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

DRAFT MINUTES

Date and Time: **March 20, 2026**

Location: **VIRTUAL ONLY**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Paola Armeni
Dr. Shera Bradley
Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Brian Filter, Esq.
Evelyn Grosenick
D.A. Chris Hicks
D.A Mark Jackson
Chief Tamrah Jackson
Deputy Director Troy Jordan
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
Captain Joshua Martinez
John McCormick
Isis Morales
Leisa Moseley-Sayles
Jarret Orcutt
John Piro
Chief Investigator Stephanie Shuman
Judge Kristin Luis
Judge Bita Yeager
Assemblymember Erica Roth
Senator Melanie Scheible
Senator John Steinbeck
Chair Douglas Herndon

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Director James Dzurenda
Erica Souza-Llamas
Brian Hibbetts
Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady

STAFF

Jorja Powers, Executive Director
Jenna Buonacorsi, Deputy Director
Marie Bledsoe, Management Analyst III
Erasmo 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: We will call to order the meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission of March 20, 2026. Good morning and welcome to everybody and thank you for your time for being here today. This is the third meeting of our 25-27 cycle and I will ask our Director, Jorja Powers, to go ahead and call roll if you would please.

Executive Director Powers: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone.

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

Chair Herndon: Perfect. Thank you. Okay.

2. **Public Comment**

Chair Herndon: We will move to agenda item number two, which is our first period of public comment. There are two periods of public comment during our meetings, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end of the meeting, giving the public two options to make comments during our meetings. The public also has the option if they wish to submit comments in writing.

If you wish to do so, you can submit it by email to the Department of Sentencing Policy and the email address is sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Any public comments submitted in writing will be distributed to the entire membership of the Commission for their review. If you wish to make a comment during the meetings, then we do so by telephone. So, due to time constraints, we have to limit everybody to two minutes and please keep your phones muted. And then when you're called upon to give comment, you can unmute and give comment and then continue to watch the meeting as you wish. So, I'm going to see, Felipe, if we have anybody that wishes to make comment.

Ms. Cecilia Felipe: Chair, we have no callers who wish to testify.

3. **Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission held on January 16, 2026.**

Chair Herndon: Great. Thank you. All right. Then we will go ahead and move on to, or close that agenda item and move on to agenda item number three, which is the approval of our last meeting minutes from January 16th, 2026. Did anybody have any corrections or comments to make about the meeting minutes? I do not hear or see any hands.

All right. Does anybody wish to make a motion to approve those meeting minutes? If they would, please.

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 16, 2026, MEETING.

JENNIFER LANTERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSES

4. **Director's Report**

Chair Herndon: We will note for the record, the approval of the meeting minutes from our last meeting. And that will move us to agenda item number four, which is our presentation from our director. So, Jorja, I will turn it over to you.

Director Powers: Thank you, Chair. I will share my screen. All right. Are we seeing my presentation?

Ms. Felipe: Yes.

Director Powers: Okay.

Chair Herndon: Yeah, it's up there, Jorja.

Director Powers: Okay. I think Zoom changed a little bit. I'm not seeing what I normally see. All right. So, we will begin. Hold on just one second. I apologize.

Okay. So, with administration…Administrative and Budget core functions, things have not changed much. We are fully staffed at this point. And in Budget, we are beginning the budget building process for the next biennium. In data and reports, we have received all of the submissions for 178.750, which is the homicide report. And those are being analyzed at this time. Later in the meeting, you will be seeing our presentation regarding the female population of the NDOC. We also are still working with the RCCD misdemeanor dataset we've received to facilitate the misdemeanor subcommittee. And let's see.

In Commission and Outreach, we were able to meet--Deputy Director Bounacorsi and I--with the majority of our Commissioners. We had one-on-one meetings to be able to meet new Commissioners, but also understand what is important to each. Here, you'll see the top topics that were brought up during our meetings, things that people would like to discuss further, have research done, and also presentations during meetings.

Recidivism was at the top of that list. Mental health and incarceration, NOC and NRS issues, and reentry came next. Many people talked about competency and civil commitments, long-term commitments without sentencing, truth in sentencing, victim restitution, and working groups that we are now allowed statutorily to do through the Commission. Next, AB4 from 2025, which was the governor's crime bill. Contraband in prisons, our data gaps, domestic violence, and sentencing guidelines, victim impact, youthful offenders were also heard.

Then we did talk about AB236 from 2019. We heard differing opinions on that, being able to protect what's in statute for 236, and also any changes that, we, the Commission might want to see happen. AB510 from 2007 was mentioned. That was what changed the credits for C, D and E nonviolent offenders to have time taken off the front of their sentences. Geriatric parole was mentioned. That is something that the department is already working on with DOC. When that statute came into being, they thought that it would let more people out of prison and onto parole for older population, but it only affected actually seven people. Intensive offender programming and case planning, medical care within incarceration, medical litigation costs, programming statistics, offender's fees and debt, smaller commission size, and temporary revocations were also things that we talked about.

If anybody did not have a meeting with us and would like to talk to us, or if there are any things that you thought were important that didn't make the list, you can let me know. So, I'm going to stop there right now.

Chair, we can either have a discussion about what we might want to see moving forward, or if we just want to take the top things as they come and start having presentations about them, that is fine also.

Chair Herndon: Well, let me just ask just with this and everybody's recollections of their meetings, is there any comments or questions that anybody has for the Director? I would say go ahead and keep going, Jorja. Thank you.

Director Powers: Okay, perfect. Thank you. All right.

Next, we're going to talk about our next meeting and the tour invitation that we received from DOC. Currently, our Commission meeting is scheduled in person in the South so that we could all come together as one body. That would be May 15th. What we have discovered is that that is the weekend for EDC and so, EDC usually brings 525,000 people to the area. So, flights would be very difficult. We have some options. We could do a virtual meeting as planned on May 15th, and we could push the tour off to the 29th. That way people would be able to travel.

Otherwise, we can cancel the meeting and have that tour on the 29th. The other option is to keep the tour on the 15th. However, again, flights are booked and it seems not very plausible that that is a good decision.

So, I will let you discuss that.

Chair Herndon: Is EDC the weekend before or the weekend after that?

Director Powers: It's the 15th, 16th, and 17th.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Director Powers: Yeah. And Memorial Day is the week before. So, I think it's the 25th.

So that is not a problem. It's not that 29th weekend. So, I honestly think that if we either want to continue our meeting, we could have it on the 15th, but we would change it to virtual. And if not, we could cancel that meeting. The 29th would be the best tour date unless we want to go ahead and push it forward into June. We do…we are not married to those dates for the tour.

Chair Herndon: Yeah, I can tell you the 15th for a tour date is difficult because that's also the date of our bar swearing-in ceremony. I mean, that's not until three o'clock in the afternoon, but nonetheless, to get out and back and take the tour, particularly if we had a meeting in that morning, would create some difficulties. Just speaking for myself and maybe some of the other judges or attorneys that are on the Commission as well.

So, it'd be my preference if we could find a different date for the tour.

I'm agnostic about whether we have the meeting that day or not. Does anybody else have any thoughts?

All of you that are coming to EDC, come up with a different date.

Ms. Evelyn Grosenick: Are there other dates that tours might be available?

Director Powers: Yes. The DOC is very open, so we can basically choose a date. And if we want to push that forward and I can send out a poll about dates and everyone can vote, that would be fine too. We don't have to decide the tour date today.

Ms. Paola Armeni: Jorja, this is Paola. You have May 29th on there. I know Justice Herndon was talking about May 15th, but is May 29th an option for all of us?

Director Powers: Yeah, that is an open date that we could tour, but if you…if that doesn't work for people, we can find others.

Chair Herndon: What does everybody think about May 29th? Does anybody have any scheduling conflicts right now that they know of for May 29th? Well, I think you may have found a date, Jorja.

Director Powers: Okay. I appreciate that. I am sorry for the confusion.

We did not know about EDC when we originally planned. So, what I am hearing is we will be having a virtual meeting on May 11th. I mean, I'm so sorry, May 15th. As our normal date, but we will change it to virtual. And then we will be reaching out to DOC for a May 29th tour.

Chair Herndon: Perfect.

Director Powers: Okay.

Chair Herndon: Thank you.

Director Powers: Perfect. And then I will be sending out information and asking the Northern Commissioners about their travel plans because we do have funds that can help with that. Okay. All right. In outreach, we have the National Association of Sentencing Commissions. The 2026 NAS Conference has been announced for August 12th through 14th. It will be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico. And so, everyone save that date. Last year, we did have, I believe, two or three Commissioners who were able to go.

And we do have travel funds that can help with that also. So please, if anybody is interested, reach out to me. And then are there any other questions?

Chair Herndon: Anybody have any questions for Director Powers?

Director Powers: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Do not hear any. Okay. All right. Thank you, Director.

Director Powers: Thank you.

5. **From Custody to Career: College as the Framework for Reentry Presentation**

Chair Herndon: And with that, we will go ahead and close agenda item number four, our report from the Director and move on to agenda item number five, which is going to be a presentation From Custody to Career: College as the Framework for Re-entry Presentation from one of our Commissioners, Jarret Orcutt with Truckee Meadows Community College Educational Partnership Programs Coordinator. Jarret, you're ready to go?

Mr. Jarret Orcutt: Yes, thank you so much, Chair.

Chair Herndon: All right. Take it away.

Mr. Orcutt: Thank you, I'm just gonna share my screen. Can everybody see my screen well? Thank you.

Good morning. And thank you so much for your time today. My name is Jarret Orcutt. And today I'm excited to walk through a framework I call From Custody to Career: College is a Framework for Re-entry. Before I start, I do want to make an important distinction about my role. Although I'm the Educational Partnership Programs Coordinator at Truckee Meadows Community College, and I'm going to share information about my programs today, the views I share should not be interpreted as the official positions of TMCC or the Nevada System of Higher Education. My views are my own. So today I'm speaking as a fellow member of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. And this is grounded in my own experience working at the intersection of education, workforce and re-entry.

What I'm going to share is first my own experience attempting to re-enter society after incarceration. And second, when I now see every day in my professional work supporting justice-involved students as they transition into college and careers. So, my goal today is simply to share what those experiences have shown me about where our system works and where I see that there are opportunities for Nevada to build something stronger.

So, I want to begin by thanking you for the opportunity to speak today and for the continued privilege of serving as a member of this Commission. To give some context for why this work matters to me, I spent 17 years incarcerated in the Nevada Department of Corrections. Each time I was released, I left with the same intention. I wanted something better, but things fell apart. Sometimes motivation faded, sometimes addiction resurfaced. Often it was simply, I couldn't get a job. So, when I speak about re-entry systems today, I'm not speaking only from policy or program experience, but from direct lived experience.

So, who am I today? Well, this May I'll graduate from TMCC with a Bachelor of Applied Science in CTE Leadership, summa cum laude. And I start graduate studies in the fall at University of Nevada, Reno's Master of Public Administration program. Professionally, I serve as the Educational Partnership Programs Coordinator at Truckee Meadows Community College. And in this role, I manage several programs that support students facing barriers to education, including the Displaced Homemakers Program in partnership with the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation, the SNAP Employment and Training Program in partnership with Division of Supportive Services and the JIVE Program, Justice-Involved Education in partnership with Nevada Department of Corrections and our justice system partners. Most importantly, I stand before you today as a member of the Commission representing organizations that advocate on behalf of incarcerated or formerly incarcerated individuals. And finally, I'm honored to serve as a 2026 Jobs for the Future Fair Chance to Advance Fellow. Through this national fellowship with the Center for Justice and Economic Advancement, my work focuses on aligning education, workforce, and correction systems to expand opportunity during reentry. And that's what I'd like to talk to you about today.

So, when I was inside, I thought of prison as time, punishment, survival, idleness. Now I work in workforce development and I see it very differently. Prison is a human resources system. It's a state-run pipeline that takes in people, does something to them for a period of time and then outputs them back to the community. And that's not a metaphor, that's an operational reality. The system can only do a few things well when a person is inside. It can train them, it can treat them, it can stabilize them, but most often you're left in idleness and that idleness isn't neutral. Idleness is training too. It trains people in hopelessness, criminal identity, and survival behaviors that simply don't work on the outside.

So, what is corrections for? Public safety, accountability, deterrence, yes. But once someone is incapacitated and their freedom's been taken, the real public safety question becomes what happens during that time and after release? Because the return on investment for the public is realized when that person comes back to the community. So if we return people to the same environment with the same skills, thinking patterns, instability that brought them into the system, we shouldn't be surprised when nothing changes. People don't magically transform on release day. So, reentry matters, but it can't carry the weight of the whole system. You can't exit your way out of a broken pipeline. If the middle of the sentence is mostly idle time, then reentry becomes an emergency response instead of a launch. And so the real opportunity, I believe, is inside of the sentence, that training window, the time we already control.

To understand the issue as I see it, we have to look at the volume of movement within our state. In 2024 alone, Nevada saw over 4,600 admissions and nearly 4,200 releases. At any given time, we have roughly 10,800 individuals within the system. And when we see thousands of people moving through this cycle annually, we have to recognize that this isn't just a collection of individual failures. It is a systemic churn that without interventions that actually alter a person's trajectory, the state is essentially running in place. Our population remains stable, our costs remain high, and our long-term public safety outcomes stay unchanged.

So, when we talk about incarceration, we usually focus on punishment, accountability, and public safety. But there's another reality for people who've lived inside. Time in prison isn't neutral. And what happens during that time matters for young people especially. Long sentences of idleness produce three predictable outcomes. First, identity hardening. The longer someone sits without constructive engagement, the more being a criminal becomes part of how they see themselves. Second, the criminal network exposure. Prison is a concentrated social environment. And the idle time often produces relationship building with other system-involved people. And that network follows you home. Third, no skill development. If someone leaves prison with the same or fewer skills than when they entered, we basically guaranteed a harder re-entry. And I know this personally. Early on, my education came from the culture around me, not from formal programming. It took time before structured programming and real education shifted my direction. Now, to be clear, I'm not arguing for less accountability or shorter sentences. I'm saying that once the state takes control of someone's time, we're responsible for what happens with that time. And the real question isn't only how long the sentence is. It's what we do with the time.

If someone isn't in education, treatment, or work, they're just sitting on the tier often. And the tiers are flooded with drugs and violence that doesn't produce stability. They produce hopelessness. And when people feel like nothing matters, prison culture takes over.

But when environments are structured, people respond differently. We've seen it in structured living programs like in Lovelock, routines, clear expectations, accountability, stability. People like and value the structure because it replaces the chaos. And I'm not suggesting an expansion of boot camp models. I'm suggesting that programming units, drug-free environments, education pathways, clear expectations, and pairing housing structure directly with education and programming. Because if time is idle, we shouldn't be surprised by the outcomes. But when it's structured with education, training, and purposeful activity, we can produce very different outcomes when people return to the community.

So, when I last spoke to the Commission, I'd been in my role for about a month. And at that time, I had a lot of belief in education. I had my own experience as someone who had gone through education while incarcerated. I could see the impact on individuals, and I knew that education changed identity. I knew it created hope. But over time, I've learned a lot more. I've now been able, I've now been in this position for about two years, and I'm able to look back at students who've been out for three or four years and see what actually happens after graduation. And what I'm seeing now is that the impact is not just identity change, it's long-term stability. I'm watching students who graduated a year or two ago continue to move up in their careers. Some are now earning six-figure salaries. Some are leading teams in manufacturing and skilled trades. Others are continuing their education and building more credentials. But these aren't isolated, they're patterns. So, the difference between what I knew then and what I know now is really this: Two years ago, I believed that education worked. Today, I can see what it produces, long-term employment, stability, and safer communities.

So, I want to share an example of what this pathway can look like for one of our students. Danny Vasu graduated from Truckee Meadows Community College with his Associate of Applied Science in Machining and Manufacturing Technologies, earning a 3.98 GPA, while he was still in transitional housing. And while he was still in the machining program, Danny worked with the career hub at TMCC to connect him with an internship in the field. That internship quickly turned into full-time employment. He built an incredible rapport with his employer, and he's now a key member of leadership in his company. And what's really impressive about Danny

is he didn't stop there. After stabilizing his career, he came back to TMCC and is now pursuing his Associate of Applied Science in Welding so he can continue building higher-level technical skills, as well as dual declaring for the Applied Business Management Bachelor's Degree program. So, Danny's story shows what happens when education, workforce training, and employer partnerships line up. And it's exactly the type of outcomes that these programs are designed to produce.

Another great student, Danny Weiss, really shows how education can become foundational to your journey. Danny's one of our justice-involved education students, and before prison, he had strong technical skills and a lot of intelligence, but addiction pulled those abilities in the wrong direction. He became involved in credit card fraud and selling stolen goods to support his drug use, and eventually he went to prison. And when he entered prison, the gap between what he knew he was capable of and the reality of where he was became impossible to ignore. Over time, he began taking classes and participating in programs. Eventually, he transferred to Stewart Conservation Camp, where he worked on wildfire crews with NDF. And there he became a crew leader on wildfire response teams, directing crews and gaining real leadership experience.

Later, he transferred to Northern Nevada Transitional Housing Center and enrolled in TMCC and information technology. Now, after his release, a former supervisor from his forestry crew encouraged him to apply for a position with NDF. And because of recent legislation passed by the Nevada Legislature, agencies were able to evaluate Danny based on his experience and skills rather than automatically disqualifying him because of his record. He was hired. And while working for the state of Nevada, another opportunity opened with the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources in IT. Danny didn't hide his past, he addressed it directly. And when students come prepared and show the effort they've put into rebuilding their lives, many employers are willing to give that fair chance. Today, Danny Weiss works for the state of Nevada as an IT tech IV while continuing his education at TMCC. And Danny's story is what public safety looks like when education works.

I want to highlight one last example, Mr. Reese Frye. Reese was sentenced at age 23 as the youngest habitual offender in Washoe County at the time. And statistically, people who enter the system that young with multiple convictions struggle to change their trajectory. But a few years ago, while serving his sentence, Reese heard that individuals in Northern Nevada transitional housing were able to start taking classes in person

while incarcerated. And that opportunity changed everything for him. He made the decision to do what he needed to do and stay out of trouble and work his way through the system until he earned placement in transitional housing.

About a year ago, he began taking classes through justice-involved education at TMCC. And today he holds a 3.69 GPA in diesel technology and is progressing towards his Associate's Degree. What's interesting about Reese is he's not just thinking about getting a job, he's thinking about the future of the industry. He talks about pairing diesel technology with business management and logistics, eventually managing fleets of vehicles and maintenance operations. So, Reese's goal is to position himself in that space, combining technical expertise with management and logistics. And again, what made this possible is that when he left custody, he didn't start from scratch. He walked directly from transitional housing back into the classroom, continuing his education and the pathway he'd already begun. And that continuity is exactly what successful re-entry should look like. And Reese has told me that what it meant to him, without education, release feels like stepping off a cliff. With education, it feels like a runway.

So, everyone wants to know what's in it for us. Let's look at return on investment. These figures come from TMCC's 2025 Economic Impact Report conducted by Lightcast. And from the student perspective, for every dollar invested in education at TMCC, students receive $6.20 in higher lifetime earnings. The average annual rate of return is 20.7%. And associate degree graduates earn about $9,100 more per year than someone with only a high school diploma. So, over a career, that's gonna compound dramatically. And from the taxpayer perspective, for every public dollar invested, taxpayers receive $1.80 back. And that includes added tax revenue from higher earnings, reduced demand for public services, specifically lower justice system costs, reduced health expenditures, decreased income assistance usage.

So, from a broader social perspective, the return is even stronger. For every dollar invested, society receives $9 back. Total long-term social benefits equal approximately $1.1 billion and that includes increased income, stronger business output, and measurable social savings. So, from three perspectives, student, taxpayer, and society, TMCC is a net positive. And when we're talking about public policy, sentencing reform, workforce development, or long-term economic stability, these are measurable returns tied directly to education.

So, we often treat release from prison as a celebratory moment. Like someone simply walks out the gate into freedom. But for many people, that moment is actually the beginning of acute anxiety. Day one is a scramble. Maybe someone has saved a little gate money, enough to get two weeks at a motel. But the reality of day one usually looks like this: no ID, no transportation, and a social circle that's the same someone had before incarceration. The people around you are the people you knew inside, before prison, the people you met inside, or the people living around you in those same motels. In that moment, it is extremely difficult to build a new network of positive support.

People are not looking to fail, but the system they step into often makes success very difficult. You are dealing with immediate survival problems, anxiety, and pressures of supervision. Even when someone is doing everything right on day one, they are already afraid of making a mistake and terrified of their parole officer. So that's what makes the JIVE pathway different. For our students, re-entry doesn't start at the gate, it starts months earlier. If someone is releasing to NNTH, they're already enrolled with us before they ever parole. They're thinking of themselves not as a parolee anymore, but as a student.

Part of that transition is our partnership with Reconnect 180. They work with individuals before release, helping them obtain identification, connect with Department of Motor Vehicle Services, and prepare for re-entry during that critical window before they ever walk out the gate. We have an information sharing agreement between Reconnect 180 and TMCC, so we're able to coordinate that transition directly. So, when someone paroles, they're not getting dropped off in a motel or at the parole office. They're getting picked up at the parole office and brought to campus. And that first moment matters. We sit down together in the campus cafe, talk about schedules, classes, enrollment, financial aid, and what the next two years are going to look like. And that's a psychological shift. Instead of survival mode, they're thinking about structure. Instead of worrying about the next few hours, they're thinking about semesters, degrees, careers. And some…when someone is planning two, four, or five years into the future, it changes how they make decisions in the present. And I'm not saying that it guarantees success. Nothing does. But that shift from survival to structure is what changes trajectory.

So, let's talk about why I believe education must scale as Nevada expands transitional custody.

The good news is that the Legislature has already moved in this direction through SB 457 and AB 321. Nevada expanded alternative custody and transitional housing options. This means more individuals are now going to be serving part of their sentence under supervision in the community. Roughly 300 placements per year are currently projected through these pathways. And also, the legislator added another tool through AB 4, which authorizes the director of the DOC to establish alternative correctional programs, including determining who qualifies and assigning individuals into the program. In other words, Nevada is not only expanding community supervision pathways, it's also creating new structured custody programs designed to support that transition back into the community.

So, there's an operational reality that comes with that expansion, though. Many of these individuals that will be on house arrest or other…other forms of structured supervision. When someone is on house arrest, idle time increases the risk of violations. So, the question is, what are we asking people to do with that time? What I have seen from working with these students is that college fits extremely well into that structure. Students attend class, they're on campus, they're in a supervised environment. Parole and probation officers often like seeing individuals engaged in education because it is structured and accountable. In the two years I've been running the JIVE program, we've had students in diversion courts, specialty courts, supervision programs. We've not had a single supervision violation originate on campus. And what works is structure. Work combined with college enrollment creates a predictable schedule, classes, assignments, milestones, and progress. That structure becomes the anchor during reentry.

Programs like JIVE help provide the anchors. Students enroll in workforce-aligned programs, they stack credentials and begin building a real employment pathway. The outcomes we see are…align with what I'm sure lawmakers want to achieve, reduced violations, increased employment, and more stable reentry. So, as Nevada continues expanding transitional custody, the policy question becomes, are we scaling the structured educational opportunities that make that transition successful?

So, one question people often ask when they hear about prison education programs is how is this work funded? Who's paying for it? The key point here is that this is not charity. It's actually a relatively small public investment that produces a significant public safety return. Nevada makes a modest investment through the Nevada Prison Education Program under Budget Account 101-3017 administered through the Nevada System of Higher

Education. Those funds support core infrastructure required to deliver college courses inside correctional facilities, instructors, coordination, and program delivery. But what makes this model powerful is what that small investment unlocks. With the restoration of Pell Grant eligibility for incarcerated students, federal financial aid can now support eligible students who enroll in college while in custody. So those federal dollars flow directly to the Nevada colleges providing instruction. Colleges braid those funds together with other resources to sustain these programs. So, the result is a relatively small state investment producing significant workforce and public safety outcomes.

So where do these students come from? What you're looking at here are some of the justice partners that currently refer students into the program. Right now, the pathway into higher education for justice-involved individuals is still fragmented, but locally it is working because of strong partnerships. On the correction side, we work closely with the Nevada Department of Corrections. Our computer lab at the Northern Nevada Transitional Housing allows individuals leaving custody to continue their education immediately instead of waiting until after release. And actually many of our students are transitioning in the middle of the semester. That's something I'm exceptionally proud of in many programs across the country. Students are not allowed to start school if they have a parole eligibility date coming up. The assumption is that they might leave before the semester ends, but the problem, parole eligibility is not a guarantee and someone might delay education for months or even years waiting for a hearing that gets denied. So, we do the opposite. If someone is ready to start, we enroll them. Now, beyond corrections, we also receive referrals directly from the courts, both Reno Municipal Court and Second Judicial District Court regularly refer individuals from their Specialty Courts.

So let me bring this down to what it actually looks like on the ground at Truckee Meadows Community College. Across our three educational partnership programs, we're currently serving 227 students. The largest group is Justice Involved Education or JIVE. We have 158 total students with 72 actively enrolled this semester. Of those, 22 are currently incarcerated in Northern Nevada Transitional Housing with seven paroling during the semester and about 10 other students that are on house arrest currently. And so, when I started till now, we really exploded in scale from about 34 students when I started to 158 today. And what that means in practice is that we're already really operating a custody to campus pipeline here. Students begin education while incarcerated and continue that pathway immediately upon release. Our Displaced Homemakers program serves 29 students with 20

currently enrolled. These are individuals rebuilding financial independence after separation, loss of income, or other major life disruptions. And the SNAP Employment and Training Program serves 40 students with 25 currently enrolled, supporting individuals receiving SNAP benefits who are working towards education and employment. Now, these students don't arrive randomly. They come through the partnerships of Nevada Department of Corrections, Specialty Courts, Parole and Probation, housing providers, workforce agencies, SNAP caseworkers, and internal TMCC referrals. Really, these programs are functioning as a regional re-entry infrastructure linking corrections, education, and workforce pathways.

So, let's take a look at how these students are actually doing. When we look at academic performance, one of the things we consistently see is that our justice-involved education students perform very well academically. Right now, the average GPA for students in the program is about 3.31, which is above what you typically see across community colleges nationally. Now, I want to be clear that doesn't mean that every student walks in performing at that level. Our students come in at very different academic starting points. Some have been out of school for years. Some are returning after incarceration. Others are balancing court supervision. Housing challenges and employment while trying to rebuild their lives. But what we consistently see is that once students are in structured educational environments, outcomes improve. And that ties directly to what we've talked about on previous slides. First, structure matters. College provides routines. Students have classes, assignments, expectations, timelines. And for many individuals coming out of chaotic environments, whether that's at home or in carceral settings, that structure alone creates stability.

Second, there's intensive support. Our students are not navigating systems alone. They have direct communications with program staff, access to advising, connections to campus and community resources. Third, and this one is important, the clear long-term goals change motivation. When someone sees a pathway to a credential, a career, and honestly, a different identity, their level of engagement changes dramatically. And finally, accountability is built into the system. Many of these students are involved with specialty courts or other forms of supervision. So, progress in school becomes part of how they demonstrate stability and move forward. So, when we see strong academic outcomes, it's not accidental. It reflects a combination of structure, support, accountability, and clear career pathways all working together to help students succeed.

So, this slide is just a snapshot of the student stability ecosystem that's surrounding many of our students at Truckee Meadows Community College. So, these are some of the places where our students are living, stabilizing, receiving services, and building support where they're enrolled. What matters is that this works in both directions. TMCC connects students to these organizations and these organizations also refer people to us for education and workforce pathways. For many returning citizens, education only becomes possible because of this broader support network that exists around them.

So, I want to talk briefly about the Hudson Link Reentry Capacity Initiative and the gap we're trying to address with it. Right now, Northern Nevada does not have a centralized reentry coordination system. Services exist, but they're scattered. Through this $50,000 pilot grant, it is designed to rebuild some of that coordination locally anchored at Truckee Meadows Community College through our justice-involved education program. There are three main parts to the grant. The first goal is to connect the programs that already exist by creating a regional reentry council with the Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce. The goal is to have this group meet quarterly to bring agencies and employers together, improve referrals, and host fair chance hiring events.

Second, we're building a mentor network made up of justice-impacted individuals who have successfully navigated education and employment. We have already hired five mentors who will conduct outreach in jails, specialty courts, transitional housing programs, helping individuals understand available education and workforce pathways, and connecting them to services before and after release. Third, we are building a shared digital services directory and a referral toolkit so partners across the region can coordinate referrals more easily. The goal is simple. Demonstrate what coordinated reentry support looks like when higher education serves as the anchor. When students see mentors who have walked this path and when employers are part of the system early, it becomes easier to move from supervision to education and employment.

That said, the way transitions currently happen for students participating in higher education in prison is still largely informal. A student may write a request asking how they can continue college after release. Sometimes a prison coordinator passes that request to the campus contact. Sometimes there's a person-to-person handoff. Sometimes a previous student calls and says, hey, such and such is about to get out. Families occasionally call the college asking if a reentry program exists. Sometimes individuals simply show up on campus after release looking for information. These pathways depend heavily on outreach and relationships rather than formal

transition processes. And in many cases, college coordinators step up, make these connections happen. Institutions have built meaningful partnerships and people genuinely care about supporting these students.

But those transitions are not guaranteed, and a coordinator at another college may be responsible for 80 students, dozens of classes, and many competing responsibilities. So, transition support at that level is rarely formally resourced. We are also seeing challenges around credit for prior learning. Many individuals have long work histories interrupted by incarceration, recovery, or other setbacks. They may have earned certifications years earlier or taking college courses in another facility or another state. And sometimes those credits are difficult to verify or transfer. So, housing changes, institutional movement, and release timelines can also interrupt educational continuity. When individuals are told simply to reconnect with the college after release, higher education is not always the first priority. Housing, employment, stability are going to come first. And what becomes visible at scale transitions are relationship-based rather than protocol-based. And there's not yet a standardized statewide transition framework for post-secondary education. There is no shared cross-agency data system consistently connecting corrections, higher education, workforce systems, and employers. Colleges are tracking outcomes locally. Coordinators are investing significant time in building employer partnerships, celebrating workforce placements, and advancing fair chance hiring initiatives, but that coordination remains decentralized and dependent on individual campus capacity.

So, I want to shift for a moment from what we're doing today to what the future could look like. And I've titled this idea the Warm Springs Vision, but the concept really applies to any Nevada facility, whether that's Warm Springs, Northern Nevada Correctional Center, or others. Across the country, we're seeing movement towards education-centered facilities where learning and workforce development become the organizing structure of the yard. And when that happens, the culture of the yard changes. Instead of idleness, instability, and informal prison economy shaping daily life, the environment begins to revolve around class schedules, assignments, trade training, and measurable progress. There's a few components that make that possible. First is college inside defense. That means real classrooms, trade shops, and direct degree pathways. Not just occasional programming, but structured partnerships between the Nevada Department of Corrections, community colleges, unions, workforce training providers. Second is a secure technology infrastructure across the country. Incarcerated students, even

in maximum security units, are participating in Zoom classes and accessing their learning platforms from secure laptops. That technology already exists. The question is simply whether Nevada chooses to scale access to it.

Third is something that may sound unconventional…unconventional, but has proven powerful in other systems, lifers as educators. If someone is serving a 20-year sentence, we should ask a simple question, what are we doing with that time? In some states, individuals serving long sentences complete advanced degrees and become peer instructors inside the facility. They help teach the classes, tutor the students, and stabilize the learning culture on the yard. It builds the internal capacity and reinforces the norms. And finally, this works best in zero-tolerance programming yards. Drug-free, privilege-protected learning environments, places where participation in education and programming could come with incentives, a combination of structure, incentive, opportunity, as well as zero-tolerance changes behavior. Because people respond to environments where progress is possible. And when a prison yard begins to function like a campus with security rather than simply a warehouse with cells, I think you start to see very different outcomes. So, the goal is simple. If the state is going to control years of someone's life, we should be intentional about…intentional about the environment we place them in. And an education-centric facility turns that time into preparation rather than stagnation.

And let me shift also to something that's changed dramatically in Nevada over the last couple of years. The digital learning infrastructure that's now inside our correctional facilities. So, most Nevada prisons have the secure tablets deployed across their units. And through platforms like Edovo, people in custody have access to massive libraries of content, including GED prep, career exploration, financial literacy, academic subjects like algebra, business, computer literacy. Now, the public debate recently has focused on the price of messaging, video calls, and media content. And while those are legitimate policy debates, from an educational perspective, something much bigger is happening. Nevada has quietly deployed the largest digital education content library ever available in our correctional history. Thousands of hours of learning material already sitting inside our facilities. And the issue now is an access to the content. The issue is what happens next. Almost all of this coursework on these platforms is currently non-credit. A person can complete dozens of courses and spend hundreds of hours learning. But when they walk out of custody, that work does not translate into recognized college credit or workforce credential.

So, at TMCC, our advisors are already seeing people coming home who have spent substantial time working on these tablets. We've adapted our credit for prior learning procedures to review this work using CPL assessments and CLEP testing to bridge coursework to translate their effort into actual college credit. The goal is simple. If someone did the work while they were incarcerated, they shouldn't have to start from zero when they arrive at college. But we have to be honest, tablets alone cannot support a full college education. Accredited courses require learning management systems, research tools, and live virtual classrooms. Other states have already solved this by deploying secure academic laptop systems inside their prisons. And these laptops allow enrolled students to access their course platforms and join live instruction via Zoom, all on tightly controlled secure networks. And this would create a layered technology model where we have tablets provide broad access for the general population, while secure laptops support students formally enrolled in degree programs. These systems can be deployed through partnerships between corrections and colleges separate from telecommunications contracts.

There's also one final critical piece, data. Because right now, Nevada lacks a unified system linking corrections, higher ed, and workforce agencies. We can't easily track a person's education, credential attainment, and employment outcomes across agencies. Without the shared data, the state cannot fully measure the return on investment of these programs. And so the opportunity before the Commission is to design the system that turns these activities into recognized credentials and workforce outcomes. We should consider establishing a cross agency working group to look at this infrastructure, connecting tablet learning to advising systems, assessment pathways, and the secure computing needed for full college instruction. The learning is already happening inside. Our job at the schools is to build the pathway that leads to a career. Another idea I want to talk about is a targeted community college education benefit for NDOC employees and their families. Now, I'm not, I wouldn't frame this as another unfunded mandate on the Nevada system of higher education. I wouldn't broaden it to every public employee. I think it loses the policy focus and probably loses the politics as well. What I'm talking about is more narrow and intentional. If we're asking correctional officers and staff to prioritize programming, help move people to class, support the idea that education matters inside of correctional settings, then I think that officers and their families should be able to benefit from higher education as well. A lot of these families make too much to qualify for Pell, but that does not mean that college feels affordable.

And also on paper salary does not always reflect take home reality, especially when retirement contributions and the structure of correctional compensation are factored in. So, this is not just a financial aid idea, it is a culture and workplace idea. It says that education matters across the entire correctional ecosystem. It says that if we want the Department of Corrections to see higher education as part of public safety, then that value should not stop at the cell door. I also think that this is politically more viable than other broad proposals because it's targeted, practical and tied directly to workforce recruitment, retention and institutional culture. And for me, the real value is a narrative shift. We've rightly expanded college access for incarcerated learners, but we want education become part of the identity of corrections in Nevada. I believe the NDOC officers and their families should be included in that story as well.

So basically, two near term policy options for the Commission. The first recommendation is about formalizing the transition from custody to campus. Right now, students make it through because someone knows someone. A coordinator makes a call, a case manager has a relationship with the campus contact that works at a dozen students or dozens, it doesn't scale to thousands. And so we need standardized handoff protocols between NDOC, NSHE and reentry programs.

So every person leaving with educational interest has a clear pathway to enrollment. Also, designing the data sharing from the ground up would give us workforce recidivism data that would make funding the right programs easy. The second piece is the digital infrastructure. Tablets are deployed across facilities and people are using them thousands of hours of content, but that learning doesn't connect to anything on the other side. So TMCC has already adapted credit for prior learning and CLEP testing to bridge the gap. But the broader system hasn't caught up and there's a lot of opportunity there. And for students formerly enrolled in college, students with many years left of their sentence, tablets can't do what secure academic laptops can. Other states are already running Zoom style courses inside maximum security units. Nevada needs to evaluate whether we can do the same.

Moving to medium term, this one is about changing what a facility is organized around. Instead of idleness being the default and programming being the exception, you flip it. Credit bearing coursework, workforce credentials, peer educators, drug free programming units. And I believe the culture changes when education becomes the norm. And then the correctional officer benefit. I strongly believe that correctional officers, program staff, administrators, they're the ones making programming work inside facilities. If you want education to be part of

the identity of corrections, their families should be included in that story as well. It's also recruitment and retention tool for a workforce that has been under real pressure. And I think all of these are grounded in what we're already doing and what the evidence supports.

So there's no debate as to whether or not education works. The research is clear on that. I actually, national research on higher education in prison is very consistent over the past decade. One of the most widely cited findings comes from Vera Institutes of Justice, which reports that people who are to participate in college and prison programming have 48% lower odds of returning to prison compared to those who do not participate. And large national meta-analysis, including the RAND Correctional Education Study and more recent 2023 review of nearly 80 research papers reached similar conclusions. Across these studies, participation in post-secondary education during incarceration is associated with substantially lower recidivism and stronger employment outcomes after release. So, the percentage is, when you account for even the differences between national percentages and what we're using to measure in Nevada, people who participate in higher education while incarcerated are less likely to return to prison, more likely to obtain employment, and more likely to achieve long-term stability after release.

So, we already have programs producing results. We have students who started coursework while incarcerated who are now employed, enrolled, and contributing. The legislative framework is here. The funding exists. What I see missing is coordination to connect all of it into something consistent and statewide. Every year, thousands of people leave Nevada's correctional facilities, and the state controls what happens during that time. The question is whether we're going to use that time intentionally or keep releasing people into the same conditions that brought them in. I will please direct the Commission to take the time and review the policy brief that accompanies this presentation, as that contains the same proposals and issues in greater depth.

And thank you so much, Chair. I'm happy to take any questions.

Chair Herndon: Thank you, Jarret. Real quick, Director Powers, will you note that Judge Yeager joined us as well, so she's present?

Director Powers: Yes, Chair.

Chair Herndon: Okay, before I ask for any questions, let me tell you something, Jarret. You don't need my approval, but I am incredibly proud of you, my friend. I've been involved in the criminal justice system in a variety of ways for 36 years, because I'm an old man at this point.

But you are what everybody hopes in their life, that we don't get defined by the lowest moments, and we do things to constantly try and improve ourselves and are a really terrific example of how improving yourself has trickling effects throughout your community and our state. So good on you. This was a wonderful presentation, and I have a question before I let anybody else ask questions, which is the 200 or so total students across the three programs right now, is that just because that's the number that's there, or is that because of the budget?

Is that because of the capacity to have people in that program? Are we maxed out right now, or how does that work?

Mr. Orcutt: So that's just currently my capacity.

Chair Herndon: Right.

Mr. Orcutt: And so as we scale, we hope to actually take on additional staff and scale as well. For our justice system partners, we have never had to say no or turn anyone away. Essentially, our goal at Northern Nevada Transitional Housing every semester is to enroll as many students already. And then constant referrals from our, whether it's our Specialty Courts, those referrals are happening often mid-semester, summer, winter. So, you know, sometimes they might happen a week after school's already started. So it's like, so it's really the capacity is just based on staffing. I believe that TMCC and the other colleges can accommodate many more students.

Chair Herndon: But you'd need more of a budget, I'm assuming, to get more staff to kind of beget growth.

Mr. Orcutt: Absolutely.

Chair Herndon: Okay, and if I read the other things that you gave us correctly, you all have like less than $100,000 in your budget that comes from the Legislature, yeah?

Mr. Orcutt: That's correct. We really, because we are getting reimbursed on our tuition, a lot of times we're not actually charging our tuition. So, we're able to get money back on the next semester and pay it forward. But yeah, we are operating pretty slim and using every dollar.

Chair Herndon: Okay, thank you. All right, I know I saw a number of hands that were up, but I don't have everybody on my screen right now, let's see. Well, maybe I didn't. I thought I saw some hands up. Did anybody have any questions?

Ms. Felipe: Chair, I believe those were claps.

Chair Herndon: Oh, oh, okay. John, I see your hand on the screen.

Mr. John Piro: Thank you, Justice Herndon. Jarret, what's the likelihood of getting a program like this in the South? Or is there even one? Because this is the best presentation I've heard in a very long time.

Mr. Orcutt: So, at Casa Grande right now, Dr. Minter is operating some programs that are very similar in nature. I have tried to focus on that transition. When I first started, if someone was going to be paroling two months into the semester, I'd say, eh, let's just wait. But now I see it very differently. That continuity of getting dropped off on Wednesday morning at the office, then brought to campus and no change is just really powerful. And I can't tell you the specifics on how Casa Grande's model is working, but I will find out more and circle back with you, John.

Chair Herndon: Okay, do we have any other questions? I don't see any hands up on the screen.

Ms. Leisa Moseley-Sayles: Hi, Justice Herndon, this is Leisa Moseley. I have a question.

Chair Herndon: Yes, please go ahead, Leisa.

Ms. Moseley-Sayles: Jarret, I want to thank you for such a thorough, enlightening presentation. There were some parts of your presentation that I'm familiar with and many you highlighted that I didn't know. My question is related to some of the barriers for re-entry.

You highlighted some things that employment is a priority over education, housing and things like that. My question is, in your experience personally or with others that you are in contact with, formerly incarcerated folks, has debt upon release been an issue? We see it in my, I see it in my work sometimes when people are attempting to get housing and they can't find employment and they have this debt that they come out of incarceration with that they have to pay back, and sometimes they're leaning on family members or they're doing whatever they can to pay that debt back. Have you seen that as a barrier to folks being able to get into your program and complete it successfully?

Mr. Orcutt: Thank you so much for the question. It can be, yes. So, I enrolled at TMCC in 1999 and I got the Pell Grant and I dropped all five classes after a couple of weeks and I owed my Pell Grant back. And so when I released in 2010 and tried to go to college, I went up to the school and was told no, I would have to pay back to go to college. And I ended up relapsing and going back to prison. And so now when we have students that have back, they owe some sort of debt to the school. We figure out how to work around that, whether that's a payment plan. So, I'm communicating with students. Thankfully, WNC is operating in NNCC. So, students have reached out to the coordinator there and said, hey, I know I owe some back money to TMCC or I know I messed up in the middle of semester. How can I do this? So, we can start looking at how we do financial aid appeals.

Often if the student was arrested or had some sort of issue or something, if we can find documentation of what happened during that semester, we can get them on an academic appeal so that it can be forgiven if they complete this semester or next. And so we really build a plan. So if you tell me that I owe the school $5,000, I can't go to college, I'm going to say, OK, this is how we figure that out. Yes, it's a barrier, but I see barriers as a plan. If you say, OK, well, OK, so we have a six month on ramp instead of a one month on ramp, you know, it's just checking boxes. But thank you so much for the question.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else have any questions for Jarret? OK, Jarret, thank you again very much. And like John, I would look forward to whatever assistance you might be able to provide and information you could help us out with as to whether or not there's a kind of a pathway to making a program like that down south.

Mr. Orcutt: Thank you so much, Chair.

6. **Data Report**

Chair Herndon: OK, we will close that agenda item, which was number five, and move over to agenda item number six, our NDSP data report from Deputy Director Buonacorsi. On the Department of Correction's Female Population. So, Jenna…

Deputy Director Jenna Buonacorsi: Thank you, Chair, let me share my screen. All right. Good morning, everyone. My name is Jenna Buonacorsi and I'm the Deputy Director for the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy. Today, we'll be covering the overall Nevada population trends and NDOC female population looking at

total population, all offenses and admissions. Department of Sentencing Policy's current and future data projects, and as well as our contact information and a time for questions.

At our last presentation, we were asked a question about the Nevada Department of Corrections population compares to the racial and ethnic makeup of Nevada's overall population. Per the Nevada Department of Taxation, Nevada's population is estimated at 3.3 million people in 2025. Per the Nevada Department of Corrections, the offender population on December 31st, 2025, was 10,862. When we look across groups, we see that the incarcerated population does not mirror the demographics of the state as a whole. While some groups are represented at higher rates in NDOC rather than in Nevada's general population, and others appear at lower rates. One of the largest disparities is among individuals identified as Black or African-American.

Although this group accounts for a relatively small share of Nevada's population at 9%, the group represents a much larger share of the Nevada, of the NDOC population at 33%. Individuals identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native also show over-representation in NDOC relative to their presence in the statewide population, though to a smaller degree than the previous group. In contrast, those identified as White and Middle Eastern or North African, Hispanic or Latino, and Asian or Pacific Highlander slash Native Hawaiian appear underrepresented in NDOC when compared to their population share statewide. Taken together, the data illustrates a clear mismatch between the demographics of Nevada and the demographics of NDOC. These differences are important context for understanding system impacts, barriers, and the broader landscape of sentencing and corrections.

The Department of Taxation also provides a population breakdown by gender. This slide shows Nevada's estimated and projected population broken out by male and females from 2010 through 2029. The state population moves from about 1,000…or sorry 102 males per 100 females in 2010 to 98.5 males per 100 females in 2029, indicating a gradual shift toward a slightly larger female population that started in 2020.

This slide shows Nevada Department of Corrections total population by gender from 2017 to 2025. The overall trend is a steady decline in both groups from 2017 to 2021, followed by a slight increase beginning in 23’. On average, male offenders account for approximately 91% of NDOC's population, and females comprise the remaining 9%. This slide shows the isolated trends in NDOC's female population. The NDOC female population

decreased by 35% from 1,275 offenders in 2017 and 825 to 2021. From then, the population has increased slightly to 962 offenders in 2025. For the female population, the largest groups are aged 30 to 34 and 35 to 39, which make up 20% and 18% of the female population for 2025. Offenders under 25 account for about 5%. The oldest groups remain very small, with less than 1% of the female population.

In December 2025, the Nevada Department of Corrections updated its race and ethnicity reporting to align with the March 2024 U.S. Census Bureau guidelines. Under the updated methodology, race and ethnicity are collected using a single combined question rather than two separate questions for race and ethnicity, as was done before. For NDOC data, individuals with multiracial backgrounds may select up to two categories, designating one as the primary. The primary designation must match or closely align with information listed on an official document, such as a birth certificate. The data presented here reflects the primary race and ethnicity recorded for each offender. As of December 2025, the largest race and ethnicity group for females within NDOC was white offenders at 55%. Followed by black or African offenders at 24% and Hispanic or Latino offenders at 12%.

The county of commitment refers to the county in which the crime was committed. For female offenders housed within the NDOC, 64% were from crimes committed in Clark County, 19% from Washoe County, and the remaining counties each accounted for 4% or less. This slide shows the distribution of the female NDOC population by the felony category for their most serious offense, also known as their MSO. Category B continues to dominate, but has declined as a share of population from about 59% in 2018 to 55% in 2025, with a sharp drop around 2020 to 2022. Category A has steadily increased, growing roughly from 12% to 18% of the population. Category C declined significantly in 2021, but has since recovered to around 15% in 2025, nearly returning to earlier levels. Category D has also decreased overall, falling from about 10% of the population to 8% despite some fluctuation. Category E has remained…has remained a very small share throughout, dropping sharply in 2020 and stabilizing around 2% to 3% since. Overall, the key shift is the reduced Category B and the increased Category A proportions.

This slide shows the distribution of the female and DOC population by the offense group for their MSO. Violent offenses remain the largest share at about 36% in 2025, holding relatively steady over time except for the significant dip seen in 2021. The biggest shift is the decline in property and drug offenses. Property dropped

from about 31% to 24% of the populations, and drug dropped from 15% to 17% of the population in 2025. DUI and other offenses stayed fairly stable, each around 7% to 8% of the population, while sex offense remained minimal at about 2%. Overall, violence has remained the largest portion of the population. However, in recent years, the population has shifted away from property and drug offenses, creating an even greater concentration for violent offenses.

This slide compares the female and male population's proportion of each individual population for their offense group based on their most serious offense. Violent offenses make up the largest share for both groups at about 45% for females and 50% for males. The biggest differences are in sex and property offenses. Sex offenses account for 18% of males, but only about 2% of females, while property offenses are 24% for females compared to 10% for males. Overall, males are more concentrated in violent and sex offenses, while females are more concentrated in violent and property offenses.

This slide shows the 2025 female population by offense group and felony category. Violent offenses dominate the most serious categories A and B, making up the largest share overall. Property offenses are concentrated in mid-level categories C, D, and E,… C, B, sorry, B, C, and D, while drug offenses are spread across B, C, and E.

This slide shows the total number of offenses per female offender on their booking in 2025. Overall, most offenders are booked for a single offense at 49%. Roughly 31% had two offenses, and about 21% had three or more. This slide shows the female offender's maximum sentence lengths for their entire booking. About 52% have sentences under 10 years, 30% are serving 20-plus years or life sentences, and no female offenders are sentenced to death.

Let's take a look at how sentence lengths differ between female and male populations. Females tend to serve shorter sentences, with about 52% of the female bookings being under 10 years compared to 34% of males. For mid-length sentences, or 10 to 19 years, both groups are similar, around 18% of females versus 19% of males. Males are more likely to serve the longer sentences, as over 22% serve 20 years or more, and nearly 19% get life with parole, which is roughly double the female proportion. Overall, females are concentrated in short-term sentences, while males are concentrated on the long-term sentences.

Before we begin this next section, I want to take a moment to review again what an NDOC booking means in the context of this presentation. A booking encompasses any conviction at the time of, and subsequent to, an offender entering NDOC custody. An offender could begin their booking with one or more judgments of conviction, and could potentially add JOCs to their booking once it has already begun. One way this could happen is if an offender is still pending sentencing for one or more charges when they enter NDOC custody. If they are convicted, these sentences would join the original booking, and may add time to the offender's booking maximum. Another way is if the offender is paroled to the community, but receives a new charge. These charges would join the original booking, and may similarly add time.

As of December 2025, the Department of Corrections had 962 female offenders in their custody serving Nevada felonies. Historically, we used to only be able to look at one offense per offender, their most serious offense, for our analysis. An offense is essentially a criminal conviction, as stated on their JOC or JOCs. There could be one or many offenses, with each having unique sentence terms, such as felony category, offense group, and sentence lengths. Depending on whether the convictions were adjudged to run concurrently or consecutively, each offense in the booking could have a different status. Possible statuses are active, discharged, paroled, pending, and among others. An offender's booking does not expire until all sentences are discharged.

Through collaboration with NDOC, we developed a new data set called the All Offenses Data Set a few years ago. This has allowed us to be much more precise in our analysis, as it allows us to see all offenses on an offender's booking, not just their most serious. This gives better insight to the types of crimes, sentence lengths, enhancement usage, and other data points to give a more well-rounded view of sentencing trends and usage of prison resources. So, for 2025, among the 962 female offenders, there were 1,994 offenses on all bookings.

Total offenses peaked in 2018 at 2,519, then declined to 1,764 in 2021 before rising slightly to 1,994 in 2025. The population followed a similar pattern, peaking at 1,275 in 2018 and dropping to 825 in 2021, rebounding to 962 in 2025. The average offenses per female offender increased from 1.8 in 2017 to 2.7 in 2025. If you remember back to the data overview presentation from January 16th, 2025, the average number of offenses per offender for the entire NDOC population was 3.1…3.01, excuse me.

Category B consistently makes up the largest share of offenses, ranging from 1,036 to 1,437 per year, which was peaked in 2018. Category A offenses gradually increased over the period. Categories C, D, and E all saw declines to 2021, then rebounded slightly by 2025. Violent offenses are the largest group and have been steadily growing, returning to pre-2020 levels after the dip in 2021. Property, drug, and other offenses have generally trended down with a slight increase in property and drugs since the 2022 lows. DUI offenses have steadily increased since 2020.

Sex offenses represent a much smaller proportion of all offenses. The cases that do appear are primarily involving minors. The female population is dominated by violent offenses. Many of these involve enhancements, robberies, or homicide-related charges. Property offenses are the next largest group, with most cases tied to burglaries, stolen vehicles, and financial or forgery-related crimes. In the drug offense group, most of the population is tied to trafficking and possession offenses, with several cases involving larger weight thresholds. The DUI group is dominated by the most serious DUI offense, those involving death or substantial bodily harm. The other group is a mix, but many of the top offenses involved identity-related crimes, prohibited-person firearm violations, and habitual criminals.

Male yearly admissions are consistently higher than female admissions, ranging from 3,529 to 5,087 at its highest period over time, seen in 2018. Yearly female admissions have declined from 933 in 2017 to around 589 in 2025, with fluctuations in recent years. Both genders saw a notable dip in 2020 and 2021.

Female admissions have declined about 37% from 2017 to 2025. The largest decline occurred in 2020 and 2021, falling just over 54% of the 2017 levels. Admissions have steadily increased since 2021, but show a slight decrease in 2025.

Category A remains the smallest category with very low admissions throughout the period. Category B consistently represents the largest share of female admissions each year. Category C shows a familiar pattern with a decrease leading into the low of 2021 and then a gradual increase after. Category D has remained relatively steady since the drop in 2020, though there is an interesting spike seen here in 2024.

Sex offenses remain a concern with extremely low and a minimal variation throughout the period. Property offenses consistently make up the largest share of admissions.

All offense groups, except DUI, began a decrease in admissions in 2017 to 2019, leading into the major drop of 2020-2021, with varying increases since. New commitments are the largest admission group.

Chair Herndon: Jenna, if you can hear me, you froze…

Ms. Felipe: Chair, sorry to interrupt. Chair, I believe Deputy Buonacorsi laptop just shut off, so I'll share the screen for her. One moment.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: So, Miss Cecilia is very kind to let me finish the last few slides from her screen. I'm going to just slide through. To...there we go. New commitments are the largest group of admissions at 45%. Probation violators make up 31% and parole violators account for 22%. Not physically received with concurrent sentences are minimal at 1%. Overall, new commitments remain the primary entry point. However, community supervision failures are also a major pathway into NDOC for women.

Here's a list of our current NDOC data projects. Some have come up from conversations during our meet and greets with the Commissioners. One I wanted to know is as the state prepares for 2027's legislative session, NDSP is available for legislators or agencies to request data for their proposed BDR ideas and any effects it may have to the prison population or other areas of criminal justice in Nevada. If there are additional areas of research you would like to see, please reach out to our team. We welcome your questions and suggestions. Thank you for your time.

Chair Herndon: All right. Thank you, Jenna and thank you, Ms. Felipe for teamwork makes the dream work. All right. Anybody have any questions for Ms. Buonacorsi? John, go ahead.

Mr. Piro: Thank you, Justice Herndon. I just wanted to say thank you for digging up that population information for me. I really appreciate it and thanks for putting that together. The question I did have was in 2019, we got that ACAJ final recommendation report. And at that time, it said that the number of people admitted to prison, sorry, the number of women admitted to prison increased 39% between 2008 and 2017. And obviously we saw a drop, but our female imprisonment rate per 100,000 of the population was 43% higher than the national average at that time. And I know I'm just asking and maybe you have that data. Maybe you do not and we can get it.

How are we looking now compared to the national average, especially after the passage of AB 236?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: We have not yet compared to those trends to the national average, but my team and I can work on it and we'll have an update for you at our next meeting.

Mr. Piro: Thank you so much.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you, John.

Chair Herndon: Ms. Moseley-Sayles.

Ms. Moseley-Sayles: Thank you, Chair. Jenna, thank you so much for another thorough presentation. Regarding the violent offenses that the females come into incarceration for, do you have, is there a breakdown of the specific offense? I'm wondering how many of those, if any, are related to domestic violence, particularly like the, I think I have the slide up just a second.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: So, we could look into those numbers more deeply into all of them. For visual sake, we only showed the top 10 and for time, but we could look into those numbers for you and provide that to you later.

Ms. Moseley-Sayles: Okay, thank you. I was particularly interested in the use of daily weapons enhancements and the murder and things like that, if any of those are related to domestic violence. Thank you, Jenna.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: We can look into that. Thank you, Leisa.

Ms. Moseley-Sayles: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else have any questions? I do not hear and I do not see any other hands. All right, Jenna, thank you again. Appreciate it very much and we'll look forward to getting the updates at our next meeting.

7. **Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings**

Chair Herndon: With that, we will go ahead and close agenda item number six and move to agenda item number seven, which is future meetings. We already discussed a little bit earlier that we'll have our May 15th meeting remotely and then schedule our facility tour for May 29th, Friday, May 29th. And then our next meeting thereafter

will be July 17th. As always, staff continues to work on topics and agenda items for future meetings. So, if anybody has anything, please go ahead and voice it now or obviously reach out to us thereafter.

But first, does anybody have anything right now that they know of that they would like to get on a future agenda? Do not hear anything. Okay, thank you.

8. Public Comment

Chair Herndon: We'll go ahead and close out item number seven, future meetings, and move on to agenda item number eight, which is our second period of public comment. Again, just like with our first period of public comment, we can take public comment right now via phone. If you're on the phone and wish to comment, please stay muted until you get a direction to go ahead and present. We also accept public comment through writing, email to sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. And if you submit comment in writing through the email, it gets directed to all the Commission members. So all of us have a chance to review it. And with that, I will ask Ms. Felipe, if we have anybody online that wishes to make public comment.

Ms. Felipe: Chair, we have no at this time.

9. Adjournment

Chair Herndon: Okay, great. We will go ahead and close our second item of public comment, agenda item number eight, and move to agenda item number nine, which is our adjournment. So everybody, thank you again for your time today. To everybody that presented, as always, appreciate all the work that goes into that. Great presentations. And we will see everybody at the next meeting on May 15th. All right, have a good weekend. Bye-bye.

Director Powers: Thank you, everyone.