

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Jorja Powers
Executive Director



Justice Douglas Herndon
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

Date and Time: March 22, 2024

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Arrascada
Chief Michelle Bays
Dr. Shera Bradley
Suzanne Crawford
Director James Dzurenda
Deputy Chief Aaron Evans
Evelyn Grosenick
D.A. Chris Hicks
D.A. Mark Jackson
Deputy Director Troy Jordan
Captain Joshua Martinez
John McCormick
Julia Murray
Jon Ponder
Erica Souza-Llamas
Judge Bitu Yeager
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Senator Lisa Krasner
Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady
Chair Justice Douglas Herndon

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Franklin Katschke
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
Senator Melanie Scheible

STAFF

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

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

Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady: Good morning. I'm Christine Jones Brady, Vice Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission and I will be conducting the meeting until we have elected a new Chair. I will now call to order the April 5, 2024, meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. It is good to see you all and a great welcome to those who are viewing the meeting on the Department of Sentencing Policy's YouTube channel. This is the sixth meeting of our 2023 through 2024 meeting cycle. I will now ask Director Powers to take the roll.

Director Jorja Powers: Thank you, Vice Chair.

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

Vice Chair Brady: Excellent. Thank you so much, Executive Director Powers.

2. Public Comment

Vice Chair Brady: Now we will open agenda item two, the first period of public comment and for everyone's awareness there are two periods of public comment, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end. Members of the public have these two opportunities for submitting public comments. First, members of the public may do so in writing by emailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comments 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 also do so today by telephone. Due to time constraints public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any members of the public that exceeds that two-minute limit may submit your remaining comments and writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy at the email address indicated previously. And at this time, I will ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify by telephone.

Ms. Hunter Jones: Thank you, Chair. Members of the public who would like to testify by phone press star nine to raise your hand. When it's your turn to speak, please slowly state and spell your first and last name. Caller with the last three digits, 717, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You have two minutes. Caller with the last three digits, 717, please slowly state and spell your first and last name. You have two minutes. You may now begin.

Vice Chair Brady: Perhaps he's on mute? I know he was on the line earlier.

Ms. Jones: Let me try one more time. Caller with the last three digits 717. Are you ready for public comment?

Vice Chair Brady: Okay, it sounds like he's not on anymore. Maybe if he's not able to rejoin maybe he can join at the second public comment.

Ms. Jones: Okay. We do have some other people, so I can circle back to him. Okay, so caller with the last three digits 602, please slowly state and spell your last name for the record. You have two minutes. Caller with the last three digits 602, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You have two minutes.

Director James Dzurenda: I'm not on public comment. This is Jim Dzurenda, I'm on the board.

Ms. Jones: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. All right. Okay, so caller with the last three digits 556, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record you have two minutes.

Ms. Anne Marie Grant: Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent. I'd like to talk about the Washoe County Conviction Integrity Unit, CIC and – excuse me – I had put in a request for data from the CIC in June

of 2020, and again in 2022, and there have only been two cases submitted since its inception, both submitted in 2018. I was told as for the question of self-initiated reviews, the Washoe County DA's is not an investigative agency. When the Washoe County DA comes into possession of such evidence within the course of the appellate process, or when a defendant presents that evidence to the office outside of the appellate process in the pool of persons who have requested and received a review of newly discovered evidence since 2018, is limited towards a request by Tonya Brown. It's clear from the 2019 EDA Noble's letter to Miss Brown, regarding her so-called review of Nolan Klein's case at all. What Noble did was read previous court orders when the CIC committee should be looking at the filings of the defendant, not simply rehashing old court orders. What made it clear to me is that Ms. Noble did not do an adequate job and most likely her actions, was reading the old orders, was the fact that the other case that did not alleged prosecutorial Brady Violation received a fair review. In the Klein case prosecutorial misconduct Brady Violation was alleged in that case did not receive a fair review. Thank you.

Ms. Jones: Thank you. Okay. Caller with the last three digits 037, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You have two minutes. Caller with the last three digits 037, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. Press star nine, I believe if you want to unmute.

Director Powers: Caller with the last three digits 037, we see your hand up. There we go. I think you are unmuted now. Good.

Tonja Brown: Good morning. Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent. I'm just kind of going to expand on what Ms. Anne Marie Grant had just told this Commission. And to give you a rough or to give you an idea of who I am, my brother, Nolan Klein was wrongfully convicted, he spent 21 years and five days in prison for a crime he did not commit. In 2009, Judge Adams ordered the District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney, Dick Gammick to turn over the entire file on the case. When the file was turned over, all the exculpatory evidence was found hiding in the DA's file, including the handwritten notes of the prosecutor showing him defying a court order and not turn it over. In 2009, right after that my brother passed away, an innocent man, just as his attorneys were about to file a motion to trial and bail, he died. In 2011, I actually found the real perpetrator of the crime that had been hidden for all those years, and lied about it, that he never existed, but he did. Anyway, in 2018 during the ACAJ meeting DDA Jennifer Noble announced that they had opened up the Conviction Integrity Committee, I submitted for a review and then, I received a letter in 2019, that they were not going to get a review. All she did was go online, look at the court's decision, did not look at any of the newly discovered evidence, and the fact that her own prosecutor had withheld the evidence. In 2022, I filed a police report with the Sparks PD, and they submitted my complaint to the Attorney General's Office. In 2023, the Sheriff's office, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, submitted my complaint for them to look at. Now it's been sitting there, and my understanding now is that there is a law that was passed in 2021, dealing with the practice and patterns of these Law Enforcement State Agencies and under NRS 228, the AG's office can go in and look at other, they have the same power as the District Attorney. Now I'm just going to keep you updated on what the Attorney General's office is going to be doing in this and I am saying that.

Ms. Jones: Caller, you've actually reached your time limit. If you can conclude your statement.

Ms. Brown: Okay. I just want to keep you updated on what's going to happen. They cannot, the District Attorney Office is violating, they're discriminating against people who claim Brady Violations and that is wrong, and that is obstructing of justice, when they are provided the information, knowing what their fellow colleagues have done.

Ms. Jones: Caller, you've reached your time limit, I'm going to have to place you back in the waiting room.

Ms. Brown: Well, thank you very much.

Ms. Jones: Yes. All right. Caller with the last three digits, 717, please slowly state and spell your first and last name for the record. You have two minutes.

James Wadsworth: Good morning. Hello. Hello. Good morning and I'm reaching out to share a transformative idea that has the potential to revolutionize the way we support individuals with learning disabilities and attention deficit hyperactive disorder within the Nevada Department of Corrections. Having navigated the challenges associated with ADHD personally, and witnessing the profound impact it can have on one's life especially. I've dedicated myself to developing the solutions that address these needs head on. My proposal introduces two innovative AI systems, NDOC.AI and TMC.AI. Designed to identify and provide tailored support for offenders with LD and ADHD. These systems leverage the latest in AI technology to offer personalized tutoring, mentorship, and coaching thereby significantly reducing recidivism rates and facilitating more effective rehabilitation. The key to our approach lies in its simplicity and efficiency. We can accurately identify individuals who need support with minimal human intervention by utilizing written tests and AI-driven assessments. This is not only streamlines the identification process, but also ensures that treatment plans are precisely tailored to each individual's needs promoting better outcomes and a smoother reintegration into society. I believe that with the NSC support, we can pilot this program within the Nevada Department of Corrections, setting a precedent for how technology can be an honest sponsor in rehabilitation.

Ms. Jones: Caller, you've reached your time limit. If you could conclude your statement, that'd be great.

Mr. Wadsworth: Okay. Thank you for considering this opportunity to innovate and lead these sorts of individuals with LD, ADHD within the NDOC. I look forward to working together towards a more exclusive and supportive future. Best regards, James Wadsworth.

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

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

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission held of February 23, 2024

Vice Chair Brady: Right. Moving on to agenda item three. Members of the Commission have been provided copies of the minutes from the February 23, 2024, meeting. Are there any edits, comments, or corrections?

DA Mark Jackson: Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Brady: Good morning!

DA Jackson: Good morning. First of all, I just want to state, I apologize I was not present for the item number one, the call of order and the roll call, if you could please mark me present. I did hear all of the public comments.

DA MARK JACKSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 23, 2024, MEETING.

DA Chris Hicks: I'll second it, I do have one correction though. By the minutes I have, it says location was virtual only and it was actually in person. So, that is the only correction I'd make, but after that I would second DA Jackson motion.

Vice Chair Brady: So, then DA Jackson with that amendment, are you good to include that amendment for the correction in your motion.

DA Jackson: Yes.

DA MARK JACKSON AMENDS HIS MOTION TO THE MINUTES, TO SUBSITUTE THE WORD IN-PERSON FOR THE LOCATION AS OPPOSED TO THE VIRTUAL ONLY

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you. And then I'll just ask, since there were a couple of people that spoke up. Anyone else with any corrections or comments?

Mr. John Arrascada: Vice Chair Brady. I have no corrections or comments, but I too was late for the roll call and asked to be marked present.

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you so much.

Judge Bitá Yeager: Me too. Thank you.

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you. So, I think since the beginning we had DA Jackson, we had John Arrascada, Judge Yeager, and we had Director Dzurenda, I believe? Or DeRicco? Maybe DeRicco?

Director Powers: It was Director Dzurenda. I have those four people marked present.

Vice Chair Brady: Very good. Thank you. Sorry for that diversion there. Anyone to second the motion then? I think maybe, DA Hicks, was that a second you gave?

DA Hicks: It was. I'll give it again.

DA CHRIS HICKS SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED

4. Election of the Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission

Vice Chair Brady: And so, moving onto the fourth agenda item, which is the "Election of the Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission". I now open that agenda item and members, please have ready access to your emails as upon election, the newly elected Chair will receive information to help guide today's meeting. At this time, I will now entertain nominations for election of the Chair of the Nevada Sentencing Commission.

DA CHRIS HICKS NOMINATED JUSTICE DOUGLAS HERNDON TO BE THE CHAIR OF THE NEVADA SENTENCING COMMISSION

JOHN ARRASCADA SECONDED THE MOTION

Vice Chair Brady: I will ask, Justice Herndon, are you willing to accept that nomination?

Justice Douglas Herndon: Justice Stiglich told me to expect that might happen. So, I was kind of prepared for that. So, thank you, Chris, I appreciate it and John. And yes, Vice Chair, I'll accept the nomination. Thank you.

MOTION PASSES

Vice Chair Brady: Well, congratulations Chair Herndon. I will now hand over the meeting to you, please check your email. Please stand by, we will have a brief five-minute break.

Chair Herndon: Thank you, Vice Chair and thank you everybody, I appreciate it. And yeah, we will take a break and I will check my email and see what it is I need to know.

Director Powers: We will resume at 9:28.

Chair Herndon: Jorja, does it seem like we have everyone back that we need to get started?

Director Powers: Yes, I think people are turning their cameras back on and we can resume.

Chair Herndon: Okay, great. We will resume the meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission, April 5, 2024.

5. Presentation on NDOC Budget

Chair Herndon: At this time, we are going to move onto our next agenda item, which I had as number five, which was, "Presentation on NDOC Budget" with Kristina Shea, the Deputy Director. Ms. Shea, I know in light of questions regarding the budget increases in light of Assembly Bill 236 in 2019. I'm sure everybody is looking forward to your presentation and I appreciate you being here. Please go ahead.

NDOC Deputy Director Kristina Shea: Thank you very much Chair, and congratulations again, I think that's in order. So, I'm going to share my screen. Let me know when you see my slides up.

Chair Herndon: We got it.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Okay, great. Excellent. So, first of all good morning, everyone, members of the committee, I'm Deputy Director Shea. I first want to express my gratitude to Jorja for inviting me to this presentation, so just wanted to say that first and foremost. Also, to Director Dzurenda, without Director Dzurenda, I would not be here and so, I have a lot of gratitude, and really enjoy the opportunity to kind of shape this agency and move things forward working alongside Director Dzurenda, so I just wanted to give him a shout out before we begin. So, my goal of this presentation is really to be interactive, it's for all of you. So, please interrupt me, please ask questions. If you are interested in further depth of it, the Department can get you additional information. But I really want this to be interactive, so please interrupt me as I go through the presentation.

So, first I just wanted to share about me, and why am I here, and why am I qualified to be before all of you to talk about the Department of Corrections. So, I fell in love with Corrections as fiscal staff to the Assembly and the Senate, so I am an LCBer for all the senators and the assembly people on board, I actually worked with Sara Hoffman and was mentored by Mark Capodic and Cindy Jones at the legislative body and had the great honor of being fiscal staff. And from my perspective, I feel like those are great jobs and they're great training grounds to really understand what's going on, not only from the big picture, but also to really get intricate knowledge about how the government works. So, I just want to give a shoutout to my friends and colleagues at LCB, without the Legislative Council Bureau and Fiscal Analysis Division, it would be interesting to see where the state is. So, I just wanted to, you know, give some gratitude to that group who worked endlessly and support us very much so in the efforts. I was trained by the group and so, a lot of the presentation I'm going to share with you today is based on my years of working alongside Sara Hoffman, who really was the person who was the fiscal, well she was analyst for the correctional budgets for six sessions, maybe? So, really got the great opportunity to train alongside her. So, at the Legislative Council Bureau, I fell in love with Corrections. I'm not sure how it happened, and why, maybe it's a calling in life, but definitely felt an overarching desire to really come into the Department. To take the things we've been talking about over and over for many sessions and think about how we can create solutions to solve some of the real-complex challenges. Additionally, about myself, normally I am the Deputy Director, but also, I consider myself to be a scholar and a researcher. I am an applied researcher and working at the <inaudible> schools, getting my doctorate degree and so, I really value education, data, and using data tools to form decisions. So, just want all of you to know a little bit about me. In my spare time, I tend to study wellbeing, primarily in prisons. So, I just recently am working on publishing a peer-review article about wellbeing in prisons, a systematic review, and really thinking, and calling into what it really looks like when well-being is really being considered as an outcome factor in the prison system as a whole.

So, let's begin by talking about the Department of Corrections. So, the mission is to improve public safety by ensuring a safe and humane environment with proven, you know evidence-based rehabilitative initiatives that prepare individuals for successful re-entry and I think Director Dzurenda really does drive this home in the way he values programs, but also what we are trying to do from a humane perspective of the way we actually interact and connect with our offenders. I think in general, that's a goal of ours and our new Deputy -- who I believe is on the line -- of Programs, all three of us are really thinking about what it looks like when

we vision into the future, what this agency can do to the lives of not only the offenders, not only to our staff, but also to the lives of the people in our community. The vision is, to reduce recidivism and victimization by providing offenders with incentives for self-improvement and tools for effective change. The philosophy is, we will pursue our mission with integrity, act in a professional manner, be responsible for our actions, and raise the Department to higher standards, and finally, the goal is to operate the Department according to best practices to ensure the best use of the Department's resources, educate stakeholders and customers, and provide excellent communication.

So, here's a little bit of a layout of the map with the all the institutions, we have seven major institutions, two transitional housing centers, and nine conservation camps. Again, this doesn't reflect some of the new initiatives that the Chair mentioned, in the sense of some of the reforms that have taken place and the impacts it's had on closing some of our conservation camps. As many of you are aware, this last session we've close down Humboldt Conservation Camp and so, we're in the final stages of that. Tonopah is closed down and we're talking with the Governor's Finance Office and with Director Settlemeyer about what it's going to look like and what the program is going to look like for conservation camps as we go into the future. Additionally, Warm Springs is currently in temporary shutdown status.

Chair Herndon: Deputy Director, just a quick question. The plan to shut down, as it stands now, when do you think you'd be at that point, where everything that is going to be shut down, is shut down?

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: From the perspective of the conservation camps?

Chair Herndon: Yeah.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah. So, we're working with Settlemeyer and the team to really draft what the future of the conservation camp program looks like, with some of the initiatives that have been taking place with Kasey KC, who's really looking into these civilian work crews, and they're doing an excellent job envisioning a new program on the camp side. We're hoping to go through the next legislative session with our recommendations. So, if everything goes well and it's approved by the Governor, and it goes over to the Legislative body, and gets approved, at the end of this next session would be the next phase of our what we will call, our reimagination of our camp program.

Chair Herndon: Got it. Okay, thank you and I'm sorry to interrupt.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: No, please bring the questions, it helps me stay engaged as well. So, our friends, Jorja and the group, thank you for all your work. I think these dashboards are really awesome, to be able to kind of see where we are at and also, be transparent with the public. So, this is just the offender population, from 1995, which I think is important to look at and to kind of see big picture of where we're going, where we are at, and kind of where we are heading from the big picture perspective.

So, getting into the budget side, this is a report that the fiscal staff at the LCB -- again, you'll see much of my presentation is informed by their work -- and this is in the Fiscal Appropriations Report, which the legislative staff in the Fiscal Analysis Division publish at the end of every biennium. And you can see kind of the big changes in total funding for the Department from actuals in 2022 to fiscal year 2025, total funding in each year starting from 2022, roughly 319 million upwards to 354 million, Leg. approved for 2025. Average offender population is 10,141 in 2022, and we're expected to end of 2025, 10,480. Cost per offender \$31,547 compared to \$33,838 and the FTE approved legislative positions in 2022, were 2,887 and we're approved for 2,762. So, the main point I wanted to make about this slide is that from fiscal year 2022, to fiscal year 2025, we're seeing roughly an 11 percent increase for total cost and a three percent increase in offender population, with the reduction of FTE. So, in general that reduction of FTE is primarily driven by the reduction of or the temporary closure of Warm Springs. So, that's that.

So, as far as the total expenditure, there was a lot of confusion around the Department of Corrections budget. It's like, "Oh you know, are the offenders really driving the costs", and this and that, but in general, the majority of our budget is really FTE. So, 80% of our budget is made of category one expenditures with

the next largest proportion being our offender-drivers. So, these are expenditures associated with food costs, and medical costs that are related to offenders, or particular costs of the offenders having you know, clothes and different aspects of things that they need on a regular basis, so that's 13 percent. Utilities – my favorite conversation right now – is 4% of our budget and then, operating is 3%. So, is the highest level of our expenditure's for fiscal year 2024.

And then, just as far as activity budget goes from the 23-25 biennium. As you can see, the majority of the costs really are nine percent, tied to 69% are tied to what we call medium, close, maximum- and minimum-security operations. 9% is inmate services, so this makes up our offender accounting units. We do accounting for more than ten thousand offenders -- which is a whole other fun project -- so that's the accounting unit. This is, you know, basically being able to operate all the commissaries, being able to do all the different services we provide. Fifteen percent is made up of health care services, so prison medical costs. Prison industries has 2%, internal investigations is at one, fiscal and financial is at two, and human resources is at two.

So, I think this slide I built because I wanted to have some conversations with the group about the question that was really posed -- I think in the November meeting -- about you know, what is it looking like for the Department of Corrections over, you know over since 2016, a ten-year period, in the sense of a cost increasing and of course, as a fiscal analysis I'm like, "Oh, is that number correct?" And you know, what information can we glean from it? So, in fiscal year 2016, these numbers are coming from the fiscal appropriations report. In 2016, the legislative body approved \$265 million in funding, and you can see for fiscal year 25, we're sitting at \$354 million of approved funding, so it's an \$89 million increase over time, and that's total funds, and the Department is primarily funded by general fund.

Chair Herndon: Hey Jorja, did that freeze up for everybody or just me?

Director Powers: No, she's frozen at the moment.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Director Powers: I'm going to shoot her a text and we'll see.

Chair Herndon: Deputy Director Shea, if you can hear me?

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah, I can. Sorry.

Chair Herndon: That's okay, right around you talked about the \$89 million differences between 2016 to 2025, is when you froze a bit. Thank you.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Okay, I think I'm back.

Chair Herndon: Yep, you're back.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Excuse me. Excuse my internet. So, let me just start my presentation. So, the last thing you heard was about the -- let's see -- was when I was talking about this slide, right?

Chair Herndon: Yes, ma'am. I think you had just been addressing the \$89 million differences between 2016 to 2025.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yes, so I think the point I was making after that is, we are primarily general fund appropriated. So, I think it's you know, it's important for us to look at total funding and Director, myself, and Emily, our Deputy Director of Programs, is really working on what does it really look like when we are working on leveraging grant funding. However, since we are generally fund appropriated, I thought it would be effective to talk about, you know, the difference between fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2025. So, \$259 million in 2016, and now in fiscal year 2025, \$330 million, so a \$70 million increase. So, over time we're

seeing a 34% change in total costs. And one of the things that's interesting is, oh well, you know is this primarily driven by the offender population because that's the conversation. You know, the more people we have in our prisons, the more additional costs, however it doesn't seem to be correlated that easily. So, that's kind of the point I wanted to make here today, is our offender population in 2016 was 12,890, we're expecting to be sitting around 10,480. So, we have a reduction of 2,410 offenders over that time, with a reduction of 45 positions.

DA Jackson: Chair Herndon?

Chair Herndon: Yes, sir, Mark.

DA Jackson: Thank you. Deputy Director Shea, could you go back to the previous slide.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Sure.

DA Jackson: So, and I appreciate you talking about what was brought up at that November 2023, meeting. One of the items on that agenda was about the Cost Avoided Report, and I talked a lot about AB 236 that came out of the 2019 legislature and there were a lot of projections that came forward that we're relied upon by the legislature, from the reporting from CJI and I just kind of want to make sure I'm reading this correctly, and I do appreciate this table that you have. So, the data that was relied upon in that report was really the fiscal year 2018, and so, by looking at that column, the budget funding for the Department of Corrections was the \$295 million in fiscal year 2018, and the prison population was 13,867 inmates, and the calculation of that is \$21,279 per inmate. And that's how it's been calculated for years, as long as I've been the DA. When people talk about how much does it cost to house an inmate, that's what the cost would've been, \$21,279 in 2018. So, let's fast forward to fiscal year 2025, the inmate population is 10,480 inmates, so that is a decrease of 24.42% in the inmate population from 2018 to 2025. Would you agree that in fact is a 24.42% decrease, if I'm calculating that correctly?

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah, I think so. I think that, just looking at it, like a rough difference, I would agree with that.

DA Jackson: So, we almost had a quarter of the reduction, but looking at the budget that we've had a 59% a nearly 60% increase in the budget for the Department of Corrections, even though we had a nearly 25% reduction in the inmate population, between 2018 and 2025. So, the question is, really about, I think one, all of us recognizing those numbers because this Department of Sentencing Policy is about data-driven decisions and so, you know, do we re-think about what was presented to the Legislature back in the 2019 session, what those projections were by CJI, how far off they were in those particular projections because they're supposed to be, you know, 600 million dollars in cost savings, but we're not seeing that. We have currently -- where we were \$21,279 per inmate in 2018 -- we're currently at \$33,838 per inmate, and I think that's significant and it's a number that I think we need to talk about. How did we get here? I understand that there's been an increase in the labor costs, part of that is through the unionization, I get all of that, but it just seems that that so far exceeds even what the increases in the salaries are and I was hoping you could address that.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah, would it be okay if we continue through the presentation? Because I think some of the other slides will kind of talk about it. And then, I have lots of ideas and then, I wonder if it's better suited if Jorja, and some of the other conversations about cost avoidance, and all the other things, and Director Dzurenda has a lot to say about this as well. So, I'm sorry, he had to jump off because I think there's lots of further conversations that can be had about all of this, but it's a really good question, and I have some thoughts about I think more information to kind of share with you about how the budgets are built and what potentially is driving a lot of it, and that's really the goal of me being here. So, I put this graph together that shows the FTE with the ten-year funding, so you can see kind of maybe some of the correlations, not causations of the funding sources with the FTE. So, you see these stable, then ups and downs, then you know, increases and basically going over and around, and dropping back down, and so, my thoughts are there's a lot to be said from this graph. I think from my perspective, one of the things we're

really eager to get done is our staffing study, which we've been working very hard, it originally got funded in the, 21 session and hadn't really gone anywhere. So, Director Dzurenda and I are going to be working pretty closely on getting to staffing study, and the recommendations for best practices of our staffing study in this next year prior to going through this next session. So, we're excited about that and there's a lot to be said about the correlations between FTE and our funding.

And then, this one I think is interesting too. It's really looking at the same graph but with the offender population and I think it goes to your point DA, that you know, the costs of prisons are increasing even though the population is declining and it's like, "Well, how is that possible?" And it's true, some of it is based upon the cost of the FTE's, with the COLAS and some of the increases that we're getting over time. Which I think a lot of us are supportive of again, Mark Crompodic, who really did train me in a lot of this stuff, is like "it's really at the time the design of our prisons." You know, we can't get away from the design of the prisons and the number of staff it takes to actually, you know function posts and in the design, and so it's one of the things that I was looking at recently was in New York, where they were building a new system, they're actually constructing a vertical high-rise in New York City, and I think there is much to be gleaned and much to learn about, you know, what if we were actually invest in the building of a prison that could actually go into the future, what cost avoidance would that have, you know? And thinking about the effectiveness of operations and prison construction.

So, I think it's important to talk about the driving factor to that point about the FTE calculations in Corrections, because I think it's you know, it's an area that is important for me to share with other people around me since I was trained by the Legislature, and really looking at what's really driving the calculations in the FTE. So, some of it does have to do with the CPAs, and the funding sources, and the increases, however, a lot of it has to do with what we call our Shift Relief Factor. So, the Shift Relief Factor establishes the number of hours required to fill a post during a given shift. So, when a person is regularly assigned to the post in the prison and is unable to fill that post because he or she is occupied somewhere else, maybe there's a staffing shortage and we're having to you know, shut down posts or they're on annual leave, or they're on sick leave, or they're attending training, or injured, or all the different types of leaves. To account for that time, the person is not available, additional staff are needed to be allocated to the post. So, I wanted to share with all of you what it looks like. So, this is our post chart that the Department puts together, it's actually not put together by the Legislature, the Legislature is not responsible for these, the legislature uses this as a tool to approve the FTE. However, this particular chart isn't legislatively approved by the legislature. It's really a tool that the Department is responsible for maintaining and informing what post, and what relief, and how many people it really takes to fill a seven-day post, since we are 24/7 operation. So, the Shift Relief Factor currently is at 1.7 for a seven-day post and 1.21. So, you can see what we do in these, we put the 0.21 and then we multiple it across all the positions that are needed in the prison, and this is really what's driving our FTE costs and the last time the Department had the Shift Relief Factor reviewed was in the 2015 session, that was the last time the Legislature approved the current Shift Relief Factor of 1.7 and 1.21. However, prior to that it hadn't been done since 1979. And so, really the recommendation of best practices is for us to be re-evaluating our Shift Relief Factor every year or every two years, and really keeping a really solid handle on what it's taking, what we need, why we need it, and being more data driven, and being more data informed. So, as I mentioned, Director Dzurenda and I are very excited about the staffing study and thinking about new post charts that really can take into consideration things like, muster pay and all the different aspects it takes for us to operate the institutions. So, I thought it was important to share with all of you what the post charts look like.

So, you can see in the end how it ends up rounding out, and how we actually end up getting to the recommendation of the FTE that are presented to the Governor and approved by the Legislature.

So, another important thing that Jorja and I are constantly talking about is our favorite JFA, our Jeff Austin and Associates Report, which is the report that's required by NRS, which is, really used for us. It's a ten-year projection report that uses a wizard that's pretty complex, and we've been working with this organization for quite some time. And these projections really are very important for a number of reasons because they impact some of the reports that we create internally, which is on the left is our capacity analysis report, which is really taking into consideration all of our institutions, the medium, maximum, and

minimum capacity, the emergency capacity, and base structures. Then, really thinking about how many people can we actually house safely in each of our prisons at any given moment, it's kind of a snapshot. And then, from there it informs what we call the biennium plan, which is the two-year plan based on the projections from the JFA and then it goes into minimum, medium, close, and maximum projections for the two-year period and kind of based on our housing structure, you know where we can house and why. And then, finally, the ten-year male and female bed capacity projections, which in general influences are long term CIP projects and lots of things within the overarching aspects of how the budget is built. Because one of the things I want to share with all of you is, you know, although the DA mentioned about the total costs, the other part of it is you know, there is millions and millions and millions of dollars sitting in the Capital Improvement Project and I want to make sure we are all taking into consideration here, and what is the actual total cost of corrections, and the impact it has on our taxpayers.

So, this is an example from the fiscal appropriations report prepared by the Fiscal Analysis Division. And I wanted to show this, so you can see kind of what ends up happening from a legislative perspective, based on what we call the M200's, which is really driving the population by institution with the emergency capacity. You know, what's the actual, what's been legislatively approved, and kind of how we track that to be able to understand how the population is doing. And so, in general you can see although the camps, you know the legislation in the last couple years has really impacted our minimum custody offenders. You can see that in general, you know, it's really our main institutions that are housing the majority of our population with the camps being a much, much smaller capacity.

And, yeah, I wanted to take a moment and talk about this, which is the calculation of our inmate driven costs. So, this is the spreadsheet that we use, which includes the operating supplies. So, this is like cleaning supplies and different things that are needed by offenders, the inmate supplies, which are things like soap and for the females coming into the prison, you know, hygiene items and all those things; clothing; inmate labor because we do actually pay some of the offenders to actually work in the system; food, which as you can tell is our largest driving offender driven cost and then; the bakery costs. So, this is the way it all ends up getting calculated out and what we do is, we go institution by institution and use three-year averages to understand where we are at, how many offenders are currently incarcerated in that facility, and then doing three-year averages, and then taking it in the end it ends up looking like this. So, I wanted everyone to kind of take a look at it and see, you know, really these are the offender driven costs, the 13% I was sharing with all of you in the pie chart and kind of the main aspects of each of those costs.

And then, yeah, getting to the CIP. So, since I was the corrections analyst and then also, the CIP analyst at the legislature, I cannot talk about the CIP, because in general, the corrections tends to be one of the larger organizations or agencies that gets funding through the CIP. So, this last CIP was relatively large, so I think it's skewing the percentages of the correctional funding. I think it's a lot closer to 20 or 30. We can go through the fiscal reports and kind of see over time how the Department of Corrections is getting funded, but you'll see it's 90 million dollars of the ask. So, not only is it the general fund appropriation, but I also think taking the bonding considerations into these costs is super important and I'm curious about the calculations that were used when the legislative changes were recommended by the organization. I think you said CJI, were there capital improvement costs associated in that calculation, DA?

DA Jackson: I don't recall.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Okay, so that would be something I think we could take a look at because in general, it's not a small number and our facilities are one of the things -- next week Director Dzurenda and I are going to go before the Legislature and asking for relocation for funding to our deferred maintenance. Our facilities are -- how do I say it -- are in dire need. You know, we are allocating lots of money towards them, you know they are continually in CIP, they needing repair. And again, these \$90 million, I think the backlog right now is, just for Department of Corrections is, substantial. I don't have the numbers in front of me, but I wanted all of you to kind of get a glimpse of the reality of our aging facilities, and the conditions that they are in, and the amount of bonding that's being allocated through the CIP process. Yes, I see your hand up.

Vice Chair Brady: I was also on the Access to Justice Commission, and I think that were some presentations given regarding some of the needs of NDOC, but not really enough. I do recall here being -- let me put it this way -- I recall myself being a little frustrated because I knew that there were a lot of improvements, and different things that may be needed to take place with NDOC. At the time I was a public defender, and I was just thinking from a you know, having clients at that time go into the prison in terms of the need for increase mental health services, maybe there were issues with people with disabilities, and other health issues, and as the population ages, then the cost increases for things like that and there being space limitations. And so, I don't think that on the access on the CJI, I don't know to what extent to what they really sat down with NDOC and kind of talked about what is needed, even including maybe more transitional housing or more you know, camps and things like that. I don't remember there being a robust conversation about those things.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah, thank you for that. I appreciate it. So, I think that was all I really wanted to share. I wanted to give you a high enough level overview where you could start stimulating thoughts about things and also, just give you enough so that you can understand the basis and structure of how the budget works. And so, I'd be happy to take questions, I'd be happy to go back through the presentation if you have questions on individual slides. So, yes, John.

Mr. Arrascada: Well, maybe questions and comments. The number 600 million was mentioned, my understanding is that's costs savings from new prisons not having to be built or the majority of that, and I didn't see in your presentation the inclusion of inflation, which increases everybody's budgets. So, I just read an article lately that the Department of Prisons is negotiating with Nevada power to be able to keep the lights on. So, power has increased dramatically I think for everyone, and we have an aging population within the prisons, which is increasing medical dramatically from that standpoint. You mentioned the cleaning supplies and all that, but even though our prison population is declining, it is an aging population that has tremendous medical needs and even -- I think it's been mentioned before -- even with a population declining, the lights have to be on in the buildings. And so, I don't know if the numbers you showed us or we discussed, the mere fact that inflation is raising the budget prices or the budget costs for the prison and as I said, that 600 million costs savings, is for the building of new prisons that were avoided by AB 236.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah. Would you like me to answer the inflationary costs question?

Mr. Arrascada: Please.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Okay. Yeah, so in general the way the process works is the budget instructions come out and the agencies get together and we go through, and we you know, we adhere to the two times cap and all the things. In general, there are mechanisms for inflation for example, in the medical budget, we do have a CPI adjustment that gets built in as a decision unit. However, in general, there is no mechanism for increasing the costs of the utilities for inflationary and hence, you know, what you saw that I'm doing my best to maintain public, you know, positive relationships and you know, positive connections through the media. However, you know, the majority of the line items in our budget are either schedule driven based on the offender cost that you saw, so the inmate-driven costs, or their driven by our FTE, which is a direct correlation with our Shift Release Factor and our post charts. So, outside of that most of all the other items in the budget are really calculated on a three-year average. So, that's the mechanism we use right now.

DA Jackson: I have comments also on what Mr. Arrascada had stated. You know, it's all part of that presentation as to the \$640 million of projected savings and 140 million of that, you know whether that was or was not related to the prisons, it's still a significant amount. As part of the data, and two of things that were addressed by Mr. Arrascada, he talked about the aging population and the increase in the medical related to that, and prescriptions, and all of that. We should have that data. Can we get the report from 2018 through current, as to how much has been paid and all the medical expenses, prescription meds? You know, are we truly saving hundreds of millions of dollars on that and as well as the power, what were the costs of that in 2018 and all the way up until now? So, let's talk about what the data truly is and then, let that data drive the ultimate decisions and recommendations of this Commission.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: I think that was a statement, but yes, we have the data and we're willing to work with the groups and whoever it is to give the data, to share the data. The data that is coming from our medical side is not as robust as I would like it. However, we can get it and do analysis. Absolutely.

Chair Herndon: Judge Yeager? Do you have your hand up?

Judge Bitá Yeager: Yes.

Chair Herndon: I can only take a few of us at a time right now. Deputy Director Shea? Can you un-share the screen? That'll bring us all back up so I can who else might have their hand raised.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yes.

Chair Herndon: All right. Thank you.

Judge Yeager: So, I had a question. So, you know it was a number of years ago that I visited Carson City for the mental health prison, and I was interested in knowing if you've seen an increase in those numbers of prisoners that you're seeing with acute mental health issues? Because I also know that they were far more costly as prisoners. And my other question is, I know that this session that you would be or you know, I think you said next week you were going to be asking for money from the legislature for the emergency type of issues, and I was interested in knowing if, long term if you had been looking at other prison facilities to see what other programming and things that they have implemented to reduce recidivism upon release.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah, thank you for the questions. I really appreciate it. I think Deputy Director of Programs, Emily and I are really excited next week because next week, not only are we asking for funding for 1.5 million for deferred maintenance, but we are also asking for 3.3 million relocation of a grant funding for a new pilot program that is going to be based on evidence based programming, hopefully with a foundation called, Amity Foundation, who's doing a lot of work in Arizona, and California, and New Mexico, that is going to help us with the evaluation, that's going to help us with providing the services that we need to our population. So, we're really excited about that, we're hoping to get support from the legislative body, and we have the support from the Governor's office, and so, yeah, I think that there's some really important things that need to happen from a programming perspective, and of course, I think there's many things that we can continue to do. When it comes to the question about the mental health, I think it's interesting and I'd have to get more data, but just from a report the Deputy Director of Programs and I ran, I think a couple weeks ago, we were more curious more broadly about the number of mental health offenders within our system and it was surprising because overall I think out of the 10 thousand, roughly 10 thousand offenders, 75% of them weren't actually in the mental health classifications. It was 22 % of them were you know in there with some mild, you know, there was I think two percent that were kind of severe and it was pretty surprising to us that, you know, 75% didn't have that. And so really, I think the question is you know, is it our needs assessment, is it our calculation, are we getting the data we need to be able to make sure we are capturing it. So, to answer your question about seeing the increases in mental health, I think that would have to be a follow-up, that we could gather for you, but hopefully that was helpful to share.

Judge Yeager: That would be great, thank you.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah.

Chair Herndon: John, I think you got your hand up as well.

Mr. Arrascada: I do. Okay, the mental health care we are talking about programming, could you provide to us, the Commission, all the various programs that are offered within the prison system from whether it's addiction treatment, mental health treatment, sex offender treatment, and maybe curriculum with them also, of what the treatment is, if it exists, for all those areas and others?

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yes. We'd be happy to put that together and provide it to staff.

Chair Herndon: I don't see any more hands but are there any other Commissioners that have questions for Deputy Director Shea and you just don't have your hands up.

Director Powers: Chief Bays has a question.

Chair Herndon: Oh! Thank you, Jorja.

Chief Michelle Bays: Good morning. I just wanted to add on to that request from Mr. Arrascada on the programs, I'd like to see data to include the offenders actual use of that. So, the program, so who takes advantage of it, whatever the capacity of the program is, percentage of inmates that actually apply for it, maybe finish the program, like use factors or use formulas. Does that make sense?

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yes. Yes. We'll be happy to include that in the information for the committee.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else? Am I missing any hands Jorja?

Director Powers: Vice Chair Brady has her hand up.

Chair Herndon: Okay, thank you.

Vice Chair Brady: Thank you, Chair Herndon. I would also with the mental health piece on there, I would like to see if any restrictions that are placed on inmates, if they are classified as having mental health issues? So, that's the first thing I wanted to ask. The other thing, I wanted to say too is that one of our Victim Witness Advocates and myself, and another Deputy Attorney General did a tour of Northern Nevada Correctional Center to include the pet program, the horse program, the High Sierra Industries Program, and we also spoke with the correctional officers and it was a great tour, I just recommend that everybody kind of go and visit that's on this Commission. I want to encourage people. Sorry, Director Dzurenda if I am putting more on you, but I do want to encourage people to go to the prisons and see what it looks like, what the programs are and I will say that the correctional officers were so thankful for getting more people, because now that they have some sort of pay parity, they are able to – according to them – they've been able to hire more correctional officers and they were greatly thankful for that. So, I just wanted to say that. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Deputy Director, I have a question as well, just really quick. And this is probably more reflective of ignorance of budgeting issues and it may be a completely of no concern, and I'm sure from the 30,000 foot view, so long as you have your total funding, we're good, but one thing I notice in that 10-year retrospective was, for about the first seven or eight years, the gulf between general funding and your total funding was pretty consistently about six or seven million dollars. Last several years, it seems to be jumping up. 14 million dollars and then, in 24 and 25, 24 million dollars. Is that reflective of anything? Is that concerning to you? Is there some policy change, that in terms of how you were getting your funding that's kind of in the process of occurring or am I just reading something into something that really isn't a problem?

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Yeah, that's a great question. And my perception of it is that I think in general, the agency is working to secure more grants and to have more grant funding. However, I think what it is, is what we're not great at is, we're not great at you know, we can get the grants, we can get them in, but we're not great on executing the grants and then getting the cash when the grant, you know, get the grant, execute the grant, receive the funding back, and make sure it all works, and what we end up doing is having these large sums of reimbursements of grants over time and I think that's inflating. I think that's two years here, and two years there, and this year. So, I think that's inflating the actual difference between the general fund and the grant funding portion of the budget.

Chair Herndon: Thank you. I appreciate it. Okay, I don't see any other hands. Jorja, any other hands you see on the screen anywhere?

Director Powers: No, I don't see any more Chair.

Chair Herndon: All right. Deputy Director Shea, thank you very much. I appreciate your time and your presentation.

NDOC Deputy Director Shea: Thank you all, I really appreciate all the work.

Chair Herndon: And feel free to stick around.

6. Re-Entry Presentation

Chair Herndon: We will move onto our next topic which was “Re-Entry Presentation”, that’s actually going to get continued over at the request of Truckee Meadows Community College, Education Partnership Program, to our May meeting. So, we’re not going to have a presentation on that today.

7. Update on Misdemeanor Subcommittee

Chair Herndon: Which will take us over to our next topic, “Update on Misdemeanor Subcommittee”. That’s lead by John McCormick. I know I saw you John somewhere. There you are. So, I’m going to go ahead and turn it over to John to introduce this topic and then, fire off any questions that you all have with John as well.

Mr. John McCormick: Thank you, Chair Herndon. We had our first Misdemeanor Subcommittee meeting right at the end of March, I believe it was the 22nd and I think we had a pretty good discussion on that meeting and subsequent to that, I met with NDSP staff and we’re working on getting another meeting going and developing an agenda. The charge in Senate Bill 103 on this one and just in general, is so big and there is so much to look at with misdemeanors, that’s been one of the challenges is sort of funneling it down and making some aspects workable. So, that’s what we are concentrating on for the next meeting.

Chair Herndon: Anybody have any questions for John?

Mr. McCormick: I think Ms. Murray does.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Ms. Julia Murray: Sorry John, you already know what my question is going to be because I ask it a whole lot of times at this point, could you please share the membership of the Committee with all the Commissioners who is on that?

Mr. McCormick: Sure. Jorja, do we have that, that we can throw up on the screen or?

Ms. Murray: I don’t care if it’s in this meeting today, just at some point prior to this meeting, like if it went out in an email or something. I don’t care how we get, just love to see it.

Mr. McCormick: No problem. I will work with Hunter and NDSP, and we will get that sent out.

Ms. Murray: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else? Don’t see any other hands and I don’t hear anybody. All right. John, thank you very much, I appreciate it.

8. Director’s Report

Chair Herndon: We will go ahead and move on to, then the “Director’s Report” with Ms. Powers. Director Powers, as you know, reports to the Commission on sentencing and related issues relating to the Department, and we will have her provide a report and update us on recent NDSP activities, and anything else she feels relevant to chat with us about. So, Jorja please go ahead.

Director Powers: Thank you, Chair. All right, you can see. I'm just going to do a quick update on what's been going on. These are our core functions for our Department and so I try to stick to that way of talking.

So, administratively on behalf of the Department, I'd like to thank former Chair Stiglich for her service to the Commission and the partnership with our agency, and I welcome Chair Herndon and I look forward to working closely with you. So, we are going to the August Interim Finance Committee to request the Management Analyst II position that was put into contingency through Senate Bill 103, in 2023 to facilitate the data collection for the Misdemeanor Subcommittee. As Subcommittee Chair McCormick talked about, there's going to be a lot of data to identify, collect, and maintain. So, hopefully we will add to our staff by October of this year.

As far as budgeting, NDSP staff attended budget kickoff meetings. There was one for the Directors and one for other staff, and those happened in March. And we are doing the preliminary work needed for our Department budget build.

Regarding data and reports, the prison population report through JFA that Deputy Director Shea from NDOC talked about. NDSP staff have been working this last year to see if we can do a report like that. However, the current contract is with JFA and per NRS, Nevada has to have an outside contractor provide those projections. So, with this current course of action, we do have a report that we made, it is available, and I will share with you in the coming months. And we wanted to thank our stakeholders that have worked with us this whole last year, namely, NDOC, NPP, and the Parole Board for their collaboration. As far as what we are colloquially calling the Murder Report, we have received data from 16 of the 17 county DA's offices for that report. The remaining county did contact us, they're working to provide their information in the new format that we've asked for it and we should be receiving their data shortly. So, NDSP staff will complete the compilation at that point and publish those data points. Also, in data and reporting, this reporting season is slowing down and so before this window before Legislative session, the data team is exploring new ways to store and maintain our data. Their researching database improvements and options to see what we can do to store more data and their also taking advantage of training opportunities. We have training in our budget, and we have found a company that allows them to take many different classes and so, that's been really great. We are available as always to perform any research and how to hop data polls that anybody needs.

Outreach, we continue to have recurring meetings with our stakeholder agencies, regarding data and other topics. Right now, it's DOC and NPP, but we will be reaching out especially with this misdemeanor project to courts and local jurisdictions. I was able to attend a tour of Hope for Prisoners, Vocational Village at Southern Desert Correctional Center on Monday. I know that our member John Ponder had talked about that recently. It's an impressive undertaking, it's going to have amazing opportunities for these returning citizens. So, that is happening with NDOC and Hope for Prisoners.

Onto the Commission, the Nevada Sentencing Commission currently still has two vacancies. I wanted to point out seat C2, which is one of the two members who are judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is open and also, seat K, which is a member who has been a victim of crime or is a representative of an organization supporting rights of victims of crime and that one is appointed by the Governor. I have been in contact with the Boards and Commissions Office quite intermittently. Applications for this vacancy have been received, but they have not made a decision yet. As soon as they do, we will have that seat filled. NDSP is continuing to examine ideas for the projected amounts of the Costs Avoided report due on August 1st. We will discuss this at length in May. This presentation from DD Shea has really helped with that. Shea is interested in being involved in that and please contact me if anybody else on our commission would like to be part of that group that is working on the ideas for that Cost Avoided Report. The Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Grant application period has opened and that is through our Coordinating Council, that's the three million dollars that was appropriated through Assembly Bill 388 last session to fund county level grants related to reducing recidivism. Each of you should've received an email with that information. It is also on our website, please feel free to post this information anywhere and pass it along to any agencies or organizations that you think would be interested in applying. I have a save the date announcement, the National Association of Sentencing Commissions annual conference -- that we hosted

last year in Tahoe -- is being held in Raleigh, North Carolina, this year August 6th through 8th. The theme is the NASC 30-year conference part two, so it will build upon the last years, "Sentencing Now: The Role of Commissions and Sentencing Reform". As more information becomes available about that, I will pass it along. I would love to see Commissioners be able to attend that.

And that concludes my update for now. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Can I ask you Director, who was in the Judge seat that is now vacant? My sense is, we should be looking for somebody either in Northern Nevada or rural areas since we have Judge Yeager from the south.

Director Powers: Yes. It was Teirra Jones, and I am trying to remember who the other Judge was, does somebody want to?

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Judge Freeman.

Director Powers: Judge Freeman. Yes.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Director Powers: And so, yes, we have been looking, and I have been talking to Chair Stiglich about it, and it is the Chief Justice who does that, so I will reach out to Chief Justice Cadish. There have been some difficulties finding someone who wanted to join the Commission.

Chair Herndon: Nobody wants to get drafted?

Director Powers: No.

Chair Herndon: I can talk to Justice Cadish as well. I mean we are doing a lot of things or we're going to be doing a lot of things moving forward because I will be the incoming Chief when she finishes this term, but we will figure it out, and find somebody, and get at least that one filled. And if there is anything I can do to facilitate anything with the Governor's office on getting somebody into that other spot with some expediency, just let me know.

Director Powers: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Sure. All right, does anybody have any questions for Director Powers?

Mr. Arrascada: I have one and maybe it should have been a question for Mr. McCormick when we were doing the misdo presentation, but is there any way possible that we could get from each of the local county jails, the percentage of misdemeanants that are in custody?

Mr. McCormick: Thanks, Mr. Arrascada. We're going to talk about that at the next meeting as far as what data elements we wanted to collect, and I think that will be one to discuss. So, yeah.

Mr. Arrascada: Okay, sorry. Jumped the gun.

Mr. McCormick: No worries. No worries at all.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else with any questions for Director Powers or Mr. McCormick?

Captain Joshua Martinez: Yeah. My name is Josh Martinez. So, I'm a Captain over at Las Vegas Metro Police. So, I was just replacing Beth Schmidt, she retired. She was the one sitting in for Metro, she was the legislative person. So, I am the new legislative person that's heading up the bureau for that. So, I've just been trying to introduce myself to folks. I've been here at Metro for 23 years, so I don't know exactly what

my role is with this. So, I don't know if she would be able to provide just a little bit of direction for me, you know, or I can call her off-line.

Director Powers: Yes.

Chair Herndon: Hey, officer who is it your – and I apologize what's your rank?

Captain Martinez: My rank is a Captain. I'm a Captain with Las Vegas Metro Police down here. I've been here 23 years,so.

Chair Herndon: Captain Martinez, who is it that you are asking to chat with about direction moving forward? You're on mute.

Captain Martinez: Sorry. Jorja, I guess would be the right person to get some direction on what my role is, so I know what to expect and how to interact with the Committee.

Chair Herndon: Got it. You're doing great. Look, we're all on equal footing here. So, we're all in it and I'm figuring it out myself as well. So, welcome we will share the pain.

Captain Martinez: All right. Thank you, sir, and congratulations.

Director Powers: And yes, I will be reaching out to you, and I was remiss because I welcomed our new Chair. We do have Justice Herndon, and Captain Martinez, and also, Senator Cannizzaro has put Senator Schieble in her place. So, Senator Schieble is now a new Commissioner. And so, yes, I will be reaching out to all of you to talk about what it all means.

Chair Herndon: Perfect. Great. Thank you, Director Powers. Okay, we will go ahead and close that agenda item.

9. Data Presentation

Chair Herndon: And move onto agenda item number nine, which is, "Data Presentation" and I apologize Jenna, but let me ask, do I pronounce your last name Buonacorsi?

Deputy Director Jenna Buonacorsi: You know, it's always been a fun one. It's Buonacorsi. If you ignore the u, it helps a little bit.

Chair Herndon: Perfect. I appreciate that. So, this NDSP Deputy Director Jenna Buonacorsi who is going to talk to us about NDOC aging population. Ms. Buonacorsi, please go ahead.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Hi. Thank you, Chair. I am the Deputy Director for the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. Good morning, Commission, it's great to see you all. I don't know what it's like down south, but up north we are having a nice snowy April morning here. So, hopefully you guys have a little more sunshine than we do.

So, the Department of Sentencing Policy has been asked to look into the aging population of the Nevada Department of Corrections and given the conversation early today in agenda item four and the mention of the aging population, we are well aware of how impactful and important this area of study is. This presentation lays the groundwork and acts as an introduction to research and the data analysis NDSP plans to complete on this topic. Today, we will mainly be looking at the historical number of admissions and total population of offenders broken up into two age groups, offenders 54 years and younger and offenders 55 years and older. So, the Bureau of Justice Statistics found older inmates are more susceptible to costly chronic medical conditions, they typically experience the effects of age much sooner than people outside the prison because of issues such as substance use disorder, inadequate prevention primary care before incarceration, and stress linked to the isolation and sometimes violent environment of prison life. We will see

in the upcoming slides how the aging population compares to the total population is changing and how population is distributed amongst offense groups. Industry research estimates that the cost of housing aging individuals is at four times that of the younger population. So, first here we have the total admissions over the last – oh I just realized you guys cannot see my screen, can you? Hold on one second, that would be helpful to see the data. All right let's go back to this screen right here. All right, now you should be able to see my screen. You should see a nice chart that says total admissions on it.

Chair Herndon: Yep. You got up now Jenna. Thank you.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you. I apologize for that. So, total admissions since 2017, the aging population is that light blue section, right at the top of the graph, versus offenders 54 years and younger in the dark blue. It represented 5.49% of yearly admissions in 2017, whereas in 2023 it represented 8% of admissions coming into prison. Over the last seven years, the average aging population has represented 6.79% of all admissions into the Department of Corrections.

So, when we break the admissions down into offense groups for these two age groups. We see that for offenders less than 55 years old, the highest two offense groups are violent offenders and also, property offenders. The third and fourth place kind of switched over the last couple years between drug and other offenders, and down at the bottom is going to be sex and DUI offenders. When we look at the 55+ population, violence still takes the lead for the majority, but the rest of the offenses are a little bit more evenly distributed and we will look deeper into those numbers in a moment.

So, when we look specifically at the 55+ admissions under their offense groups, you will notice that violent offenders on average over the last seven years have taken up 25.78% of admissions in the Department of Corrections. Whereas sex offense only takes up an average 4.6% and down with property drug and DUI.

When we look into offense categories for the population breakdown, category B offenders takes up the largest majority in both age groups. Where categories A and C follow very closely behind for offenders 55 and older. In the less than 55 group, we see the trends have remained fairly constant except for that large drop in category B offenders.

For the deeper dive into the just 55+ admissions for the aging population, category B has taken up largest percent at 47.3%. Whereas category E takes up a much smaller. Now this is a trend that we've seen in admissions as a whole for the Department of Corrections, where the majority is coming in as category B offenders followed by the subsequent categories and category E that takes up the smallest percentage. However, that difference between the two is much stronger in the aging population.

Now when we look at the breakdown of the total population, over the last seven years the aging population represented 3.75% of NDOC total population in December 2017, and by December 2023, it represents 16.11%. On average it has been about 15.24% of the population over the last seven years. When we look at the offenders staying in the snapshot total population group, as you see in the less than 55 age group, violent offenders take up the majority. Whereas the rest of the offense groups are much further down, and you'll see that decline in property offense that we've been discussing in the last few meetings, and same with drug offenses as well have gone down. The rest of the offenses have remained fairly stagnant with minimal change outside of violence. When we look at the 55+ group, you'll see that sex and violence makes up a huge majority of the aging population. Where DUI, other, which is typically habitual criminals who are classified in that other category, and property crimes are much lower. It's common to see the rise in the habitual criminals for the aging population as they typically have longer lengths of stay, given that habitual criminal offense. So, that's why that number is going to be a little bit higher proportionally in 55 group versus the less than 55 group.

For the deep dive into offense groups for the total aging population. You'll see that violent offenders and sex offenders are almost matched at 36.4% and 35% on average. One thing to note is for violent offense specifically, in 2017, it took up 34.6% of the total population and that number has been steadily on the rise to 38.06% of the population in 2023. The next largest group is going to be represented by the other

category, which is 11.72% on average, trailed by property, drug, and DUI, all in the 5% range. I think the other area of note here is the decrease in property and drug offenders over time, they were taking up approximately 6.68% for property and 5.94% for drug in 2017. Whereas in December of 2023, they only represented 4.73% and 4.85% of the total population.

When we look into just specific offense categories, we see that for the less than 55 population, the largest majority is taken up by category B offenders, followed by category A, C, D, and E offenders. When we look at those numbers versus the aging population, the largest majority is made up of category A offenders and significantly made up of A, followed then by B, C, D, and E.

With the deep dive into that 55+ for total population based by offense category, you'll see that historically it has been made up of category A and B offenders at 54% in 2017 for category A and 38.55% for category B. Now in 2023, category A rose to 58.33%, whereas category B shrunk a little bit at 36.75%. What we found very interesting, to see the numbers actually broken down to just exactly how low category C, D, and E offenders represent the population for the aging population. So, this are the most serious and violent offenders being represented in the aging population and they're going to have on average longer lengths of stay in the Department of Corrections due to the severity of their offenses.

So, looking forward, as I said at the beginning, this is our first dive in our introduction to the aging population to get the Commission acquainted with this demographic and see where we have been historically. Moving forward we are working closely with the Department of Corrections of receiving a new data set from them, that'll help us dive deeper into lengths of stay and specifically be able to look at lengths of stay for the aging population, as well as a deeper dive into offenses groups, categories, and down to specific offenses and where the lengths of stay are at with each of those groups. We're really excited to see, and to get the numbers, and be able to pull that together for you. Especially, given our conversation earlier today on just how the aging population is having an effect on the Department of Corrections, in terms of their stay, which then affects costs as well. As always, the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy is open to request in areas of study by the Commission members. This area of study was requested by a Commission member and that's what started our deep dive analysis into this topic, but as always, if you have questions, please feel free to reach out to Director Powers or myself for a further dive into NDOC data.

If you guys have any questions, I'll take them now. DA Hicks?

DA Hicks: Thank you. As I always tell you guys and I will say it again, the data that you have made available to the public and to all of the Commission members, was coveted for so long in our state and it is so refreshing to be able to see this, and be able to evaluate it, and be able to go to the Hub on your website and look at all this stuff. It's excellent. You're doing an amazing job with all of that. My question is, I got to dive into this a little more, that was a lot of information that you just gave us, but there has been some assertions made that our aging population in the prison has grown and you know, in my experience, a lot of the aging population that is in our prisons, are those people that committed very serious crimes and are serving life sentences. And so, you know, it's an unfortunate reality of the circumstances of what they have done, but my question to you is, I was looking at some of the grand total numbers as you were going through and the 55+ – I want to make sure I have this right – the 55+ group in 2017 was 1,886 and now, it's 1,692. So, we've almost had a 200-inmate decrease – if I am reading that correctly – is that right? Am I reading that right?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Could you repeat which slide?

DA Hicks: So, if you look at the grand total there. I assume this is inmates in 17 and there are 1,886 and then, 1,692. Now, I also recognize our prison population since AB 236 has dropped dramatically. Far greater than many projected, but this seems consistent with that. So, is our aging population actually booming in the prisons, or is it really remaining constant, or is even going down?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: I think to better answer your question, would to be to look at this graph right here. So, what this is showing is for the 55+ population on the right side of your screen, the actual trend line

for that age group. So, if you notice for those each specific offense group, specifically violence offense, has been very stagnant in growth and change. Where see that dip down to that 200-offender change you mentioned, is going to be mainly represented from that slight drop in sex offenses, right over here, and then also, a drop almost evenly with drug, and DUI, and property offenses have fallen. What this chart right here is showing, is the proportional group of the population. And so, I think that if we look right here, proportionally, to the total population, so yes, the total population had a drop. Whereas, when you look at the aging population, there has actually been a rise in the amount of aging population that proportionally to the total population. The numbers have dropped about the 200, that you have mentioned, but proportional to the total population of offenders in the Department of Corrections, it's taking up a larger number and part of that is due to the trend, in which we gave a report – and I don't think it was at the last meeting, but the one prior to that, where we looked into just a general overview, since we had some newer Commission members – of trends in the Department of Corrections and one of the trends we had highlighted there was this decrease in property and drug offenders over the last seven years in the Department of Corrections. So, there is a decrease overall in Corrections, what we are highlighting right now is the proportional change for the aging population versus the total population.

Chair Herndon: Ms. Buonacorsi, can I attempt to simplify that? Because I am trying to understand it as well. So, it sounds like the aging population today represents bigger percentage of the overall population than it did in 2017, but the total number of aging population inmates has actually gone down a little bit.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Yes.

Chair Herndon: Yeah? Okay. Thank you.

DA Hicks: Just to follow up on that. Thank you for clarifying that, Justice. What is the percentage change? I think I saw it there, but my screen I couldn't see that bottom part. Okay. So, on average it's 15.24%, but in 2023 it was 16.11%?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Yes.

DA Hicks: Okay. Thank you.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: DA Jackson?

DA Jackson: Thank you. Deputy Director Buonacorsi, I too want to thank you. I really appreciate how the Department of Sentencing Policy continues to drill down and gives us data which ultimately can assist us in driving our recommendations, and I think it's important. And I want to recognize that it's just not you, you have an incredible team that works there, and I think all of them should be recognized. Hearing a previous presentation from the Nevada Department of Corrections, there were some comments about the cost of utilities specifically and you know, the NV Energy cost increases since 2018 through the present and, building the fiscal year 25 budget, and then, also about the medical costs in the prisons, which included the prescription medications. So, because of the 55+ aging population, I think it would be helpful to me at least, to see what those total medical costs are for the Nevada Department of Corrections and then, of those total costs how much of that is actually for the age 55+ aging population? I think it would kind of give us a perspective. I want to make sure that if we just presented what the total costs were for the prisons, that doesn't mean that's all for aging population. So, let's just get that data. I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you. Doctor Bradley?

Dr. Shera Bradley: I have a couple of questions or data suggestions -- I guess -- or request so we can get them. So, I'm wondering about, if we can look at those 55+ and know how old they were at the time of sentencing and then, also, looking at how long they have continuously been incarcerated versus if they were on probation or parole violators. And then, this is not the very first time in the recent past I've heard this idea of the aging population, is this different from other points in history? Like 20 years ago was there similar aging trends, where there is a larger proportion of the population in correctional facilities that were older? I

don't know if you can even answer that. I didn't ever think to look it up before, but I'm just curious if this is a new sort of phenomenon we are facing.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: As far as data that I currently have available, 2017 is the farthest that I can look back at right now. Going back that far -- a lot of this data comes from technical advances in modern history to be able to capture and store this -- so going back that far, I'm not sure, but I can work with the Department of Corrections and see if there is more historical that we can get. I know we can probably get a little bit further back than 2017, but how far back? I'm not quite sure yet, but I will look into that for sure.

Dr. Bradley: Okay. I don't know if you are aware of any studies that people have done in other states, I can certainly browse around a little bit just to see. I'm not sure what it would show or if it would be useful in any way, I'm just sort of wondering about that.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: That would be great. Thank you. And to also add in, I appreciate the follow up from you, and DA Jackson, and Hicks, because the goal of this presentation was to begin this conversation of aging population, and so the specific points and questions you guys have for a deeper dive is greatly appreciated for us to go into those avenues because there's you know, as many areas of research there's a lot of different ways we can go. So, having you guys' input to see us dive into deeper is always appreciated. So, thank you. I'm not sure who was next, if it was Mr. Arrascada or Ms. Bays.

Mr. Arrascada: Ms. Bays can go.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: All right, go ahead. Thank you.

Chief Bays: I echo that. This is great information, and I just have a couple real quick points to add to the additional research. It would be great to look at with those new offenders, what their prior convictions are? Number of felony convictions would be really useful and then, one other point 55 isn't what it used to be. Speaking from someone who is 56. It would be great to see the breakdown within those 55+ overtime, you know 60, 70, 80. That would be useful too.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Great. Thank you very much. Mr. Arrascada did you still have a question?

Mr. Arrascada: I do. A comment I think becomes a question, is that I think it would be important to know the opposite direction Ms. Bays mentioned and look at those that are 54, 53, 52 that are there on category B and A felonies that are going to be with us for a long time and which are our projected aging population as we keep moving forward year by year.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Great, thank you very much. Are there any other questions at this time?

Chair Herndon: I do, Ms. Buonacorsi if I could? As somebody who is going to be 60 next month, I would like an aging population to be older than 55 as well. But, in terms of the numbers I had some of the same questions as Dr. Bradley had raised, but I also was curious if you could dig into how many people in your aging population, specifically are under a sentence of death or life without possibility of parole. If you could get us that information as well. Thank you. And I believe somebody else started talking and I apologize if I had cut them off. It was Senator Krasner.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: And to clarify the 55 plus breakdown is national average produced by the BJS. So that's where that number came from, that is not Department of Sentencing Policy's official view on aging. All right, well if there are no other questions, I thank you for your time and for your input.

Senator Lisa Krasner: I have one.

Chair Herndon: Senator Krasner.

Senator Krasner: I was just waiting to be called on. Thank you so much for your presentation, Ms. Buonacorsi. Could we go back to that slide presentation, particularly the one that showed side by side the under 55 and over 55 and had the horizontal lines. I think it's that one. And I apologize, we have light blue, dark blue, cornflower blue, medium blue, so it's kind of hard for me to tell, there's one crime here in the 55+ where the light blue line is way up, what crime is that please? It's up towards the top in the 55+ the lightish one.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: This one here?

Senator Krasner: Yeah, the light blue line.

Director Powers: I think she is talking about DUI.

Senator Krasner: That's DUI?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: So, down at the bottom of this chart they all kind of morph together because their numbers are very, very close. So, that purple-gray line is representing violence, the teal line towards the top is representing sex offenses, that royal blue line is going to be other offenses, and then down below the remaining three are slightly joined together. Drug is going to be that deeper blue, property is going to be the more gray blue color, and DUI is representing that light blue that kind of ticks up right here at the end of 2023.

Senator Krasner: Okay. Thank you.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Your welcome. And as this is kind of our first step into this aging population analysis, we are open to producing an aging population report that can provide some more tables and breakdowns, so you guys can see some of the actual numbers, but if you are curious for the actual numbers in this report, the PDF for is on our website. In the chart that follows right after those groups are broken down same here; violence, sex, property, other, and DUI and so, you can see the actual breakdowns in the numbers below. So, you'll see for property, drug, and DUI their all very close in 2023; 80, 82, and 93. So, that's why those graphs get a little bit layered. So, this chart is representing the same exact data in a way that you might be able to glean off a little more insight off of better by seeing the bar chart versus the line chart. So, that's why we provided a couple of different ones because it can be helpful to see the data in the same data set presented in a couple of different formats for you.

Senator Krasner: Thank you.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Your welcome.

Chair Herndon: Hey, Director Powers can I ask if you could share with the Commission members this presentation, I don't think it was in any of our materials or maybe jump email them out to the membership the link to get it. The one Ms. Buonacorsi just referred to.

Director Powers: Yes, absolutely. We will send out an email. If you did not receive it, we will send an email out and it is also on our website.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Got it. If I missed it, I do apologize. And then, in light of some of the things Ms. Buonacorsi that we've asked you to dig into a little further, I'd like to invite you to come back. Would it be too much to ask you to come back to the May meeting and kind of update on these things, while it's still fresh with everyone?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Yes, we can give an update. As far as all the data points being ready by then, I'm not quite sure, but some of these we can definitely dive deeper into by then and hopefully in subsequent meetings after that, we can continuously provide more analysis on the topic.

Chair Herndon: Great. Appreciate it, thank you.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Okay. We will close that agenda item.

10. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Herndon: We will move onto our next agenda item, which is future meetings. Right now, our next meeting, which is also going to be virtual, is set for May 17th. And then, we will meet in person at the June meeting, I think our schedule has meetings through July and then one set for November, with some to be rescheduled between July and November. But also, staff is working on topics for the upcoming meetings. So, if anybody has any ideas about that, I know both Director Powers and myself, you can reach out to us or if anybody right now has some ideas for future meetings that they just kind of want to verbalize to get on our record, please do so. Dr. Bradley?

Dr. Bradley: Thank you, I recently attended the American Psychology and Law Society conference, which is a division on the American Psychological Association, and there was a group that presented on, they call it, Young Adult Court. I don't know if people are familiar or if we have a program like this here, but essentially it is a program for young adults -- and the group that presented was from Orange County, California -- and it is a program to try and divert with certain eligible felonies from incarceration. And the neat thing about it was that, so they had the DA, defense attorney, the judge, and a couple people from the program, in addition to a psychologist researcher out of UCI. They are doing really great research actually, randomly assigning people to the different groups, you know, treat court normal versus the special court and looking at recidivism information. So, I don't know if folks are familiar, but I thought if we can get them, it might be a really interesting presentation for this group, and potentially be something for us to consider in our programming here.

Chair Herndon: Just out of curiosity Dr. Bradley, how did they define young adult? Was it kind of like an 18 to 25?

Dr. Bradley: I think so, I think it was 18 to 25.

Chair Herndon: Let's see, Vice Chair Jones Brady?

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Thank you, Chair Herndon. I would be interested in two topics, one would be kind of taking a look at, how we are victims, how are we reaching out to victims and any progress we've made as a State involving victim input in the prosecution and the sentencing particularly, of offenders. Especially, since Marcy's Law, we passed Marcy's Law a few years back and I don't know if we have actually looked at the victims and whether or not the changes in our Constitution have improved or impacted how we serve or have victim-centered approaches to our cases. The other thing I would like to, and I know it's been on the schedule a couple of times, but looking more and more at re-entry and especially, issues of transitional housing. Maybe transitional housing before people go to prison and as a stop gap before prison to reduce recidivism and also, on the re-entry side as inmates come back into the community and how are we doing as a State? And I would like us to look at how we are doing as a State in how we are providing those kinds of programs. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: DA Jackson?

DA Jackson: Thank you and I appreciate Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady talking and suggesting the victims, and that's what I was going to suggest, but the main purpose I raise my hand, is to advise the members, as well as our executive Director that I will be able to be present at the May 17, 2024, meeting. In conformity with NRS 176.0133, I will provide an alternate to attend in my place. It's my understanding under that statute, that the alternate would be a non-voting member. It will either be a rural DA, because that's my position or a Deputy DA that works in my office. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Judge Yeager?

Judge Yeager: So, on the heels of what Dr. Bradley said, I would be interested in knowing about the trends in if there is an increasing number of youthful offenders that are going to the prisons and how they are being segregated or not, what kind of programing they have that are particular to those youth. And then, also, on the heels of what Assistant Brady said, I would also be interested in looking at re-entry with mental health, because I think that could be particularly challenging and if there's an appetite for some sort of re-entry for mental health port or not, or see what other jurisdictions are doing to overcome that challenge.

Chair Herndon: Hey, Judge Yeager. Let me ask you a question because I never assume that people have been around as long as me to remember certain things, but my sense is you may have been in the public defender's office, way back when down south when had a program called, Going Home Prepared. Judge Walt presided over it.

Judge Yeager: Right. So, we currently have a mat re-entry court, but it's not really mental health. I'm looking at something a little more mental health focused because there are a lot of moving pieces, I think. But yes, you are correct, and it was unfortunate that there wasn't funding for Judge Walt to continue that program because I thought it was a really good asset to our community.

Chair Herndon: Yeah, I mean it kind of dovetails into what Vice Chair Jones Brady was talking about with re-entry and my recollection of that was, it was a really successful program, but we allowed it to be cannibalized by sticking to many people into it and diluting the resources that were available as to why it had been so successful and then, I think your right, it just stopped getting funding. But I never really knew why that exactly why that happened, why we lost funding for that since it had seemed to be pretty successful. But maybe I'll see if I can dig that up a little bit. All right. DA Hicks?

DA Hicks: Thank you. So, one presentation I would love to see is regarding restitution for crime victims and I think it would be helpful to have a presentation perhaps from the Department of Parole and Probation that explains the mechanism in which they collect restitution, how it's administered back to victims. I also think that what would be helpful in that same vein, is a presentation from the Department of Corrections and how the restitution center works and how they collect restitution, and then, how they administer it back to the victims in our community that are subject to, you know, subject to a court order. I also would be very interested in knowing how they navigate the crime victims Bill of Rights that's in our Constitution and a certain prioritization victims get on the collection of restitution with their procedures. So, I'm not going to be at the July 19th meeting, so if you please wouldn't do it on that one Ms. Powers, that would be awesome. But that is my request.

Chair Herndon: John McCormick. Sorry, John, I missed your hand up there.

Mr. McCormick: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to comment in reference to Dr. Bradley's comment, we do have three or four youthful offender specific courts in Nevada. I think there's a couple in the Las Vegas Metro and a couple in the Reno area and so, we could catch up offline if you want more information that Doctor.

Chair Herndon: All right Director Powers, I do not see any other hands, on suggested topics. Okay, so we will go ahead and close that agenda topic on future meetings, and again, if anybody thinks of anything once we're done with this meeting at any time, please just reach out to Director Powers or myself about future topics and we will make sure we get them on.

11. Public Comment

Chair Herndon: But we are going to go ahead Hunter and move back to public comment before we adjourn our meeting. So, I'm going to turn it back over to you to see if you have any people with phone numbers who want to hop on again. Maybe you'll have more luck this time.

Ms. Jones: It looks like no one wants to participate in the second period of public comment.

Chair Herndon: Great, so we will go ahead and close the agenda item on public comment.

12. Adjournment

Chair Herndon: And then, we will move to adjournment. I appreciate everybody's time today and your patience with me, and I'll apologize for any future missteps I may make as I kind of go through this process. Those of you that I've met in person, those of you that have known me for a short period of time, long period of time; Judge Yeager, John Arrascada, Julia Murray, DA Hicks, DA Jackson. You all know me -- I hope -- that I don't really do the title thing a whole lot, right? So, if you want to call me Doug, that's terrific, right? That's really, really terrific, but more importantly I apologize if on occasion I might not say Director Powers, I might say Jorja or something like that. I certainly don't mean any disrespect by it and so please, bear with me on that. But other than that, we will go ahead and close the meeting out for today, and I look forward to everybody joining us again on May 17th. All right folks, enjoy your weekend. Thank you.