

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: July 18, 2025

Location: VIRTUAL ONLY

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Shera Bradley
Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Director James Dzurenda
Evelyn Grosenick
D.A. Mark Jackson
Chief Tamrah Jackson
Deputy Director Troy Jordan
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
John McCormick
Julia Murray
Jon Ponder
Stephanie Shuman
Erica Souza-Llamas
Judge Kristin Luis
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts
Senator Melanie Scheible
Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady
Chair Douglas Herndon

MEMBERS EXCUSED

John Arrascada
D.A. Chris Hicks
Franklin Katschke
Captain Joshua Martinez
Judge Bitia Yeager
Senator Lisa Krasner

STAFF

Jorja Powers, Executive Director
Jenna Buonacorsi, Deputy Director
Marie Bledsoe, Management Analyst III
Erasmus Cosio, Management Analyst II
Mia Yu, Management Analyst I
Cecilia Felipe, Administrative Assistant III

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

[Meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m.]

Chair Douglas Herndon: All right, we will go ahead and call to order our meeting of July 18, 2025, of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. The first thing we're going to do is do a roll call to see who all we have with us today. So, Director, if you don't mind, or Cecilia?

Executive Director Jorja Powers:

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

Chair Herndon: So we do have a quorum, yes?

Executive Director Powers: Yes, we do have a quorum.

2. Public Comment

Chair Herndon: Terrific. And before we move into agenda item number two, public comment section, first thank you to our four legislative members. I'm sure you're glad the session is over. Hopefully you're getting a little bit of a break, although I know that doesn't really translate the way the public thinks it does. But nonetheless, thank you all for everything you did over the last session and for being here today. I'm also pleased that John McCormick, who is on the line with us, and Judge Yeager both recently agreed to re-up with us for another two-year term. So thank you to both of you all for staying with the Commission. And very pleased that we're joined by Judge Luis today. For those of you that don't know Judge Luis, she's the Chief District Judge in the First Ju-[inaudible], she agreed to accept a two-year term last week, so a very short notice. But Judge Luis, thank you for joining us for a little bit. She's going to have to leave early because she's heading out to Storey County for a court calendar this morning. But we filled that vacancy as well, so I'm very happy about that.

And to everybody, welcome. Thanks for joining us today. And we will move over to item number two, which is our first section of public comment. I would note, in case she's on the line, we did receive public comment in hard copy form from Aleah Freeman about a particular case that she was referring to with an individual that she's affiliated with. But in terms of our overall public comment section, we'll open that agenda item up.

There's two periods of public comment, one at the beginning and one at the end of our meeting. So the members of the public have two options for submitting their public comment. They can do so in writing to the Commission, and it'll get distributed to all of our membership. Or you can do so, and you can email that to sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. As I said, that gets provided to all of our commission members. We also allow testimony by telephone. Due to our time constraints for our meeting, testimony by telephone is limited to two minutes for a person that wishes to speak. As a reminder, when you're speaking, please mute your device on which you're watching the meeting. Otherwise, we get an echo of two things. So I'm going to ask Ms. Felipe to let me know if we have any people on the line that wish to speak, and I'll let you take it over, Cecilia. Thank you.

Cecilia Felipe: Thank you, Chair. Caller with the last three digits, 720, are you here for public comment? Press 6. Press star 6 to unmute yourself, please. Caller with the last three digits, 720, are you here for public comment? Press star 6 to unmute yourself.

Executive Director Powers: Caller, you will remain in the waiting room, and we do have another session of public comment at the end of the meeting.

Chair Herndon: And, Cecilia, do we have any other callers on the line, or was that the only one that we thought was going to make public comment?

Ms. Felipe: That was the only caller we had on the line.

Chair Herndon: Okay. So we will go ahead and close the first section of public comment. And, yes, with the caller with the last three digits, 720, if you are still there, if you can hear us, please hang around, and we'll obviously try again at the end of the meeting.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission held on March 14, 2025

Chair Herndon: With that, we'll go ahead and move to agenda item number three, which is the approval of our prior meeting minutes. That's from the meeting of March 14th, 2025. Did anybody have any edits that they wish to offer up for those minutes? I don't see any digital hands, and I don't hear anybody. So would anybody like to make a motion to approve those minutes, please? Please?

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 14, 2025, MEETING.

MARK JACKSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSES

4. Director's Report

Chair Herndon: Okay. We will note that we've approved the minutes from the March 14th, 2025, meeting. Okay. We will move to agenda item number four, which is our report from Director Powers, and we will turn it over to Jorja for your report.

Director Powers: Thank you, Chair, Commissioners. Let me share my screen quickly. All right. So I will start in the administrative realm. We are fully staffed once again. Mia Yu has joined our data team as a management analyst, and you have been receiving correspondence and materials from Cecilia Felipe, our new administrative assistant. For budget, we are closing fiscal year, 25 and now working in fiscal year, 26.

Data and Reports. During the 2025 legislative session, we conducted several ad hoc data polls and analysis to support legislators and stakeholders. In the course of this work, findings emerged that prompted us to explore certain topics more. During a look at hate crimes, the use of Nevada Offense Codes became an item of interest. The purpose of Nevada Offense Codes, or NOCs, is to standardize and improve efficiency of the criminal justice process within Nevada agencies. However, there seems to be some difficulty. For example, in many cases we pulled, NOC information and the criminal statement varied agency to agency. When discussing this with agencies at different points of the process, they acknowledged issues. Some of these stem from limitations in data management systems, some human error, and/or a tendency to embrace the status quo. In response to these discoveries, the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy is initiating a study to examine the complexities surrounding NOCs and their implementation. This proactive approach follows outreach and discussions with various criminal justice stakeholders. NDSP aims to leverage insights from this study and stakeholder input to develop solutions that may help to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of NOC utilization across Nevada's criminal justice system.

And on to Commission, after the Department's initial research on NOCs, we would ask the Commission to develop a working group to include commissioners and stakeholders to process our findings and suggest next steps. In other commission happenings, the National Association of Sentencing Commission's annual conference will be held in Madison, Wisconsin, August 11th and 12th. Commissioners Tamrah Jackson and Jon Ponder expressed interest to attend this year and will be coming.

We begin the 2025-2027 Nevada Sentencing Commission meeting cycle August 1st and staff has been working diligently to collect appointments. We do have two seats open for application through the Governor's Boards and Commission site. The openings are seat K, one member who has been a victim of crime or is a representative of an organization supporting the rights of victims of crime appointed by the Governor, and seat Q, one member who is a representative of an organization that advocates on the behalf of inmates appointed by the Governor. If you know anyone who might be interested, please direct them to gov.nv.gov/boards to apply.

For outreach, we continue to hold regular meetings with stakeholders and look for ways to obtain more comprehensive criminal justice data. One current project is looking at other states to determine other systems being used to collect and share criminal justice data to make it more accessible and functional for analysis and data-driven decision making. Next, NDSP is named in the newest prison population projection contract held by GFO to collect data from agencies and be the conduit to Justice Planners, the chosen contractor. We continue to meet with all parties involved. Chair, that's the end of my report. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Thank you. Anybody have any questions for Director Powers about her report? Okay, Director, thank you very much.

5. Statewide Recidivism Definition Presentation

Chair Herndon: We will close agenda item number four and move over to agenda item number five, which is a statewide recidivism definition presentation. We've discussed the topic of recidivism and a possible statewide definition previously. The need for shared information exists, but can one be adopted that will suffice at each agency level is an important question. And we're going to hear a presentation from Drs. Terry Kerns, Substance Use Law Enforcement Coordinator for the Nevada Office of the Attorney General, and Dr. Katie Snider from Justice Research, LLC. I wasn't sure which one of you all wanted to go first, but I'll leave it up to you to direct your presentation. Thank you very much for being here.

Dr. Katie Snider: Thank you very much for having us. I will go ahead and go first. Let me see if I can share my presentation screen. Let's see. All right. Hopefully you are all seeing this presentation.

Chair Herndon: We are, yes. Thank you, Dr. Snider.

Dr. Snider: All right. Let's see. I think I've got you seeing my presenter screen. Give me just one moment, please. All right. Is that a little bit better?

Chair Herndon: I think it's, I don't, for me, I think it's the same. Okay.

Dr. Snider: Okay. All right. Well, thank you very much for having us. My name is Dr. Katie Snider. I completed my PhD at UNR in 2023. While I was there as a grad student and continuing after, I've been working with a lot of programs around Nevada that work in the area of deflection and diversion, our FASTT programs, our MOST programs, some specialty court programs, and the idea of defining recidivism has been a challenge through all of this work.

So briefly today, before I hand it over to Terry, I'm going to talk a little bit about what recidivism is. I know that you guys are familiar with that. But for anyone on the call who maybe is not, and then how it's currently defined, what are the challenges that unifying the definition could address, and then what solutions we're proposing. And then I'll turn it over to Dr. Kerns. So recidivism, repeating or returning to criminal behavior, a tendency to return to criminal behavior, especially after being punished for a crime. So in theory, this is whenever somebody is re-offending. But in practice, it comes around whenever somebody is caught re-offending. Currently, recidivism is used as an outcome measure for most of our programs. So it's also a stated goal on many of the scopes of work for these programs. So a lot of our deflection and diversion efforts see this as their primary purpose, in addition to helping the clients they serve get better access to services, get into treatments that they need, and improve their lives overall. The fiscal goal underlying that and the public safety goal underlying that is to reduce recidivism. Unfortunately, for a lot of these programs, measuring that is very challenging. And for the state, it's more challenging to even compare if they are successful measuring what those measurements mean at these early intercepts in the criminal justice journey.

So our current definition, the only one I could find for Nevada, and I think Terry is going to speak a little bit more to some of the other definitions available, but a return to NDOC custody. So reincarceration in the NDOC within 36 months of an individual's release. First return events, either parole violations or new felony-based convictions leading to the imprisonment. So where this falls short for other programs is if this person is released from NDOC custody and they return to jail, or they return to criminal behavior, but they don't escalate to a charge or conviction that lands them in NDOC custody, it would not be counted as a recidivism event in the way that they're currently measuring. So the current definition that's adopted by NDOC is not really applicable for early intercept diversion and deflection programs. A lot of the clients who have a cycle through the criminal justice system at these early intercepts do not ever reach NDOC, yet they engage in a pattern of repeated criminal behavior or criminal justice system contact for many, many years. It fails to capture variances in recidivism, including frequency as a measure of progress. So for example, if somebody does return once and then again and again, that's lost under that current definition, which looks at that first return event. And again, for those early intercepts, if we see somebody recidivating less frequently, that is a measure of progress, but it's not really captured in the current definition. It also doesn't measure escalation as far as I understand the way the definition is currently applied. If somebody goes to NDOC for one level of offense and then they return for a much more severe offense, a recidivism is a recidivism. And then desistance, which is completely stopping, would be captured if they never

returned to NDOC, but that nuance is lost if somebody's cycling through local jails or deflection and diversion efforts like specialty courts where they're under supervision instead of being recommitted to NDOC.

And so when I'm talking about intercepts, I'm sure a lot of you are familiar with the Sequential Intercept Model. This is how we've envisioned it in our work around the FASTT and MOST programs is looking at it more as a cycle. You may be more familiar with a linear presentation, but essentially somebody starts in the community and has access to things like 988 crisis lines, community coalitions, assertive community treatment teams, and various resources, specifically for people who struggle with mental health and behavioral health issues. And they may come into contact with law enforcement. That's the first intercept, which is the first opportunity to deflect them away from further justice system involvement. So as they move through intercept two, which is courts, hearings, detention, then into jails and courts, jails and prison, reentry back to the community, and then back to community corrections. So prison and jail really operate kind of between intercepts three and four, and then back into community, they have parole, probation, support. So where the definition, the current definition of recidivism operates best is at that intercept four. And at all of the other intercepts, it is not capable of capturing the nuance necessary to measure progress and recidivism reduction at those other intercepts.

In looking through a couple of the materials that Dr. Kerns shared with you, and we're going to get into a little bit more later, there are some key elements for what we are looking for in a statewide recidivism definition or agency-wide. The precursor, the start of the measurement, when do we begin measuring for somebody? So the arrest, the program enrollment, the start of court supervision, et cetera, what counts as a recidivism event? So whether it's misdemeanors, criminal accusations, failures to appear, status offenses, et cetera. And right now, under the current definition with NDOC, it would be only a commitment to NDOC that would count. Then we're looking at location and system parameters. So if somebody recidivates in a different city or county at the lower levels of the justice system, those earlier intercepts that may or may not be captured within the same state, it would be captured under the current definition. But it's unclear at this time whether this definition would encompass a return to prison incarceration at a different state. And a lot of times that's more a question of measurement capacity than actual intent. But we find that the definition needs to be measurable and operational. And then the timeline. I think right now we look at 36 months. That's pretty standard across the board. In what we've seen, there are some states that have statewide definitions that go shorter or longer depending. But a uniform period of time is important for measuring accurately and to be able to compare between different measurements.

So we, like this body, tried to figure out a way that a single definition could possibly encompass all of this. And it does not seem like that is going to be possible. Different departments, agencies, and programs are going to operationalize it differently. But those different definitions make comparison difficult. So our goal is to come up with a way of defining it statutorily that would guide policy and research to more consistently measure the impacts of different initiatives. Right now, if we have, for example, our FASTT programs, which are jail reentries, so people who are leaving local jails and returning to community, if each of those programs is measuring it differently, we can't compare the efficacy of different of the different programs in different counties. And we can't compare to other types of programs that are engaging this work to see if their model is more or less effective. Because they may be measuring this differently. So what we're looking for is to have, hopefully, a unified definition. And I know Dr. Kerns is going to talk a little bit more about that. But some of the resources we shared look at ways we can do that by leveling and by asking agencies that fund programs to require that a definition is either proposed in any funding requests or implemented by the agency for different funding streams so that similarly situated programs can be held to the same standard when it comes to measuring recidivism. And a couple of things that might address is, one, how researchers define it. It allows for the assurance that we're not applying a post hoc definition based on what data we are able to get, that we are holding ourselves to a standard of this is how this program is supposed to be defining it and whether it's measurable or not, finding what data we need. It also allows for a solid foundation for requesting the data that we need by saying this is required to meet the definition under this agency's funding stream. And it would also help, again, with the comparison between the different programs. So being able to look at whether somebody is recidivating more or less after engaging in program A versus program B or whether the implementation of these programs has different effects in different counties as far as recidivism is concerned.

So again, what we're proposing is that agencies should require programs to adopt an operational definition whenever they're awarding funding for programs that purport to reduce recidivism. We want to offer flexible options for definitions that include those key elements and specify them at the different levels and then offer

appropriate tailoring for programs at different places in that Sequential Intercept Model. But ideally, any program situated in the same intercept should be measuring it along the same lines. And then measurement should capture those changes in frequency of recidivism events, not just whether or not someone has recidivated over time. That captures more nuance and it shows stronger evidence for the effectiveness of programs, again, especially at the early intercepts because we know that, for example, people with behavioral health issues, substance use issues, that's a journey. And it's not just, okay, I've stopped. It's usually a pattern of cycling through, hopefully with less and less frequency until they're able to completely desist. And then as I've emphasized, it would allow for comparison between the different programs. I think it would also allow for comparison upwards and downwards. So if you're looking at people who haven't returned to prison, perhaps with this structure, you might be able to see whether or not we're seeing differences in these earlier intercepts and how that factors into the differences we may or may not see at NDOC. I will go ahead and stop sharing now. I'll hand it over to Terry and then I think if there's any questions, we can take those at the end.

Chair Herndon: Thank you. Dr. Kerns?

Dr. Terry Kerns: Hi, thank you. Can you see my slides?

Ms. Felipe: Yes, we can see your slides.

Dr. Kerns: Okay, great. Thank you. And it looks like I'm going to be staying in this view as well. So first of all, let me introduce myself. My name is Terry Kerns. I am the Substance Use Law Enforcement Coordinator with the Attorney General's Office, but I would provide the caveat that the funding for my position comes out of the State Opioid Response Grant, which is under DHHS, the Department of Public and Behavioral Health. I've been in the position for eight years. The original mission for this position was to try to bring law enforcement and public health together. My background is I was a registered nurse for 11 years and then worked in federal law enforcement for 20 years and retired. So it's kind of the melding of both of those. I think the position has really expanded to not just include public health and law enforcement, but first responders, treatment providers, the specialty courts, and really criminal justice first responders, public safety, as well as that public health side of this. As I go through this, I know I put defining recidivism, but my goal in this presentation is not really to provide a comprehensive definition, but to really discuss some of the need and gaps and some of the work that has been accomplished that I want to discuss. My overview for this is what work has been completed with the National Governors Association Pre-Arrest Diversion and Deflection PDAD Learning Collaborative? What is the Wisconsin framework for defining and measuring recidivism? What is Washoe County Sheriff's Office work surrounding desistance? And what is the Statewide Substance Use Response Working Group, the SURG's recommended dictation for defining recidivism?

So as we start and look at the National Governors Association, the DPAD Learning Collaborative, I did provide the National Governors Association Executive Director's 2023 letter to Governor Lombardo, which really does highlight the activities that were accomplished through that Learning Collaborative. That Learning Collaborative was not a funded activity, but what it did was really let us see what the resources we had within the state for our diversion and deflection programs. And we also were able to find out that NAMI has done some really good work and recognized some of the work that was being done and did give an award for some of the boots on the grounds that are doing the pre-arrest diversion and deflection work. And then it furthered really that education and interest statewide in deflection and pre-arrest diversion programs. As you all probably know, some of our counties do have these MOST and FASTT teams that Dr. Snider talked about, but not all of them do. Some of them are very interested in getting these programs, but right now it's currently an issue of funding to get these programs in place.

As we worked with this and the way that I really got involved in this is that through the COSSUP grant that the Attorney General's Office has, we worked with other states and jurisdictions that had COSSUP grants as well. And we learned of this Wisconsin—I call it the Wisconsin Framework, but it's a framework for defining and measuring recidivism. And as well have shared this with many people and they find it a really good way at looking at recidivism because it not only looks at reincarceration, but as you can see, it includes re-arrest, recharge, reconviction, or reincarceration. And it looks at the frequency that individuals re-engage with the criminal justice system and as well that defined period, all of that criteria that Dr. Snider has already discussed. And I provided a copy of this framework to you all, which you should have in the meeting materials. And this, we found this Wisconsin model was probably one of the more comprehensive definitions and processes for defining recidivism.

And it's something that we hope to use. As we look at the Wisconsin model, you can see that it has the re-arrest recidivism, which is measured on the basis of new offenses that result in a new arrest. There's also the recharge, which is measured on the basis of a new offense that resulted in new charges being issued by the district attorney. Reconviction, which is measured on the basis of a new offense that resulted in the conviction and sentence to jail, prison, or probation. And then of course, reincarceration, which is measured on the basis of a new offense or technical violation that resulted in a return to confinement, whether that's jail and prison. And as Dr. Snider already mentioned, as we started to look down this road and see what already existed, when we saw the NDOC definition of recidivism, that really didn't work for many of the programs that the Attorney General's office funded, those MOST and FASTT teams, because it wasn't necessarily a return to prison, but maybe a return to jail. So that's what started us down this journey. Under this Wisconsin framework, and this really comes down to what the organizations want to define, they do not include non-criminal events as part of what they measure as recidivism. So these treatment episodes, failures, civil violations, or ordinance violations. They also do not include events that do not result in direct criminal justice action, where there's no arrest charge or conviction, or the absence of events, such as a failure to appear, failure to submit a drug test. Again, this is the Wisconsin model. But there are additional measures that may be of interest when trying to understand the behavioral changes. So one of the things that I will say that the Attorney General's office wasn't the only funder for the MOST and FASTT teams. They had been previously funded under other programs, and part of the evaluation became, kind of, a hashtag. Were these teams called, and were they able to respond? So it really became, what's the need for the teams? And it didn't get into that quality of, are the teams working? So we wanted to look a little more in depth to see, you know, these teams. Yes, they're getting calls. They're getting more calls than they're able to go out on. But what's the effect that these teams are having in the community? So again, this went down the, why do we need a definition of recidivism? Because we were trying to compare, you know, programs in one county to programs in another county that use different definitions of recidivism.

This also led us to this, it was new to me, this concept of desistance. And desistance really gets into variations in the definition and measurement. It's a concept that criminality or engagement in criminal behaviors really declines over the life course and may be impacted by criminal justice interventions. So again, the why, what programs are working and why are these programs working? Although often measured by the number of percent of individuals who do not have additional contact with the criminal justice system after release or the program participation, there are arguments that using surveys to measure this desistance, as well as indicators of desistance, such as intervals between offenses and changes in those offense severity. So we really liked this, this concept, and I'll talk a little bit more about desistance. But also within this Wisconsin framework, they found that the documentation becomes important. And I know that part of the report was talking about sharing of criminal justice data. And oftentimes this is a barrier to some of these programs that would work, at least for the evaluation but the documentation under Wisconsin framework is that all steps of recidivism analysis should be documented. The methodology for accounting recidivism events, what is that methodology and how are you measuring it? And then those data sources and the known limitations of maybe access or what is included. And one of the examples which Dr. Snider already hit on that we see often with some of the MOST and FASTT teams is that people don't stay in one county and they go to a different county and become involved with criminal justice in the other county and being able to have access to that data. And that information that is or is not included in that recidivism analysis.

So as we go, we had interaction with Washoe County Sheriff's Office Bridge program, and they are really pushing through this Bridge program, this concept of desistance. And again, that refers to the reduction in criminal justice behaviors. And this is Washoe's looking at their definition, criminal behavior that typically occurs after an individual reaches adulthood. And it's understood that as a process where individuals stop engaging in criminal behaviors, often influenced by various social, psychological and environmental factors. And this concept really distinguishes between the termination of offending and for Washoe's Bridge program, it's the point at which their criminal activity stops and the underlying process of desistance, which involves changes in behavior and identity over time, kind of that people, places and things that we often talk about. We asked Washoe, where do you see desistance fitting into this Wisconsin framework? And as you saw, the Wisconsin framework does have a definition for desistance. And for Washoe's purposes, the starting point is they define the moment of re-entry after incarceration as their starting point for measuring desistance. Their cohort would be based on the specific program involvement. So the Bridge program or any other programs that they may be looking at, and then their follow-up period, they would have to have a clearly defined follow-up framework that they're going to look at for

the desistance as part of their evaluation. And again, asking Washoe County, where do you see desistance fitting in this Wisconsin framework? And they felt it really opens the door for more nuanced reporting, recognizing that while recidivism is very important to look at and to measure, it functions mostly as that systems level outcome and accountability tool. It really tells us what happened. So the person recidivated but it doesn't get into the why. And the example that they provided is it's like learning that cancer deaths decreased 10%. It's a signal worth looking at, but it doesn't tell us which treatments or behavioral changes were the most effective. So from Washoe, they feel that desistance really gets more into the specific behavioral change that a program's designed to produce, or that why. Why did they recidivate or why didn't they recidivate? So as we went through this, and I started working with the MOST and FASTT teams that the Attorney General's Office funded, we have that statewide substance use response working group, which is a legislatively mandated group that looks at, it, primarily, we've looked at opiates, but it looks at all substances. And it's to make recommendations on spending, not just the opioid litigation funds out of the fund for Nevada, but to make recommendations, for example, to DPBH on some of their programs and how they use their funding for these programs. But one of the recommendations that we came up with is that we needed state agencies under all branches that have deflection and diversion programs or involved with them to have a comprehensive definition of recidivism and the policies related for how to measure and report recidivism.

Like I said, it's important that we know that we had these teams out there, these pre-arrest diversion and deflection teams, and that there was more of a need for them than what they were able to fill. But again, are those programs working and what's the quality of that work? This is some of the justification and the background that we looked at within the SURG for needing this definition, and it's pretty much everything that we've already discussed, and that we need some definition other than just reincarceration, looking at, again, that Wisconsin framework and looking at recontact, re-arrest, reincarceration, or reconviction, and realizing the NDOC was the only definition of recidivism that we could find within the state. Then the action steps became to start reaching out to the different agencies to let them know this was a recommendation and provide some guidance, on, such as the Wisconsin model that we hoped to follow to look at having a definition for recidivism for their programs, and then that evaluation and that policy for evaluation. One of the things that the SURG is going to do is the SURG is we didn't previously have desistance as part of our definition of recidivism, but we do plan to include, to revise that recommendation to include this desistance because, again, it's important to know, yes, these programs are out there, yes, there's a need for them, but what's the quality, what's the why, what's the behavioral changes that are occurring that make these programs work? And that's Dr. Snider's and my presentation. This is my information if anyone would like to get in touch with me, and I will stop sharing my screen.

Chair Herndon: Thank you, Dr. Kerns and Dr. Snider. Does anybody have any questions for either Dr. Kerns or Dr. Snider? I can't see hands right now. Oh, yeah. Mark, go ahead.

D.A Mark Jackson: Thank you, doctors. I do appreciate this. This is something that's been driving me and other prosecutors across the state crazy for a lot of years. There's a lot that I liked about that Wisconsin model. You know, looking at it, we've come a long ways as a state, and I really want to thank Jorja and everybody that works within the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy in going and capturing this data and bringing it forward because I believe that our legislature now is so much more informed than legislatures in the past in making policy-driven decisions. Since we'll be making recommendations on this, I think that, you know kind of, my understanding is part of what our discussion will have to be is what exactly is it that we're trying to examine. Is it only about evaluating program effectiveness? Is it about assessing what's driving our policy decisions? If it's about improving public safety or understanding these individual outcomes. And I would suggest that really all four. I think it's real important that improving public safety is a big part of this. So one of the things that I've never have understood, and my biggest problem overall about the Department of Corrections is one of all of those, they're only doing that reincarceration. But this three years is a major problem. If we really want to collect the data, why are we limiting it as far as what the time would be at this stage? Why don't we collect everything as much as we possibly can and then bring it back and discuss it and try to develop a policy based upon all of those factors, the effectiveness of these programs in the prisons, in the jails, better policy decisions by us in making recommendations in the Legislature in enacting that new definition in addressing all of these issues, the public safety component of it, and even those individual outcomes. Because at the end of the day, it's not just about this binary past failure that we've gone upon based upon that very limited Department of Correction definition. But in understanding those individual outcomes, it also will be looking at some of those successes, which I think would help with that evaluating program effectiveness. I've always had a hard time understanding while the

prison that so many of us were always reaching out for funding and why they would want such a short time period, because I would think that more funding would be available if they could actually identify what the issues are or the lack of effectiveness of certain types of programs. But there's no doubt that, and I will tell you from a prosecutor standpoint, on behalf of all of the prosecutors, public safety is always going to be paramount to us. So I definitely want a part of that discussion and I do understand Dr. Snider was talking about that three years seems to be kind of across the nation. I've pulled up some from other states that isn't really limited yet.

But Dr. Snider, I guess I'll turn to you first because you specifically talked about the three years. But don't you think it'd be beneficial at the very beginning when we're looking for this data to capture as much as we possibly can before deciding on what that time frame will be?

Dr. Snider: I will say yes. I think as a data person, more data is always my preference. When it comes to standardizing though, we do need to have some sort of a uniform time frame between programs. For a lot of programs that are federally funded, and I think this changed recently to be slightly shorter, but a lot of those cycles are three years. So it makes sense from that perspective. And it takes a little while to get the data together. I agree with you that looking at everything we have can be a really powerful tool to see where we should be going. But in terms of actually saying yes, no, this was or was not effective, a more uniform definition is necessary. I don't have any particular attachment to three years as the firm benchmark. That's a trend I noticed in the document that Dr. Kerns shared with the definitions from states where there were states that deviated from that. There were some that did not have a limitation. There were some that had one year or two years, but the majority of states that specified a time frame were looking at three years. But like I said, I'm not married to that time frame. I think figuring out what makes the most sense that we can actually look at in terms of what data are available, and also kind of looking at it from the perspective of what is reasonable and feasible for a new program to be able to measure. Because a lot of these programs like FASTT and MOST have been going on for a while, but we've seen a lot of other programs pop up that get three to five years of funding, and when that funding ends, they are no longer continuing. And so we may never know, if we have an extended time frame, we may never get to the point where we can continue to follow that for those programs and know if it's worth reinvesting in those efforts. So yes, I agree with you, and also that's where we kind of drew that three years.

Chair Herndon: Dr. Kerns, was there anything that you wanted to add on to that?

Dr. Kerns: Yeah, no, I agree with everything that Dr. Snider said. It becomes typically an issue of funding, and then also, you know, like Washoe, they haven't prescribed a time yet on their desistance program. You know, that's something that they're looking at right now. It's an open-ended, so I think that speaks to Mark Jackson's point about following somebody. You know, we want these programs to change behaviors, and we want them to be lifelong changes in behavior. So because of that, the three years does limit, but I think it's a starting point and something commonly used, and it's usually, unfortunately, driven by the funding.

Chair Herndon: No, I get that. One question I had about the Wisconsin model, do you know if they have a uniform kind of case management system around the state that allows jurisdictions to access each other's information to know about issues of recidivism or anything else? I know we had some difficulties with that here many years ago when we were developing our pretrial risk assessment tools, where we couldn't, you know, necessarily access data to know whether somebody was arrested or charged here or exactly what occurred when you're kind of trying to evaluate.

And most people are kind of more confined to localities where they may be committing offenses and going in and out of incarceration, but it also spreads out across the state a little bit.

Dr. Jennifer Lanterman: This is Jennifer Lanterman for the record. Just to follow up on what Dr. Snider said in response to Mr. Jackson's question, three years is a really standardized follow-up period to track recidivism for a number of reasons, primarily because outside of the traditional funding mechanisms and what that means in terms of how you have to complete data collection, generally speaking, that time window captures a majority of reoffending that will occur. So typically that's going to occur within three years. Some larger scale studies have also tracked reoffending for five-year periods, and so you do capture a slightly larger percentage of people who might reoffend. But generally speaking, the data suggests that once you get past three years, the likelihood of reoffending really drops off. So at that point, you wind up having this cost-benefit analysis situation where does it, does it make sense to continue investing money, collecting those data, and tracking reoffending if you're going

to be identifying such a small percentage of the population at that point? So three years really is like the tipping point. You're going to capture the largest number of people, and you're going to be using your financial and personal resources the most effectively.

Dr. Snider: Thank you for that. I want to kind of come back to, I think that ties in really well to the question that was just asked about Wisconsin and their data, because as you mentioned, it is an effort, and it's a considerable effort to go from three to five years in terms of the data collection, what we're able to get, consolidate, clean, analyze, collate. There's a lot of work that goes in, especially when you have when you have disparate data collection systems.

So when we met with Wisconsin, it was through a technical assistance request. It was coordinated by RTI under the COSSUP grant, because we were asking them as a national TA provider if they knew of work going on in this area. If I remember correctly, and correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. Kerns, they were one of the states that was working on a coordinated, more centralized database. Politically, that was a very heavy lift for them. They've been working on this for over a decade when we met with them. And it took, I believe it took getting a specialized agency or department under the executive branch in their state to be in charge of a centralized database and to connect their existing systems to feed into that with very tight controls on who could have access to identifiable information from that system and set it up so that it was available for data requests and data pulls that could be matched between different systems. So it would require, and I believe Virginia was doing the same thing when we spoke with them, but it would require a very coordinated effort and probably at least a handful of full-time positions to make that centralizing a reality, especially if it's going to be something that is useful to the rest of the state in terms of being able to request that whoever is in charge of that system can collate data from different jurisdictions, different intercepts, and pull it all together to answer a research question to provide the necessary data. Especially if we want to protect people's privacy that go into that system and use more anonymized numbers to combine that data for the same person from different systems.

Chair Herndon: Evie?

Ms. Evelyn Grosenick: Good morning. This is Evie Grosenick for the record. Thank you so much for this presentation. This is so important and also very fascinating. I have three hopefully quick questions and a request. The first question, when you talk about the Wisconsin framework and there are four types of recidivism, rearrest, recharge, reconviction, and reincarceration, does the Wisconsin model track all four of those types for each person?

Dr. Snider: I believe they are putting this out in their state as a framework as we hope to do to allow for programs to select the appropriate definition. I don't know that at this point they've reached a statewide coordinated effort to look at all the people in their state across all of those levels through different programs and justice intercepts.

Ms. Grosenick: Ok. And the second question is somewhat related. So the definition, well a definition of recidivism as the act of committing another crime or coming into conflict with the criminal justice system, is there a further definition of coming into conflict? I know this is where Washoe county struggled when we were trying to figure out recidivism or a definition for it to track the risk assessment tool. We couldn't agree on you know, should a traffic stop be considered a re-offense? Should it, if it's not a jailable offense, what if they're arrested and no charges are filed? Is there, do you know of any kind of definition for coming into conflict with the criminal justice system?

Dr. Snider: That seems pretty vague to me. Conflict can mean a lot of different things in that context. The criminal justice system could mean a lot of different things.

As an evaluator and a data person, I don't know that I'd be able to look at a data set with that definition and filter cases and say this one applies, this one doesn't, this one does, this one doesn't. I would need more specificity than that. I think that's where the concept of desistance may come in really handy because if we're looking at what the behavior patterns are, why a traffic stop would be anything meaningful for somebody who had a history of battery and assault in terms of their recidivism, their pattern of behavior, it does not seem meaningful to me unless of course they were getting stopped because they were battering the person in their passenger seat. So really looking at what the behavior patterns are, but I understand that when we're dealing with massive data sets,

we do need quick yes-no delimiters. I don't think personally that conflict with the criminal justice system makes a lot of sense.

I think documented steps in the process like yes or no this person was arrested, yes or no this person was cited, those make a lot more sense in terms of defining recidivism. Getting more into the nuance of desistance and what the behavior patterns are looking like, there's maybe a little bit more room for that nuance.

Ms. Grosenick: Okay, thank you so much for the clarification.

Dr. Kerns: If I can, I was just going to add, I think your concern is the same because as part of the SURG, our member that represents the Sheriffs and Chiefs, Christina Payson, took to the Sheriffs and Chiefs and those same comments came up about I don't just want it to be reincarcerated, what if someone comes into contact? They call because someone was overdosing and they were doing drugs with that person, for example, was one of the examples we've got. I think within this Wisconsin model, that's why they specifically say what is not included in that definition as opposed to the all-inclusive what is included.

So that's going to be, you know, a decision. That's why we originally wanted a statutory definition but realized that probably wasn't the way to go as opposed to having organizational definitions, so, especially when funding programs so the programs know what's being looked at and how to A, have a definition of it in order to implement the program and to measure the program.

Ms. Grosenick: So, that [inaudible] up a really good point because when you talk about, you know, it is illegal to use many controlled substances, many street drugs, right? And it's illegal to possess them and if somebody is overdosing and they, you know, help shows up and they're not charged with a crime because it's the Good Samaritan rule. But if that person is moving from the realm, you know, we know for substance abuse, it's not a situation where someone's necessarily going to just stop because they got arrested.

I mean, perhaps enforced sobriety in jails is one thing but as far as them being able to control an addiction, the reality is many people, it takes them a very long time to get a hold of that. And so they will be breaking the law and recidivating, an addict will, for perhaps a lot longer and in a different way than other people. So how do you take into account, you know, somebody, I mean, to me this is why the desistance sounds like a more realistic and useful tool just because it would take into account, okay, somebody's using, but that, you know, if they're able to use and not impact community safety, if they're using in their own home and they're not driving and they're not stealing or hurting other people, that's a better situation, right? And would be probably, you know, under desistance, that would show up as probably an improvement or it's not escalating severity if it's just for use or possession. Whereas under recidivism, if they are having contact with the criminal legal system because they're getting arrested for possession, that would show that they're just recidivating all over the place.

So I think that's a really good example of where desistance and recidivism may be capturing nuance, different nuances and data. And then my last, I'll skip my last question, but my request would be, I hope that there's some mechanism to allow defense attorneys and care providers in the community and individuals who work with vulnerable populations and populations suffering from mental health issues and substance abuse issues to be involved in the process of working on these definitions and what's going into it. Because I think that's a really important perspective that sometimes doesn't get included when it's mostly law enforcement agencies making these decisions.

But thank you very much for your presentation. I really enjoyed it.

Chair Herndon: Thank you, Evie. Don?

NDOC Representative Don Southworth: I just kind of wanted to chime in from the NDOC's perspective. Our definition of the three years to reincarceration is really in line with the CLA, the Correctional Leadership Association's definition. But it's also something that we have access to the data and we can measure and we can be real concise with, this is what we're doing, and we can measure internally what programs may or may not be having an effect on that reincarceration rate. And while we're kind of generally very agreeable to a more holistic approach to examining recidivism or returning to criminal justice, that definition just needs to be very clear. There are some statutes that do require us to issue a recidivism report. So we're kind of in compliance

with that. One of them is 176 Sentencing Commission NRS that does kind of outline that we need to provide the Sentencing Commission with data on 36 months to reincarceration. So we're in compliance with that.

But, Chair, I think you kind of hit the nail on the head a little bit, is if we're going to measure that, we all need to have access to each other's data. As a state, we need to have access to the local jurisdictions and counties, and counties need to be able to share with each other. And that's sometimes challenging with the current system that we have in our state. But we are not set in stone with the current definition. We do want to do what's best for the state. And if there's another way to approach that, we're very, again, agreeable and amenable to that. But it just needs to be very clear and measurable so that it's consistent. It's also transparent for the state and applicable to our mission as a department.

Dr. Snider: Yeah, I just want to chime in and say, for all that we've said about the NDOC definition, it is beautifully operational. It is very clear. It is measurable. And I do appreciate that about it. And I would say that going forward, if the NDOC adopts another definition, I would hope that they would include for at least a couple of years the results on the current definition for comparison, so that it's not such a hard change. I see that all the time where definitions change, and then it's like, oh, we're doing this now, and there's no comparison to prior reports.

But yeah, I want to acknowledge that it is a very operational definition. And from that standpoint, I do appreciate it.

Chair Herndon: Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady: Thank you, Chair. Christine Jones Brady, for the record. For Dr. Kerns and Dr. Snider, did you also look at, I have two questions. The first one was, did you also look at a universe of information or studies, like valid studies conducted that discuss programs that have been looked at over the years and are, you know, in a statistically significant way, reduce recidivism? Or is it that you couldn't even really get beyond have a definition of recidivism to even be able to look at that?

Dr. Snider: I will say that for the studies that I've looked at, I've been doing evaluation with FASTT and MOST for about five years now. And over the course of all of that work, looking at these early intercept studies, a lot of them do look at measures of recidivism. What was concerning to me was that the definitions are not uniform between studies. So it's really hard to say this program is more effective than that program in terms of recidivism reduction when they're using different definitions.

Dr. Kerns: And I would just add to that is we did look at different studies. And we also, through the cohorts and the technical assistance, both through the National Governors Association that DPAD, and also through the COSSUP grant, were able to talk to other jurisdictions that have been evaluating programs and have what they deem as successful programs, Wisconsin's one, Virginia, North Carolina. So we got that, you know, where we were able to ask specific questions, but having definitions and being able to measure those definitions, those definitions what became really important as part of these programs as well. Because, you know, as Dr. Snider said, what we found is we're trying to do the old comparing apples to oranges because the definitions don't even match from county to county or program to program.

Dr. Snider: Yeah, and I'll add on to that too. One of the biggest challenges, a lot of the published research that we can find tends to be very large, very robust, very well-funded studies of programs, things like the LEAD program, a lot of stuff that comes out of Massachusetts and Ohio. They have a lot of funding for deflection and diversion up front. But my experience working with Nevada's programs is that the program, the studies that don't get published tend to be presented at conferences. We've seen those. And it's always a question of how do we get the data? How do we measure this? And everyone seems to be having the same challenge of how do we define it and then how do we get the data to back that up? And so it's more than just what is published, it's what's not published that I think informed our push for this.

Vice Chair Brady: And then my second question is, you know, Dr. Kerns, you mentioned, I think you both mentioned about the funding, not only for programs, but for the data collection and system processes. Were there, I suppose there aren't any estimates as to how much it would cost to get us all being able to be in systems that speak with each other and where we can share data with, is there any anyone working on that to your knowledge on how to collect the data and have a system that works statewide? Thank you.

Dr. Kerns: Yeah, to address that question is I don't have a custom out. We did look at Virginia who has a really good program with data sharing and with having one dashboard with de-identified anonymous data on it. And so we out of the SURG pushed a recommendation to have such a, a data dashboard as that in our state. And it went to the chief technology officer, chief information officer. So that is something that's being looked at, but I think we're a long way from getting to that.

Chair Herndon: So, I can, I can tell you that that's one of the things that we were looking at this year and John, you can jump in on this as well. Cause I just don't recall sitting here right now, all of the various one-shot requests we had, but one of the things we were trying to do is get a statewide data repository in place that would allow for the collection and collation of data for everybody in the state and help the Legislature and others with policy decisions moving forward. I'm not sure what the legislature was incredibly taxed this year from a budget standpoint, national statewide, all kinds of issues.

So I don't know if we got anything on that that allows that to move forward right now?

Mr. John McCormick: Thanks Chair. This is John McCormick for the record. We, and sorry, my coffee pot is going.

Chair Herndon: That's okay.

Mr. McCormick: We did, we are current, still working on, on the judicial branch project to implement what we're calling a data warehouse.

Chair Herndon: Right.

Mr. McCormick: Will allow the AOC. So the data team at the Supreme Court level to get agreements and reach out and pull data from the backend of various court case management systems.

Chair Herndon: Ok.

Mr. McCormick: And it will also have that dashboard component, but that's on just the judicial branch, the court side. So we're moving in better data from the court side direction and greater accessibility in the dashboards and stuff.

Chair Herndon: Got it. Thank you. Okay. Ms. Souza-Llamas.

Ms. Souza-Llamas: Thank you. There's been some discussion about the lack of a unified criminal justice system here in Nevada. So I was curious if Dr. Snider or Dr. Kerns feels that there's a gap in the data held at the central repository that makes it difficult to collect this data.

Dr. Snider: I don't know if, okay. Yeah, Terry. No go ahead.

Dr. Kerns: Go ahead, Katie.

Dr. Snider: I was just going to say from my perspective, it's a lack of access. But I know that a lot of the programs that I work with are not necessarily feeding their data into the central repository. And so something that would be more accessible for them to input, kind of going back to what was mentioned earlier about that situation where Good Samaritan conflicts with legal use or illegal use of substances.

In that situation, I can see something like a mobile crisis team responding, and that would be an early deflection effort. And that data would be then captured, but I don't know that that's going towards the central repository. So still building out all of the data for the Sequential Intercept Model, and then looking at how that's integrated between state and local jurisdictions and systems.

Dr. Kerns: Yeah, I don't have anything else to add other than that. Like I said, we looked at a dashboard and system out of Virginia that is a really nice. It has criminal justice information. It has prevention coalition data. It has treatment data. It has EMS data. And I'm happy to share that with the group if they'd like to take a look at that dashboard out of Virginia.

Chair Herndon: Dr. Lanterman?

Dr. Jennifer Lanterman: Hey, this is Jen Lanterman for the record. So I know that there have been a lot of conversations with different groups of people, different organizations, different commissions over time about data-related issues. This specific. There's a difference between data that are collected that we might use to make recommendations, say, to the Legislature versus a platform that can be used by relevant parties to make relevant real-time decision-making.

And so I know that there. Back in 2016, the Department of Corrections received Second Chance Act funding. And there was a planning grant, and then that planning grant led into an implementation grant. And then that, of course, involved Parole and Probation that touched a little bit on Parole Board but not so directly, and some of our treatment providers. And so part of that planning grant conversation involved generating a database that sort of existed alongside what essentially became a data repository. And they don't necessarily have to be discrete, although we would have to figure out how they might interact.

But part of the conversation at that time was working with a vendor, I think it was, RedCap, to develop a database that all relevant parties throughout the legal system or various treatment providers would be able to enter data in, but then they could control what types of agencies or parties had access to what types of data so that we could maintain data privacy where that was necessary, be really mindful of protected health information because that's important, but also make data available to decision makers so that they can make data-informed decisions in real time instead of having to make a request for data that might take a couple of weeks, right?

So there have been a lot of ongoing sort of conversations about this, but I think we need to be mindful about sort of what are we asking for, right? Are we asking for an enhanced data repository or are we asking for some sort of data management system that people could just go into at any given time and get the type of data that they're looking for?

Because they're not the same thing, right? So if we're going to make requests, we're going to make recommendations to the legislature, we're going to make requests for funding or recommendations for funding, then we need to be really specific about what we want the system to do, because we can't say we want a particular system managed by a particular organization to do one thing and then expect it to do something else, right? We need to make sure that we're comparing apples and apples.

Chair Herndon: I don't see any other questions. So Dr. Kerns, Dr. Snider, thank you very much. I appreciate your time today. This was a really interesting presentation and I appreciate everything that went into it. But let me just ask, since I didn't see any digital hands on the screen, was there anybody else that had any questions? Okay, perfect.

Thank you again, Doctors.

Dr. Snider: Thank you.

6. Nevada Homeless Alliance Presentation

Chair Herndon: Okay, we will close that agenda item, which is number five, and move to agenda item number six, our Nevada Homeless Alliance presentation. That's going to come to us through the Executive Director of the Nevada Homeless Alliance, which is Catrina Grigsby-Thedford.

Dr. Catrina Grigsby-Thedford: Hi, can you guys hear me okay?

Chair Herndon: We can. How are you?

Dr. Grigsby-Thedford: Awesome. I'm great. Thank you. So let me see if I can get my slideshow to work here. Are you guys able to see it?

Ms. Felipe: Yes.

Dr. Grigsby-Thedford: Awesome. All right. So again, my name is Dr. Catrina Grigsby-Thedford. I'm the Executive Director of Nevada Homeless Alliance. I've been in this position for almost four years. November will be four years. I am a certified drug and alcohol counselor and a licensed social worker. I completed my doctorate in public policy in 2023. And a lot of my work was around the prison or jail to homelessness pipeline.

So over here at Nevada Homeless Alliance, we do a lot of policy and advocacy. We do collaborations, public awareness, and trainings on best practices in working with individuals experiencing homelessness. I'm also part of the Justice Involved Reentry Advisory, the Governor's Nevada Inner Agency Council on Housing to Homelessness Legislative and Technical Assistance Committees.

And as a side gig, I am a drug and alcohol counselor for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, their residential reentry program here locally where I do drug and alcohol counseling. And so a lot of my work at this in this position is surrounding homelessness. But we found that of the individuals that we're serving, about 35% of the individuals we served last year, their prior living situation was institution, either jail or prison. And over 60% of the individuals that we served have at least one felony on their record. So this slideshow will go through a little bit about what we did in 2024. And when we get to the end, we'll dive more into the reentry work that Nevada Homeless Alliance do. This is a passion for me as a person in long-term recovery. I have lived experience in homelessness, substance use, criminal involvement, and I spent time as a resident in the NDOC here in the state. So we will get started.

First of all, thank you, Dr. Katie and Dr. Kerns for all that great information. It really sparked my interest. Here we go. Okay, so what happened? Let's see. There we go.

So I just always start off just thanking our funders, partners, volunteers, and advocates for helping us make a difference. I'm going to go through these slides pretty quick because it's briefly an overview of 2024. Then we'll get down to the reentry things.

At Nevada Homeless Alliance, our mission is to advance collaborative strategies to end homelessness in Southern Nevada through advocacy, public awareness, education, and coordination of services. And our vision is to end homelessness in Southern Nevada. So one of these strategies to end homelessness is to end the, to decrease the inflow into homelessness. So as some of you may or may not know, with housing and homeless programs, a lot of the times we have to use a specific definition of homelessness and often exit from institutions, the individuals that don't meet the definition of homelessness in order to get services. So there's always a gap in coordinating with the prisons or the jails. If an individual was in that institution more than 90 days, it's almost like you have to get out, go to a shelter, meet the definition of homelessness in order to get services. So that's always a challenge.

So just in 2024, we served over 5,000 individuals. And so I'm sharing these stats because, again, 35% of the people we served, their prior living situation was either, was institution, either jail or prison, and over 60% of the individuals we served have at least one felony on their record, not necessarily in the state of Nevada.

So in 2024, we did our Pop Up Connect events where we go directly to encampments, we go to churches, we go to community centers, we go to libraries, anywhere where low-income or people experiencing homelessness are engaging so that we can bring those critical services directly to them, all the way from legal aid to housing assessments to on-the-spot medical care, substance abuse, mental health, all those things. We do Family Connect Pop-Ups where we meet family needs. We partner with Clark County School District to kind of address family homelessness and youth homelessness. We have a program. Well we contract with people with lived experience. So we center their voices in all systems change work. We'll talk about that. Our Homeless Diversion and Barrier Busting programs and some Southern Nevada Health District work we did.

So we're going to dive into a couple of these. So also, we have Homeless Service Provider Training where we hire professional trainers to assist homeless service providers with understanding best practices like motivational interviewing, trauma-informed care, self-care, de-escalation, all the things that are really important in working with this very vulnerable population who is not only homeless, but they also have a lot of other barriers and challenges that just exasperate their current situation.

So we had our 2024 Statewide Conference on Addressing Homelessness at the Flamingo last year. I started in 2021 at the agency in November of 2021, and the previous executive director had a brainchild that we need to have our own statewide conference, homegrown conference. So about nine months later in August of 2024, we had our first statewide conference. And so this year, we're having our fourth. So we're keeping that trend going. We also do a homeless candlelight vigil to celebrate the lives of individuals who passed while they were experiencing homelessness.

We, I am the Capitol Hill Day Captain for our state as it relates to going to D.C. to advocate on different policies and things as it relates to homelessness. And as a person with lived experience, we always attend any lived experience leadership conferences because we believe that people closest to the problem are closest to the solution. And there should be nothing about a particular population of clients that we serve without them being involved in these work. So our Project Homelessness Connects was held about 36 times in 2024. Like I said, it's a mobile outreach event where we bring resources directly to people in need, offering a wide variety of services. We did 13 Family Connects in partnership with Clark County School District to support, you know, families in crisis and the youth and things like that to give them those wraparound services or those on-the-spot services that they need in order to resolve whatever their current issue is.

So now, Project Homelessness Connect events, here are just some few stats. Recovery and substance use services is always bigger than housing services. Those needs are always very vital to the population we serve. So, we contract with people with lived experience. We hire them and pay them a living wage for their work. We have our Southern Nevada Lived X Consultants who we started with in 2022. As a person with lived experience, I think it's really important that if we're talking about homelessness and how to solve that, we need to have people at the table who've experienced homelessness because they can see gaps that people like me, 15 years down the line, may not see. While I'm trying to create policy and create change, I have to make sure those individuals are involved in those conversations. We also assisted with creating the Lived, the Washoe County Lived Experience Advisory Board in 2023, and they're still going strong there.

So we are, this group is people with lived experience of homelessness, justice involvement, mental health and substance use, domestic violence. We have veterans, youth, a big group of individuals. So we help to ensure inclusive, informed decision-making across systems. There's a lot of advocacy scoring and ranking of applications that relate to housing or development. They co-train our homeless service providers in the community on best practices with our professional trainers, and then they educate the community about what we can do about the gaps in the system as it relates to homelessness, substance use, mental health, justice involvement, domestic violence, things like that. So we were funded by some ARPA funds in 2022 and ended in 2024, and we were able to assist people with a lot of ID recovery financial assistance.

We used a lot of those funds to do re-entry services at the NDOC, and we were able to go into Florence McClure, Southern Desert, Casa Grande, to meet with individuals before discharge. Just a little caveat, our goal as it relates to re-entry is always primarily individuals who are discharging and they expire their sentence. I think that population is often forgotten. I know that when individuals are on parole or probation, there are, you know, stipulations, they need to have an improved housing plan, they have a PO, a lot of resources, but when individuals are just expiring their sentence, I think they should be included in all re-entry conversations because they're actually re-entering, though they're not on any paper or supervised oversight. Again, like I said, we're Capitol Hill Day Captains, so we go to Capitol Hill, DC, a lot to talk to federal lawmakers or you know, the federal people about changes that we need to see. We, I mentioned earlier, our statewide conference on addressing homelessness was at the Flamingo last year, and you know, when I was doing this slide, I didn't intentionally put like, our Angel Lash, who does a lot of re-entry work at the—with the LIMA Courts, and we have a couple of our other people who do re-entry courts—re-entry work.

We always have panels and groups that talk about justice involvement and homelessness. It's always—since it's near and dear to my heart, I ensure that at our conferences, it's there because our population has very deep justice involvement as well as deep mental health and substance use issues. And lastly, like I mentioned, we have a Celebration of Hope for people who experience homelessness on the street due to the conditions and lack of resources and services, so just a couple slides there. And a couple people in our community that worked were tireless and fearless advocates for people experiencing homelessness. We always remember them as well. All right.

So, that was kind of quick. So, like I said, when I got my doctorate degree from UNLV, my research was 100% about the intersection between incarceration and homelessness. So, there's some really smart people on this call, and I'm pretty sure you guys know these things. That you know, national research suggests that up to 15% of incarcerated people experience homelessness in the year before admission to prison. This was from some research in 2018. I'm pretty sure—I've been looking for some new research because I'm pretty sure it's increased since then.

Homeless shelters find that many formerly incarcerated people rely on shelters immediately after their release and over the long term. Research shows that people who've been to prison just once experience homelessness at a rate of nearly seven times higher than the general public. And people who have been incarcerated more than once have rates 13 times higher than the general public rates of experiencing homelessness.

So, when I talk to prison staff and other individuals, this is the buzz. This is things I hear. People don't want to share where they're going when they expire their sentence. I've heard they're no longer in NDOC responsibility once they expire their sentence. And others, you know, there are laws in place to stipulate they have to provide gate money, medications, and drop them off if that's part of their release plan. So, that was really interesting to hear that a release plan includes dropping a person off with a shelter list. I strongly believe that prison exits shouldn't be an entrance to homelessness. So, when I looked up Nevada's re-entry vision on the website from 2021, this is what I hear. "The reentry vision is dedicated to reducing the rate of offenders returning to incarceration by utilizing collaborative interagency partnerships and nationwide best practices. Success for an individual offender is defined as having stable housing and employment, effective treatment, positive personal relationships, family support, and appropriate supervision that would enable productive law-abiding lives." That statement kind of tells me it doesn't include individuals who are—who've expired their sentence. However, they should be included as people reentering the society.

The site also states that Nevada believes it has an economic and moral imperative to support offenders recently released from custody to regain entry in the community. So, this really sparked a lot of my interest because the first thing for success is having stable housing. However, there are, from what I've been seeing over the past seven, eight years, is that our prison system doesn't have a real relationship with our housing program systems. There are many other communities and many other examples. For instance, in Atlanta, where their prison works closely with their housing authority in order to have programs where offenders can qualify for vouchers and move directly into housing when they are getting out. Or there's other communities where the information is shared about the housing status of individuals at entry-exit is compared against the homeless data so that eventually we have real numbers of how many people are exiting.

We have numbers about jail, but we don't have numbers about prison, how many people are exiting to prison. So, there is a link between poverty and incarceration nationwide, but what does that look like in Nevada? There's no data about recidivism rates specifically for poor and homeless Nevadan, Nevadans, because the state's incarceration data isn't run against the homeless service data or the data is simply not collected.

Maybe it is collected, but where can we access that? So, returning citizens, which is the term we use, they face the same challenges that lead to homelessness among the general population. They have unique barriers as it relates to housing and employment because of their criminal history. And, you know, honestly, I think there is a lack of ownership of the problem among government agencies and community agencies. Often, community organizations are like, well, we can't do anything until they get out. The government agencies or the prisons are like, well, once they get out, if they're not on parole, it's not our problem anymore.

Yet, our governor wants to reduce recidivism and there is just a lack of collaboration. When I was doing some research on recidivism, I've noticed that we're looking so much at the criminogenic factors and, you know, recidivism also relates to social and environmental factors. So, I think once we start collaborating in the community and doing research that is also looking at the social and environmental factors, right, we literally will improve public safety when we look at and address the social and environmental factors as much as we address and look at the criminogenic factors. Because an individual can get out of prison and get discharged, okay, they're free, and have to live at a shelter, nowhere to take their belongings, they have a criminal history, you know, how can you? You can go to a program, we have great programs like Hope for Prisoners and FIT and Goodwill reentry programs. Our NCOs do a lot as it relates to reentry and employment, but, you know, an individual that has to sleep at a shelter every night and go to work, right, it's kind of hard.

People will revert back to their old ways of trying to make quick money or committing a crime and now public safety is really at risk. And when we look at making sure, we can keep looking at workforce, but we have to make sure coupled with workforce that people have somewhere to stay. Shelter is not a place to stay and thrive. It should be temporary. However, we know that our community, I know that our doesn't have enough shelters, doesn't have enough funding for affordable housing. Housing is not affordable, so there's so many things that make this problem worse for individuals exiting prison who are specifically those who are expiring their sentence

and they don't have the mom or, you know, the wife or the children that will be picking them up when they're dropped off at P&P, right? These individuals are showing up at the shelters with their all blues on and their clear bags saying, "I just got out of prison."

So, I think that it's critical that local leaders, leaders on the local state level, nonprofit agencies understand the connection between homelessness and criminal justice systems to develop communities and ensure everyone has access to safe and stable housing. So, in Nevada Homeless Alliance, we tirelessly do this work.

We do work, I saw Mr. Ponder on here with Hope for Prisoners. His case managers reach out to us and, you know, if they have an individual who needs help with rent or things like that, like we're always right there making sure that individual doesn't go into homelessness. We also work, go to a lot of the re-entry fairs they have in the community, the CCDC things, and we have funding from Civil Assignment to assist individuals who are exiting the NDOC for federal prison, and they have no housing plan because from what I'm hearing, individuals who are expiring and won't be on paper, there's no in stone housing plan. There's just like, "people don't want to tell us where they're going."

So, I know that when in the last legislative session, I was promoting and trying to get support to add, adding housing status as a data point to be collected at prison entry and exit. That was accomplished with AB 32, but originally it was AB 236 that I wanted to kind of get it in. And so, the goal would be to add housing status. It's just a drop down. We don't need an address, where were you at before you got arrested that led to this conviction? And when people leave, where are you going? It could be as simple as to a friend, temporarily with a friend or family, permanent with a family member and going home. I don't know, shelter, right? At least we can get some data to see where people are going.

So then when you're looking at the recidivism data, if you know, we adopt a definition of recidivism as Dr. Katie and Dr. Kerns was giving us a couple examples, we'll be able to also look at that housing status of those individuals. So we can really have some idea of how the social and environmental factors relate to recidivism. Because I honestly believe that people are not morally all bad and with the right amount of support for people who accept it. And one of those things support could be temporary housing, sober living housing, coupled with their workforce development and having mentors and getting back to be productive taxpaying members of society. We may see something different, right?

So I think there needs to be a reentry task force or a working group. So I am a member of, like I said, the Justice Involved Reentry Advisory. They do some good work, but you know, I go to other groups as well.

But some of the key things that we need, like data sharing, looking at the research and the data to say how does homelessness, how does it or how does it not impact recidivism rates, where we have partners at the table who are knowing, you know, these are the programs and this is where I need to refer people to, where the justice system and the community partners are co-writing grants together to ensure that people are not exiting to homelessness, the people who choose not to, because we can't force a person who is expiring their sentence to accept a housing plan. But, you know, things like that, right? There is so many things that we can do in our community, but I think there's just a gap of whose responsibility these individuals are when they get out of prison.

So, you know, another suggestion is to strategize community plans to ensure that people who are getting out of prison are informed about housing options that are available to them, right, before they get out. They're screened for those housing options prior to exit and make sure that they are provided with housing search, housing placement, and financial assistance as well as case management upon exit from prison or while on parole, if appropriate. Because often people that I've been meeting, they're given like a handout or a little pamphlet and a lot of those things are no longer funded and individuals don't know what to do until they get out and get in a situation. So, a lot of people are released to housing that may not be permanent, you know, things happen, lives change, and people think they're getting out and going back with the wife and it doesn't work out and now they're at risk of homelessness. Just making sure that the individuals who are expiring or people who are on parole cannot have access to what the community has as it relates to individuals who are just as involved, I think it would be great. So, there's a lot of work being done in the community, but there is a disconnect.

So, I'm just going to go through this slide and then I'll see if anybody has any questions. So, we are launching an app. We're going to continue doing our pop-up events. We host employment connect events. We host

quarterly connects and these, the connect is, the resource fair where it is on the spot. We go and set up the tents, the tables, the chairs. We invite our partners out and like I said, we will have on-the-spot medical care, on-the-spot legal aid, on-the-spot, we get people hired on-the-spot. Often, we have second chance employers that come out and set up tables. We have the housing providers, the mental health, the substance use providers, and all these things. And so, we'll also be having Youth Connect started in quarter three this year. Currently, we are assisting with pet deposits and fees because we're finding that individuals experiencing homelessness are not accepting housing because federal grants do not pay pet deposits and pet fees. So, I've been working tirelessly to get extra funds from corporate partners to ensure that we can encourage people to accept their housing options when they know they have a financial source for pet deposits and fees. So, that is new for us.

Like I mentioned earlier, we have our Silver Summit re-entry program that launched this year, and we have a lot of flexible funding from our corporate partners, specifically casino partners, to ensure that we have funding to assist individuals to obtain, that means to get housing, or to maintain permanent housing that would be a person who is in housing who may be at risk. And then, we continue to do our homeless service provider training, where CEUs are approved by the Board of Examiners for Social Workers and the Nevada Certification Board for, you know, prevention specialists, peer recovery support specialists, doulas, community health workers. And for the first time since 1992, we were founded in 1992, and we've always co-resided in a building or facility with another agency. This is the first time that we actually have our own location and our own keys, and so that is something that we are very proud of at Nevada Homeless Alliance.

And of course, we're going to have our 2025 statewide conference. The theme is Mission Possible, Policy, Practice, and Partnerships at the College of Southern Nevada Cheyenne campus in 2025. We, our community, was awarded \$8.5 million for the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program, where we're going to be hiring youth who have experienced or are experiencing homelessness to be peer navigators for other youth to help them to link them to all of those wraparound services. We have our Project Homeless Connect that will be occurring, and we do have a legal section in that event where we connect with over 150 partners. We're going to be at the World Market Center. If you've heard of the Homeless Stand Down that used to be us in the community, and Veterans Stand Down, they had their event at the World Market Center, so we want to have that same venue this year. And of course, we're going to have our annual Candlelight Visual honoring individuals who lost their lives to homelessness in December, so that is kind of what's coming.

And that's my information. And thank you for the work you guys do, and I'm strongly and I firmly believe that together we can build a future where everyone has a place to call home.

So, I know I went pretty quickly. I just wanted to, again, share a little background on our agency, as well as kind of go in and focus in on the reentry work that we have done, we're doing now, and that we will continue to do. So, if there are any questions, I am open. And if not, thank you for allowing me to be here today.

Chair Herndon: Dr. Grigsby-Thedford, thank you very much. Very informative. Do we have any questions from any of our commission members? Checking my screen here.

Dr. Grigsby-Thedford: Well, thank you guys again.

Chair Herndon: Okay. All right. Thank you. Okay. We will close agenda item number six, our Homeless Alliance presentation. Does everybody want to take a quick, like, five-minute break? Anybody? I get a couple of nods of head. So, let's take a quick five-minute break, and then we'll jump back on and move into the last two reports on our agenda for today. Thank you.

(COMMISSION GOES ON A FIVE MINUTE RECESS)

Director Powers: Chair Herndon, would you be amenable to swapping the last two items, just in case we run out of time? We would like to get the murder report out.

Chair Herndon: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Absolutely.

Director Powers: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: I got to get out about 12:15 ish. I have a thing at the medical school with my daughter, but we can switch those around and do whatever we're doing.

Director Powers: Perfect. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Who was presenting which one? Jenna was presenting the last one, right?

Director Powers: Yes. Jenna has the murder report, and the grant report is Marie.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Perfect.

Director Powers: Thank you.

8. Data Report and Discussion on NRS 178.750

Chair Herndon: All right. We will go ahead and call our meeting back to order. I believe we pretty much have everyone. Yeah. Okay. Pictures are popping up. Okay. We're going to skip over agenda item number seven right now and go to agenda item number eight first, with regard to our data report and discussion on NRS 178.750, and I will turn it over to Deputy Director Buonacorsi.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you, Chair. Let me share my screen. All right. Everything look good on your end? Perfect. For the record, my name is Jenna Buonacorsi, and I'm the Deputy Director for the Department of Sentencing Policy. This report represents an analysis of data on reported homicide and voluntary manslaughter cases in Nevada during 2024, as reported by Nevada Revised Statute 178.750. The data covers various aspects of these homicides, including defendant and victim demographics, file death penalty notices, and final case dispositions. Assembly Bill 13, passed in the 2003 legislative session, eliminated the panel of judges used in certain hearings where the death penalty was sought. The bill also required district attorneys and district courts to report specified information on certain homicides to the Nevada Supreme Court. Legislative discussions at the time reflected concerns about potential racial bias in sentencing, particularly regarding certain defendant and victim combinations. Part of the bill's purpose was to collect and make data available to detect trends and examine whether the death penalty system demonstrated prejudice against specific populations. Later, this responsibility was transferred to the Attorney's General's Office.

In 2023, Senate Bill 316 transferred the responsibility for collecting this data to the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy, or NDSP. Last year, NDSP completed its first full year of data collection and provided a summary report to the Commission. We identified some challenges with the data collection process and subsequently made several improvements. NDSP staff, with assistance from Commission Member D.A. Jackson, developed a new online submission form. D.A. Jackson provided valuable feedback from the District's Attorney's Association, which helped refine the form as well. We worked closely with the Clark County District Attorney's Office to improve their data submission. Notably, Clark County implemented a new case management system in August of 2023, enabling a more comprehensive and consistent submission compared to prior years.

The change in the submission process, from a filled-out PDF to an online submission form, streamlined the data collection process greatly. Thank you to our analyst, Erasmo Cosio, for the hours he spent creating that new online form. Through continued collaboration with the District's Attorney's Office, we are confident that the quality of this data will continue to improve over time. Per statute, each county's district attorney must submit an annual report by February 1st to the Department of Sentencing Policy on all cases filed in the previous year involving murder or voluntary manslaughter charges, excluding motor vehicle crash-related manslaughter. The report must include details on the defendant, co-defendants, victims, age, gender, and race, dates of the offense and case filings, case number in court, death penalty decisions, final case outcomes, jury demographics, if available, and the identities of all prosecutors and external consultants involved in charging plea, in key charging plea or death penalty decisions.

If a case is still ongoing and all required information isn't available, updated reports must be submitted to the Department of Sentencing Policy with each subsequent filing until all information is provided. To comply with Section 3 of NRS 178.750, NDSP asks counties to answer whether each case is a new submission or an update for this reporting period. We compared the responses found in the second, third, and fourth columns to the filing or indictment years provided for each case. This comparison raised the question, what exactly would count as a 2024 case? Upon review, NDSP staff identified six cases initially marked as updates that should instead have been classified as 2024 submissions. In total, NDSP reviewed 144 case submissions for 2024. Additionally, four

counties had no data to report for 2024 or any updates for prior years. Two counties submitted only updates to prior cases with no new 2024 cases.

Here you'll see the six counties that had no cases to report for 2024 along with the 11 counties that did submit cases. Nevada presents a unique challenge when comparing county-level statistics to do the vast difference in population size from just over 700 residents in Esmeralda County to nearly 2.5 million in Clark County. To account for this, we provided a breakdown of 2024 submissions by the estimated 2024 population size of each county for comparison. The largest age range at 33% of the reported defendants are between the ages of 18 and 24 years old. 81% of the defendants reported were male and 18% were female. Regarding defendant race and ethnicity, Black or African American and White defendants represented the largest proportion of race at 42% and 41% respectively. Of the 12 defendants with their reported ethnicity marked as Hispanic, 10 had their race reported as White and two as unknown.

We provided a visual to help illustrate the counting challenges in reporting unique individuals with this homicide data. One of the key questions we posed during the reporting was, did the defendant have any co-defendants reported for their case? In total, 64 defendants were reported with one or more co-defendant. However, because defendants and their co-defendants originate from the same crime event but are filed as separate cases, tracking the true count of co-defendants is complex. The same individual may appear as a co-defendant in multiple case records leading to potential overcounts. Our visual example demonstrates this issue using a single crime event involving one victim, shown here in teal, and four perpetrators, represented in blue and purple. Each perpetrator is charged in a separate case but all cases refer to the same incident. Thus, we have one crime event, one victim, four separate cases, one per defendant, and three co-defendants listed on each case. When aggregated purely by case record, the data reflects four defendants, 12 co-defendant entries, and four victims. However, the actual count is four unique defendants and one victim. This example highlights the difficulty of accurately counting unique victims and co-defendants when each defendant is reported under an individual case record.

Similarly, counting the number of individual victims is challenging because co-defendants may share victims and victim information is not always consistently available. The chart provided shows how many total victims were reported per case across the 144 submissions for 2024. 57 of the 144 cases, or 40%, had one victim. 38 cases had two victims. 24 cases had three victims, etc. The highest reported number of victims was seen in two cases involving two co-defendants and 17 victims. As reported for 2024, 26% of total reported victims' age was unknown. The largest age group of a victim's age that was known was 18 and younger at 13%, followed by 18 to 24 at 12%, and 25 to 29 at 11%. 53% of the victims were reported as male, 14 as female, and 53 were reported as unknown. For homicides victim race, 49% were reported as unknown, 26% as White, and 24% as Black or African American. 91% did not have an ethnicity reported. Of the 13 with an ethnicity reported as Hispanic or Latino, their race was reported as unknown. 3% of the cases had notice of filed intent to seek the death penalty filed in 2024 reported. There was one offender who was a 2024 case, but their notice of intent was not filed until 2025, so it will be reported in the next year's submissions. Of the four notices of the filed intent, three were from Clark County and one was from Esmeralda County.

The majority of the 2024 cases have not yet had their final case disposition, with other and awaiting jury trial categories representing 11% and 75%, respectively, of the 2024 cases. 13% of the cases the defendant pled guilty, 1% of the case was dismissed, and 1% was found guilty by a jury trial. This represents one of the challenges we have faced with processing this data. Since this report has been inherited by NDSP, we have worked to continually improve the data collection process and final product.

With this year's reporting, the main problems we had stemmed from five challenges. First, the case filing and indictment date. There was a lack of clarity surrounding some of the dates, and we would like to make these more specific moving forward. Second was race and ethnicity. This is a required field for defendants, co-defendants, victims, and jury members, which is often unavailable to the DAs. Age data. We want to clarify the language to ensure we are getting the ages at the time of the incident. Counting. There's. Fourth, there was counting challenges. As I explained earlier, there is a risk of double counting victims and co-defendants due to separate case filings for related incidences. And last, the case dispositions. Reporting final case disposition for all closed cases, not just the current year's reporting cases, would provide valuable insight. NDSP has collected this data in alignment with the guidelines established by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, or OMB, in effect at the time of reporting. Throughout this process, we identified significant challenges faced by the District

Attorney's Office in reporting demographic information. Much of this data, whether pertaining to the defendant, co-defendant, or jurors, is self-reported. For victims, the information is often sourced from death certificates. Because demographic information is self-reported or secondarily sourced, individuals may identify in ways that do not always align with the standardized categories. Therefore, any instance of unknown for a demographic data point reflected these source limitations.

For example, victim race and ethnicity data is typically drawn from the coroner's report as listed on the death certificate. In one instance reported to NDSP in 2023, the victim was marked as a Mexican American, a classification that did not neatly correspond with the national reporting standards for race and ethnicity at the time. Additionally, in late 2024, the federal OMB revised its standards, combining race and ethnicity into a single question with seven available options and the choice to select all that apply. Similar to our earlier discussion on recidivism data, it may be worthwhile for Nevada to explore whether adopting a standardized approach to race and ethnicity data collection would improve the consistency and accuracy across agencies.

So, for moving forward, first we need to start by discussing what are the current goals of this report. As we begin this work, please take some time to reflect on what would best serve our stakeholders, the public, and the state of Nevada as a whole. What insights are we truly trying to gain from this report? Understanding our purpose will guide the improvements we will make and we'll be working on this throughout the coming years, so please feel free to share any ideas or suggestions as they arise. Second, one of the key challenges we are considering is to shift the reporting time frame. Rather than focusing solely on cases filed within a single year, we are exploring a model that would capture all new cases filed in the year, provide an update on all existing cases from prior years, and identify all cases that closed during the year. This approach would enable us to track the full lifecycle of the case from initiation to resolution, rather than just capturing it at a single point in time. It would also help us to better comply with Section 3 of NRS 178.750, which emphasizes providing updates on previously reported cases. Lastly, implementing some of these changes and rethinking the report's focus may require statutory updates in the 2027 legislative session. We are open to pursuing these changes and want to start considering what statutory revisions may be necessary based on the goals we define for this report.

Before we move into questions, I wanted to take a moment to thank the NDSP team. We received over 200 submissions and our staff dedicated a significant amount of time and effort to prepare and analyze the data so that we could present this information for you today. So thank you, team, for your hard work and commitment. We are excited to see how this report will continue to evolve and improve, ensuring that it provides a valuable insight for the state and our stakeholders in the years ahead. With that, are there any questions from the Commission?

Chair Herndon: Anybody have any questions for Deputy Director, Oh, yep, Dr. Bradley?

Dr. Shera Bradley: It's a question, I don't know if it's for you necessarily, Jenna, but I thought that when there are co-defendants that the case number was common, but then there would be a dash or hyphen 1, 2, 3, 4, depending on how many co-defendants. Is that not the case everywhere?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: I don't know what the case is for everywhere. I know that as we were working through the data, that was something we noticed. Something we want to explore is comparing the responses of the case numbers that share the same base case number and then have the dash 1, 2, or 3, like you mentioned, versus what the reported answers from the DA's office was for the co-defendants and compare how that lines up with the reported data.

Dr. Bradley: And then I guess my second question is, did, do we know what the legislative intent was in adding this reporting criteria? That's what you're kind of trying to figure out. Why are we doing this?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Yes, because like I said at the very beginning of our presentation, this originated in 2003 originally, and we've had a few years since that point, and so this might be a good opportunity for us to reevaluate where we see this report going moving forward and what insight we can draw from it to bring it 22 years into the future.

Dr. Bradley: Thanks.

Senator Melanie Scheible: This is. Scheible. I'm sorry, I couldn't find the return button.

Chair Herndon: That's okay. Go ahead, Melanie. Thank you.

Senator Scheible: Sorry, and my camera is also not working today. It's just not my day technologically, but I did want to respond to that question because I worked with the Department of Sentencing Correction in 2023 on a bill addressing part of this NRS and happy to do it again in 2027. I was going to follow up off line but I spent some time reading the minutes from back in 2003 about how the statute was structured at the time, and I think there are just some gaps in it. Conceptually, I think, you know, broadly the idea is to gather data on murder cases and how we're prosecuting them and when we're seeking the death penalty and to gather some information about race, gender, ethnicity, and age. And in the 20 years that have passed since then, we have tried to get more specific. And still, some of those things just aren't going to be neatly laid out in a case docket or a case file.

And so, we did a small update in 2023 to include the case numbers to hopefully address some of the issues with that cross-referencing. I thought, Ms. Buonacorsi, your slide with the four co-defendants and the one victim who looked like four victims was stellar. I mean, that was exactly the problem that we were trying to address in 2023. And I know we haven't done it completely because I don't think anybody in 2003 either meant for us to have bad data. They just, you know, wrote a bill that was, straight, was supposed to be straightforward. Report the data on the cases that have been filed without getting into the weeds of what happens when there are co-defendants, what happens when there are updates to a case in a new calendar year, what happens when, you know, a justice court case is dismissed and an indictment is sought and there's a new case number, things like that. So, I hope that gives a little bit of context.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you, Senator.

Chair Herndon: D.A Jackson.

D.A Mark Jackson: Thank you. This is just informational for Dr. Bradley. I agree with you that when there are multiple defendants that it should be under the same case number, but that's not what is happening in all the jurisdictions. I can speak specifically to Douglas County. We currently have a multiple defendant first degree murder case and the court has required, our justice court, really from what's provided by the district court judges, they require that they be separate case numbers. So, one of our current cases, we have a defendant that has a case number ending 890 and the other co-defendant is 891. There is no dash or hyphen with the letter that's attached to separate the two. So, that kind of can add to one of those issues. We have the same exact one victim. We're going to have two separate case numbers, two separate defendants.

Chair Herndon: I Don't see any other hands. Okay.

Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady: I did have a quick question, Chair.

Chair Herndon: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, go ahead, Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Brady: Christine Jones, Brady for the Record. Did we capture White Pine information and or homicides occurring in the prison in your report?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: If it was a report in that county that was going through that county's court, then yes, we would have that recorded.

Vice Chair Brady: Okay. It seems like there might be some information missing.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Okay. We will check with...

Vice Chair Brady: Let's follow up offline.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: ...White Pine County then, because yeah, we sent the survey out. We made sure we got a response from every county, whether it was a yes or a no, for what they had to report. And so, to our understanding, every county submitted all of the cases that they had for that calendar year. I think that is one of the things that we, one of the things we do want to clarify, because that was some of the challenges, is that question that we posed at the beginning, which is what is a 2024 case. And I think once we can clear up some of that language and rather have it provide what updates do you have from the year of 2024 or moving forward 2025 for all of your cases, that will help solve some of the date issues.

Vice Chair Brady: Sure. So, as you said before, if a homicide happened in 2024 but wasn't filed until 2025, it will be counted in the 2025 data.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Yes, if it's marked as a 2025 case beginning. So, we do currently collect the homicide date as one of the data points. So, it's one of the things we want to build is a timeline of the homicide date to the cases filing or the cases beginning the indictment or filing of the information and so on and so forth until the final case disposition. Thank you.

Ms. Julia Murray: Chair Herndon, this is Julia Murray. I apologize. I'm in the same boat as Commissioner Scheibel this morning.

Chair Herndon: No, you're all good. Go ahead, Julia.

Ms. Murray: I appreciate it. Thank you. One, I wanted to thank you for all of the clarifications the department this morning on this matter. I have had a history of making quite the temper tantrum about the numbers and the way they're being reported in the past. So, I also would like to say to Commissioner Jackson, thank you for making good on your word and taking this up at the DA meeting as you had assured me would in updating these forms. I think it shows in these reports this time that improvements were clearly made. I do have a question as to slide 15 when you track the dispositions. What exactly are you encompassing under the category of other? Is it not guilty? Because I can't really think of any other disposition that would remain given the categories you gave.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: A few of them were awaiting warrants and a few of them were competencies.

Ms. Murray: Okay. So, in the competency, they'd still be technically awaiting trial theoretically if we're going like pure on your categories. Where then do you reflect not guilty outcomes? I'm aware of some in Clark in 2024.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: I would have to look at the exact Clark County submissions we got for 2024. I know I had to work with Clark County's District Attorney on some of their responses. The 16 other counties used the online form for submission, but since Clark County had such a large number to submit, we worked with them with more of a data set type submission for them. Their answers didn't always as neatly fall into the pre-made categories that the other counties had to respond in with the other. I'd have to follow up and look into the responses from Clark County and what the raw data had said for those, but those were the breakdowns that the, that we had come to together.

Ms. Murray: Okay. That makes sense. I am actually aware that you were working by hand with Clark County. Alex Chen at the District Attorney's office actually included me in a lot of those discussions to make sure that we were not going to continue to have fights about numbers. So, I do appreciate being included in that discussion as well. I think that that is it for today's purposes. I would like to say that in your moving forward category, I believe it was your second item, and my note is unclear now. I'll follow up with you in writing, but you did have something on that list that I thought was very critical, and unfortunately, I didn't write your words down exactly, and it's not on your slide exactly. So, I'll follow up with you on that, but a few of those items that you guys are looking at, I'm more than happy to help you out with anything you need there, and I think that you're going in the right direction with these. So, thank you for your work.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you, Julia. We appreciate that and all of your help with this report as well.

Chair Herndon: I do not see any other questions. Okay. Deputy Director Buonacorsi, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you, Chair.

7. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Herndon: We will close agenda item number eight and move back to agenda item number seven, which is our report from Ms. Bledsoe on the local reinvestment grant presentation. So, Ms. Bledsoe, good morning.

Ms. Marie Bledsoe: Good morning. Thank you, Chair. Let me share my screen real quick.

All right. Can everybody see that?

Ms. Felipe: Yes.

Ms. Bledsoe: Okay. Thank you. So, good morning. I am Marie Bledsoe, for the record, a management analyst with the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy, and this presentation is an update on the 2024 Nevada local justice reinvestment \$3 million dollar grant program. So, there is a lot to catch up on with the NLJR grant, but I promise I'm going to go through this really quickly because it's been quite a meeting. So, today we are going to be reporting out on NDSP's required report to the Interim Finance Committee, results from six months of programmatic reporting, deobligated funds, and then a new round seven of grant funding.

So, the required Interim Finance Committee or IFC report was mandated in AB 388 from the 2023 legislative session. This legislation also created the \$3 million dollar Nevada local justice reinvestment grant and gave the Coordinating Council and the NDSP the authority to distribute these funds. That report was due December 20, 2024, and can be found on the NDSP's website at sentencing.nv.gov. Once you are on the main website, select the webpage called The Hub, and then scroll down to reports, and then select 2024. So, here are some highlights from the report. 20 applications were received over six rounds of funding. Those rounds of funding ran from March 18 through June 21, 2024.

Four peer review committees reviewed and scored 18 applications, and 11 applications received grant funding. The full \$3 million was granted, plus five recipients were governmental entities who were required to include a 30% match. This resulted in an additional \$288,000 in benefits to these communities for a total of \$3.288 million for our target population, which is people in reentry and recidivism prevention. Considering Nevada as a whole, eight rural counties received a shared total of \$623,827 in funding. Washoe County received \$782,000, and Clark County received \$1.5 million. In a broad view, here are three highlights from the report: \$1.4 million in granted funds are provided direct benefits to our target population. The direct benefits included job training, childcare, housing, and transportation assistance, to name a few. \$1 million in grant funding was for community health workers, therapists, counselors, case managers, and peer recovery support specialists. And then \$600,000 was allocated for other supportive services like fiscal and clerical staff, essential documents, needed supplies for completing mental health assessments and conducting drug screenings, and additional training for staff at the grant recipient organizations. I encourage all members of the commission to look at the report. The full report is 33 pages long, but only the first 11 pages were required. The final 22 pages are an appendix with two pages dedicated to each of the 11 grant recipients. A final NLJR grant report is due to the IFC on September 19, 2025. We plan to follow this same format in the final report and welcome comments or suggestions, any ideas that you have, anything you'd like to see, include or do differently. And again, this report is on the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policies website.

Moving on to programmatic results from the first six months of the grant, there were a couple of challenges to programmatic reporting. One challenge was the newness of the grant effort. The other is that each grant recipient was afforded the opportunity to set their own project goals. In this analysis, NDSP looked for places where the individual program results lined up and created three main project buckets for the grant awards from rounds one through six. Those buckets are MOST and FASTT teams. In this bucket, we have four grant projects, then mental health courts and substance use treatment with three projects in this bucket, and then training and employment as three projects in this bucket. Please note that adding up the numbers here comes to 10, not 11. The reason is we have one grant for victim services, which was a requirement of these grant funds. This one award has its own tiny little bucket. The results I'm going to be presenting here are for the performance period of June 1 through the end of December 2024. I think we've covered MOST and FASTT teams and their definitions. I will just mention one thing is that our observation of FASTT seemed to follow the two models with the organizations that had applied for this funding. One was through a county's human services department, and then a second model was services that were being run through a non-profit.

So, first, we've got Partnership Douglas County. This is a non-profit that maintains the funds for both the MOST and FASTT teams in Douglas County. The MOST mental health professional is paid by Partnership Douglas County. She wears a bulletproof vest and is partnered with the uniformed Douglas County deputy. The FASTT personnel and program runs out of the non-profit through a partnership with Douglas County Jail. Lyon County has been trying to create a new effort using pure recovery support specialists on their FASTT teams, and then Community Chest, which is a single non-profit operating in two counties, is pioneering a new way to run their

MOST and FASTT programs by using community health workers who are specially trained to also provide crisis intervention. They can be called in by the sheriff's department at a moment's notice, and as you will see, they also provide ongoing case management to create stability for the person in crisis. The Suicide Prevention Network is only operating in Douglas County, but provides deep emotional work in the jail.

The next set of statistics spans all four grants. The MOST staff have completed 13 initial calls with 70 follow-up calls. Please note that the heavy burden for this team is not the initial crisis call, but the follow-up work. The FASTT team in Douglas County expanded to start working with 12 low-risk offenders, and I want to mention that the NDSP's Executive Director, Jorja Powers, and our Deputy Director, Jenna Buonacorsi, and I conducted monitoring visits with some grant recipients. One interesting nugget we learned in Storey County is that Community Chest staff try to work with offenders in the jail, but most offenders do not want assistance because they do not live in Storey County. So this makes sense when considering that Virginia City is on the south side of Storey County, and there you're primarily jailing folks who are visiting the city, while the business park off of USA Parkway on the north end of Storey County is primarily made up of employees driving in from Washoe and Pershing counties. So this creates an interesting data point for future exploration. Our data question could be what percentage of those being jailed are county residents?

Programmatic results for bucket number two includes two mental health courts and a substance use disorder treatment facility. So here are grantees are Las Vegas Municipal Court and Carson City's Justice Municipal Court. We also have Ridge House, a substance use disorder facility in Washoe County. It's important to note that these programs accept a limited number of people, and once participants are accepted, the program takes 18 to 36 months to complete. So this time frame exceeds the 12-month performance period for these grant funds, and so limited data from these programs is available, but here's what we know. At the end of December, the programs had received 26 applications, with 24 of those applications being submitted to Ridge House, and the Las Vegas Municipal Court had two people from Mental Health Court pending for admittance into the program. There have been 11 enrollees, with six unique individuals successfully completing the program, and a second set of six unique individuals being terminated from the program for non-compliance. One other point I need to make is that Ridge House has been completely revamping their entire program, and for the performance period ending December 2024, had only accepted applications, but had not yet accepted people in re-entry into their new program. So that was going to start in February of 2025, and we'll have those results for you in a future presentation.

Bucket number three is a training and employment pool for three grant recipients. They are Humboldt County Human Services, the City of North Las Vegas' Youth Court, and the Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow, or FIT. So these grant recipients were collectively focusing on assistance services like housing, bus passes, gas cards. Job training includes a participant's chosen profession, like welding, truck driving, or warehouse jobs, while also including job and life preparedness training, like employment readiness, digital literacy, and financial literacy training. There is also data on the services being provided, like legal assistance, help enrolling in Medicare, and providing hygiene kits for participants so they are prepared for schooling or job interviews. And our final tiny little bucket, number four, is that single victim services grant to the Nevada Outreach and Training Organization, or NOTO, located in Nye county, and these folks have been busy.

Over the reporting period of June 1st through December 31st, NOTO assisted 278 primary domestic violence victims. 28 of these victims were children. One adult and seven children were driven to Las Vegas for a SANE exam. They also had 79 secondary victims. NOTO's advocates provided over 3,000 direct services to these victims, including assessments, intake, and direct advocacy services, like accompanying victims to court, securing temporary protective orders, and providing 18 victims with over 600 shelter bed nights. 38 victims attended support groups held at NOTO's facility in Pahrump.

And with that, we are now going to be shifting to discuss deobligated funds. So, it is important to know that deobligation is a normal part of grant management. However, the process can be unnerving as grant funds begin to sunset, which was the case with this grant. So, this chart may look familiar from past presentations. On the left, there is a column showing the major grant spending categories, like personnel, contracts, travel, etc. Next, there is a column for awards granted in rounds one through six, with the corresponding funds allocated for each spending category. Then, this chart has a column showing PCRs, project change requests. This is where grantees request to shift money between categories to keep funds in line with where their projects are going.

Here, you can see that most of the funds were moved from the personnel and supplies operating categories to the contractual, consultants, and travel categories.

In December 2024, grantees were asked to report a good faith assessment of whether grant funds would be fully spent in the remaining six months or would funds be deobligated. Holding grantees accountable took some cajoling and one emergency in-person meeting, but by mid-February, NDSP was aware that at least \$500,000 was going to be returned unspent, and by the 14th of March, you can see that this number had risen to almost \$900,000. Thanks to the Nevada Office of Financial Assistance and the Silver State Grant Conference held in Reno in February, NDSP identified seven contacts interested in applying for funding. A seventh round of funding was created that included a two-week application period and a peer review committee. Five applications were received and a three-month performance period from April 1st to June 30th was set. The peer review committees decided on the following grant awards.

The NLJR grant number 12 was the Northern Nevada Legal Aid located in Washoe County. This is a non-profit and it was awarded \$38,119, and it is our second victim services grant. The goal of this project is to provide legal aid to victims of crimes focusing on adult guardianship, consumer and housing protection, and their senior legal center. This assistance includes attorneys and staff helping victims navigate the justice system. NLJR grant number 13 is Quest Counseling and Consulting. This non-profit was awarded \$76,895, and their program is Behavioral Health Services for justice-involved individuals in Washoe County. With these funds, Quest primarily focused on individuals in drug court by providing therapeutic interventions, including enhanced drug testing, and then increased access to stable housing. NLJR grant number 14 is \$225,450 to Eddie House for their project titled Reentry for Youth Experiencing Homelessness in Washoe County. This project was designed to address the underlying factors that contribute to incarceration and recidivism among youth ages 18 to 24. Eddie House provides emergency shelter, trauma-informed care, and intensive case management.

NLJR grant number 15 is \$416,171 to the Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada located in Washoe County. Their project was titled Recidivism and Relapse Prevention, Peer Support Recovery, Residential Services, and Employment. Catholic Charities' goals include comprehensive support services, building supportive community networks, and removing barriers to reentry with a focus on long-term recovery. And finally, NLJR grant number 16 was for \$30,562 to Lincoln Community Coalition of Nevada in Tanaka. This project expanded what LCC offers to include therapeutic sessions with newly released offenders and transportation for clients going to either Las Vegas or St. George for in-house mental health care or in-house recovery programs. They added web-based life skills training for incarcerated individuals and provided reentry backpacks containing essential items when individuals are released from jail. Altogether, these five grants aggregate to \$787,197. The peer review committee for round number seven was very thoughtful in their deliberations and did not rubber stamp the grant applications received. Please note that three of the five grant awards were reduced from what was originally requested with over \$50,000 being reduced to award number 15 for Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada. Wrapping up, when round seven awards were complete on April 1st, the available funds being deobligated was at \$894,000 and the round seven awards came to \$787,000 bringing the deobligated amount to \$107,000. As grants have completed since April 1st, this number now stands at \$138,000 and NDSP anticipates deobligated about \$300,000. So those final numbers again will present all of that in a future presentation. Looking to the future, we anticipate reporting out on the monitoring visits that we had, a final financial reporting and then continuing the programmatic analysis that we've done so far.

And with that, Chair Herndon, that ends my presentation and I would love to take any questions.

Chair Herndon: Anybody have any questions for Ms. Bledsoe? Well, I guess you covered everything, Marie, so thank you.

Ms. Bledsoe: Thank you.

9. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Herndon: Okay, we will close agenda item number seven and jump back up to agenda item number nine, which is just a reference to our future meetings. We currently have our two future meetings set right now for September 19th, 2025 and then the November 14th, 2025 meeting, September being another remote meeting and the November meeting being an in-person meeting. As always, staff is already working on topics for

discussions at those meetings, but if anybody has any ideas about things they'd like to get on the agenda, please reach out to myself or more importantly to Director Powers and Deputy Director Buonacorsi and we can get items on that agenda for one of those two meetings. Is there anything that anybody has right now that they'd like to bring up for one of those future meetings? Okay, thank you.

10. Public Comment

Chair Herndon: With that, we will close agenda item number nine, move to agenda item number 10, which is our second period of public comment. Cecilia, do we have anybody on the line for public comment?

Ms. Felipe: Chair, we have no callers to wish to testify at this time.

Chair Herndon: Okay, then I won't go through that whole spiel. Thank you.

11. Adjournment

Chair Herndon: We will go ahead and close our second item of public comment, which brings us to agenda item number 11, which is simply our adjournment. Thank you, everybody. Director Powers, everybody in your staff for everything you've done to put the meeting together again. As always, thank you to our participants and our commission members for giving us your time today to be here. Anybody who's still with us that was involved in presentations, greatly appreciate that as well. And we will see everybody in September and we will be adjourned. Thank you.