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 17, 2026**

Location: **VIRTUAL ONLY**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Paola Armeni
Chairman Christopher DeRicco
Brian Filter, Esq.
Evelyn Grosenick
Chief Tamrah Jackson
Deputy Director Troy Jordan
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
Captain Joshua Martinez
John McCormick
Isis Morales
Leisa Moseley-Sayles
Jarret Orcutt
John Piro
Erica Souza-Llamas
Judge Bita Yeager
Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts
Assemblymember Erica Roth
Senator John Steinbeck
Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady
Chair Douglas Herndon

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Dr. Shera Bradley
Director James Dzurenda
D.A. Chris Hicks
D.A. Mark Jackson
Chief Investigator Stephanie Shuman
Judge Kristin Luis
Senator Melanie Scheible

STAFF

Jorja Powers, Executive Director
Jenna Buonacorsi, Deputy Director
Marie Bledsoe, Management Analyst III
Erasmo Cosio, Management Analyst II
Cecilia Felipe, Administrative Assistant III

1. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

   [Meeting called to order at 9:03 a.m.]

Chair Douglas Herndon: We will go ahead and call to order our July 17, 2026, meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission. Good morning to everybody. Thank you for joining us today and thank you to anybody that may be watching these proceedings through our YouTube channel. This is the fourth meeting of our 25-27 cycle and I'm going to ask Director Powers to go ahead and take roll. If you would please, Jorja.
Executive Director Powers: Thank you, Chair. Good morning.
(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DIRECTOR POWERS; QUORUM IS MET)

Chair Herndon: Perfect. All right. Thank you for that.

2. **Public Comment**

Chair Herndon: We're going to move to agenda item number two, which is our first period of public comment. We have one public comment period at the beginning of our meeting and then another public comment period at the end of our meeting.

Just a reminder to everybody that may be watching, you can also submit comments to the commission through writing and that would be sent to the email address, which is sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Any public comment received in writing will be provided to all the commissioners for their review. If you wish to testify, you can do so by phone. It's limited to two minutes because of our time constraints.

If you exceed that two-minute limit, then we may need to cut off the call. But let's first remind everybody that if you're going to speak through phone call, you need to mute the device on which you're watching the meeting so that we don't get interference during your call. And then I will ask, Miss Felipe, do we have anybody online or on the phone, excuse me, that wishes to make public comment?

Ms. Cecilia Felipe: One moment.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Ms. Cecilia Felipe: Miss Shannon, are you here for public comment or are you one of our commission guests? Press star six to unmute yourself. I believe that is one of our guests.

Chair Herndon: Okay.

Ms. Cecilia Felipe: So, no public comment.

Chair Herndon: No public comment. All right. Thank you. We will go ahead and close agenda item number two. I will note that I just noticed that Judge Yaeger joined us as well. Good morning, Bita. So we'll put her on the list of attendees.

3. **Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission held on March 20, 2026**

Chair Herndon: Okay. Agenda item number three is the approval of our prior meeting minutes from March 20, 2026. Does anybody have any edits or comments about those meeting minutes? I do not hear any comments, and I do not see any hands raised on my screen. Would somebody be so kind as to make a motion to approve those minutes, please?

JUDGE BITA YEAGER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 20, 2026, MEETING.

JOHN MCCORMICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSES

4. **Department of Corrections Recidivism Report**

Chair Herndon: Okay. We will note the approval of our meeting minutes.

Thank you. And with that we'll move over to agenda item number four, which is our Department of Corrections recidivism report that's going to be given to us by NDOC staff. So please folks, let's go ahead.

Don Southworth: Thank you, Chair. My name is Don Southworth. I'm the chief of the Offender Management Division for the Department of Corrections and I am going to try to share my screen here so that I can get this presentation ready. Can everybody see?

Chair Herndon: We got you on the screen, Don.

Mr. Southworth: Thank you. Okay, so this is our NDOC recidivism report that is based off of our 2021 release cohort. Why do we look at recidivism and why is it important to us? The reality is that part of our mission as a department is to prepare the offenders that are sent to us for a successful re-entry back into society and the best way that we could really measure that is whether they return to us in our custody.

The DOC defines recidivism as a return to incarceration within DOC within three years of the offender's release date. What that means is if the offender is jailed at a county jail or gets incarcerated in a state prison outside of Nevada, they're not going to be reflected in our data here. It's only if they are released from NDOC and then returned to NDOC within a three-year time period. Like I said, it includes offenders that are released from NDOC whether they left for parole, mandatory parole, or sentence discharge. It will not include offenders that are released due to overturning of their case or the offender death. Only the first release for an offender during that release cohort is considered because we do have offenders that will be released from our custody, returned to us, and released again all within the same calendar year. So if that happens for a particular offender, we're only going to use the first release during that year. We have several programs that we use to hopefully address an offender's needs and they are split into five different categories.

The first is what we call correctional. These are programs to address their criminogenic needs. It could be MRT or moral recognition therapy, good intentions, bad choices, things of that nature. We also have several substance use disorder programs to address an offender's substance use needs. We have educational programs, everything from GED high school diploma all the way through graduate degrees. We also have vocational programs or job trainings. These are some examples on here. And then we have more like work training things like OSHA, construction safety, health, those types of programs. And so, we could look at how programs that fall in each of these categories may affect an offender's recidivism.

Right here is the annual recidivism. What you can see is for that 21 cohort, which is the most recent cohort we have to use data from, our recidivism rate was 29.5%, which unfortunately is the second highest recidivism rate that we have on this here. But when you think about what was going on in our world in 2021, it was a very unique situation with a global pandemic and lockdowns and things were pretty difficult for everybody, much less offenders being released from custody.

We can break it down by quarterly and this tends to match different seasonal trends for recidivism. Lots of different things, especially with this cohort that could have played a factor in it. It could be status of the lockdowns at that particular time or during that season. Or there could be patterns where during certain months it is more difficult for releasing offenders to find employment.

This is some of the program participation based off of those five different categories. The entire release cohorts included about 4,500 offenders that were released from our custody in 2021. The biggest group of programmers that we had fell into the correctional programming category with about 1,466. Then after that, there's a pretty big fall off for the work training, educational, vocational, and substance use disorder, which was the lowest amount of completions that we showed that year of 334. Of those approximately 4,500 offenders that were released, 32.5% of them participated in at least one of those correctional programs, while about 7.4% completed a substance use disorder program.

One of the other further limitations that we have for tracking this data is that many of these programs are multi-phase programs. For example, MRT has several phases. The substance use program has several phases, and not everybody who starts in these programs finishes. 62.1% of the offenders who started a substance use program completed one, and 67.6% of the offenders who started a correctional program sequence completed it.

We use different predictive models to help analyze the effects of various factors on recidivism, but there's limitations to the data that we just don't have. We don't have data on income or wealth, which obviously would play a big factor in whether the offender may come back to us or not. We don't have much information or data on offenders after they're released from our custody, such as has the offender passed away, have they relocated out of state, and we don't have the employment records for them either. Additionally, for these different programs, there is selection bias, and I'll get a little bit more into that in later slides, but what that means is not just random offenders are selected for these programs. There's criteria for each program, and the offenders that are selected for these programs may have a different risk of recidivism than the general population as a whole. And then lastly, it's small sample size. You saw earlier that some of these programs had very small, limited participation.

The biggest predictor of recidivism is age and gender, and this goes along with historic trends. Male offenders have a significantly higher recidivism rate than females, and younger offenders have a significantly higher risk than males. You'll see on this chart here that a 21 or 20-year-old male has nearly a 50% chance of returning to our custody within three years. There are other things that we could look at in addition to age and gender, such as education, number of prior felonies, etc.

One of the other big predictors here for recidivism has to do with their release status, meaning how were they released? Were they released on parole, mandatory parole, or sentence discharge? And what we saw here was a much higher percentage of recidivism for offenders that are released on parole, and that is steps down for mandatory parole and much less for discharge. Does this mean that there's a failure in our system somehow of offenders being granted parole and out in the community? Probably not. It's more likely that these offenders who are being supervised have a much more structured nature of how they are in the community. They are monitored much more closely than an offender who is discharged, and a step down from parole to mandatory parole is likely due to the fact that it's a much shorter term that these offenders are on that supervised status, typically six months to up to a year.

Prior felonies was also a big predictor. An offender that had three or more prior felonies, their risk of recidivism rate was over 30%. While no prior felonies, their recidivism rate dropped to less than 20. Of the entire cohort that we looked at, about 40% of those offenders had no prior felonies, while about a third had three or more.

Talked a little bit earlier about selection bias. Again, because the different programs that we offer aren't selecting offenders based off of a random pool of offenders, they look at offenders that meet certain criteria, such as no recent write-ups, certain scores on the NRAS, the Nevada Risk Assessment System. They can look at prior substance use history, what we call the risk factor score, yard points, meaning that's an objective classification tool that looks at a variety of different things from the offender's criminal history, disciplinary conduct, nature of offense, those types of things. Where traditional selection bias or program analysis requires more randomness to it than what we do. What we've done to try and make up for that selection bias is we use two different techniques. One is called the propensity score matching, and the other one is Heckman treatment effects.

The first one, the propensity score matching, really what that does is it tries to help control for selection bias by matching participants with non-participants who are estimated to have a similar probability of programming. What it does is say, if we had two twins that came to prison for the same crime, and one was selected for programming and one wasn't, it tries to account for that. What are the odds that one offender will recidivate that got the programming versus the one that did not? This is a technique that was used in all of our recent past reports. What we showed here is that programs really did not have a statistically significant association with recidivism using just this method.

So, the other thing that we did here was use a Heckman model. This helps to control for selection bias by estimating the effects of being selected for programming as a separate factor than the programming itself. The actual selection criteria is part of the estimation factors here. Why were they selected? That goes into the criteria. What we've shown here is that when we apply this model, you can see that the correctional programs that we offer to address specific criminogenic needs has a fairly significant impact on recidivism. Again, this is data from 2021. We're dealing with a very different world back in 2021. Based off of our very limited definition of recidivism, it is difficult to fully comprehend how these different programs will affect offenders going forward. Our hope is that as we get additional data in the future, we can have better statistical analysis of how these programs affect recidivism and affect the offenders return to the criminal justice system as a whole. Right now, this is the data that we're having to deal with or use in order to try and prepare offenders for that successful reentry.

With that, I will return it over to you at the committee and be available if you have any questions or comments.

Chair Herndon: Thank you very much. Anybody have any questions? Dr. Lanterman?

Dr. Jennifer Lanterman: Good morning, everybody. It's Jen Lanterman for the record. Thank you, Mr. Southworth. I do have a question about program participation and its relation to recidivism. So, it looks like about 7.4% of the 2021 release cohort participated in substance use treatment. Substance use disorder tends to be very high among justice-involved populations, and this was certainly the case in prior Nevada Department of Corrections program evaluation.

Specifically, I'm thinking of the Second Chance Act grant evaluation. I was involved in that, and we picked a particular cohort of people to track because of the very high rates of substance use disorder among NDOC's population. So, 7.4% of our release cohort participating in, whether or not they completed substance use treatment, is actually very low relative to the percentage of that release cohort that would have a history of substance use disorder.

And so, in that situation, what we know is no matter what otherwise effective programming a person might participate in to address other criminogenic needs such as issues related to education, employment, employability, antisocial thinking, even if they completed all of those other programs, if they have substance use disorder and they do not participate in and ideally complete a evidence-based program properly delivered to address the substance use disorder, their risk of recidivism will remain very high. This leads for me to the question of, was that low level of participation in substance use treatment at 7.4% a function of limited substance use treatment availability while in Department of Corrections custody, whether that was just as a general matter or it was changes related to COVID, or was it the fact that there was sufficiently available programming but a lack of interest on the part of people who were in Department of Corrections custody at the time? Because that's going to be, we could give people all of the effective programming we want, but if they have substance use disorder and we don't treat that, it's like a waste of money otherwise. So are you able to provide any sort of insight into what was going on with that particular treatment?

Mr. Southworth: Yes. Thank you for those comments and that question, but you really hit the nail on the head there. You're absolutely right that the number of offenders that we have coming to our custody that have a history of significant substance use problems is far greater than the number of offenders that have completed substance use disorder programming, especially in this 2021 release cohort. And what this snapshot of data showed is that very limited participation, but it also did not have a great effect on recidivism.

Now, does that mean that we should give up on substance use disorder programming at all because it's not working? No, we don't think that's the case. In fact, in 2021, we did have very limited programming available for a variety of reasons. The lack of interest by the offenders, I don't think was one of the factors at all.

Really, most of what that was was due to the lockdowns related to the pandemic at that time. We were running, unfortunately, very limited programming's during 2021. So effectively, in that time, we had three substance use disorder programs going on. We had, and they were all in-house treatment kind of therapeutic community type programs. There was one up here in Carson called the Phoenix program, which is males. There's another male-based program in the South, and then a female-based program in Las Vegas and that was it. And the only offenders that could participate in these programs had to meet the criteria, which included being right at the very end of their sentence, along with additional criteria, such as their NRAS score, disciplinary record, those types of things.

What we have done since then is expanded those programs and one of the big things that we've now started doing is we have introduced MOUD, Medication for Opioid Use Disorder treatment. Initially, that was started last year. It was only as a continuation of MOUD treatment if they were already on it when they came into our custody. We were then able to continue those offenders in those programs. What we are now doing is initiating that treatment. So if we have an offender in our custody that has a clear substance use disorder program or problem and could potentially benefit from MOUD, we will conduct an assessment on them and our medical and mental health teams will then initiate offenders on MOUD treatment in order to help them get stabilized. And we'll continue that while they're in our custody and then try and help them transition that into the community, which has been a challenge for a lot of these offenders when they release into the community, continuing that medication that they need in order to be sober and succeed.

Dr. Lanterman: Okay. So just to follow up on that, I really appreciate that insight there because what we do know is that both MOUD is really effective for people who are able to maintain it when they transition back to the community, but also therapeutic communities, when combined with follow-on community-based treatment, are very effective ways to support people living with substance use disorders such that it exercises a significant reduction in their risk of recidivism.
And so I think it's important that it's reflected in the Sentencing Commission notes that, and this has nothing to do with Nevada Department of Corrections, but this is going to be a general trend that we'll see because of the effects of COVID on in-person programming, that when we examine data from release cohorts from about 2020 through 2022, due to the delayed effects of various things, that we need to note that there are significant historical effects in the way that program availability and delivery operated during that time that we might observe really different outcomes with those release cohorts that are not solely a function of individual failure to engage, but a function of a lot of changes to program availability and delivery modality that could be exerting an unknown effect on their outcomes.
So just really important to keep in mind that there's some fuzzy stuff in those data that we need to really examine cohorts over many years after that period. We don't ignore them because it's really important to understand what happens when we reduce the availability of programming because it shows it in stark contrast, but to just keep in mind we don't want to rely solely on those data from those release cohorts because there's a lot going on that could essentially reflect many years ago when there was no programming available in Department of Corrections. It sort of exerts a similar effect on potential outcomes for people in those release cohorts.

Chair Herndon: All right.

Mr. Southworth: Yes, and I'd like to echo and agree with those comments, 2021 was a strange year for all of us, but especially in the NDOC, and some of this data may be skewed because of the status of the world at the time and the availability of programs due to certain policies relating to lockdowns and things of that nature at the time. So thank you.

Chair Herndon: All right. Evie?

Ms. Evelyn Grosenick: Good morning, Evie Grosenick for the record. Hi, Mr. Southworth. Thank you so much for being here. I had a couple of questions, if I may. The first, I just wanted to clarify, these are individuals who left NDOC custody either for parole or because they completely finished whatever sentence they were serving. Is that right?

Mr. Southworth: For the most part, yes. There are some offenders here that were here on temporary parole revocations, but the great majority were offenders that were released for either parole, which includes both regular parole and mandatory parole, and sentence discharge.

Ms. Grosenick: And are the people being held on temporary revocations, are they included in this set of this cohort?

Mr. Southworth: They would be, yes.

Ms. Grosenick: Okay. But only for their first revocation?

Mr. Southworth: Correct. Their first release during that calendar year.

Ms. Grosenick: Okay. And then on slides six and seven, I was just a little confused. Are you…are these…are the people who participated in these programs, are they, does this represent everyone who was released? Or are these people who recidivated? So, for work training, 513 people participated in those programs. Is that 513 out of everyone in the cohort that was released that year? Or is it 513 of the people who recidivated?

Mr. Southworth: Good question there. Our 2021 release cohorts was 4,489 offenders. So just a hair under 4,500 and so, what slide six is showing is that of those almost 4,500 offenders that were released in 2021, how many of them had completed these different kinds of programs?
Ms. Grosenick: Okay.
Mr. Southworth: Of those 4,500 offenders that were released in 2021, 513 of them had completed work training programs while they were incarcerated.
Ms. Grosenick: Okay, yes**.** And then I guess a follow-up would be, is there other data that would show how many of the people who completed the…let's say the work training program, that also recidivated?

Mr. Southworth: Yes. And I think I had that on a later slide. On the 14th slide, the last slide, when we apply the Heckman model to account for selection bias, it showed the different recidivism or the effect on recidivism rates that each of the kinds of programs completed. And again, I want to put the caveat on here that 2021 due to the lockdowns, both within NDOC and in the communities had some very unusual effects on some of this data. You can see that certain types of programs here, like the work training program had a slight increase in recidivism rate for those offenders that completed those programs.

Ms. Grosenick: But the…oh, I'm sorry. I thought the Heckman model was a projection.

Mr. Southworth: Yeah. So what it's trying to do here is use this snapshot of the 2021 release core data and how offenders recidivated based off of various things and predict the impact of how the offenders that completed these various programs, what the change in the recidivism rates for those offenders were. And what we found for this particular cohort was the only one that had a positive impact on the recidivism rate or projected positive impact was the correctional programs.

Ms. Grosenick: Um, okay. So that is a projection, but you don't have data from the 2021 group of, within the people who recidivated and were returned to NDOC custody, this many completed a vocational program while in custody prior to release, this many completed, excuse me, substance abuse, et cetera. Right?

Mr. Southworth: So, sorry. I think I understand your question. We do have that data, but we use these projection models to try and help account for the selection bias that goes into those offenders that complete those programs. Um, but we can certainly provide the more raw data and say, “Hey, offenders that completed these particular programs, here's their recidivism rates”.

Ms. Grosenick: What’s the… inaudible, I'm so sorry to interrupt, go ahead.

Mr. Southworth: Um, so these projections are trying to just account for that selection bias or the program criteria that goes into, uh, which effectively says, “Hey, the offenders that are selected for these programs are already less likely to recidivate than the random pool of offenders from the same cohort.”

Ms. Grosenick: Okay. Because they're seeking out treatment, essentially.

Mr. Southworth: Potentially because they're seeking out treatment, but because they are, um, uh, some of the criteria could include things, factors like, um, no disciplinary conduct, whereas that may not match the overall trends for the general population. It could include, um, that the offenders need to score certain ways, uh, in the Nevada risk assessment scoring system. Um, uh, so that these offenders are likely, they need to be a certain custody level. These offenders are just potentially less likely to recidivate than the offenders who are getting in trouble, are not seeking treatment, um, are housed in higher custody levels for a variety of different reasons.

Ms. Grosenick: Okay. Um, and then my last question, I'm sorry to take so much time. Um, were there statistics or do you keep any kind of statistics on the types of housing or financial situations of people at the time of release? So my understanding is that, that if somebody is released on a parole, they have to have a housing situation that's been approved by the division. Um, are any statistics kept on that? Do you know? And does the prison keep any on people who are just discharged?

Mr. Southworth: That is data that we would love to have. Um, you're right. Under Nevada law, an offender who is granted parole is not going to be released into the community until the division of parole and probation approves their release plan. So we will often have, um, a snapshot of where they are transitioning to in the community, uh, from us, but that is not really good data because a lot of times offenders will go to a halfway

house or something like that, where they're only going to spend a very short amount of time before they go somewhere else. Um, we, we don't have any data on their employment or income, uh, after they're released from us. And when an offender discharges from our custody, most of the time we have absolutely no data as to where they are going. Um, if they're staying in the state where they're going to live, what their plans are, because they're not required to provide us with anything. Once their sentence is discharged, we release them and they're kind of separated from us completely without any supervision.

Ms. Grosenick: Thank you very much.

Chair Herndon: I know a number of other people have questions up, but Evie got into a question that I had, and I just want to follow up on it, Don, if I could real quickly, can you get us those, what I'll just refer to as the hard math numbers? I would like to know of the 67.5% of people that did no programming, what was the overall recidivism rate of those folks? Of the 32.5 that did at least one program, what was the overall recidivism rate of those folks? And then in each of those five, uh, categories of release that did at least one program, what was the recidivism rate of those people that completed correctional programming? Just correctional. What was the recidivism rate of those people that just did work training, et cetera. And then the overall recidivism rate of people that did multiple programs. Um, I get the predictive models and that we have to account for certain biases and things, but I also think kind of the hard math, just understanding those numbers would be helpful.

Mr. Southworth: Certainly, I could provide that to, um, I don't know if it'd be easier if I give it to Ms. Powers and then she can distribute it to the entire group here, but we could get that data and provide it to you guys.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Um, and I might ask you just to come back next time and maybe present that and we can have some discussion in case anybody has any questions about it.

Okay. Christine.

Vice Chair Christine Jones Brady: I think John might've been before me, but I'll go. The, question I had was you mentioned the more of a proactive, um, enrolling people or reaching out to people to participate in these programs. And you mentioned, you know, people who obviously have a substance abuse issue. Uh, is that obvious based on their charges when they come in, or is it obvious based on the amount that they're using while they're incarcerated? And are you keeping numbers? Do you have numbers of the amount of inmates who either use some form of alcohol or made up alcohol, homemade alcohol, and or pruno and or, um, people who are attempting or maybe getting high from the mail that's coming in laced with different things. Do you keep numbers on those? So, so just to recap, the question is, are you basing it on the state of their condition when they come in or something that they're doing when they're incarcerated?

Mr. Southworth: Yeah. Great question. And the answer is yes, we were doing both. Um, when an offender comes to us, uh, we look at their precincts, um, investigation questionnaire, um, that comes from the division, uh, that oftentimes breaks down the offenders substance use, uh, history. Um, we have information on the, the nature of their crime. So if an offender is coming to us on a felony DUI, it's, you know, we can say that they have a substance use problem if they're coming. Um, and it's clear that the criminal history is, um, related to their, uh, history of substance use. We'll have that at intake, but we also have data as to substance use issues within our department. And our director has testified several times at various committees about a very significant increase in substance use disorder use while incarcerated. He's talked pretty extensively about the K2 and spice problem that we've been experiencing over the last couple of years. And we do have data that has been presented on that by the director and it, it relies, you know, heavily on the problem that it is so much easier now for offenders to get these illegal substances through the mail than it ever has been. Um, he, he has a great presentation where he, he shows a video on how easy it is to do that, where they can mix wasp spray with printer ink and then print a letter and mail it in. And then the offender just has to roll it up and smoke it. And now they're high. And there's really very little that we could do to combat that currently, at least. But we do have data on, um, the increased substance use while incarcerated that's been going on over the last few years, including overdose deaths and things of that nature. Um, but we would use both the data that we have, uh, for while offenders are in our custody and the data that we get when they first arrived to us about their past substance use history to analyze whether they're appropriate or eligible for substance use programming.

Chair Herndon: Alright, John.

Mr. John Piro: Thank you, chair. Don, I had a quick question about when you talk about the 29 and a half percent number, do we know how we compare nationally in terms of recidivism numbers?

Mr. Southworth: If you would ask me that six months ago, I could have told you the number right away. Um, but I don't want to misstate it. I could certainly provide that pretty quickly though. Um, yes, we do have those numbers for national recidivism. Um, but I, I, off the top of my head, I don't know it right now.

Mr. Piro: Okay. And then I have one more question. When I did a tour of the prison, um, one of the assistant wardens was talking about some of the, maybe I would say legislative roadblocks. I want to ask your opinion of that. Like if, if I'm doing a sentencing and I say, you know, this person's going to prison judge, could you recommend them for the 184 program? But their sentence isn't 18 months long. They're not going to get into the 184 program. Am I correct?

Mr. Southworth: Yeah. And there are certain judges that will routinely put on, um, judgment of conviction orders that they recommend this offender for the 184 program. But there is certain criteria, like you mentioned, you know, they need to have a certain amount of time. We've had JOCs where the offender is a sex offender or serving a life sentence, and it still says recommended for the 184 program. And that offender will never be eligible for the 184 program. So, um, that recommendation on a JOC, um, we, we will look at it, but it, it doesn't, um, change, you know, whether the offender is going to be eligible or not. That, that language is not needed to get somebody into the program. And if the language is not there on a JOC, that doesn't mean an offender is barred from going to program.

Mr. Piro: Are there certain things we could do legislatively, though, to remove some roadblocks for treatment?

Mr. Southworth: You know, that is a loaded question there, but, um, certainly more funding for additional treatment is always going to be welcomed, and we could use it. Um, I would defer specifically for substance use programming to, uh, Director Robyn Feese, who's the director of our substance use programming, uh, or various programs. She would have a better idea than I would as to, uh, any potential legislative roadblocks that might exist for the substance use programming. A lot of our programming depends heavily on volunteers and community partners, um, and that is difficult, uh, especially in our rural areas. You know, Ely and Lovelock, Pioche, they don't have a lot of community partners and volunteers willing to go to those areas. Um, so there's a lot of reasons why offenders may not have access to programming, or certain facilities may have less programming than others. But if we had additional funding for, uh, legislatively approved positions that are specific for, uh, various treatment, uh, options, that would be welcomed.

Mr. Piro: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Judge Yeager.

Judge Bita Yeager: Uh, my, I have a question, actually, about the 184 program as well. Do you know, uh, since the 184 program has court oversight, if there's been any comparison as far as recidivism rates between those in programs that are, you know, post-release but still on parole, like the early release program, like 184 program with court oversight versus just the within-the-prison programming and then just released regularly?

Mr. Southworth: That is not something that we currently track, but I can tell you that I would be very interested to see, um, what that data would, would look like, uh, because we do have data on the offenders that are going from our custody into the 184 program. Uh, it is a very limited, um, pool. I think statewide, we average about 70 offenders, somewhere around that number, um, of offenders in the 184 program at any given time. So, it is a very small pool, but I think it would be worth looking at because I would imagine that the recidivism rate for those offenders, uh, potentially could go either way depending on how you look at it because it's such a strict, um, monitoring, you know, they could potentially have a higher recidivism rate because they're coming back to us. But in reality, I don't think I see that very often with those offenders. I think most of those offenders, um, do well in the program and don't come back to us as quickly. Um, I don't see, at least personally me, I don't see a lot of offenders that return to us after going through the 184 program successfully. Um, but I don't know, either way, I would be interested in looking at that data.

Judge Yeager: Well, I mean, I think there would be recidivism rates that you could track both ways, meaning even those that don't complete the 184 program while they're in the program, once they're released afterwards,

if their recidivism rates compare differently, because, you know, like in, in drug court and that kind of thing, even those that get terminated often have lower recidivism rates overall. Um, and then if that were to be compared and shown to show, shown that it is more effective at reducing recidivism rates, um, would there be any interest in expanding the 184 program?

Mr. Southworth: Yeah, I would, I would be very interested in that data as well. Um, um, we can look at what the data available to us is, um, and see how it looks. There are certainly a lot of interest in the 184 program and there's more interest than available, you know, spots in the program.

Judge Yeager: Right.

Mr. Southworth: Um, and in addition to, to that program, we also have the, um, community transition program that's getting ready to get started, which is a, a different residential confinement program where the offender will remain under NDOC custody, but in the community, um, it certainly will not have the rigorous, uh, types of requirements that the 184 program has, but if there's things working in the 184 program that, you know, we would want to implement as part of the CTP program, I think it's worth looking at, certainly.

Judge Yeager: Right. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Captain Martinez.

Captain Joshua Martinez: Yeah, I just had a quick question for the presenter in regards to the recidivism. Uh, is that a policy that you guys use the three-year return to, uh, NDOC or is that something written in NRS that you guys use, or is that like a national standard?

Mr. Southworth: Um, it is our policy, but it is also pretty standard nationwide for, uh, different, uh, DOCs to, to utilize, to be able to measure. Um, we would love to expand that definition of recidivism to have a more comprehensive snapshot of what is working and what's not. Uh, but it's difficult right now because there's different agencies and there's different, uh, systems that we use. Um, I've had the benefit of working with, uh, Ms. Powers and her team there, um, to, you know, discuss this issue. Um, there, there is a lot of movement about redefining what recidivism should be. Is it a return to criminal justice, whether it's jail back to DOC? Um, uh, but ultimately in order to be able to do that, we have to have shared data or be able to compare, you know, notes with each other in a better way than we currently do.

Captain Martinez: I have a follow-up chair, if you don't mind.

Chair Herndon: Yeah, please go ahead.

Captain Martinez: So with the sharing of data, I work over at Las Vegas Metro and, you know, we have the Clark County Detention Center, which houses the largest population of folks that are waiting, you know, for their cases. And so that was my, why I asked the question and like you said, to expand the definition. So if somebody's out on release and they're on one of those supervised roles that you had on your PowerPoint slide, and then they're returned to CCDC because they're on parole, that wouldn't count as recidivism because they didn't return to NDOC, even though they're under state supervision.

Mr. Southworth: You're absolutely correct. So if an offender is released from our custody, whether it's to parole or say the 184 program, and while they're out under that supervised release status, and they are re-arrested, sent to a county jail, but never returned to us as the DOC for whatever reason, they would not be counted here as part of the, or be included in the recidivism rate because they're not returning to our facilities. They're only going to county jails.

Captain Martinez: Okay. I appreciate that. I think it would, you know, warrant further discussion on what that recidivism looks like, like you said, and I think that's a good discussion to have. And maybe that's a legislative thing, or maybe that's a policy change internally with NDOC, but also communicating with some of the other agencies like us, Metro, and to get that data from jails, I think, in regards to some of those offenders.

Mr. Southworth: Yeah, and I think one of the roadblocks right now is, you know, the state ID number issue is, you know, to make sure that the John C. Smith that you have at county jail is the same John C. Smith that I have in the DOC, which was the same John C. Smith that was in Nye County Jail six months ago, to make sure that

we're able to track these offenders, whether they're in county jails, our custody, or even, you know, potentially somewhere else.

Captain Martinez: Thank you. That's all I had, Chair.

Chair Herndon: Thank you. John?

Mr. Piro: Thanks again for the other question. Sorry if this question seems very simplistic, but can you kind of explain to me what correctional programming entails? Because I'm not quite clear on that, as opposed to the other sections.

Mr. Southworth: Yeah, absolutely. Correctional programming is, to put it very simply, trying to address what we would call their criminogenic needs. So, if an offender has an anger impulsivity problem, you know, let's address that. Put them in anger management. If they have an issue with, you know, they had a poor upbringing, they didn't have any positive role models or mentors in their lives, let's, you know, get them to understand, okay, that the role models that you had were not good, and what would be a good role model, and pair them with something along those lines. And the NRS assessment tool is something that we use to help identify various criminogenic needs so that we could address them. And these are basically programs that don't fall in some of the other categories. MRT is a big one, the Moral Recognition Therapy. Getting them to kind of think for a change, which is the name of one of the programs we use. Get them to think about their behaviors, really. Good Intentions, Bad Choices is another program that we use that falls under the correctional programming umbrella. These are effectively programs to get offenders to think differently, to hopefully make different choices in the future that don't lead to criminal behavior.

Mr. Piro: Thank you very much.

Chair Herndon: Dr. Lanterman.

Dr. Lanterman: Yeah, so to follow up on the question regarding measurement of recidivism, important preface to all this, I'm a researcher, so this is, I deal with this issue all the time. And this is an issue that has come up in a lot of discussion throughout the state over many years in terms of program evaluation. And if I recall correctly, it's something that's come before the Sentencing Commission before in this sort of goal to have a broader statewide definition of recidivism. It was correctly pointed out that one of the issues is how we track data. So different agencies, we don't have a unified statewide data management system that everybody who works in the legal system can access. And so this is one of the reasons why you'll see when people, like agencies apply for grants, they're looking for external evaluators. And that's essentially, external evaluators are stepping in and they're saying, we recognize that overhauling information management systems, especially when you're dealing with potentially sensitive data, whether that is, those are data regarding someone's legal status or certain types of information that might have HIPAA protection, such as substance use or mental disorder diagnosis or treatment information. There are a lot of challenges associated with addressing this data management issue.

So instead, what happens is the external evaluator steps in, they draft a scope of work and they say, here are all of the data we will actually need to answer the questions you want to answer. And one of the things that we do with criminal justice related research is we say recidivism is not just some data we're going to get from Department of Corrections, right? Because Department of Corrections by definition is tracking people who returned to their custody. And so their ability to track that is necessarily limited by their data management. And that's not anything they're doing wrong. It's what their information management system looks like. So what the external evaluator does is we say, okay, we want to know about recidivism, but what is recidivism? Recidivism is not just returned to Department of Corrections custody.

And we can measure this in several ways. So this is why researchers take forever doing stuff. We are collecting rearrest data. We are collecting reconviction data. We are collecting reincarceration data, whether that is returned to Department of Corrections custody within a certain period of time. And then we go out and look to the extent we are able with each county and saying who's coming into your jail to serve a short sentence. So in most states, including Nevada, that's 364 days or less. And then we are also going to say of the people who are going into jail or Department of Corrections custody, who's going there for conviction on a new offense versus a revocation or parole or probation. And the reason for that is revocation or parole or probation, that is not a new offense. It doesn't result in new conviction is because it's a violation of the technical conditions of parole. So it's

not new criminal behavior. It's not technically recidivism, but what we can do in evaluation is track it as noncompliant behavior. And then we can further, depending on resources, say what is the nature of the noncompliant behavior? Is it simply that a person is repeatedly violating curfew because they just don't want to follow the rules. They're doing sketchy stuff outside between 11 p.m. and 4 a.m., which is real bad. You don't want people out there because that's what all sorts of kinky stuff's going on.

Or is it a function of they have a job, but they're on public transportation where they live. Public transportation is terrible. Is it a function of they're repeatedly failing drug tests, right? So there's an ongoing issue that requires intervention. So the external evaluator, in a lot of cases, is the person who steps in and addresses this data issue because we know that it's not returned to department corrections. Custody gives us an important but limited understanding of what is going on with the people whose behavior we wish would change in a particular direction. The other thing that this gets into, and I know it's a broader issue, but is Nevada in particular has a particularly transient population relative to other states. And so we get a limited picture of recidivism where we are only looking at Nevada data, which is where the whole NCIC issue comes into play and, of course, how restricted access is to those data. So every time these conversations come up, particularly with respect to recidivism outcomes with Nevada populations, you're going to run into this conversation about access to NCIC because we do have, more than other states, a population of people who are crossing the border, largely into California, Arizona, Utah, sometimes other states further north, who are finding themselves justice involved, but we're not tracking that. And so it distorts our data in Nevada a little more than it does other states because of the transient nature of our population.

Chair Herndon: Senator Steinbeck.

Senator John Steinbeck: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate it. Quick question. Do we have a cost of these programs broke down? So we're seeing that the correctional program, at least on the model, is so much more effective. And I certainly want the same data that you want, Chief Justice, on the actual turnout. But I was wondering if we have a cost per participant available in each one of these programs so we can kind of monitor the effectiveness of our dollars spent.

Mr. Southworth: Thank you for that question. I am not a fiscal or numbers guy by any means. And I know that much of our programming is based off of, some of it is grant funded, some of it is based off of volunteers and community partners. But I could speak with our fiscal department and see if we could get some kind of breakdown of cost relative to the number of offenders participating in those programs and see what kind of data we could provide, you know, to answer some of those questions to make sure that, you know, what kind of bang are we getting for the bucks that we are spending?

Senator Steinbeck: That would be appreciated. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Herndon: I do not see any other hands at this point. So here's what I'm going to tell you, Don. Based on all the questions, a lot of really good questions and a lot of really appropriate requests for some further information, we're going to see you again in September. I'm going to absolutely put it back on the agenda to have you come back and kind of fill us in on these issues related to digging down on the numbers a little bit, cost per participants in our programming, a number of different things. This has been really helpful and enlightening and I appreciate your time and I thank you in advance for kind of coming back again down the road.

Mr. Southworth: Thank you, Chair. I look forward to it.

Chair Herndon: Okay, we will go ahead and close out agenda item number four and move on to agenda item number five is the report from our director, Director Powers. So I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to you, Jorja.

Director Powers: Okay, thank you. Let me share my screen. All right.

5. Director's Report

Director Powers: So thank you, Chair, Commissioners. I will start my report with the review of our activities by core function, I think. There we go. For administrative, our management analyst one, Mia, has left the state for private industry, unfortunately. So that position is open and we are working with the Department of Human

Resources to get that filled. In May, we renewed the lease for this Carson City office. We are actually in a non-state-owned building at this moment. So that was a five-year lease.

On to commission. On May 29th, we were able to have 15 people tour High Desert State Prison. We appreciate NDOC's hospitality. We are planning on making this an annual activity for the commission, alternating between northern and southern facilities.

Next, Chair Herndon has appointed John Piro to chair the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. We are getting ready to resume meetings for that body. As you have heard me mention, the National Association of Sentencing Commission's annual conference is being held August 12th through 14th in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Along with NDSP staff, we have had our highest commissioner response yet and we will have four commissioners going to Albuquerque. Leisa Moseley-Sayles, John Piro, Evie Grosenick, and Jarret Orcutt will be attending. Mr. Orcutt has submitted a presentation proposal to the NASC executive committee and he will be presenting a breakout group on college and incarcerated individuals. We will hear from our travelers at our next meeting.

I also just want to express our gratitude to our commissioners. From myself, Deputy Director Buonacorsi, and our staff, we have been working on new projects recently and have reached out to our commissioners for their specialized expertise. We are very appreciative of your willingness to help and the depth of information provided. Your valuable insights make a real difference in our work. Thank you again for your support.

Like all state agencies, recently we have spent time working on the fiscal year 26 budget closing and the next few months we will be preparing the budget bill for fiscal year 28-29.

On to data and reports. We have received a felony data set from RCCD that is going to be a tremendous step forward for us. You will hear about that later in the data presentation. Also to come is an agenda item regarding the projected amount of costs avoided report that is due August 1. The data team has been working with the Nevada homicide data set and we will be requesting some changes to statute coming in the 27 session to help with that information.

Finally, for outreach, we continue to work with stakeholder and partner agencies on various projects. We recently have been working with local law enforcement, DOC, parole and probation, district attorney's offices, attorney general's office, governor's office, legislative leaders, and criminal justice partners from other states. Also in outreach, one of our staff members, management analyst three, Marie Bledsoe, went on a one week rural meet and greet tour to speak with members of the Nevada Local Justice and Reinvestment Coordinating Council and community organizations engaged in reentry and recidivism in these rural areas. It is our hope that we will be able to have our council members be part of larger groups in their communities so they can bring back the needs and ideas to the NLJRCC. And that is my presentation.

I will take questions and, also chair, we do have a need to swap items six and seven on the agenda because someone has a prior engagement. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Got it. Thank you. Anybody have any questions for Director Powers? Not seeing any hands on my screen. Okay. Thank you again, Jorja. Appreciate it. All right. So let's jump ahead then to agenda item number seven.

7. **Unique State Identifier Discussion**

Chair Herndon: Agenda item number seven is a unique state identifier discussion. Director Powers, are you going to do that one as well?

Director Powers: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Herndon: And you've got somebody else presenting with you, right?

Director Powers: Yes. Erica Souza-Llamas will be speaking also. Let me get my share going. I think you might be seeing not the presentation. Sorry about that. Let me fix this. Okay.

So, we will be discussing a unique state identifier and streamlining Nevada's criminal justice life cycle data.

All right. So, as we all know, one of the biggest reasons that the Department of Sentencing Policy exists is to identify criminal justice data that is not being collected or shared across agencies in Nevada and to facilitate the collection and aggregation of data from courts, the Department of Corrections, parole and probation, and all other Nevada agencies of criminal justice.

Currently, Nevada's criminal justice agencies operate in data silos. When an individual is arrested, the records communication and compliance division of the Department of Public Safety generates a unique state identification or SID based on biometric fingerprint verification. However, due to many reasons, including legacy records management systems, many criminal justice agencies and stakeholders, arresting agencies, district attorneys, courts, detention facilities, et cetera, do not integrate or maintain this SID within their local tracking software.

Without a universal identifier tied to every stage of a case, the state cannot efficiently track the defendant's entire cycle through the justice system, hampering accurate policy analytics, crime prevention tracking, and beyond. Here, I'm going to turn the time over to our Commissioner and Administrator of the Department of Public Safety's Records Communication and Compliance Division, Erica Souza-Llamas, to speak on Nevada's state identification number and how it comes to be. Erica?

Ms. Erica Souza-Llamas: Good morning. My name is Erica Souza-Llamas, and I serve as the Administrator of the Records Communications and Compliance Division within the Nevada Department of Public Safety. Our division is responsible for maintaining the state's central repository for Nevada records of criminal history, which includes statewide records of arrests and related prosecutorial and court dispositions. This morning, I'm going to provide a very brief overview of the Nevada state identification number or SID.

The SID is a unique identifier assigned by the central repository to ensure that an individual's criminal history information, including arrests, charges, and court outcomes, is accurately linked and maintained. These records are generated at the point of a subject's arrest. During the booking process, the local law enforcement agency typically fingerprints the individual and submits those fingerprints to the central repository.

Once we receive it, the repository conducts a technical fingerprint search to determine whether the subject has been previously arrested in Nevada by way of a fingerprint comparison. If the fingerprint comparison confirms that the subject has not been previously arrested, the repository creates a new SID for that individual. If, however, the comparison shows that the person has been arrested before, the new arrest cycle is appended to the existing SID record.

From that point forward, any subsequent fingerprint-based event or activity will continue to be appended to the same SID, creating a complete continuous record for that individual. At both the point of SID creation and the point of SID update, our systems generate an electronic unsolicited message, and we send it back to the contributing agency. This notification provides the SID associated with the fingerprints they submitted, ensuring that the agencies have accurate and up-to-date identifier information for their records as well. Pretty short process. That's pretty much it for the SID overview. I'm available for any questions, should they come up.

Director Powers: Thank you, Erica.

Chair Herndon: I do not see any hands on the screen, but does anybody have any questions for Ms. Souza-Llamas or Director Powers?

Mr. Piro: I do, Chair, if that's okay.

Chair Herndon: Yeah, go ahead, John.

Mr. Piro: Ms. Souza-Llamas, I know that down south we use a scope ID, so then their state ID will be statewide, but scope would just stay local for, like, Metro? Am I correct in saying that?

Ms. Souza-Llamas: Correct, yes.

Mr. Piro: And then can I just ask a further question?

Chair Herndon: Sure.

Mr. Piro: Sometimes we have a lot of difficulty getting people IDs when they're leaving prison, but we have these fingerprints, and we're fairly certain that we have enough information to hold this person in prison for a certain amount of time based on this identity, but not enough to get them a quality ID when they're released. Is there some way that we can work on that issue?

Ms. Souza-Llamas: I will do my best to answer that. I think that's more of a Department of Motor Vehicles issue. I mean, we could certainly have conversations, you know, because my office maintains the fingerprints, but I would note that criminal history sometimes contains alias information and not necessarily, you know, I may be arrested and could provide a false name. I mean, that doesn't mean that's me, right? So I just wanted to throw that out there as well.

Chair Herndon: Vice Chair Brady.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Thank you, Chair. I don't know, Jorja or Erica, if either of you are the right person to ask, but do we know what, if any, barriers there are to the local correctional institutions or courts using the state ID number? Do we know if there are barriers or why they're maybe not using them?

Director Powers: We do. Later in this presentation, I'll touch on that a little bit, and then if you still have questions, maybe we can go to that.

Chair Herndon: Senator Steinbeck.

Senator Steinbeck: Yes, thank you. So, what would be the gold standard? Would the gold standard be, what does that look like and what would it take to get there so that all of our facilities are using the same ID? What would we need to do to get to accomplish that?

Director Powers: Let me go into the next few slides, and then we can discuss that a little bit more. Thank you.

Senator Steinbeck: Sorry for skipping ahead.

Director Powers: Oh, no, no. That's fine. Thank you. Okay. So NDSP has been researching what can be done to help agencies utilize the already existing unique identifier. Our plan was to continue researching and talking to stakeholders and build a robust plan for the 2029 legislative session. Our outline includes a mandate for agencies to use the state ID number and tier the rollout plan depending on agency size and capability.

Our strategy for 2029 also includes technical assistance and mitigation and a hope for financial support for agencies to achieve the ability to utilize the SID within their systems. The purpose of this would be to close critical data gaps in Nevada's criminal justice system by ensuring seamless tracking of an individual's case life cycle from arrest to final disposition.

However, we cannot wait until 2029. It has been brought to our attention that there is a need for expediting portions of this SID utilization project. Intent would be a stopgap measure to apply agencies' reported data, synthesize it with existing data, and connect the disparate cases to a single SID using proposed changes to statute in 2027.

One of our hopes is to give the Department of Sentencing Policy a designation of agency of criminal justice. In some ways, this will help us to access data we haven't before. There still will be some barriers of which we are aware and we are working through. The criminal justice agencies in Nevada report their information to RCCD, but it then becomes federal data. So, we are working to determine a way that our agency can receive the data while it's still just Nevada data. The thought for 2027 is to identify a path to allow this data to come through NDSP and our staff can assist in helping to match the justice-involved individuals to their SID at the different criminal justice intercept points and begin to build the longitudinal data pathway we envision for Nevada. This will be an interim measure for the coming biennium and then we will continue to work toward larger statutory change in 2029.

So, our key points moving forward will be making NDSP an agency of criminal justice, moving forward with the interim plan for NDSP to assist in beginning to establish a manner in which to follow a criminal justice-involved individual throughout the system by using the SID, and then moving into a larger mandate where all criminal justice agencies will utilize the SID in their own systems to more easily create a longitudinal look at activities and

outcomes from start to finish. To answer a question earlier, part of the problem, as I mentioned, is the legacy systems that people use, and we talk about this in many different forums. People's systems are old and there just isn't a way to add another number or they've never needed to use it before, so they just aren't, and the cost prohibitiveness of just even adding a box in some of these systems makes it impossible for them.

So, we can take questions and talk about this a little bit at this point.

Chair Herndon: Senator Steinbeck, did that get you an answer to your question, or do you want some follow-up?

Senator Steinbeck: It did, sir. It really did. I'm just wondering, is there a sponsor for this now, or will this be an agency bill? What's the plan moving forward?

Director Powers: It will be an agency bill. We had to add it later. Again, we were asked to expedite some of this in 27 rather than waiting until 29, so we'll see how it moves forward.

Senator Steinbeck: Phenomenal. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else have any questions? Vice Chair Brady.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Thank you, Chair. It sounds like, I mean, people are pretty quiet. It sounds like there's not a lot of opposition to this other than, you know, maybe figuring out a path forward to overcome barriers. That's kind of the vibe I'm getting from the silence, but I'm not sure if that's the case.

Director Powers: Yeah, that is our hope. We have talked to a lot of stakeholders, and people want this. That's what the whole state needs is a longitudinal look at a criminal justice individual and what happens, but we'll just have to see about the barriers and the designation of federal data versus Nevada data.

Chair Herndon: Yeah, I think there's certain things that aren't difficult at all, and then the others, you're going to have to have a really good handle on what the fiscal impact is going to be to create these things. That's kind of where the rubber hits the road, I think. Paola.

Ms. Paola Armeni: Thank you, Chair. Jorja, kind of to follow up on what John said earlier, are you envisioning that SID would replace the scope that Metro uses, or would it just be Metro would keep their scope, but they would also, everybody would use this SID?

Director Powers: No, they would still be using scope. In fact, Metro was one of the agencies that we reached out to and talked about. They already have this SID in their system. There are agencies that have it. They're just not using it in the same way to connect that we hope moving forward they will.

Ms. Armeni: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Captain Martinez.

Captain Martinez: Yeah, thank you. That's what I wanted to say is what Jorja said is we worked with her to get some answers in regards to what Metro is doing currently, but I wouldn't take the silence as like, hey, we're all on board with it. The reason I say that is because with computerization, even for us, there was a time period if we were to do any little tweaks to a legacy system or a system in general, it could crash the system.

Those are things that the IT folks would really need to chime in about. And then when we see further details on what legislation looks like, I would welcome the conversation to continue on this because it would impact the whole state. But like she said, for Metro, we do have the SID number in our system now, but how does that connect? I think that discussion needs to continue on the connectivity there and tracking somebody through that.

Scope is an important number for us. We have a lot of time, and the county has a lot of time invested in that program.

Director Powers: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Jarret.

Mr. Jarret Orcutt: Yeah, thank you so much, Chair. Just to add to it, if we were able to also connect education and workforce data, we would be able to prove which programs lead to jobs and which programs actually work and which we could fund as well. So it'd be very helpful.

Director Powers: That is part of the future hope. We have talked to other agencies, DETR and behavioral health, and when I say beyond, that is exactly what I'm thinking.

Mr. Jarret Orcutt: Thank you so much.

Chair Herndon: Okay. With that, we will go ahead and close agenda item number seven. Before we move on, I know the meeting is going to be running long today, so let's take a break for about five minutes, and then we'll come back, and then we'll pick back up with agenda item number six.

6. **Projected Amount of Costs Avoided Report**

Chair Herndon: All right. We will go ahead and call our meeting back to order, and we're going to, it's 10:34, and we're going to move over to agenda item number six, our cost avoided report, and I will turn it over to Director Powers.

Director Powers: All right. Thank you. I will share my screen again. All right. Director Powers, for the record, we are going to go over the projected amount of cost avoided report for due August 1st of 2026. I will be reading this verbatim since we will be voting on it. I will start with, we know there's always been difficulty with this report for the considerations that we'll talk about later.

The statutory requirements per NRS 176.01347, the Nevada Sentencing Commission, is required to develop a formula using a comparison of the 2018 annual prison population projections, and we will see a note in the formula section in a moment, and the actual Nevada Department of Corrections population numbers to calculate the costs avoided attributed to the enactment of Assembly Bill number 236, AB 236, from the 2019 legislative session, effective July 1, 2020. The commission is required to submit a statement of these costs avoided by December 1st of each fiscal year. Additionally, per statute, a separate report shall be prepared by August 1st of each even-numbered year projecting the costs avoided for the next biennium and providing recommendations for the reinvestment of these avoided costs prioritized to certain programs and resources to support re-entry, address behavioral health needs, and reduce recidivism for justice-involved individuals.

The December 2025 statement of costs avoided report was completed using the newly approved formula. The Nevada Sentencing Commission calculated that Nevada had avoided $19,604,410 due to the enactment of AB 236 since the 2024 statement of costs avoided. The Nevada Sentencing Commission chose to review the previous method of calculation and, in May 2024, adopted a new formula for determining projected costs avoided. The updated formula approved by the Nevada Sentencing Commission uses the two data points explicitly required by NRS 176.013471. A, the annual projection of the number of persons who will be in a facility or institution of the Department of Corrections, which was created by the Office of Finance, pursuant to NRS 176.0129 for calendar year 2018, and, and here is our note, the annual prison population projection for calendar year 2018, which was the JFA February 2017 report, only projects through 2027. As the next biennium covers 2028 and 2029, the statutorily deemed projections cannot provide the needed information. So, the February 2019 projections were used for this report. And, b, the actual number of persons who are in a facility or institution of the Department of Corrections during each year.

Projected prison population avoided was calculated by subtracting the JFA March 2025 projections from the JFA February 2019 projections. The growth rates for the past two biennia were used to project the annual cost per offender and inmate-driven percentage. This calculated projected annual cost per offender inmate-driven portion was multiplied by projected prison population avoided to determine the projected amount of costs avoided. And you will see this chart. We did use the February 19 projection numbers because the 17 did not have what we needed.

So, the projected costs avoided for the fiscal year 2028-2029 biennium are $32,118,132. Considerations. I will say some of these are the same that we have always had and we have added some. The Nevada Sentencing Commission is a 27-member body comprised of individuals representing a wide swath of criminal justice processes. The commission meets to discuss topics related to criminal justice policy and procedure in Nevada.

The expertise embodied by commissioners brings varied ideas and points of view to discussions held. Following are thoughts offered regarding the costs avoided topic that may not be represented elsewhere. There are difficulties in calculating avoided costs as it does not represent tangible or measurable funds but represents potential future savings. The JFA 2019 population projection shows that by the time of that report, the 2017 projections had proven high. The NDOC population on June 30, 2018 was 13,611 inmates. The NDOC prison population as of June 30, 2025 was 10,922 inmates. The NDOC budget for fiscal year 2018 was $339,887,052. The NDOC budget for fiscal year 2026 is $495,376,703.

The costs avoided calculations consider prison population numbers only. AB 236 reduced penalties for certain crimes. For example, changing some felonies to misdemeanors or gross misdemeanors and giving mandatory probation for others. This means that while it may be more cost effective than prison, other agencies are still incurring costs for these individuals. Data is not readily available to the commission and department to track the rerouting of justice involved individuals due to AB 236, 2019. Methods of data collection and required submission of data should be considered.

A BDR to change the required data point from the 2017 to the 2020 JFA prison population projections will provide statutory authority to continue the costs avoided reports for the current and next biennium. Tandem reports will be completed going forward, moving closer to a more useful calculation to assist with the AB 236 question and any future proposed changes to legislation. The proposal for the 2029 legislative session will be to update statute by replacing the current calculation data points with a dynamic data-driven framework.

Recommendations. Per NRS 176.01347-1, financial support should be prioritized to the Department of Corrections for programs for re-entry of offenders and parolees into the community, programs for vocational training and employment of offenders, educational programs for offenders, and transitional work programs for offenders. B, the Division for Services for Offenders re-entering the community, the supervision of probationers and parolees and programs of treatment for probationers and parolees that are proven by scientific research to reduce recidivism. C, any behavioral health field response grant program developed and implemented pursuant to NRS 289.675. D, the housing division of the Department of Business and Industry to create or provide transitional housing for probationers and parolees and offenders re-entering the community. And E, the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council created by NRS 176.014 for the purpose of making grants to counties for programs and treatment that reduce recidivism of persons involved in the criminal justice system.

Specifically, the Sentencing Commission recommends utilization of costs avoided savings for the following: reinstatement of financial support of not less than $3 million to the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council for the 2028-2029 budget cycle for continued reinvestment into grants statutorily required to be administered to Nevada counties by the Coordinating Council. $3 million was appropriated in the 2023 legislative session and that grant cycle was completed. Continued support of this effort will expand the opportunities for county level programming to provide reentry support to help curb recidivism. The grant money funded programs for diversionary courts, housing, transportation, resource and referral, outreach teams, behavioral health, and more. And increased financial support to transitional housing opportunities for justice involved individuals.

And that is the report ready to be discussed and redlined if needed.

Chair Herndon: Anybody have any questions or comments for Director Powers regarding the report and its recommendations? Well, there you go. Okay, John.

Mr. Piro: Thank you, Chair. Jorja, I just wanted to ask we talk about more, I agree with that, you know, the data of the lack of people going to prison isn't the only data point that should matter. When you talk about a more dynamic data kind of collection, can you tell us more about what you mean?

Director Powers: Yes. So, this is our plan. I'm just going to read it to you. It's to update NRS 176.01347 by replacing the expiring 2018 population baseline and the avoided construction fiscal model with a dynamic data-driven framework. The BDR would sunset the 2018 costs avoided calculation baseline and shift to a rolling baseline using the immediate prior biennium's actual population data. It would implement marginal costing by calculating savings based on inmate driven costs, food, medical, etc. rather than out-of-date projections and hypothetical construction costs. It will address the theft threshold gap by acknowledging that case level data for

specific dollar amounts and theft cases is often not available. Lastly, it would empower the Nevada Sentencing Commission to use trend analysis comparing the decrease in state felony admissions to the increase in local misdemeanor bookings to estimate the cost shifting. So that's the general thought at this moment.

Chair Herndon: All right.

Mr. Piro: Sorry, Chair, can I follow up?

Chair Herndon: Yeah, yeah, please go ahead.

Mr. Piro: Would that also take into account maybe what they call the average length of stay? So let's say, you know, if you go to prison, the minimum you could do is one year, right? But if you're booked on a misdemeanor and you're in and out of jail, which that maybe would have been a felony pre AB 236, is there a way to like take in average lengths of stay and costs as well in the analysis?

Director Powers: That is definitely a possibility. We are now looking still right now at what the calculation will look like. We just know it needs to change to something that may look at bed days instead of, you know, just money. I don't know if that technically answers your question, but it is something we're looking at. And I definitely wrote down what you just said. So we'll make sure we see where that would fit in.

Mr. Piro: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Vice Chair Brady.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Thank you, Chair. I'm wondering to Jorja if whether having like the SID, the use of the SID number would play a role in being able to better, you know, account for these for these numbers and also for, you know, the shift in costs potentially to the local law enforcement or correctional institutions.

Director Powers: I think in some ways, I mean, the SID is going to let us follow the individual through the system. But as far as how AB 236 is involved, I'm not sure it would be quite as helpful. So, I think there are pros and cons.

Chair Herndon: Dr. Lanterman.

Dr. Lanterman: All right. So in the recommendation section, point A, with respect to recommendation for financial support to Department of Corrections programs, I think it might be useful here, given what we understand about the lack of lower than necessary availability of substance use treatment programming, that we might want to make some recommendations for additional funding to support substance use treatment while people are in Department of Corrections custody. Because, you know, related to my earlier comments, we can educate and train people all we want. But if they've got an ongoing substance use disorder where there is not an evidence-based intervention, the risk of them continuing to commit crime and returning to Department of Corrections custody will remain high.

Director Powers: Okay. Is that something that the entire body would like me to add here?

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Chair, point of order.

Chair Herndon: Yes, please.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Is this something we would need to vote on? Like, would somebody need to propose, like, a stated, like, would Dr. Lanterman need to propose, like, a stated bullet point, and then we vote on it, or what would be the way forward?

Chair Herndon: Well, I think Jorja is going to redline things as comments are coming up, and then we can take them when we move to vote. I mean, people will either agree to the entirety of the document, or if they have particular exceptions to things. But right now, I think we're just kind of, like, collecting what the comments are for possible additions. Am I reading right, Jorja, what you're doing?

Director Powers: Yes. Yes. Since we have not voted on the document yet, we can add and delete at this point, and then take a motion.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Were there any other comments or suggested edits that anybody had? Well, since that's the only edit then, I will ask, does anybody have any concerns about Dr. Lanterman's edit? I'm good with it.

Director Powers: All right. Dr. Lanterman, do you have that verbiage that will work?

Dr. Lanterman: You know, it's under, scroll to the top of page four, where recommendations per NRS. Yeah, so point A, Department of Corrections, the Department of Corrections for Programs for Reentry of Offenders and Parolees in Community Programs for Vocational Training and Employment of Offenders. You can add anywhere in there, and, you know, substance use treatment programs, really anywhere, you know, in that construction. I think that it makes sense to, in terms of just order of presentation, talk about things you're going to do exclusively or primarily while in Department of Corrections custody, and then move on to references to reentry programming.

But you would want, ideally here, we would want to offer, and I don't know if this needs to be a separate bullet point or not, but recommend use of funds for increased availability, whether that is, largely, it's going to come in the form of staffing to offer the programming in Department of Corrections custody, but also to parole and probation or to other, so that they can, this is an ongoing issue. You've got the same people who have poor access to resources when they go into Department of Corrections are going out onto parole, and they still have poor access to resources. The best available substance use treatment is that where people engage it while they're in custody, and then they continue on when they're in the community.

So, there, I don't know if you want it to be in the same bullet point as Department of Corrections or a separate one where there is a reference exclusively to substance use treatment, where we make that programming resources available to support programming in Department of Corrections custody, and then also to division of parole and probation to support ongoing substance use treatment of people under parole supervision when they transition to the community. And just not in terms of the language for this bullet point, but the reason that's important is because some people will have access to different types of insurance or Medicaid, things like that, but some people might have to pay out of pocket. Certain providers have sliding fee scales. People have different employment situations. So, often the solution to that is a pot of money available to parole where they can supplement or step in where people need that programming in the community, but they can't access it financially. So, that's really the issue with the substance use treatment and funding it. We need to fund it while people are in Department of Corrections, but we also need to make resources available to continue to support it when people return to the community.

Chair Herndon: All right. So, let's back up a little bit because, Jorja, I think Dr. Lanterman was talking about in the recommendations part in that first paragraph where we're talking about how we should prioritize financial support, not so much the bottom part about specifically what we're recommending because I think specifically what we're recommending, the language there references the idea of providing support to help curb recidivism, but up in Section A of that first paragraph, the Department of Corrections for programs for reentry of offenders and then it goes on. Dr. Lanterman, if we put in there the Department of Corrections for substance abuse programs and programs for reentry of offenders and parolees into the community.

Director Powers: Just real quickly, I'm sorry. That first part, that's NRS. That's quoted from law. We can't change that part.

Dr. Lanterman: So, this is Jen Lanterman for the record. John McCormick provided some good language for a recommendation here for both funding in Department of Corrections and for parole.

Chair Herndon: What do you got, John?

Mr. John McCormick: Oh, I put it in the text. It says support substance abuse treatment programs in both Department of Corrections and the Division of Parole and Probation to provide longitudinal recovery support for justice-involved individuals.

Dr. Lanterman: Yeah.

Mr. McCormick: And it's in the chat.

Dr. Lanterman: Yeah.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Can everybody pull that up in the chat and see that language?

Director Powers: Yeah. Now that it's been read, it'll be fine out loud, but the chat can't be used unless the public can see it. But since he read it, I'm going to try to pull it up. It's just that my screens are cattywampus right now with the sharing.

Chair Herndon: No, no, no. I get that. I'm just trying to make sure all of our members can see that in the chat so they can look at that language and see if there's anybody that has anything because John read it off pretty fast, which is fine, John. I'm not disparaging you

Mr. McCormick: No, I was just going to offer to read it again in a slightly...

Chair Herndon: I think Jorja now has it in her slide.

Mr. McCormick: It should be individuals. There should be an S on individual at the end of the sentence. I apparently didn't add that.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Is that capture it, John?

Mr. McCormick: Yes, sir.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Anybody have any concerns? Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Jones Brady: It's not a concern. It's probably a logistical thing that maybe we don't need to address here. On our recommendations of where the costs avoided could be spent, since this is as we've had discussions where this is sort of not imaginary money, but I can't remember the word that we use to describe this funding, but this is something that the legislature would budget separately these things, or this wouldn't be...these wouldn't be costs taken out of the current NDOC budget, right?

Director Powers: Correct.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Okay. Yes. Because as we've discussed, we talk about the costs at NDOC. There are so many, as we can see even in this projection or in this report that the costs at NDOC have risen despite... The budget has risen despite the almost 2000 or so reduction in inmate population, and some of that's because of older buildings and rising costs due to fuel and supplies and things like that.

Director Powers: Right.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else? Yeah. Brian?

Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts: Thanks, Chair. I just wanted to jump in and follow up on Vice Chair Brady's question is the only one here that actually sits on a budget committee. I can tell you that there is no guarantee that there will be any extra money for anything, and we may just pull money out of their budget to pay for all these wish list items. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Herndon: Thank you for that sobering reminder, but you're absolutely right to bring that up, obviously. That's one of the reasons we were talking earlier about the other issues with whatever the fiscal impact is going to be. I don't think it's inappropriate for us to make the recommendations, but we have to be realistic about things as well, obviously. Anybody else have any comments or concerns or suggested edits? I don't see any. With the addition, the red line information that Dr. Lanterman suggested and that John kind of put into words and Jorja has now put into the document. Is there anybody that I can get, please, to make a motion to approve that? I believe we've only lost one person, Jorja, so I think we still have a quorum.

Director Powers: I think we lost three. One second. I have my staff keeping track.

Chair Herndon: I only thought we lost Chief Jackson.

Director Powers: Chief Jackson, Leisa Moseley-Sayles, and I think Erica. Is Erica still here?

Chair Herndon: Erica is still here.

Ms. Souza-Llamas: I am still here for another 20 minutes or so.

Director Powers: Okay, then we are at 15. We only need 14. Perfect.

Chair Herndon: Okay, there you go.

JOHN MCCORMICK MOVED TO ADOPT THE COSTS AVOIDED REPORT WITH THE RED LINE ADDED.

CHIEF JUSTICE CHAIR DOUGLAS HERNDON SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSES

Chair Herndon: All right. That passes. Jorja, thank you very much for all the work on that.

Very well done, and I appreciate it. So, I'm happy that we were able to get that voted out today.

Director Powers: Great. Thank you very much.

8. Data Report

Chair Herndon: Okay, and with that, we will close agenda item number seven and move to agenda item number eight, which is our NDSP data report. I'm not sure where you went on my screen, Jenna, but I know you're there.

Deputy Director Jenna Buonacorsi: Hi, Chair. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: There we go. Deputy Director Jenna Buonacorsi.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: I am in a cabin in the woods right now, so I have a limited cell phone reception or Wi-Fi reception, so I'll just keep my camera off, and my analyst, Marie Bledsoe, is going to be so kind as to share the presentation for me to preserve my bandwidth. So, please give us some grace as we dual present here today, and if for some reason my Wi-Fi does cut out and I drop off, Marie is going to graciously step in for me. So, just forewarning if any of those activities happen. All right, Marie, whenever you're ready to share. Wonderful. All right.

Good morning, everyone. My name is Jenna Buonacorsi, and I'm the Deputy Director for the Nevada Department of Sentencing Policy, for the record. Today, we'll be discussing the following.

We will start with the dataset introduction, as this is a new dataset we're going to be presenting today. We also will be covering some challenges we had with the new data, as well as looking at the felony arrest instance trends. We'll look at this by offense group and felony category, and arrest title and chapter, and disposition type. So, to start, I want to thank the Nevada Department of Public Safety's Records, Communication, and Compliance Division, or RCCD. They have been a tremendous help with providing all this new data. They are the state's central repository for all criminal history information, and the data is reported to them from local law enforcement agencies in Nevada. I also want to thank one of our analysts, Marie Bledsoe. Marie helped pick this project up, partway through, and worked diligently to make this presentation happen today.

The data captures 20 years of Nevada felony arrest instances, starting on January 1st, 2006, through December 31st, 2025. Each instance in this dataset has an arrest offense and a disposition offense. Each have a NOC NRS description, and the dispositions have a related code. I'll explain all this a little bit more as we go further.

So, what is an instance? Each crime event is associated with one individual in the dataset. If multiple individuals are involved in the same crime event, each individual will have a separate record linked to the crime event. Within each crime event, there may be one or more instances. We may know them also as charges. Each instance may or may not have a corresponding disposition. As a case progresses, the original arrest offense, or the arrest NRS, may remain the same or be modified through the court process, resulting in a different disposition NRS. The example shown here represents a single crime event in which an individual was initially arrested for one count of crime A and two counts of crime B. In this dataset, it would appear as three arrest instances for one crime event. As the case moves through the court process, crime A remains unchanged through disposition. One count of crime B is dismissed, while a second count is reduced to a crime C. As a result, the dataset shows two dispositions responding to the original three arrest instances. In this example, the defendant ultimately entered a guilty plea to crime A and crime C.

Before we get further into the analysis, I want to briefly touch on a few challenges we encountered with the data. First, we are working with 20 years of instances for all felony arrests in the state of Nevada. Some of this data is quite dated. We received over 1.2 million instances, which is a lot of data to process. Also, this is brand-new data that our department had not worked with yet before, so it needed time to be collected and processed.

One other challenge is that the RCCD data contains some truncated NRS, which made it challenging to analyze that portion of the data. RCCD is aware of the issue and is working to address it. Because the Sentencing Commission is familiar with reporting by felony category and offense group, we wanted to present this data in the same way. To do that, we used a dataset provided by NDOC to match records based on their Nevada Offense Code, or NOC. This allowed us to be able to assign a felony category and offense group and supplement some of the truncated NRS. I'll talk more about some of the remaining limitations with this process later in the presentation.

This chart shows arrest instances and crime events generally follow the same pattern over time. After declining through the early 2010s, both began increasing in 2016, reaching a high point in 2019. There is a slight decline in 2020-2021, followed by a partial recovery over the next two years. While arrest instances have consistently outnumbered crime events because multiple instances can be on the same crime event, overall the trends remain very similar.

One result of the matching process I mentioned earlier is this unidentified offense group. These are records that could not be matched using the old or new NOC in the NDOC dataset. As a result, approximately 186,900 arrest records, or about 15% of the data, could not be assigned to an offense group or felony category through our automated matching process and will require manual review. NDSP is continuing to clean and validate these records to improve completeness of the dataset. For this portion of the presentation that focuses on offense group and felony category, this 15% has been excluded from the analysis until they can be accurately classified. This table summarizes offense groups across the full 20-year period from 2006-2025. Property offenses accounted for the largest share, with just over 404,000 arrests, followed by violent offenses at nearly 250,000 arrests, and drug offenses at 246,000. Other offense groups, including sex offenses, DUI, and other, made up small portions of the total. Overall, there are just over 1.26 million arrest instances for felonies during the 20-year period.

Property offenses represented the largest share of offenses until 2018, when drug offenses surpassed them, peaking in 2019. Since then, drug offenses have steadily declined. After a dip in 2021, property offenses continued to increase and reach their highest point in 2023. Violent and other offenses have shown steady upward trends since 2012, with those categories reaching their highest levels in 2023. This slide compares the offense categories reported in the RCCD dataset with the offense categories associated with NDOC prison admissions in 2025. It is important to note that these datasets capture different points in the criminal justice process. RCCD data reflects arrest instances, while NDOC admissions represent individuals entering prison and the offenses they had associated with their admission. Violent offenses accounted for 29% of all arrest instances in RCCD data in 2025, but represented a larger share of NDOC admission offenses at 38%. Drug offenses accounted for 21% of arrest instances, but represented a smaller share of prison admissions at 10%.

This table summarizes felony categories across the 20-year period from 2006 to 2025. Across the 20-year period, Category B felonies represented the largest share of arrest instances, followed by Category C and Category D felonies. Category A felonies represented the smallest portion of the overall total, accounting for approximately 5% of all arrest instances. From 2006 to 2025, Category B felonies represented the largest portion of arrest instances. Category A remained the smallest over the 20-year period. Category C experienced a steady increase starting in 2019 until its drop again in 2023.

Category B offenses made up the largest portion of both datasets, representing 40% of RCCD arrest instances and nearly half of NDOC admissions at 49%. Category A offenses showed a higher representation among prison admissions, which is expected given the severity of these offenses. Category E offenses counted for a larger share of arrest, but a smaller share of prison admissions.

The data presented in this slide, as well throughout the remainder of the presentation, now includes that additional 15% of records that were not able to be incorporated in the first part of the presentation when broken out into offense group and category. So we are back up to the 1.26 million in total. This portion examines arrest

instances over a 20-year period and groups the offenses by the corresponding Nevada Revised Statute or NRS title and chapter. This provides an overview of where arrest activity is concentrated across statutory categories and helps identify broader trends and offense types over time. Not surprising of the 1.2 million instances over the 20-year period, 819,009 of them were from Title 15 crimes and punishment. 24,298 of the instances were related to Title 16, correctional institution, aid to victim of crime. The next largest group was 315,997 for public health and safety offenses. In total, there were 936 NRS chapters used over the 1.26 million instances.

As mentioned earlier, each instance may or may not have a disposition associated with it. The possible disposition types are conviction, prosecutor, not guilty, appeals, dismissals, and necessary odds and ends. The analysis includes 1,265,051 arrests across the 20-year period. Nearly half of all instances or 49% did not have a recorded disposition in the available data. For 51% of instances with a recorded disposition, convictions represented the largest outcome at 43%, followed by dismissals at 32%, prosecutor at 25%. The remaining disposition categories accounted for a very small portion of the overall total.

The highest number of recorded dispositions occurred in 2023 with 41,105 total dispositions. The decline in 2025 should be interpreted with caution, as more recent cases may have not had a sufficient amount of time to move through the criminal justice process and receive a final disposition when this data was pulled. This table shows the annual disposition of recorded dispositions from 2026 to 2025 by the disposition type. Across the 20-year period, there were 642,132 total recorded dispositions with convictions representing the largest category at 273,266 dispositions, followed by dismissals at 202,836 and prosecutor dispositions at 160,488. Convictions reached their highest point in 2019 with 21,396 recorded convictions, while dismissals peaked in 2024 with 16,128 recorded dismissals.

This line chart represents the same disposition data over time and highlights the trends by disposition type from 2006 to 2025. Convictions show a clear upward trend through 2019, followed by notable decline in subsequent years. In contrast, dismissals and prosecutor dispositions have generally increased since 2020, minus the past years for data maturity. In future analysis with this data, we plan to explore a county breakdown, further analysis of dispositions. We would like to look into the possibility of receiving demographic data for this dataset, as well as look into felonies that change to misdemeanors from the initial arrest to the disposition and the frequency of that.Thank you for your time.

Chair Herndon: I do not see any hands on the screen. Does anybody have any questions, though, for Deputy Director Buonacorsi?

Ms. Armeni: This is Paola. I just have one question.

Chair Herndon: Go ahead.

Ms. Armeni: Jenna, when you're looking in future for the felony to misdemeanor, your last slide that you just talked about, is that going to also include gross misdemeanors?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Yes, we also received a dataset from RCCD for the misdemeanor subcommittee, and so we do have some misdemeanor data as well from them, but yes, it will help us. It's broken down by felony, gross misdemeanor, and misdemeanor, all the data we received from RCCD.

Ms. Armeni: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Anybody else? Okay, looks like not. Thank you again, Jenna.

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: Thank you, Chair.

Chair Herndon: All right, we will close agenda item number eight.

9. Discussion of Potential Topics and Dates for Future Meetings

Chair Herndon: And move on to agenda item number nine, which is just a discussion of potential topics and dates for our future meetings. We already have the two dates set in September and November, Friday, September 18th, 2026. Jorja, I can't recall as I'm sitting here right now, is that a in-person availability as well as virtual meeting, or did we do that one just as virtual?

Director Powers: Cecilia, do you have that information handy?

Ms. Felipe: That was either in-person or virtual.

Chair Herndon: Okay, so it'll have in-person availability north and south, but also, if need be, people can appear virtually. Vice Chair Brady?

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Thank you, Chair. The Office of the Attorney General, we have switched contracts from Vine to NVSAVE, and this is on victim notifications. And so, I'm wondering if anybody on the Sentencing Commission would be interested in someone from our office coming to talk to this group about the new system. So, I'm putting that out there. If that's something people are interested in, Jorja, let me know, and I can make arrangements to have someone come and talk about it.

Director Powers: Wonderful, Vice Chair. I will write that down.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Thank you.

Chair Herndon: I can also tell you all that the Pardons Board has been dealing with a lot of victims notification issues as well. Chris knows this because he's been at a lot of these meetings, and we are talking about trying to find ways to coordinate all the different agencies that are collecting victim notification information, and how that gets disseminated out, and how they can all be somewhat interconnected so that we can provide kind of a robust universe that's accessible by everybody. That's kind of different than I think what Vice Chair Brady is talking about in terms of just speaking to us right now about their new system, but I think their new system is going to be incredibly helpful in that too. So, yeah. Christine, do you want to have somebody come and talk about it in September? Yeah? Okay. So, we'll put that on the agenda.

Vice Chair Jones Brady: Yes, I can, Chair. Thank you.

Chair Herndon: Uh-huh. Anybody else have any suggested topics for the September meeting? Jarret, I see your hands up as well.

Mr. Orcutt: Yeah. Good morning. Thank you, Chair. Jarret Orcutt, for the record. I just really quick want to say I'm joining today from Hudson Link for Higher Education in Prisons offices near Sing Sing Correctional Center in New York, where I'm here with two of our Justice Involved Student Mentors from Truckee Meadows Community College for a graduation recognizing students who began college while incarcerated and continued after release. And I just wanted to briefly recognize Hudson Link and today's graduates. For the November meeting, I'd like to propose a presentation on correctional education technology and how proven platforms can expand education, workforce preparation, treatment, and reentry support. And I'd also like to explore how these systems could improve individual level outcome and recidivism data while reducing the risks associated with physical mail. And I'm already speaking with several organizations, and I'd like to coordinate with staff on the speakers and the structure of that presentation in November.

Chair Herndon: Terrific. Thank you.

Mr. Orcutt: Thank you so much.

Chair Herndon: All right. Anybody else? Well, as always, when ideas come to you about future topics, please reach out to staff so we can get those on the agenda as quickly as possible. And with that, we will go ahead and close agenda item number nine.

10. Public Comment

Chair Herndon: Agenda item number ten is our second period of public comment. Cecilia, I don't know if we have any folks online that wish to give public comment.

Ms. Felipe: No, Chair. We don't have any public comment who wish to testify**.**

Chair Herndon: Okay, thank you.

9. Adjournment

Chair Herndon: And with that, we will close agenda item number ten, and that moves us to agenda item number eleven, which is adjournment. So, I will give the great thanks to everybody again for all of your time today. Jenna, I know there's like this really great horror movie called The Cabin in the Woods, and I'm not really sure where you are, but when you said that, it struck me as uh-oh. So, I'm glad you've got good Wi-Fi. Go ahead. What were you going to say?

Deputy Director Buonacorsi: I was just going to say I'm in Bigfoot territory, so you never know.

Chair Herndon: Okay. Oh, nice. All right. Everybody, again, thank you very much, and we will see you all back either in person or virtually in September. Have a great weekend.

Director Powers: Thank you, everyone.