

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Jorja Powers
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
sentencing.nv.gov

NEVADA SENTENCING COMMISSION
MINUTES DRAFT

Date and Time: October 13, 2023

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Shera Bradley
Ms. Suzanne Crawford
Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Director James Dzurenda
Deputy Chief Aaron Evans
Ms. Evelyn Grosenick
D.A. Mark Jackson
Deputy Director Troy Jordan
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
Mr. John McCormick
Ms. Erica Souza-Llamas
Judge Bitia Yeager
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady
Chair Justice Lidia Stiglich

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Chief Michella Bays
Mr. Athar Haseebullah
D.A. Chris Hicks
Mr. Franklin Katschke
Ms. Julia Murray
Mr. Jon Ponder
Director Beth Schmidt
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Senator Nicole Cannizzaro
Senator Lisa Krasner

STAFF

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

1. Call to Order / Roll Call
[Meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m.]

Chair Justice Lidia Stiglich: All right, excellent. Then, I'll now call the October 13, 2023, meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission to order. So, it's good to see everybody. Welcome to those who are viewing the meeting on the Department of Sentencing Policy's YouTube channel. This is the second meeting of our 2023-2025 meeting cycle. Want to welcome our new commissioners, thank you for your willingness to serve and certainly our new Executive Director of the Department of Sentencing Policy. Jorja Powers is present, congratulations to her and thank you to Governor Lombardo. I'll now ask Executive Director Powers to take the role.

Executive Director Jorja Powers: Thank you, Chair.

(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DIRECTOR POWERS; QUORUM IS MET)

2. Public Comment

Chair Stiglich: All right, excellent. I'll now open agenda item number two. The first period of public comment. There are two periods of public comment, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end. Members of the public have two options for submitting public comment. First, members may do so in writing by emailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comment received in writing will be provided to the Commission and be included by reference in the minutes of the meeting. Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone. Due to time constraints public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit the balance of their comments in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy. At this time, I am going to ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify by telephone. All right, Ms. Jones?

Ms. Hunter Jones: Thank you, Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone, press star nine to raise your hand. When it's your turn to speak please slowly state and spell your first and last name. And we do not have any callers.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you. Then, we'll close the first period of public comment.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Nevada Sentencing Commission Meeting held on August 4, 2023

Chair Stiglich: Turn to item three, "Approval of the Minutes". Members of the Commission have been provided with copies of the minutes from the August 4, 2023, meeting. Are there any edits, comments, or corrections? Okay, hearing none, seeing none. Mr. McCormick?

Mr. John McCormick: Sorry. There are some line spacing idiosyncrasies on the document. On page thirteen, fourteen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-two, twenty-three, twenty-four, twenty-five, and twenty-six. They're just missing some line spaces between paragraphs. So, we should add those in.

Director Powers: Okay, we'll direct staff to do that.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you, Mr. McCormick. With those suggestions implemented, do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 4, 2023, MEETING.

EVELYN GROSENICK SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED

Chair Stiglich: All right, motion passes.

4. Report from NDSP Executive Director

Chair Stiglich: I will turn then to item four, a "Report from our Executive Director of the Department of Sentencing Policy". Today's report will include a summary of the recent National Association of Sentencing Commission's annual Conference which was hosted by Nevada and held in Stateline, Nevada, August 7th through the 9th, and an update on Legislation passed during the 82nd Legislative session that will directly affect NDSP and the Commission. I'll now turn this time over to Executive Director Powers to present her report.

Director Powers: Thank you. I'm going to start with the NASC conference, the National Association of Sentencing Commissions, to which we do belong. We hosted the National Conference this past month, well in August actually, and we had one hundred people who came from the states that are members, and many of our members, Commission members, were on the panel and spoke, and I'm actually going to have some of them speak. Vice Chair Brady said that she would be willing to speak during this time and talk about that conference.

Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady: Thank you, Executive Director. I appreciate that. It was a really good conference. There were a number of us that were in attendance from across the state. I felt it was very good to hear about the work that other sentencing commissions are doing across the country. A lot of other states are having the same challenges that we are having with our criminal justice system; being services, being enough resources for parolees, for probationers, and for programs. That you know, how do you prevent the jails from becoming overcrowded? How do you have truth in sentencing? You know, people are being prosecuted but then, getting out sooner than expected and the victims are unaware. It was very educational. I know that, I think we had our D.A. Mark Jackson speak and Evans. I don't know if he's here, I can't recall. Aaron Evans put on a good panel. I served on a panel with Lanterman, and we talked about research that's related to all of this. So, I'd like to have D.A. Jackson, Aaron Evans, and Lanterman talk a little bit about it, just to even say a sentence about what their panel was about and what they got out of it. But it was great for me to learn about what others are doing, and that we are not alone, and the improvements we're making in terms of being able to do justice in our communities. Thank you.

Director Powers: Would some of the members who were present at the conference like to speak?

D.A. Mark Jackson: Sorry Aaron, I was waiting for you to go first. So, Aaron and I were on the first panel. It was former Chief Justice Hardesty was also a part of that panel. He was moderating it and really what occurred in that is an overview of the Nevada Sentencing Commission, the genesis of it and because we are fairly new, talking about what is unique to Nevada, what is unique to our specific community as we tackle these very difficult issues, and what has worked for Nevada. We also had an opportunity to ask other jurisdictions across the country about what has worked well for them and whether or not, that it should be something that we should be looking at here in Nevada. Tackling also, the questions are you know, a lot of these subjects that we're going to be addressing, it's divided, we're not always on the same page, but it's about listening to the voice that is somewhat in the minority on a particular issue and making sure that we still work together for the common good. So, I think it was a good kickoff to the entire conference and I thought that you know, Aaron did a good job on behalf of the questions that were directed towards P&P. With that I'm handing it off to Aaron.

Deputy Chief Aaron Evans: Thanks Mark. I felt a little bit like a small fish in a big pond in that room with all you know, the academics and you know, the professionals that were in there sharing that information, but I love talking about what we do and how you know, policies that we create affect you know, me and my people downstream and how it works in the real world. So, I was grateful to be included in the opening panel. You know, conferences like these, when you go and share with everybody you realize that nobody has it right. You know, everybody's got similar problems that they are trying to solve, and I think it's really beneficial to be in a room like that, because I sat with people that were even a newer sentencing commission and you know, made me feel like wow we're really getting things done. When there's other

states that are barely you know, scraping the surface. So, it was an honor to be there, and I look forward to attending again.

Director Powers: Director Dzurenda was also on that panel along with Athar Haseebullah. Director Dzurenda, did you have anything you'd like to add?

Director James Dzurenda: Yeah, first of all, it was great. It was actually interesting seeing, like you said, the people around the different parts of the country that either had the same problems we used to have or are facing some of the same. When you talk about sentencing commissions out there, it's not really just the sentencing structures or the sentencing credits and it's a lot of the state statutes they are talking about that were hindrances or obstacles for the people that were trying to at least, like all of us are trying to do with changing people's lives that are leaving prison, knowing that if we don't do it correctly, you know more people are going to be victimized. Listening to some of the laws that some of these other states had, including ours, with you know, creating obstacles that we know will hinder what we're trying to do. Like one I brought up was one that we still have in Nevada with you know, we train offenders very well for over a year to fight forest fires, we rely on them. However, if they get back out in the community, they can't be a firefighter, or EMT, or ambulance person, whether there's rights or wrongs for what that law is in effect. Why there's you know, some of these things we have to really strongly look at and weigh out what we are trying to do. I also brought up about the last time I was here in the state it was, you couldn't be a barber, beautician, or cosmetologist in the state of Nevada for the same reason, you were incarcerated. There're these things we have to start looking at to try to prevent those offenders from getting back into the sentencing issues and back to court and you start seeing some of the crazy laws that some of the other states have too. As well as what really the whole country has to start looking at how to change their minds and doing what we believe can actually help somebody, just so we're not revictimizing people that are out there, but it was actually interesting listening to them as well.

Dr. Jennifer Lanterman: Yeah, and I was on a panel with CJ and Victoria Gonzalez, our former Director, and I spoke about research on the role of researchers as voting members of sentencing commissions, and how researchers actually have a unique skill set that influences dialogue in a different way. So, it influences actual sentencing commission function in ways that are different than commissions that don't have researchers on the commission and it's actually quite rare. There are only eight states as of 2023, July 2023, that require researchers to be voting members on their commissions. Nevada is one of them and prior to Nevada becoming one of those in 2023, there was a gubernatorial appointee and that was usually a person who was a researcher, so it was a common practice, but it wasn't required. So, we talked about some of the methodological, statistical, and outcome variable differences across commissions that are correlated with the presence of researchers on those commissions or not. So, we had a really interesting discussion about some of the things that are going on or not going on in other commissions and how that is influenced by sort of the composition of those commissions.

Vice Chair Brady: Overall, I think we should be really proud of our office of Sentencing Policy, Director Powers and her staff. They did a great job just putting on this conference, and hosting it, and it was well done.

Director Powers: Thank you. We did get the reviews back, people liked being in Tahoe, they liked the venue, and there were great reviews. I appreciate all of you who were on the panels and who attended other panels, and I wanted to say that next year it will be North Carolina. North Carolina volunteered to hold the National Association of Sentencing Commissions Conference and so, I hope that many of you will come. All right, I am now going to share my screen. We will move into legislative updates. All right, can you see this director's report?

Mr. McCormick: We got it.

Director Powers: Okay, perfect. Thank you. All right. So, I will start with AB 32, which allows now for us to have confidential information. This was a topic at past meetings, mostly regarding the parole violator project that I was doing and worries that the information that incarcerated people were giving me might be able to

be subpoenaed. So, this will help with that. AB 32 also modified the membership of the Commission. It changed to be the Chief P&P officer or representative and also, the Director of DETR or a representative. It now requires collection regarding our collection of data for AB 236 to include housing status of the people who are going into the community. It also allows the Coordinating Council to accept gifts and grants. The law now allows for intermediate jail and electronic monitoring sanctions for temporary revocations for parole and probation. It does credit time served waiting for technical violations to the sentences of the offenders and revised the definition of absconder.

AB 388 gives appropriation of three million dollars to the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council for the purpose of funding grants related to reducing recidivism. This work program has been completed and the money is now available to us. Expenditure reports will be due to the Interim Finance Committee on or before December 20, 2024, and also, on or before September 19, 2025. All monies must be committed for expenditure by June 30, 2025, and they are to be spent before September 19, 2025.

Senate Bill 35 establishes crimes and penalties related to fentanyl. The act set weights for trafficking at twenty-eight to forty-two grams and the penalty as a category B felony with one year to not more than ten-year sentence. It also enacts a crime of high-level trafficking for forty-two to one hundred grams as a B felony with terms of two to not more than fifteen years. The passage of AB 388 also allows that if someone sells a mixture containing fentanyl, they are guilty of intentional misrepresentation of a fentanyl product which is category B felony with a penalty of two to not more than twenty years. The passage of this bill also requires the Sentencing Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Sentencing Policy, to report on certain information as available. The report is due to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on the Judiciary on or before March 1st and October 1st of each even-numbered year. The information requested includes demographic and criminal history information along with charge and case information, and disposition for the cases involving these new fentanyl related crimes the act does state that the information is to be given to the extent that the information is in the possession of the agency.

SB 103 passed to create the Nevada Sentencing Commission Subcommittee on misdemeanors the bill lists the minimum membership of this subcommittee to include members with expertise on policies and practices regarding misdemeanor sentencing implemented in Nevada and other states, and administrative assessments, fines and fees related to criminal justice system in this state or other states. It has one member who is a city attorney, one member who is an attorney experienced in defending criminal actions, and one member who serves as a court administrator for a justice or municipal court. Full membership of this committee will be decided upon by the appointed chair of this subcommittee.

SB 316 passed and revised certain information submitted by district attorneys to the Attorney General concerning cases filed for murder and involuntary manslaughter charges in Nevada. It also changed the recipient of such information from the Attorney General's office to the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. NDSP staff has received the data sets from the Attorney General's office of the past collection, and we are working to streamline the collection and analysis of this data for future reporting.

SB 413 passed to change the way credits are earned by incarcerated persons in the Nevada Department of Corrections; instead of earning credits, a percentage will be applied. Maximum sentences will be reduced by thirty-five percent as long as there is adherence to case planning and programming, and minimum sentences will be reduced thirty-five percent on eligible convictions only. This act becomes effective for all crimes committed from July 1, 2025, moving forward and this act will help with transparency and key sentence dates for all involved.

In other news, the Department did receive a new position and that is a Management Analyst 3. This position is now open through the state HR system, and please encourage any qualified candidates to apply. We are looking to add to our data analysis section. That is all for that.

Chair Stiglich: All right. Thank you for your report, Director, your work on the conference, and these updates. Are there any questions for Director Powers? Or comments from the Commission? Okay, hearing none, seeing none. We'll close that agenda item.

5. Appointment of Misdemeanor Subcommittee Chair

Chair Stiglich: We'll turn to agenda item five, "Appointment of Misdemeanor Subcommittee Chair". At this time, I want to indicate I had reached out to Commissioner John McCormick to see if he would be willing to serve. He is. I think he brings a lot of expertise to the position, and I am appointing him as Chair of the Misdemeanor Subcommittee. Well at least I've said that I'm going to do that. Mr. McCormick, do you accept that appointment?

Mr. McCormick: Yes, thank you, Chair. I graciously accept, I look forward to it.

Chair Stiglich: All right. Excellent. It's a huge undertaking. We look forward to hearing about the subcommittee's work regarding misdemeanors in Nevada at future meetings. Mr. McCormick will work to fill the subcommittee members. If anyone is interested in serving, please reach out directly to Mr. McCormick or to Director Powers to facilitate that, but I am excited about the Committee. So, again, thank you and Mr. McCormick, do you have any comments you'd like to make at this time?

Mr. McCormick: Nothing in particular. I think as you indicated, it's going to be a big undertaking. We have a lot of topics to look at including fines and fees as well as the misdemeanor structure, and I think it touches on so many aspects of the system, that it'll be a pretty significant study.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you. Do any members of the Commission have any questions, at this time on this item? All right, I look forward to many of you reaching out to Mr. McCormick. You can start now if you want, just raise your hands and he'll write them down. We'll close that agenda item.

6. Review and Discussion of Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council Grant Guide and Grant Application

Chair Stiglich: We'll turn to item six, "Review and Discussion of Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council Grant Guide and Grant Application". So, you're given these documents in your packet and I'm going to ask Director Powers to review them with us in detail. Director Powers?

Director Powers: Thank you. I will share my screen again. All right. I am going to present the Grant Administration Guide and the Grant Application which are in your packet for your materials today. This is regarding the three million dollars available to be administered by the Council for programming to curb recidivism. During research for these deliverables, NDSP reviewed documents from many different states and agencies who have awarded comparable grant funding. There is much information available out there. This is a collaboration of all of it.

I'm going to start with the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Grant Program Grant Administration Guide, you should have them, and they are on screen for you. It begins with the sections to introduce the Council and the Commission. The next paragraphs give the purpose of the grant which is to support counties to strengthen local response to behavioral health needs and incarcerated persons, focusing resources on serious and violent offenders, improving efficiency and effectiveness of community supervision, minimizing barriers to successful re-entry all while maintaining public safety and next, the goals. Which are to fund data-driven programs and treatment while reducing prison usage, recidivism, and victimization, and again, maintaining public safety. Both the purpose and goals for the program have an expectation of data-driven results. The next section lays out the program requirements which state that funds must be used to reduce recidivism, that at least ten percent of the funds when awarded must be distributed to organizations which provide services to victims of crime, and that three percent of the grant funds are to be used for the data-driven evaluation of the funded programs. Grantees may conduct their own evaluation or opt to have the funds reverted to the Commission and Council to conduct evaluations. Local governmental agency applications will be required to have matching funds. This requirement promotes sustainability in the funded programs. This can be with in-kind matching. Regular reporting will be required by grant recipients. These

reports will include qualitative and quantitative data, outcome measures, and evaluations. NDSP staff will assist with this monitoring via correspondence, face-to-face, and virtual meetings. We will also do site visits. Next is the funding formula. This was a piece that was much discussed and reworked by the Council. The result was that the top scoring qualified application from each of Nevada's seventeen counties will be awarded with full or partial funding from the three-million-dollar appropriation. Any remaining funds will then be awarded to qualified submissions within the applicant pool based on scoring and need, as determined by the NLJRCC funding priorities and Grant Review Committee scoring. If no qualified applicant remains, a second solicitation for grant applications will be initiated. The scoring matrix and priorities within the goals of justice reinvestment will be reviewed for each future grant cycle. In eligibility, any Nevada nonprofit organization, faith-based organization, or local governmental agency is eligible to apply for funds as long as they support approved Nevada programs which reduce recidivism, victimization, and maintain public safety in the community. The following budget categories are allowable uses of grant funds as described in each bullet point for this section. Personnel, contractual services, housing and facilities, equipment, supplies, training and associated travel, and administrative and indirect costs. The last item may not exceed ten percent of the programs' awards. Prohibited uses are also listed here. Applicants must submit an application, a scope of work, and budget form. NDSP staff will conduct an initial review of applications received to determine adherence to the application guidelines. Help with revisions or modifications would be available to the applicants at this time. NDSP staff will recruit and organize a Grant Review Committee for application evaluation and grantee selection. Recommendations and decisions will be made focusing on adherence to the goals, priorities, and preferences outlined by legislation, Council and Commission policy, and the Grant Review Committee process. Funds may be awarded in whole, or in part, or as a provisional award with continued funding contingent upon program performance and progress. Timelines are being developed and next you will see the rubric that will be used to evaluate each application in the areas of project scope, adherence to goals, priorities and policies, the funding plan, and project sustainability. The Grant Review Committee will carefully grade each application using this system. Once evaluations are complete and grantees are chosen, grant agreements will be issued. This will be the legal contract and contain all terms and conditions of the award. This agreement will govern all recipient programs and guide compliance with the requirements. Once signed, the grant award will be fully executed and at this point disbursements will begin as scheduled within the agreement. NDSP staff, the Commission, and the Council as the grant administrators will ensure that all awards comply with federal and state law, rules, regulations, and guidelines, as well as goals of the grant program. All attempts will be made to formally resolve any issues with compliance. If resolution cannot be achieved funding may be suspended in whole or in part, not terminated, or sanctions imposed. Grant funds must be used to supplement existing funds. Supplanting is allowable and any presumed supplanting will require documentation to prove resource origin.

Now, I'm going to stop sharing for a moment and pull up the Grant Application, which we will review. Okay. So, the application has the general areas of information to be collected from the applicants. The county and contact information for the Council member representing the county of program requesting funds will be collected along with the applicant's contact information. Applicants will be guided to the report and dashboards available on our website regarding prison population by county to look at prison usage over the last year to help identify factors that may be contributing to the local rise in prison usage in their counties. Applicants will be able to look at Parole & Probation violator information to determine recidivism by county and will be asked to identify possible factors contributing to any increases. The next part of the application will help us get to know the programs requesting the funding. What type of program it is, the description of the program and its purpose, the overall goal of the program and how that goal aligns with the overall grant goals and requirements, the target population of the program, if there is a specific crime that the program serves, also an explanation of any assessments required of the participants in the program. The next piece of information requested is what type of internal methods of evaluation will be used by the program to determine success. So, while we will require evaluations or reports, this will let us know how else the program may measure success. Then, as mentioned in the guide, at least ten percent of the funds granted must be given to a victim service provider in the community. Grantees will be asked how this process will be completed. Grantees will then be asked for two letters of support and statements of commitment from each leader and partner of the program to include commitments to reduce prison usage, recidivism, and victimization while maintaining public safety. The final section will be the budget narrative. Applicants will be

asked to complete a worksheet detailing the cost of their program in the areas of personnel, travel and training, operating equipment, contracts, other costs and indirect costs. We will be developing this worksheet, and the applicants will each be providing all budgeted information into this document. Thank you for your attention to this item. Garrit Pruyt, the Chair, and Denni Byrd, the Vice Chair, of the Council are both present with us to assist with any questions at this time.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you for that report, Director. Are there any questions regarding either the guide or the application? Hearing none, seeing none, I can only say well done. I'll now entertain a motion to approve the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council Grant Guide and Application.

CHRISTINE JONES BRADY MOVED TO APPROVE THE NEVADA LOCAL JUSTICE REINVESTMENT COORDINATING COUNCIL GRANT GUIDE AND APPLICATION.

JOHN MCCORMICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED.

7. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Stiglich: Again, good work Director. I'm really excited about this. So, we'll now close that agenda item and open agenda item seven, future meetings. The dates for the next three meetings are provided in the agenda. Our next meeting will be November 3rd, and then we'll meet on December 15th, and January 19th. I know that November 3rd is quick, but we have to make some approvals. Is that correct Director?

Director Powers: Yes. We need to have a vote on the approval of the Statement of Cost Avoided, that is due on December 1st.

Chair Stiglich: All right. So, it would be great if, we need to have a quorum there. So, it'd be wonderful if people could attend and that one should be a pretty quick meeting. Our staff is currently working on more topics and items for discussions at the future meetings. At this time, does anyone have anything that they want considered on a future agenda. Dr. Lanterman?

Dr. Lanterman: I just have a question with these next three meetings. Are these by Zoom or are they in person?

Chair Stiglich: I don't know. Director Powers?

Director Powers: The next three will all be virtual.

Dr. Lanterman: Okay, thank you.

Director Powers: The beginning of next year we will schedule an in-person meeting.

Dr. Lanterman: Okay, thank you.

Chair Stiglich: Any other?

Director Dzurenda: Well, for future agenda item, it might be appropriate from this setting to share the 2023 recidivism study that the Department of Corrections did from the 2019 cohort of offenders that were released in the State of Nevada from prison, because it's got some really interesting results from it.

Chair Stiglich: Oh, wonderful! Excellent. So, we'll definitely add that item. If anyone else has any other items, now and otherwise please reach out to Director Powers and we'll get those on the agenda.

D.A. Jackson: Justice Stiglich?

Chair Stiglich: Okay. Good morning Mr. Jackson.

D.A. Jackson: Thank you. You know under the broad powers of the Sentencing Commission under NRS 176.0134, our very first duty is, advising the Legislature on proposed legislation and making recommendations with respect to all matters related to the elements of the state system of criminal justice in which affect the sentences imposed for felonies and gross misdemeanors. In light of that, one of the bills that came out of the last session that was reported on as part of the Executive Director's report was SB 35, which was the one fentanyl bill that came out. I believe there was five that were introduced during the session and SB 35 came out. As part of the SB 35, section fourteen, it requires an interim study, before the Joint Interim Standing Committee on the Judiciary. I don't know that it would limit any other interim studies and I think it's really important that this commission potentially have a voice in that or at least, we bring up for discussion, whether or not we'd want to make any recommendations or not. One of the issues that I was very vocal about during the session on behalf of the Nevada District Attorney's Association, is that we really did not have the input from the only three crime labs in the State of Nevada. The individuals that I believe that we need to reach out to, and bring in, and have a discussion about this are – trying to pull up my email that I have – first of all starting up north with Brad Taylor. He is the supervising criminalist for the chemistry section for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Forensic Science Division, and you know, this is what they deal with, and no one knows more about fentanyl in Northern Nevada than the chemist Brad Taylor, because all of the law enforcement agencies in the North submit any seized fentanyl to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Forensic Science Division. The other two labs are in the South, and David Gouldthorpe is the Forensic Lab Manager for the Chemistry Detail for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and again, they handle everything from those agencies that in Clark County that submit fentanyl to that agency and then, the newest lab that we have is the City of Henderson Police Department and the Criminalistics Administrator and the Crime Lab Director is Tanya Hiner. Part of the study is going to be whether or not the State of Nevada should go from what has been a qualitative analysis to a quantitative analysis. In other words, having to go to the purity of a substance and I know from previous discussions and not only our three crimes labs in this state, but I think pretty much across the country is, one of the most simplest things that we currently have in our criminal justice system is the qualitative analysis, and it's not just even about the expense of converting labs that aren't even certified to move from a qualitative to a quantitative analysis, but one if that is the best use of those dollars and what is that particular need. So, I would ask that we invite those lab directors to probably -- I'd prefer that they come as one of the in-person meetings, so it's not going to be the January 19th -- that it be the next one, whatever that next quarterly meeting would be in 2024. That we at least get a presentation, I think that it would be beneficial to all of us. Thank you.

Chair Stiglich: All right, thank you Mr. Jackson. That's an excellent suggestion and we will do that. Anyone else? Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Brady: Hi. I just wanted to say that I agree with Mark Jackson. That's a great idea to invite them. I know that during the Legislative Session at the Attorney General's office, we reached out to a lot of the labs through Terry Kerns, who works on our close-up grants and so forth, and was also doing the OD maps for identifying where some of the biggest damages for opioid use were. So, I think that's a great idea. We've already started getting them in some, you know different labs and those conversations, and I think the state – also, I will defer to some of the Legislators on here – but I think the state also has put a set aside some money for labs because the state at this point doesn't have a lab and they're looking at getting a lab as well, or at least putting some funding to it. So, Mark Jackson, great idea! Thanks.

D.A. Jackson: Thank you, and Justice Stiglich if I may. Executive Director Powers, I have the contact information for all three of those individuals and I will send that to you directly offline when finish the meeting.

Director Powers: I appreciate it, and I was just starting an email to you.

Chair Stiglich: All right, any other items at this time? All right, I don't think it's ever too soon to start thinking about what we want to do in the next legislature and how we want to make the system better.

8. Public Comment

Chair Stiglich: All right, we'll close then item seven and turn to item eight, our second period of public comment. Ms. Jones, is there anyone waiting for public comment at this time?

Ms. Jones: No, there's no one waiting.

Chair Stiglich: All right.

9. Adjournment

Chair Stiglich: Then at this time we will conclude our second period of public comment and turn to item nine, "Adjournment". Thank you everyone for being here today, in our kind of newly constituted Commission. There're some new faces, I see Judge Yeager, welcome and thank you. There is one more judge that we need to add to this Commission and that's in process. So, hopefully we'll get that shaken out for the next meeting. Thank you, staff. Welcome again, Director Powers, look forward to working with you and doing good things. So, today was productive, I look forward to seeing you all in November and we'll keep on keeping on. So, this meeting is now adjourned. Be well.

DRAFT