Gonzalez: Congratulations, Chair Stiglich. I will now turn the meeting over to you. I am going to send you some items that will help you navigate the meeting as well.

Chair Stiglich: All right. Thank you, Director. I look forward to those. And thank you for this appointment. First, I'd like to thank Justice Hardesty for his leadership. They're big shoes to fill. I have a lot of work to catch up with all the extraordinary things that have been happening on this commission. And I've been digging into it and I look forward to it.

At this time, on item four, are there nominations for a Vice Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission?

SENATOR PICKARD MOVED TO NOMINATE JOHN PONDER FOR THE POSITION OF THE VICE CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.

CHRISTOPHER HICKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

DR. JENNIFER LANTERMAN MOVED TO NOMINATE CHRISTINE JONES BRADY FOR THE POSITION OF THE VICE CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.

HOLLY WELBORN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Ms. Wellborn. Are there any further nominations for Vice Chair or any discussion? All right. Hearing none, Director Gonzalez, we call a vote.

Director Gonzalez: Yes. I will start with the nomination for John Ponder, if that is okay with the Chair?

MOTION FAILED: ELEVEN YAYS; FIVE NAYS; THREE ABSTENTION

Director Gonzalez: To the nomination of Ms. Brady.

MOTION PASSED: FOURTEEN YAYS; THREE NAYS; THREE ABSTENTION

Director Gonzalez: Our congratulations Vice Chair Brady.

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: All right. Thank you, Director. That closes item four. Turn now to item five, review and discussion of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. And we have Justice Hardesty and Director

Gonzalez to present.

5. Review and Discussion of the Nevada Sentencing Commission

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to turn the time over to Chief Justice Hardesty first to provide some introductory remarks and background to the Commission about the evolution of the Commission and its duties.

Justice Hardesty: Thank you, Director Gonzalez. And it's nice to be with the members of the Sentencing Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with Victoria on today's agenda and the presentations at the beginning of the meeting. And we thought it might be useful to recount briefly some of the history that leads to the Sentencing Commission, and frankly, more importantly, to identify the statutory obligations that the legislature has charged the Commission to address.

Very briefly, the -- as many of you no doubt know, the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice in 2015 urged the legislature to consider the adoption of a Sentencing Commission. And in 2017, the legislature, indeed, created Nevada's Sentencing Commission and tasked it with making data-driven recommendations in connection with the criminal justice system in the state.

As a result of that, the Sentencing Commission conducted an extensive survey of Sentencing Commissions throughout the country and found, frankly, many different forms that they take but all shared a common approach, which was to make criminal justice decisions based on data collection in the various states. It was a centerpiece to that work.

Interestingly, in 2018, although Governor Sandoval and I have tried to secure the services of the Crime and Justice Institute in 2015, they circled back -- the CJI circled back to us in 2018 and indicated that Nevada was one of four states being considered for funding opportunities by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and The Pew Charitable Trust in order to take a look at Nevada's criminal justice system. We secured the request. Governor Sandoval, Speaker Frierson and I had previously made the request in 15 and then later Governor Sisolak, Speaker Frierson and I then made the request to seek this opportunity. And the Crime and Justice Institute selected Nevada along with The Pew Charitable Trust and the Bureau of Justice Assistance for what is called a Justice Reinvestment Initiative State.

Over the ensuing months, the Crime and Justice Institute devoted well over \$1 million dollars in time, energy, staff and research going through the various records as available data and information. They did a deep dive including detailed analysis of pre-sentence investigation reports of inmates in prison during the calendar year of 2017, and as a result of that, generated a report for the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, which then led to discussions about and the ultimate adoption of Assembly Bill 236. That bill is probably the most sweeping criminal justice reform measure that the state has undertaken in 25 years. That was generated as a result of a series of findings in the CJI report. And I would refer members of the Commission to that report in January of 2019. I think it provides some important information and guidance about some of the data that they identified concerning our criminal justice system, those who were incarcerated, how they got there and the costs that the state was incurring as a result.

During the 2019 session, as I noted earlier, AB 236 was enacted, and it followed the recommendations that were contained in the final report of the Crime and Justice Institute. As enacted, the intent is to have the Sentencing Commission continue to pursue detailed efforts for data collection from a variety of sources, which Director Gonzalez and her exceptional team have pursued since they were established within the executive branch during the 2018 -- excuse me -- 2019 session. This has been

a great opportunity for Nevada to identify areas within our data system, various -- it is required the cooperation of the Department of Corrections, the Division of Parole and Probation, the parole commissioners, and they have all been -- and they -- their staff have been exceptional in working with the Sentencing Commission and their staff to help develop data to aid you as Commissioners in making significant changes if necessary and monitor the success or problems associated with AB 236 and the reforms that were enacted in that measure.

I will be happy to introduce, as you suggested, Director Gonzalez, the item six on the agenda, but I'll defer until you complete this item.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Chief Justice Hardesty. It's been a pleasure to be appointed to this Commission and to be able to serve at various aspects of the Commission. As Chief Justice Hardesty shared the origin of this, I've been involved in different ways, and now, to be here as the Executive Director, it has been such a privilege. And we have a really -- I have a lot of energy and enthusiasm for the work of the Commission and the exciting vast mandates before us. And so, I'm looking forward to this next meeting cycle and working with you all.

I prepared a PowerPoint presentation, which I will share. And at the pleasure of the Chair, I'd like to also stop periodically for questions, if that's okay, and because there's a lot of information to digest here.

Chair Stiglich: Of course.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you. So, these materials are -- these slides are included with your materials. This is an outline of my presentation that I have prepared for the Commission today. To outline, it is the main point of what I hope to accomplish. First, I'll provide an overview of the duties and mandates of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. I've organized the mandates provided in the statutes by membership, goals and objectives for the Commission, activities of the Commission and the deliverables required by the Commission.

Second, this is my second main point. I will explain the statutory duties of the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy, the staffing of our department, our activities and how those activities align with and support the Commission in carrying out its duties and mandates.

Finally, I'll present a summary of the activities of the Commission and the department throughout the 2019-2021 meeting cycle. And as I mentioned, I will stop periodically for questions or possible discussion from the Commission as may be needed to discuss anything that has been presented or if the opportunity arises to provide immediate guidance to myself and to our department.

NRS 176.0133 is the enabling statute that provides for the membership of the Commission. There are 24 members, and the membership is comprised of stakeholders from every area of the criminal justice system and they are appointed as applicable to that area of criminal justice. If you look around the zoom room that we have here, you can see we have a very vast -- a variety of experience and sources of information. And those of you that are returning from the previous meeting cycle know how much we appreciate having you on the Commission, we utilize you as a resource as well when we're trying to understand different aspects of the criminal justice system and what's important to you.

Members serve two-year terms, and the appointments align with the meeting cycle of the Commission. As I said, the current meeting cycle runs from August 1, 2021 to July 31, 2023. This means your current appointment will expire on July 31, 2023. Members can be reappointed for additional two-year terms.

The Commission is required to meet at least once every three months and may meet at further times as deemed necessary by the Chair. In other words, the Commission meets a minimum of four times each year.

Here is a list of statutes that govern the Nevada Sentencing Commission and the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. Next to each NRS section, there is a very general description of what the statute provides. For those who need a quick guide, you can use this to find the NRS section you want to reference. I have included in your materials the statutes in full. That document highlights which sections were changed during the 2021 legislative session with Assembly Bill number 393. I have also included an abridged version of AB 393 in your materials so you can see exactly how the statutes changed. My presentation today is based on the statutes included in your materials and the changes that were made with AB 393. When the changes from the legislative session are codified, I will provide the Commission with the updated statutes.

As Chief Justice Hardesty illuminated us with the history and the origin of the Nevada Sentencing Commission, I have briefly organized that information here in this table. So, again, in 2017 is when the legislative interim committee form of the Nevada Sentencing Commission was established. And so, the NRS sections that were created were the legislative findings, the creation and membership statute, the duties and other powers that were attributed to the Commission.

In 2019, the Commission was moved to the executive branch and the Department of Sentencing Policy was established. The changes to the NRS were to revise the existing sections from 2017, that provide that NRS section that creates our department and provided for the duties of the Director. In 2019 was also AB 236, as Chief Justice Hardesty mentioned, the sweeping criminal justice reform, the changes to the NRS sections that were relevant to the Nevada Sentencing Commission were to track and assess outcomes from AB 236, evaluate the costs avoided resulting from the enactment of AB 236, create the Coordinating Council and revise existing sections.

The most recent session also saw changes to the Commission where the reporting requirements for the Commission were revised. Some of the requirements of the Coordinating Council were provided, and this just revised existing statutes that outlined the duties and of the mandates of the Commission and the department.

The mandates and duties of the Commission are not just reading the statutes. The statutory mandates include goals and objectives, activities and deliverables for this Commission. The Commission's overall duties are to prioritize the goals and objectives, align activities with the goals and objectives, and develop and submit deliverables. This organization of the statute is how we have put it together as a way to support and assist this Commission in carrying out its duties. As you can see, those statutory mandates are vast and this is a way that, I think, is to help the Commission navigate, how you would like to move forward during this meeting cycle. So, rather than read the statutes to you or just share the direct language from the statute, I will present the mandates from the statutes as organized by goals and objectives for the Sentencing Commission activities and deliverables.

A great starting point for the Nevada Sentencing Commission is to prioritize goals and objectives for developing sentencing and corrections policies. Generally, this Commission is tasked with making data-driven recommendations. But those priorities and goals that will help advance those are listed here -- or could be identified here in the legislative findings.

So, we can see here that pursuant to the legislative findings, sentencing and corrections policy policies should be fair, consistent, proportional and provide opportunity. The law should have a clear and

purposeful rationale and be logical, understandable and transparent. There should be a priority for reserving prison for the most serious offenders and diversion programs and diversion programs and supervision for other offenders. These policies should be resource sensitive. They should be data driven, reflect the current circumstances and needs, and reduce crime and victimization by involving prevention, treatment and health and labor and utilize all resources.

Again, these are the legislative findings that are provided in 176.0131. These were developed during 2017 when the Nevada Sentencing Commission was first established. And I think this is a starting point for the Commission when you're looking to prioritize what's important to this Commission and then align what the Commission's doing and provide guidance to our department.

So, with those goals and objectives in mind, I then took the statutes and identified those aspects and mandates of the statutes that are activities -- what I would call activities. From the statutory mandates, we have these activities. And I've identified which subsection they can be attributed to in 176.0134. So, generally, these activities would be evaluate the effectiveness and fiscal impact of sentencing and correction policies, facilitate a statewide database -- a sentencing database, provide training and act as a sentencing policy resource for the state, evaluate the impact of programs, identify sentencing disparities, and develop and oversee sentencing guidelines. These are all provided for in 176.0134. Again, if we go back to what the goals and objectives are that are prioritized by these -- by the Commission, these activities could be aligned to that and provide a specific plan or guidance for the Commission.

There's also another set of activities that are provided in the statutes that are related to AB 236. That sweeping criminal justice reform that we mentioned was enacted in 2019, specifically AB 236 tasked the Sentencing Commission with oversight of AB 236 to track and assess the outcomes resulting from that legislation. I have listed the act activities here and characterized what the activity does. But again, these activities are generally focused on the Commission tracking and assessing outcomes resulting from the enactment of AB 236. And I think these activities can be aligned to those legislative findings that would then be listed as goals or objectives for the Commission.

There are vast data measures to collect from the Nevada Department of Corrections and the Division of Parole and Probation. If you look at that statute, it is a couple pages of listing those very specific data measures. The purpose of this data to be collected from DOC will answer the question who is in prison. Data measures collected from Division of Parole and Probation could tell us who is being supervised. And data from the central repository tells us about the crime rate throughout the state. Looking at all these pieces together is what the Commission can use to track and assess those outcomes that have resulted from the enactment of AB 236.

There's a reinvestment activity that is tied to policies that led to the enactment of AB 236. One of those policies was to identify areas for reinvestment to programs and treatments, which would slow the growth of the prison population and ensure public safety and reduce recidivism. The Commission makes specific and general recommendations related to reinvestment and where that should be focused. The Commission is also tasked with identifying correctional costs that have been avoided by the enactment of AB 236 and reinvestment. The statute requires the Commission to develop a formula to make these calculations.

The last activity that is attributed to AB 236 is the establishment of the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. This is a public body that reports to the Commission. It is comprised of members from each county in this state and makes recommendations to the Commission. If provided funding, the Council would also administer grants for programs and treatment in the

counties. Most of the members of the Council have been appointed. We are currently still waiting on appointments from Storey and Washoe County. Our department provides staff support to the Council and the first meeting for the Council is scheduled for September 27th at 1:00 pm. The Chair of the Council is appointed by the Nevada Sentencing Commission Chair. I will coordinate this appointment with the Chair not too long after this meeting.

So, I've talked about goals and objectives for the Commission, activities that could be aligned to prioritize goals of the Commission, and then they would -- by aligning -- by prioritizing goals and objectives aligning the activities this would then result in deliverables. I have taken pieces of the statute that I would characterize as deliverables as a way to focus and prioritize activities of the Commission. So, you can see here -- and I've identified which NRS section this could be found in. So, the mandate of the Commission to advise the legislature and make recommendations relating to sentencing and commission or sentencing and corrections policies is a deliverable and could be an ongoing activity of the Commission as different issues arise and would be -- could also be specific to the legislative session.

Another deliverable would be to recommend changes to sentencing and corrections with consideration for fiscal impact and incorporate objectives and goals for sentencing. So, I highlighted those legislative findings. If you look at Subsection 3 of 176.0134, there's also another list of potential goals and objectives for sentencing those could still be aligned to those legislative findings and it would be a way to focus this specific recommendation.

The next deliverable I've identified would be advice and make recommendations to our department. And when you refer to the statute, there are very areas where you could provide that guidance specific to with the kinds of reports that we provide to you, the kinds of work that we are doing collecting data and also make recommendations related to the administration of our budget.

The biggest deliverable of this Commission is to submit a comprehensive report that is provided for in Subsection 11 of 176.0134. That comprehensive report is due January 15th of each even-numbered year. Previously, the statutes had some other reports that were related to AB 236. That change that was made with AB 393 consolidated all these reports for the Commission into one report for this January 15th report. So, that would be the biggest deliverable that we'll be working towards within this meeting cycle.

There are two other reports that this Commission is responsible for, the projected amount of cost avoided report that is due August 1 of each even numbered year and the statement of cost avoided report which is due December 1 of each year. As we get -- at our next meeting, I can provide more detail as we work towards those next report, but I'd be happy to discuss that too if the Commission would like to right now because this is a lot of reports and deliverables that are attributed to the Commission.

So, taking all those pieces together that I've broken down from goals and objectives, the statutory activities and the deliverables, this is what it could look like for the Commission when -- if something were to be prioritized. So, for example, if this Commission were to take that legislative finding of prioritizing data-driven sentencing and corrections policies, that would be the prioritized goal and objective. The statutory activities that would align to that objective would be to facilitate a database, collect the AB 236 data and identify gaps in data, which are all provided for the statute as activities, which then could result in a deliverable. There could be two possible deliverables that come from this. So, there could be findings and recommendations included in the final report or recommend -- and/or recommendations can be made to the legislature.

I've identified here where we fit into this picture as far as I see it. So, the Commission has its goals and objectives, its statutory activities and this deliverable that you're working towards. In -- and to get you there, our department will complete tasks and projects to support you working on collecting that data, analyzing it, writing and revising the reports and presenting them to the Commission, and completing anything else that the Commission would like us to work on to help you advance the goal and objective and a statutory activity.

And here's another example of what it could look like by taking a prioritized goal or objective, aligning an activity to that and then working towards a deliverable. So, if the prioritized goal -- or goal or objective was to focus again on making sure that sentencing and corrections policies were resource sensitive, the activities that are provided for in the statute could be to evaluate the fiscal impact of this policy and track the savings and reinvestment. Those are two different activities, but they would both -- they both could be aligned to this objective. The deliverable then would be including these findings and recommendations in the final report, making recommendations to the legislature. It could also include those -- those costs avoided reports that I mentioned as well. Again, our department will provide the support and -- in between and complete things to help the Commission advance these priorities and these activities to then submit that deliverable.

So, with that, just the first part of the -- the Sentencing Commissions statutory mandates and how I've organized them based on goals and objectives, activities, aligning those and then working towards a deliverable, are there any questions that I could answer or any possible discussion that would -- that the Commission like to provide to the department?

Senator Packard: Victoria, I put my hand up, but I'm just going to jump in anyway. I -- I don't really have a question as much as just a commendation. I thought that was fantastic. You've covered everything. You -- this is a great primer for what's coming. So, I just encourage everyone to get on board and adopt this. The deliverables are I think exactly what we were talking about when we were talking about this at the legislative side. Of course, they're much more in depth than -- than what we discussed, but I think you're spot on and I endorse this plan.

Director Gonzalez: Thank you, Senator.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Director. Are there any other comments or -- or questions for the Director? I'd like to thank you for that overview, that orientation on the statutory mandates of this Commission, the department and the direction. I can tell you as a new member it's very informative. I'm sure it's a great refresher for those of you who are coming back. Justice Hardesty also thank you for providing some history and background of the Commission. All those things are helpful and -- and appreciated.

So, Director Gonzalez, is there anything further on this item?

Director Gonzalez: I don't have anything else. I can move on to then the mandates that are related to the department, the rest of my presentation.

Chair Stiglich: Okay. Please do.

Director Gonzalez: Okay. Thank you. So then moving on to the duties and the mandates attributed to the department. So, I generally characterize the duties of our department as supporting the Commission in its duties and your mandates, specifically the statute provides duties for the Director, which I have listed here. So, my duties are to oversee the functions of the Department, serve as the

Executive Secretary of the Commission, assist the Commission, facilitate the collection of data, and then make regular reports to this Commission.

I've also included our vision. Our department prized ourselves are -- on our collaboration efforts. That has been something that we have done since we were first established and has been really important in advancing anything and I attribute any of the progress that we make to that prioritizing collaboration. As we know, no one does anything on their own. And this opportunity to bring the agencies together is how I approach this position and approach this department, especially because I -- I absolutely know by those that I've talked to, the stakeholders, the members of this Commission, the legislature and the public, everyone wants to work towards a lot of these goals and priorities, and we want data-driven recommendations. I don't think anyone disagrees with that.

And so, if we can continue to collaborate in order to advance that -- those data-driven corrections or recommendation policies, then I just think we -- we're set up for success that way and I just appreciate everyone's efforts so far from our fellow agencies and our stakeholders and these members and the legislature in being able to do that. I attribute our success and our progress absolutely to that collaboration. I've also included our mission statement here, which as I said is to support this Commission in providing those data-driven corrections policies and assist this Commission with this oversight of justice reinvestment, which is that AB 236 piece.

The department has a total of five appropriated positions. The newest position, the Management Analyst 2, was added during the 2021 legislative session. This position is officially budgeted to start on October 1st. Currently, we are not fully staffed, but we are using this -- this as time as an opportunity to revise our duties and ensure that we are using resources effectively to support the Commission. At our next meeting, I look -- I hope to have very exciting updates about some changes that are -- I'm trying to advance in the department.

As returning of members of the Commission know, we have faced many budgetary challenges. Due to the initial impacts from COVID, we, along with other agencies, experienced budget reductions in order to help the state address budget shortfalls. You can see that we have been able to accomplish a lot despite these shortfalls and we even acquired an additional FTE during the past legislative session, which I wanted to thank for the support that we had from Assemblywoman Nguyen in advancing that -- that in AB 393 and just shows the support that we have again the collaboration. We couldn't have done that on our own.

We continue to look forward to identifying where we need additional support because I only see us growing more. We know this data-driven need is important for the state. It's necessary. And so, I look forward to identifying and sharing with this Commission how I picture that and where I see us going and how I -- my vision I have for us to continue to grow and provide those data -- the data-driven pieces you need to make recommendations related to the criminal justice system.

To carry forward my framework for identifying the goals and objectives that are prioritized by the Commission and how that looks with the activities and then the projects that we are working on, I wanted to just show you what that would look like from our perspective and what we're working on right now. So, if I were to align what we're doing with those legislative findings and then activities, where policies should be resource sensitive and the activity would be to evaluate the physical impact of that with working towards a report or any sort of other recommendations, we are currently working with the Department of Corrections, the Governor's Finance Office, to understand the budgeting process. And we want to figure out a dynamic way to evaluate the cost of corrections.

As I mentioned, for the AB 236 duties, the Commission is required to adopt a formula to identify that but at a higher level. One of the - one of the goals and objectives of the Commission is to evaluate the fiscal impact. And so, we are really working forward -- working towards helping this Commission add more to the formula that was adopted with the previous meeting cycle so that can truly be dynamic and represent what the costs are, so that you will have better information for making recommendations to those policies that relate to corrections and sentencing. At our next meeting, we will have a very thorough report for this Commission on our findings and our evaluations and what this Commission could use as a foundation for making those recommendations that are prioritized by the Commission.

The second data-driven goal and objection path that I have here -- or the second path I have here is the data -- is the data-driven goal and priority or goal and objective of the Commission. The activity would be to facilitate the collection of data. We are actively looking -- we are actively collecting data. We collected the first round of data for AB 236. One of the other things we're doing is assisting the Commission by evaluating these data systems so that you have the full picture of what data looks like in our state when it comes to the criminal justice system and then we're looking to help this Commission identify those needs that may be there and opportunities to fill in gaps where they may exist for criminal justice data.

The last path I have here is the goal and objective to evaluate the effectiveness of policies. So, this is related to what we have been doing related again to those AB 236 activities, specifically that cost avoided report and are assisting in developing the formula, but also, we established the Coordinating Council. As I mentioned, we have most of those appointments and they will be meeting soon. And so, those are some of the specific things that we have been working on that would align to this path of a prioritized goal or objective.

So, I'll just pause real quickly. All right. I can pause if there are any questions or discussion or comments about this aspect. The last part of my presentation will be to talk about specifically some of the activities from the last meeting cycle, but I want to pause and see if there any questions about our duties or what we're doing to support the Commission currently.

All right. All right. I'll just keep trucking through then. So, last part of my presentation is to go over some -- highlight some of the activities and what was done during the 2019-2021 meeting cycle as the returning members know but this will help for the it's a refresher but for the new members. It's a way to quickly catch up to what's been happening.

So, you can see here during the 2019-2021 meeting cycle, the Commission held 12 meetings. This included two meetings to hear presentations from criminal justice agencies regarding impacts from the pandemic. There -- during that meeting cycle, there were four statutorily required reports. All four of those reports were prepared, approved by this Commission and submitted. And very significant too, I think with all this work, is again another recommendation came out of this Commission that resulted in legislation and those were those changes that I mentioned about consolidating the reports and adding the requirements related to the Coordinating Council and that resulted in the inaction of AB 393. AB 393, for those who don't know, was the Cleanup Bill for AB 236. And so, again, it was an accomplishment of the department and the Commission and our collaboration with everyone to develop those recommendations throughout the meeting cycle that then could result into legislation that was ultimately passed, and as I mentioned, provided us with an additional FTE.

The other thing I wanted to mention about our activities was we, as the department, in assisting not only the Commission but the state with providing that data-driven information we took what we have learned about evaluating the fiscal impact of corrections and sentencing and tried to use that in a way

to provide some information related to the legislation that was being enacted. We learned a lot about how to evaluate costs and analysis -- how to evaluate the costs.

As I mentioned, we are currently revising our methodology. And at our next meeting, I will have a full report of where that methodology is at right now and what I recommend to this Commission in adopting because I look forward to -- this is going to be an amazing opportunity for the Commission and the department during the next legislative session and the development of any proposed legislation. This could be a very valuable resource that we will offer to the legislators and the stakeholders when they're developing those policies. They will have actual data and reports from what we've evaluated to help them really make some of those data-driven positions -- recommendations and policies that they're trying to enact.

The last page of my slide is just to highlight again the reports that were submitted. There were four statutorily required reports. You can see just from the covers they evolved, but I can tell you the substance evolved, and we continue to learn how to best put these together and make them a useful resource. They just get better and better as far as I'm concerned. And this last report in the upper right-hand side of the slide, the supplement was developed independently by the department. It was not approved by the Commission. But it is just visualizations of what was in the AB 236 report.

So, we took the data that was in that report. We -- and did some analysis in terms of just making some visualizations that I think we're useful to see where we're going. The collection, the AB 236 data, is very early as -- in the process. And so, I think this foundation will be a good place for the -- as we can collect additional data, you'll be able to see where those comparisons will be able to go over time and how we're going to be able to help this Commission truly track and assess the outcomes relating to those policies to determine how it's going and make recommendations as needed throughout the process.

So, with that, I am officially done with everything on my presentation. I would take any additional -- I guess I would buy, at the Chair's pleasure, any additional comments or questions or feedback at this time or direction from the Commission with what we're working on.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you, Director. Are there any comments, any feedback on this item?

Assemblywoman Nguyen: I have a question, has that new full-time employee started yet?

Director Gonzalez: We're hoping they'll start October. So, we are -- we are in the midst of the recruitment process right now. And so, yeah, we're shooting for that first week of October for them to start.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: Perfect. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Any other comments or feedback? All right. Thank you, Director. Hearing no other comments or feedback, we'll turn to item six, CJI presentation. In response to the pandemic, the Crime and Justice Institute is back in Nevada to undertake a study to analyze the backlog of cases within our criminal justice system, including the impact that pandemic related policies have had and will have on the court system and AB 236 and what those impacts will have on the prison population.

Chief Justice Hardesty and representatives from CJI are here today to tell us about the study update and -- to tell us about the study and update us on their findings so far. So, I'll turn that over for the CJI presentation.

6. Presentation and Update on the Project to Evaluate the Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Nevada's Criminal Justice System

Mr. Weld: Thank you, Chair Stiglich, Vice Chair Brady, and outgoing Chair Hardesty and outgoing Vice Chair Callaway as well as Director Gonzalez and welcome to all the new commission appointees today. Today, we'll be giving the Commission a progress update on the project that is currently underway to study the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Nevada's prison population.

So, here's a quick outline of today's presentation. I'll start by giving a brief project overview in part for the benefit of the new commission members. I'll then turn it over to my colleague, Dr. Molly Buchanan, for the main event today. Dr. Buchanan will present around 60 slides or so of preliminary data findings. The slides will contain data we've received so far from the administrative office of the courts, the Nevada Specialty Courts and the Nevada Department of Corrections. And we extend our thanks again to these agencies and there's several others at the state and county levels who have provided data for analysis and just generously given their time to us in this project.

So, before I get into the details of the project, I want to give a brief background of our organization and the work that we do. The Crime and Justice Institute or CJI is a non-partisan, nonprofit that works with states and localities across the country. We use data analysis to support these jurisdictions as they pursue policies to reduce recidivism, safely reduce unneeded costs, and enhance public safety. This project is funded by a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, which is part of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CJI has done other recent work in Nevada apart from this project, which has been discussed earlier in this meeting. We provided staffing support to the ACAJ in 2018 when that interim commission conducted a comprehensive study of the state's prison population and developed policies that resulted in the passage of AB 236 in 2019. Since 2019, a team from CJI has been working with agencies across the state to implement the changes from AB 236. And the project we are discussing today, which is focused on the impact of COVID-19 on Nevada's criminal justice system is distinct from the AB 236 work.

So, what are the goals of this project. CJI has been asked by state leadership to evaluate the general impact of the pandemic on Nevada's criminal justice system and its specific impact on the prison population. The project seeks to better understand the impact of COVID-19 on the state's prison population to identify any opportunities that exist for post-pandemic policies and practices, and lastly, to revise existing prison populations where necessary in response to the effects of the pandemic.

So, next, I'll describe the phases of the work. The project work has several different phases. The first two, the data analysis and system assessment, are currently underway. The data analysis consists of collection and analysis of data sets from state and local agencies, the preliminary results of which you'll see today. The system assessment consists of interviews with and surveys of criminal justice practitioners to obtain an expert perspective of what actually occurred on the ground during the pandemic. And we thank this Commission, many of you have made yourselves available for such interviews. We'll then run revised projections on the state's prison population based on any changes we see in the new data, then based on the results of all the previous work, identify any policy opportunities that may exist.

In November, CJI will deliver a report to state leaders and to this Commission that includes the information from all of these phases. So, I'll now turn things over to Dr. Buchanan to take us through

the primary data findings.

Dr. Buchanan: Thank you, Quintin, and thank you all for the opportunity to share some of our preliminary results from analyses using a subset of our data so far. Today, we'll be looking at trends, primarily in admissions to courts and corrections, looking at timeframes specifically before COVID and what we're calling during COVID. I'll describe this a little more on the next slide.

And so, our data sources that we're able to assess for today, and you know, provide an update include data from the Nevada Department of Corrections, focusing on their admissions trends as well as data from the administrative office of courts focusing on data reported to them on new filings and dispositions as well as data from Nevada Specialty Courts looking specifically at admission trends as well as some outcomes of specialty court participants, again, before and during COVID.

Now, unless otherwise stated, we performed all the analyses that we'll present here today. We've been in consultation with the agencies described on the prior slide who provided their data. We approached these data by assessing a period we refer to, like I said, before COVID and then during COVID. The during COVID timeframe for all the data files is a snapshot of cases or admissions that occurred between March 1, 2020 and December 2020. So, for NDOC data, AOC and specialty court that during COVID timeframe is a 10-month period. The before COVID timeframe is a little different, depending on the data file. For NDOC data, our before COVID timeframe is a 14-month period, looking at basically 2019 plus the first two months of 2020. Whereas AOC and specialty court, we have a little bit larger of a timeframe before COVID, looking at about 32-month period, so starting in July of 2017 through February 2020. So, as necessary, I'll try to underscore kind of what timeframes we're looking at if it impacts any of the, you know, analyses or results that we see here today.

Let's see here. Now, before we jump in, there is going to be a lot of information across several agencies being reviewed across three different agencies. So, we have -- similar to what Director Gonzalez just described, we've integrated opportunities throughout the presentation for discussions at the end of each applicable section. So, as I present the section and come to an end, we begin here with the results from Nevada AOC data and we explore the differences in caseload patterns before and during COVID.

But before I turn from there into specialty court data, I'll provide a brief summary of the slides you'll see on AOC data and then open the floor to questions or commentary, feedback specific to the preliminary findings shared from this agency. We would benefit from hearing about ideas of interest of where we might focus additional analyses as we work towards our final report, who else we might want to speak with as part of our ongoing system assessment, as Quintin described earlier, and just to gain some additional perspective or additional context that really helps put a lot of these numbers and charts into the local perspective.

And so, we're going to begin with the AOC data, like I mentioned, and exploring specifically the new filings and then we'll look into trends for dispositions and then the resulting case age from those trends. So, again, we're looking at that 32-month before COVID timeframe and a 10-month quote during COVID timeframe focusing from March to December of 2020.

So, let's jump in. And so, we see here that filings for felony cases were down by 28 percent. This probably comes as no surprise that there were declines in filings of cases during that 10-month period. And across this chart, you see the green columns. That is before COVID. And you see blue columns, these are during COVID. And so, if we start from the furthest left -- I'm sorry -- the furthest right-hand column, which is labeled total new filings. We see, you know, an overall reduction in total filings from

before to during COVID. And this is an average number of filings per month that we took from the 32 months comparing them to the 10 months.

And so, we see a decline in about over a thousand cases per month to just over 750 that during -- that during COVID timeframe and a predominant amount of these are going to be for those felony cases. So, so if you shift your focus to the farthest left-hand column labeled - labeled felony, we see that felonies comprise the majority of new filings to district courts in Nevada with about 85 percent of the cases filed are going to be for felonies. And much of our preliminary analyses here are focusing on these felony caseloads as these are the cases that are going to impact that prison population.

So, if we stay focused on the furthest left felony specific column, again, we see that we dropped here by about 28 percent in that during COVID timeframe. So, the average month -- monthly count of admissions declined. So, we have about 250 fewer felony filings per month on average during COVID, which if we extrapolate that over the 10-month time period we're looking at, it's about 2,500 fewer felony filings in that 10-month period.

So, sticking with just felony cases now, not including the small share of gross misdemeanor filings, we see declines in new filings across all felony crime types. However, the rate of decline across these crime types varied. And so, we can start with an overview of the distribution of new filings for crime types at either time point before or during COVID. Over a third of the new felony filings are for property offenses, followed by another third for person-based offenses, and then the remainder split between the category of drug or other, which includes the AOC's designated categories of felony weapons, public order, motor vehicle felonies and then a catch-all other category.

Now, if we look at the change in column heights, so to speak, for before and during COVID for these categories, we should notice a few things starting with the drug category and then working our way to the left. The number of average monthly drug filings declined by half. So, we had about 160 per month before COVID down to 80 per month during COVID. And then making up a larger base share of new filings, those property in person cases which are the more common cases coming into district courts, the monthly average for the felony property filings fell by 30 percent and that's a difference of about 95 fewer cases per month during COVID and then the person filings also declines steeply -- or sorry -- less steeply, dropping only 18 percent with about 50 fewer filings per month. So, all together, again, over that 10-month period of COVID, the sum of the differences between, you know, the before and during timeframe adds up to about 2,500 fewer felony filings into those courts. And 500 of those would be alone for just person-based offenses, 900 fewer for property offenses. So, we're seeing declines, I think, as we might expect just given the timeframe of COVID and the impact it had on the courts.

And so, as we move here, we are going to move into looking at disposition trends. And so, we have the number of new filings and we see the declines there. Now, we're going to move into the disposition trends, and these are for the original dispositions, which are, you know, the cases for which an original entry of judgment has been filed. The case has been disposed of in the courts and no longer active. And so, we start again with the chart of how these are distributed between crime types and just the overall decline that we see in dispositions also during COVID.

And so, if we start again at the furthest right-hand column labeled total dispositions, we see a similar 25 percent decline in the average monthly number of dispositions during COVID. And so, we have about 250 fewer dispositions per month during COVID than before. And again, if we shift all the way to the left looking specifically at the lion's share of these cases, which are felony cases being disposed of, we see that those dispositions also declined 25 percent, about 230 fewer felony dispositions per month during COVID.

So, here on this next slide, if we look at those felony dispositions specifically, so now just felony dispositions, we assess these across crime types to see if there were changes between person, property or drug offense crime types. And we see similar patterns that we saw in the filing charts a few charts ago as there were declines across all categories but again at different rates across the categories. So, starting with drug felony dispositions again and working our way left, we've got an average monthly disposition for drug cases that dropped by about 38 percent. And then, we have about 65 fewer cases right per month on average during COVID than before.

Again, for the larger base share of the cases that are being disposed of person and property offenses, we also see declines, property less steeply than drug crimes but still dropping 23 percent and average monthly number of dispositions. And then again, this smaller reduction for person-based felonies at about 21 percent, so altogether some differences we're looking at about 2,300 and fewer dispositions per month or sorry over the 10-month time frame of COVID-19. In a few slides we'll contrast these filings and dispositions kind of against each other and these trends just to get a feel for how the cases were coming in or going out and as well as the case age and which types of cases are aging in district courts once they are filed.

But first, we assess trends in those original dispositions that you see here meaning the path by which a case comes to an end in district courts and so looking at differences across trial type, non-trial type. And so we see a few things on this slide but first being that from the courts reporting this information to the ACO, the most dominant method of disposition before and during COVID is non-trial methods which comprise about 75 percent of all district court dispositions. A far smaller share are going to be through jury or bench trials at about 1 to even less than one percent of case dispositions overall. There are reductions across these disposition types. Non-trial dispositions, which again, are the greatest share declined by about 18 percent, so 160 fewer non-trial dispositions on month.

There is not much change to bench trials they, again, they very low on average monthly rate of bench trials and then again on average there was a reduction in jury trials moving from about 14 on average per month to about 6, which is about a 60 percent reduction but it is a small share of the disposition types before or during COVID. So, if we zoom into, I guess the non-trial disposition type specifically, we see that across the board guilty pleas before trial is going to be the most common type of non-trial disposition. And so, guilty pleas actually comprise 91 percent of non-trial outcomes and about 65 percent of all disposition outcomes.

The average case count before trial, guilty pleas declined about 17 percent during COVID which is a lower rate compared to the other categories but it's a difference of 133 fewer guilty pleas per month. Dismissals before trial and after diversion also declined but they comprise a far smaller portion of the types of monthly dispositions that we would see. And then since guilty pleas before trial make up such a large share of the disposition types, we explored trends of guilty pleas across the felony offense types before and during as well. We see here on this next slide.

And so, looking at the person, property and drug offense, we have guilty pleas, you know, that 17 percent decline in guilty pleas. We see that for drug felonies they declined by about 30, a little over than 30 percent and the guilty pleas for property offenses around 15 percent. And then moving all the way to the left, we see that guilty pleas for person offenses decline the least and so there is a fewer than 10 percent decline. So, 8.7 percent drop in average monthly number of guilty pleas for person-based offenses during COVID. And so, this starts to underscore a theme that I think we see here and across all the data sets that more serious offense types and crimes, there were less steep declines in those types of cases.

So why we looked at new filings and dispositions separately? The next few slides are going to contrast new filings and dispositions just to get a feel for cases that more cases coming in versus going out and then again we'll get into a little bit on the case age types in the district courts. So, I know this slide has a lot to unpack here, so a lot to unpack in this graph. So, we'll begin with the columns which are all representing before COVID timeframe. And so, the green columns are the average count of new filings before COVID and the yellow columns are the average count of dispositions before COVID. And so, we see fluctuation in those columns from a month to month timeframe, sometimes there's more new filings than dispositions in a month and the next month there'll be more dispositions than new filings, and so rarely are these call columns perfect even one for one.

If we turn our attention to the lines in the graph, these lines represent the same trends but just during COVID. And so, the blue line is the month-to-month count of new filings beginning in March of 2020 all the way to December and the green line is the month-to-month count of original dispositions in that same timeframe. And so, for both lines, they follow a similar path. We can see the clear drop-off in March to April even through May of 2020 in both of these lines, fewer dispositions, fewer filings. And we see both start to kind of increase again through that June, July, August timeframe and then they converge. And we see that there are greater amount of new filings for a few months than dispositions, specifically through this kind of September, October of 2020 timeframe and they actually converge again, and dispositions outpaced the new filings towards the end of 2020.

And so, what does this all mean? We're trying to figure out how these cases are being, you know, filed versus disposed of. And so overall, dispositions did outpace new filings by about five percent over the COVID timeframe, but we wanted to look, to see how this possibly patterns possibly differed for offense type. And so, we dig into this a little bit more and we separate these things by felony offense type. So, the next chart also has a little bit to unpack but we're showing here just person or the other category felony filings versus dispositions, both just during COVID. And so, if we start with the top blue and green lines these are for person-based felonies, new filings and dispositions during COVID only.

And we see that the blue line for the majority of that 10-month period is hovering above the disposition line. So, there was about 28 percent more new filings of person-based felonies than there were of person-based dispositions. We can see that convergence again around May 2020 and then not converging again until like the end of the view around December of 2020. For the other category which are the bottom two lines that you see here, we see a similar pattern overall. There were seven percent more new filings than dispositions for other felonies and which is about 15 more new filings than dispositions for this offense type specifically.

We dug a little deeper, it's not shown here, there were some increases this kind of -- this uptick of this light blue line around July through November. There are some increases in DUIs and felony motor vehicle charges during this timeframe. So, more new filings and dispositions for these two crime types; however, on the flip side we have fewer new filings and dispositions for property and drug cases. And so we see a very similar, you know, trend; however, the green line now is hovering above the blue line, meaning majority of cases for the majority of the COVID timeframe being disposed of from March to December of 2020. So, there was 22 percent fewer new filings for property offenses and then the bottom two lines representing drug case felonies, there lies about 12 percent fewer new filings than dispositions for drug cases.

Okay, so lastly, we've looked at case age and how the fluctuations and filings and dispositions might have impacted the series of age categories, some -- that some courts are reporting to the AOC. And so here we have data shown in a slightly different timeframe. I just want to highlight the caveat here

that this is looking at a 2019 compared to a 2020 period. And the reasons for that is that the data reported here to AOC only began in July of 2018 with only some districts reporting on a monthly basis. The count of cases that they have in these four age categories here which are zero to three months, three to six, six months to a year or over a year and still not all districts yet are reporting this measure to the AOC, including Nevada's largest district.

And so, the patterns could be or should be viewed preliminarily and so these are numbers that are still kind of influx and are requiring a little more digging. However, the patterns that we do see are for a case age by calendar year. We have 2019 in the green columns and 2020 in the blue columns. So, starting in the furthest left, the zero to 9 case age, there are fewer cases coming in, right. There's less new filings which are the case age zero, as soon as they're filed, they start you know aging. And so, as we move through the age categories though we see an increase in some of the cases are getting older from 2020. So, a greater portion of the cases are aging in 2020 compared to 2019.

And so if we look at this again by offense type to see if there was any notable differences, we broke these out you know by offense type across age categories again with the left four columns are looking at 2019, the right four columns are looking at 2020. We see that there are increasing age of cases across all offense types in 2020 compared to 2019. And so, the portion of cases are just getting older. It seems like from this data that we have access to so far.

Okay, so, with that, we're going to turn to a summary slide of all the information that I just shared regarding the AOC data and we please ask for information or for questions related to what we've shared so far, and so far we've seen, you know, declines in both filings and dispositions. We've seen dispositions overall out -- exceed the new case filings but it's a little different depending on the offense category and we also have seen an increase in case ages overall between 2019 and 2020. So, with that, are there any questions or comments, feedback so far?

Chair Stiglich: Well Ms. Buchanan and Mr. Weld, I want to thank you for an excellent and informative presentation. It's really -- what you've done is extraordinary to pull all this together, so thank you.

Dr. Buchanan: Okay.

Chair Stiglich: Do anybody have comments or feedback or questions?

Ms. Welborn: Thank you so much for your presentation, oh, sorry Chair. May I proceed? Sorry, I wasn't sure if I got called on -- great. I just had one question just to understand this and the bigger picture, I want to make sure that I'm understanding this in terms of how or whether the COVID-19 pandemic frustrated the goals and objectives of AB 236, if at all. Would you conclude that the decrease in filings and dispositions have us on track or even ahead of our goals, you know, the decarceration goals of that bill?

Dr. Buchanan: That is a great question. At this point, I'm not able to I guess apply these numbers exactly to the projections that we've done. That is the goal for the final report for sure is to be able to put all of these pieces of the puzzle together and try to see where at for those projections and for the reinvestment purposes, and so this is very temporary. We've got a lot of data still to get through. From a lot of different agencies, we recently received data from the second and eighth and we've got some data coming from the RCCD to look at crime rates. And so, we're looking at the really big picture before we can I guess say affirmatively that you know this has put us where we want to be or where we should be, yeah.

Mr. Arrascada: If I may ask a question? I know this is focused on felonies and gross misdemeanors, have you folks -- are you going to be looking at misdemeanor filings also and the similar impacts that they had up on the courts?

Dr. Buchanan: Sure.

Mr. Arrascada: Just anecdotally we know that, in our office at least, the Washoe County Public Defender's Office misdemeanor filings went up over 20 percent in the last year and a half and so I don't know the same study is going to be tried to tackle on the misdemeanor system also.

Dr. Buchanan: Sure, so we do have AOC provided a lot of great data from all the courts. This -- we just presenting here on predominantly felony cases in district courts, but we do have the ability and plan to look through the justice court information as well as municipal court even. We have that information there just to see these trends play out across all case types, yes. So, to answer -- a short answer to your question, yes, we plan to look at that.

Mr. Arrascada: Excellent, thank you.

Mr. Hicks: Justice Stiglich, if I may ask a question too?

Chair Stiglich: Please.

Mr. Hicks: I'm kind of echoing what Mr. Arrascada said. I think it would be valuable to look at the misdemeanor filings as well because I think those have gone up, both because of maybe some of the COVID reaction but also because the AB 236, and I think that would be valuable on your assessment. The other question I had was what is a disposition as far as how you considered it?

Dr. Buchanan: So, what we've looked at for the presentation so far today is the original disposition information and data being reported to the AOC. And so, it was either cases that have essentially closed through the non-trial or trial options. We weren't looking at reopened dispositions and then closed. We're looking, sorry, specifically those original dispositions.

Mr. Hicks: So if for example someone had been placed into a specialty court or some type of diversion in that timeframe and we're still in that program in December of 2020, that would not have been reported as one of the dispositions?

Dr. Buchanan: As far as my understanding, I'm not 100 percent sure. I know that we have -- do have one category it was you know dismissal after diversion, so it would be at the end of that. So, I speculate that that would not show up here, yes.

Mr. Hicks: Yeah, so based on my experience that would -- that would be so, it wouldn't show up. And so again, something I'd just encourage you to look at because as we've discussed previously in your analysis of this, you certainly have to contemplate the impact of AB 236 as Ms. Welborn brought up. And I think it might be good to look into how many people were placed into Specialty Courts because that number could be much greater as far as dispositions because typically a disposition isn't accounted for until either they graduate or end up going to sentencing, so just a suggestion. Thank you.

Dr. Buchanan: Thanks. Thank you. Any other questions? I saw some hands. Quentin? Yeah.

Mr. Weld: Oh no.

Dr. Buchanan: Okay.

Chair Stiglich: So, if somebody has a question or comment, just speak up and identify yourself and are there any further?

Vice Chair Brady: I just had a question about track -- I know we're going to need to do a report on cost saved. So, I agree -- I just want to echo the sentiments about tracking the justice court numbers as well but I was also wondering if we were going to do any kind of analysis or comparison regarding the crime rates in various categories here in Nevada and how that tracks with these numbers.

Dr. Buchanan: Sure, fair question, good question. We're hoping to get a feel for any sort of shifts kind of during, the same before in COVID view from the RCC data that we've requested. And so, we just recently have secured the MOU with them and we should be getting the data shortly and be able to look at different patterns being reported there and different patterns for arrest. So, really that front-end of the system that eventually will you know kind of be impacting all of the new filings and dispositions and so trying to get a feel for that, if that answers your question. That is the goal, yes.

Anyone else? Thank you.

Chief Lawson: Question is that obviously decrease in referrals of PSIs has been a great concern to me and whether there has been a kind of a backlog accumulating in the court system with, you know, filings coming in and courts not operating at full capacity and what would a surge like that look like. And so, I guess to clarify these numbers I guess help alleviate some of those concerns for me but then you also made a comment that you did not have full data from essentially the Clark County courts, is that correct?

Dr. Buchanan: Correct, so in terms of the phases at which people report or the court's reports to the AOC, there are some measures that I've included here that are in, what they called Phase Three, and as far as I could tell from the data that Clark was not included in those phases, and so that includes the case age pieces. Clark does report some of the Phase Two numbers and so some of the, you know, lower filings and dispositions were included there.

Chief Lawson: Okay and then are you doing any analysis for the first half of '21? Are you going to wait until all of '21 is complete before looking at, you know, the more recent trends with the court openings?

Dr. Buchanan: Right, so I think we'll be back in touch with the AOC. I know that they just finalized some of the kind of January to June of 2021 numbers. And so, when we started discussions with them, they weren't ready to share those numbers quite yet. The fiscal year hadn't quite wrapped up, so I think we might request the additional to kind of add that -- that view of what's happened since 2021 started.

Chief Lawson: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Buchanan: You're welcome.

Mr. Hoffman: It looks like this data is all Nevada level. Do you have the ability to disaggregate it by like, you know, Clark, Washoe, or Rurals or by the districts or by the individual courts within the districts?

Dr. Buchanan: And so not necessarily to that level of granularity in terms of -- actually and so I think we could get into the level report. We do have the ability to look at it by kind of county and who's reporting and so some of the information starts to get a little sparse as you start dividing it out by those numbers for sure but there is the ability to look at that. So far, we've just kind of aggregated things across the state but we do I think -- I'm trying to think of all those measures but for the majority I think there is the ability to look at them by who is reporting them, so which court actually reported those numbers, yes.

Mr. Hoffman: Okay, that would just be my suggestion. If there are any interesting patterns that emerge in like you know, the Rurals are still filing all these cases, even though Washoe and Clark aren't or something like that.

Dr. Buchanan: Yeah. Okay, yeah that's very helpful. Thank you.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: Hi, I have a question along the lines of that data collection. Is there a way to disaggregate like between gender or race? I'm not sure if you're collecting that information to be able to, you know, kind of determine that information, is that possible?

Dr. Buchanan: From the data that we've received from AOC and I think as reported to them it is not at like an individual case level. It's more aggregated of this, the number of cases we had this month in this court. And so, I don't believe and I'm not sure if they have that granularity of information from the data, we've requested from the second and eighth judicial district. We did request that more case level information and so for each case coming in, you know, what is the exact charge and the characteristics of the individual being charged, so able to look at kind of those demographics and then aggregate them that way, if that answers your question.

So, within this data, we haven't looked at the individual level. We'll get into Specialty Courts in a moment. We do have that case level info and we do get into some demographic differences but as far as our additional analyses that we have planned and we have the data, we just haven't been able to get into them quite yet. We do have that ability to look at.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: I guess if there's anyone from AOC, I can't see, I only have like five people on my screen as well, that might be able to answer what kind of information in that area is collected.

Mr. McCormick: Thanks Molly and Assemblywoman. We don't collect down to that individual case level data. The courts report the -- their numbers to us aggregate, like we had 100 cases and disposed 80 of them. We don't collect individual defendant level data. To get that level of data, you would have to go to the individual courts, and they would have to review each case to pull that information. Like Molly said we do get it at specialty court because we have the statewide case management system for our -- Specialty Courts that allows us to pull that data but system-wide we don't get that and we don't really have the resources to get down to that level of case-specific data.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: Thank you.

Dr. Buchanan: Thank you. All right without further ado.

Chairman DeRicco: Justice Stiglich, I have one question, if I may?

Chair Stiglich: Please.

Chairman DeRicco: A question I have on the definition of the crimes or the person crimes at the bottom let's say at page -- slide 15. It says felony person category includes crimes against person, domestic violence, elder abuse, child abuse and neglect. I'm going to assume it also includes other violent crimes in there such as robbery and -- but the one thing I don't see on here is anything with regard to specifically sex crimes at all. Is there a way to also break this into specific violent offenses and sex crimes in this -- to extract that information?

Dr. Buchanan: So, I worked with the categories within the data provided and so the categories of crime against persons within the data I believe would include many of those cases. And so, I don't have a specific category for sex offenses, or you know specific category for, I'm sorry, another one that that you'd mentioned. And so these are -- the ones in italics I guess at the bottom of this slide here were -- are provided in the data and I just lumped them into -- together like a person-based offense. And so, I'm assuming those offenses are lumped in together there. I cannot (inaudible) them.

Chairman DeRicco: So, all violent and all sex crimes are lumped into the person category?

Dr. Buchanan: Yes.

Chairman DeRicco: Okay.

Dr. Buchanan: As far as I understand, yes.

Chairman DeRicco: Thank you.

Dr. Buchanan: You're welcome. All right and so if we want to move into that more case level look at things for the specialty court data, we can do that next. And so, we'll turn to trends for the Specialty Courts before and during COVID like I said. Again, this is a similar 32-month timeframe and a 10-month during COVID time frame as we looked at with the AOC data. And so, for Specialty Courts, we saw a decline in admissions of about 42 percent during COVID. So, sticking with this theme, there were declines in admissions during COVID and so we had about 262 admissions before COVID down to about 152 admissions per month. So, 110 fewer participants on average a month during that 10-month period.

If we extrapolate that again over that 10-month period, we've got about a thousand fewer admissions by the start of 2021 for Specialty Courts. Not shown here is the kind of that month to month data on that monthly admissions to Specialty Courts increased in June 2020 and so they kind of dipped really low and then kind of picked back up and then again in September through that late fall timeframe dropped down again. And so, a preliminary glimpse into the 2021 numbers that we have available from Specialty Courts did show that the numbers of specialty court admissions are increasing again but they're still far lower than the average monthly before COVID. And so, they're getting higher than the during COVID numbers but are still lower than prior to COVID.

As for the charges that come into Specialty Courts, the predominant types of cases, the lion share of them for admission types are felony admissions while a third were for misdemeanors, about 37 percent and then the remaining distributed across petitions, gross misdemeanors, other category and status offenses. And so, during COVID, the average monthly count of nearly all charges declined by nearly half for misdemeanors and about 40 percent for felonies.

So, digging into that largest share again of those felony admissions and felony cases, we looked at the

admission category of whether admissions were solely a new offense or were they violations for probation and parole, et cetera. And so, among the types, the vast majority again are going to be felony admissions are new criminal offenses. So, 86 percent of the felony admissions are going to be for new criminal offenses and that decline, if we're looking at that furthest left column, that declined by about 37 percent from, you know, almost 100 cases to a 60 a month during COVID.

Violations, if you're looking at all the other columns in the rest of the chart are comparatively rare to new criminal offenses but technical violations of probation were the most common. They're about nine percent of the total and so they dropped by about 50 percent which is a difference of about 10 cases a month to five during COVID. So far these trends again supporting that theme of kind of the more serious new criminal offenses coming into the system during COVID versus violations.

So, still exploring felony admissions, we also looked at admissions to court, specialty court by offense type and found some interesting patterns from before to during COVID. First being the type of offenses for cases admitted to specialty court during COVID were more serious overall. Drug cases which are this middle column here make up the larger share of felony admissions. They're 38 percent of the admissions and so they declined at the greatest rate during COVID as well. They dropped by nearly half from about 50 admissions per month to about 25 during COVID.

To the right of those are alcohol-based admissions. Those also dropped by half during COVID. Their share of the total felony admissions obviously is less at about only 12 percent. A preliminary glimpse into the first few months of 2021 here for alcohol offenses, this is something we saw kind of in the AOC new filings and disposition trends. There were some -- the increase of alcohol-based defenses are coming back, are rising in the specialty court data as well. So, individuals coming in with felony alcohol offenses has increased a bit in the start of 2021.

And then lastly, we noted a slight increase in the rate of admissions for violent person offenses and so their share of admissions before COVID was 12 percent. It increased to about 20 percent of the share of admissions during COVID and this is, you know, largely due to declines in the more larger base rate categories of drug and alcohol. We've got about one additional violent person admission per month than there was before COVID, during COVID.

So, then we dug into the person-based offense shift a little bit more. So, we assessed the two categories that fall into person-based offenses for the special court data or that are -- are accessible in the specialty court data. And we saw that the increase in violent person admissions during COVID Specialty Courts was spurred mostly by this four percent increase in admissions for crime against persons which is again more of a broader category. And there is no change in admissions for cases that fall into the domestic violence category which does again make up a very small base of the admissions to specialty court to begin with.

We also looked at the changes in drug admissions a little more closely. The large share of felony admissions like I said to Specialty Courts are for drug-based offenses. We wanted to see which -- what was changing whether it was drug use and possession cases or was it drug manufacturing distribution cases. And so, if you look in the center, you know, blue column the admissions for drug use possession declined by nearly half from about 40 admissions per month to about 20.

And the rate of admissions for drug and manufacturing to the left, if we're looking at the blue line specifically or the blue bars specifically, they declined by about 11 percent. Thereby, the share of total admissions for drug manufacturing and distribution increased because they declined at a lower rate than the rate of use and possession. And so, a preliminary look at 2021 numbers, not shown here, is

that the patterns are returning to the -- before COVID numbers with increases in the admissions of use and possession individuals versus of the lower manufacturing and distribution admissions.

So, lastly we assessed felony admissions by admission type in terms of how the case found its way into specialty court and we see here that among felony admissions the most common path to specialty court types were deferred-delay sentence or post-sentence. And so, during COVID the rate of average monthly admissions for deferred sentences dropped by nearly half from 60 to about 30 admissions per month while the admission rates for post-sentence did not decline as steeply. They dropped about 39 percent from 65 to about 40 admits per month.

From these changes, deferred sentence admissions comprise now a smaller portion of the admissions during COVID which is about down six percent and post-sentence admissions into specialty court increased a bit, and this looks to be a similar pattern for 2021. There are a greater portion of individuals coming to specialty court through that post-sentence path, okay. And so, we were able here to turn to look at the demographic and characteristics of the admissions into Specialty Courts and get an idea for who the individuals are before and during COVID, if there's any changes.

We see this first chart showing that the share of admissions during COVID increased for people who are unemployed and so this is the top green bar, an increased portion of individuals were unemployed. In a similar pattern, we see decreases, so you know, shorter grain lines for the part and full-time employees. So, these are people reporting employment or unemployment before and during COVID. In terms of their behavioral health needs, we also see an increased share of the admissions coming in during COVID. Twenty percent for both of these increase in people reporting prior substance abuse treatment and/or prior mental health history, and so some higher behavioral health needs in the admissions of individuals who came in during COVID.

And then for the share admissions by race and ethnicity, the data also show that overall, the majority of the admissions fall into the racial category of white. That's not necessarily shown here, we show here the change in the share of admissions during COVID and so the share of the admissions category declined for the white category all the way to left here by about six percent. And alternatively, you see increases for the categories of individuals who are black or Hispanic increased by 18 and 10 percent respectively during COVID.

Let's see, the last demographic, this last piece, we looked at were self-report of drug of choice. And so as for drug of choice, there was fluctuation in the reports from admissions during COVID. The top four substances of choice remained the same, so they are alcohol, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine. And during COVID with the reduction, there was going to be some sorry, reduction in admissions. There's going to be some fluctuation here and so of the admissions that came in during COVID, a greater share reported meth as their top drug of choice and it's about 50 self-reports prior to COVID, I'm sorry during COVID and this is down from about 80 per month. And compared to a shrinking portion, if you look to the left, for marijuana we have individuals coming in. They were reporting about 40 per month, reporting marijuana as their drug of choice during COVID. This reduced to about 19 per month, so a growing share for methamphetamine and decreasing share for marijuana.

Okay, and so lastly for the outcomes for Specialty Courts, we moved into the outcome trends and we find that the rate of success declined during COVID. It dropped by 50 percent from about 60 percent successes before COVID, so it's 57 percent up here. This green line was before COVID and down to a 28 percent during COVID. So, this suggests a higher rate of failure during COVID than before and we explored some reasons for failure. And so, we saw that there was actually fewer portion of cases failing because of non-compliance but an increasing portion of cases failing because of absconding.

And so, we see the top bars again the decline in share of non-compliance dropping from about 60 to 55 percent and then the increase in the second blue lines here next to absconding, I'm sorry blue and green lines, an increase in the share of failure for absconding from about, you know, 16 percent before COVID to about 23 percent reporting absconding as the reason for failure during COVID.

As for those who successfully completed their specialty court programming during COVID, we do see an increase in the percentage receiving case dismissal as their outcome of their case upon successful completion during COVID-19.

Okay, so similar to the AOC data, we're going to take a little pause here, so we can turn to a summary slide and kind of wrap our heads around specialty court data and open it up again for questions or feedback regarding additional analyses or what we've seen here. So again, admission trends we have declines, declines by admission type, changes to the share of admissions by different characteristics and demographics and as well as outcome trends. We have some changes to the success rate, failure, reasons as well as outcomes of cases. So, any questions?

Director Cafferata: Hi, less of a question just an offer of a resource. The Specialty Courts number of admissions of folks who are unemployed was new information to me and but not surprising, I guess. What surprises me is that it went up so little, considering how unemployment has hit the rest of the population but we have been -- because extended unemployment benefits are ending this week, we've put together a resource guide of all the resources available to folks who are losing those benefits. And I can share that guide with this group, so that you can share it with the folks who are presiding in those courts. There are a lot of resources available to folks that we probably want the Specialty Courts to be aware of. So, I will commit to doing that.

Dr. Buchanan: Great, thank you.

Mr. McCormick: Director, if you just e-mail that to me, I'll get it to our Specialty Court Coordinator, and we'll push it out.

Director Cafferata: Great, will do.

Mr. McCormick: Thanks.

Dr. Buchanan: All right so pending no other inquiries, we'll move into the final portion. Thank you all for bearing with me. We're almost there. So, the third and final installment of data analyses for today regarding data trends of admissions, specifically admission trends before and during COVID to Nevada Department of Corrections. And so, this timeframe just to add is a slightly different and so the before COVID timeframe like I said is a little shorter here. So, far we have data for 2019 as well as the first two months of 2020 as that pre-COVID, before COVID timeframe and then we're looking again at the 10-month, March to December 2020, as post or sorry during COVID timeframe and where applicable.

I do mention we have a glimpse into the 2021 data as well up through June of 2021 and so if applicable I've mentioned it here. I just wanted to give that caveat and so we'll jump into these slides get through these similar to the other two data sets, we see declines during COVID. And so, we begin with the view of the incoming admissions across 2019 being that blue line 2020, the yellow line and then the green line being the first half of 2021. And so, we have declines of about 27 percent during COVID. The average admission per month to NDOC was 468 admissions. It dropped to about 342, so 120 fewer admissions per month during a 10-month timeframe. We're looking at about 1,200 fewer

admissions in just that 10-month COVID time point.

And so, you know, not shown here um the first half of March 2020 alone there was -- the first second half, we did kind of like a daily admission look and so there was a second -- a 17 percent decline. And so, kind of looking at that March 15th turning point for a lot of states and a lot of this -- the shutdown occurring and so that drop occurred pretty quickly. And so, we see the remnants of that starting in March 2020 here and then that steep decline all the way through May, leveling out again through the summer and again dropping pretty starkly in the late fall of 2020.

So, as far as the offense types by admissions, among those 27 percent drop overall, there were declines in all offense types. There was about 38 percent fewer monthly admits for drug offenses and then if we go all the way to the left here, an 18 percent decline in monthly admits for person-based offenses.

So, looking at these changes accordingly while all categories declined, they did so at different rates. And so, we saw the steepest decline in this third column for drug admissions which declined by about 40 percent. These declines in blue to all offense types shifted, obviously the share of offense types of admissions during COVID. So, we see that person offenses declined the least at 18 percent but the share of admissions for person offenses increased by 12 percent during COVID. We see a similar for drug offenses which declined the most and so the -- the share of admissions also declined.

So, we also assessed admission to NDOC by admit type and we see that among all admissions over half are for new commitments while the remainder are for violations of some kind, parole or probation, both at about 21 to 25 percent. And these include, on this slide, grouping together individuals who violated parole or probation with a new conviction or a technical violation. The average monthly admission among these categories changed at comparative rates between 20 to 20, sorry, 25 to 27 percent each.

So, we looked at these same categories of parole, probation violations and new commitments and we see the share of admissions during COVID increased for all three categories. For probation violations, it admitted, during COVID especially, here we're looking at the criminal histories of the admissions who are coming in. So, across the same categories the percentage of individuals who had one or more prior felonies increased.

So, looking at maybe some higher risk admissions during COVID and this is so -- especially true for the probation violations. So, individuals who were admitted for probation violation, a greater share of those individuals had prior felonies who were admitted during COVID. And so, when we tried to parse out these trends across those violations, we kind of broke out the new conviction versus no new conviction across the violation types. And we see that the portion of admissions for those probation violations with new convictions, so that kind of middle graph there, the only one that increases.

I know 75 percent looks incredibly stark. This is about a change of about five admissions per month to ten admissions per month during COVID and so we were able to dig a little deeper into what was pushing that increase and what type of offenses were coming in. And so, we saw that, you know, approximately five more monthly admits for B or C level predominantly property offenses. And so again, this would change about five individuals a month but there was you know that one increase in that one category for admissions during COVID.

So, if we're looking at the admissions by felony category, we also see that you know among all

admissions the felony category distributions were largest amongst category B and C felonies. It may comprise over three quarters of admissions for B and C level felonies. During COVID there were fluctuations in the admission patterns for all these groups declines range from 20 to 43 percent and this again affects the share of admissions across these groups. And so, not shown here, you know the greatest decline was actually in the category E admissions because they comprise a smaller portion and category B declined the least at 23 percent which results in a greater share of admissions for those category B felonies. And the, you know, growth of 48 percent to over half of the admissions for category B felonies that you see here.

As far as the demographic trends of admissions from before and during COVID, similar to the Specialty Court growth in minority category we see a similar trend here. And so, the racial composition of admissions are predominantly in the white category of about a third in the category for black and the category for Hispanic 20 percent. And then, we see the rate of decline in average monthly admissions differ across these categories, meaning the racial composition again changed and fluctuated during COVID. There was an increase of 5 percent for the category of individuals who are black and a decline in admissions of white individuals from 43 to 41 percent.

As for gender composition, there were also changes and so female admissions declined far steeper than male admissions during COVID. Female admissions make up a far smaller portion of the admissions overall to NDOC and so there is about 100 fewer male admissions per month during COVID than before and for female admissions there was about 30 fewer female admissions per month than before COVID.

Looking at characteristics in terms of risk, looking at the NRAS Risk Classifications we broke this out by gender because there were some differences here. When we look at the risk classifications by gender, we see that male admits during COVID were generally higher risk and this is similar to before COVID, and so we had zero percent of female admissions before or during COVID. Here we're just looking at during but before or during who were falling into that very high-risk category, whereas for male admissions we have 11 percent falling into that category. And so, the distribution of risk scores for male admissions did not change too much. For female admissions for those who did were admitted during COVID, the portion were higher risk.

And so, the portion of higher risk individuals from females prior to COVID was a little bit smaller than during COVID. And so, we see that shift here, so for the darker green line being the total rate of change for all admissions and then the blue and lighter green breaking those out by gender composition. And so we see increases in admissions or the share of admissions that during COVID compared to before are generally higher risk and so we have an increase in share of individuals coming in at high risk and a very high risk increase. And this is, if we look to the line to the right of this, driven by the increase in male admissions predominantly coming in at very high risk during COVID.

As far as mental health indicators, we also see a slight increase in the percentage of individuals reporting or having mental health indicators at admissions, a change of one percentage point but growth nonetheless of the number of people who are admitted reporting this mental health indicator. Similarly, we see growth of individuals reporting substance abuse, treatment needs from before to during COVID.

And the last piece of this puzzle that we're presenting here today we did explore just the minimum and maximum sentence lengths before and during COVID. And so other than this one section here for parole violation, sentences didn't really change too much so for new commitments, we see no change whatsoever from before to during COVID. As far as the minimum sentence, they're both, you know,

one year and six months and then we got about five years for before and during COVID as the maximum sentence.

For parole violations we see an increase in the minimum about six months, longer for pro violators who came in during COVID and we see about a year as the maximum for those who came in as with parole violations. And so, this could be due to the seriousness of offenses perhaps that were coming in during COVID and being violated.

And so, for our final summary, we are going to open it up for inquiries and questions or feedback for NDOC admission trends, again we have a decline. A larger share had those felony prior convictions, so a higher risk group overall and changes somewhat to the composition of the types of felonies and types of offenses. And as far as demographic trends, seeing that disparate growth in admissions across some racial and ethnic categories and differences in the characteristics of the admissions group. All right, any questions? And thank you all for your attention to all of this information and charts, lots of charts.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: I have a question, Molly. So, for these, when you're tracking the gender and racial and ethnic categories, are you looking like through the PSIs or the judgments of convictions, how are we getting that NDOC? Are they tracking that stuff internally as well?

Dr. Buchanan: I mean I can allow NDOC to respond, I mean -- so for as far as the data we received from them, it was recorded in the data received, so what we requested was information. And so that was, you know, the one category that we did requests was race and gender, age, things along those lines.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: And then another question as far as like some of gathering some of the data to see whether -- I mean obviously it sounds like there's a decrease by about 27 is that my correct ...

Dr. Buchanan: Yes.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: ... during that time period are 20 -- yeah, there we go, decline 27 percent, do we -- I can't remember are there like certain specific goals that we were looking at, like a percentage decrease by year as a part of like some of that reinvestment that we were expecting to see on this end?

Dr. Buchanan: That is a great question. I don't have the answer directly tangible.

Mr. Weld: I can answer it, Molly.

Dr. Buchanan: Great, thanks.

Mr. Weld: So, I think that there's -- we have not yet compared the data that we're finding now with the anticipated cost savings of AB 236. I think that's a next step, if that makes sense, so this is all basically just we're seeing this fresh and not comparing it to any previous projections and we're going to do that a little bit later on.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: Thank you.

Dr. Buchanan: Thank you, Quentin. Okay, so barring all other questions we can wrap this up. So, next steps for us as we continue our system assessment and our data analysis, we have a lot of

planned analyses for a lot of data that we've received recently and just have not a chance to get to preparing for today with the data that we've been able to get into and that includes data from the second and eighth judicial districts. Clark County Detention Center, we had a (feel) for jail admissions and trends there. Nevada RCCD, Parole and Probation as well as including NDOC release trends, so those go directly into those projections that we were discussing. And so, our report will summarize both of the qualitative and ongoing system assessment findings as well as quantitative findings, again to be published in the fall and winter.

And if you have any questions that you know come up after or you've been able to mull over, the series of 60 plus slides, feel free to reach out to any one of us here and we'll happy to try to answer your questions. Thank you again for your time.

Chair Stiglich: Thank you so much. It was just amazing report. With that, we'll close agenda item number six and I'll now open agenda item number seven. So, anyone that has anything to be considered for future meetings at this time?

7. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Stiglich: Please.

Assemblywoman Nguyen: Is it possible to look at and talking with -- there's so much data collection and I know that we have like a unified court system now that's kind of in play for our Specialty Courts and I know that there's a lot of talk about like one-time ARP-like funding sources, is there anything that we can do that would help facilitate some of this stuff with like better statewide data collection systems that maybe were integrated, that we might be able to use some of those things to like integrate like amongst the different -- there's a lot of data out there. And it sounds like some people are collecting it, some people aren't and how it's integrated, I was wondering if that's something that we might be able to look into?

Chair Stiglich: That's a great suggestion and certainly something we should delve into. Any other items or suggestions at this time?

Vice Chair Brady: I think for a future meeting one of the things is that this last legislative session, two committees, advisory committees or commissions were put together to study the impact of substance use as well as opioid use it -- throughout Nevada. And I think at some point it might be helpful to either have um one of those, you know, once those commit -- those commissions I think they're going to start meeting in -- by October of this year. And once they've met and they put -- they're both tasked with getting statewide plans together and more data on substance use and to the extent that that has an impact on our criminal justice system, I think it would be good for us to get a presentation from them at some point and see how their data might interplay with the data that CJI has collected.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you. It's great (inaudible), sorry great suggestion I was on mute. Does anyone else have any further items they'd like to add to the agenda? If there's something -- if you get a brainstorm when you hang up, this is frequently the case, if there's something you'd like to be considered for an agenda for a future meeting, please contact me directly or the Director and I will certainly coordinate with staff and schedule the next meeting.

All right, so I'll now -- I'll move to item eight public comment.

8. Public Comment

I'll now open the second period of public comment. Just as we did during 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 the two minute limit you may submit your testimony in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy at SentencingPolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. At this time, I'll ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify. Ms. Chiazza?

Ms. Chiazza: Thank you, Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone press star 9 to raise your hand. When it is your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name.

We currently have no one in the waiting room. I'm going to give it just another second just in case -- maybe they're trying to get through and it's not coming, one moment.

We currently have no one for public comment at this time.

Mr. McCormick: Justice, you're on mute.

Chair Stiglich: Am I there now? Perfect. Can you hear me?

Ms. Chiazza: Yes.

Chair Stiglich: All right. Well without public comment, I'll close agenda item eight. We'll move to item nine, adjournment. I'm very excited by this meeting, its content and the enthusiasm that's here. I want to thank everyone for your attendance and participation and certainly a big thank you to staff. The meeting is now adjourned.

Meeting ended at 11:59 a.m.