**Joe Lombardo**
***Governor***

**Jorja Powers**
***Executive Director***

# STATE OF NEVADA
# DEPARTMENT OF SENTENCING POLICY

625 Fairview Drive, Suite 109
Carson City, NV 89701-5430
Phone: (775) 684-7390
sentencing.nv.gov

## NSC Misdemeanor Subcommittee

## DRAFT MINUTES

**Date and Time:** **October 19, 2026, 1:30 PM**

**Location:** **VIRTUAL ONLY**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Christine Jones Brady
Nickolas Graham
Evelyn Grosenick
Peter P. Handy
Captain Joshua Martinez
Lt. Ned Nemeth
Alisa Goodman
Chair John McCormick

**MEMBERS EXCUSED**

John Arrascada
Judge Steve Bishop
James Conway
Wes Duncan
Eve Hanan
Dr. Jennifer Lanterman
Kristina Mortensen
Leisa Moseley Sayles
John Piro
Erin Tellez

**STAFF**

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

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

**[Meeting called to order at 1:33 p.m.]**

**Chair John McCormick:** Great, thank you very much. With that, it's 1:33PM, so we will call the October 19th, 2026, meeting of the Nevada Sentencing Commission's Misdemeanor Subcommittee to order. Good afternoon. It's nice to see everyone here, and welcome to those viewing the meeting on the Department of Sentencing Policy's YouTube channel. This is our fourth meeting of the 2025-2027 meeting cycle. I will now ask Deputy Director Buonacorsi to take the roll.

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

(ROLL CALL IS CONDUCTED BY DEPUTY DIRECTOR BUONACORSI; QUORUM IS NOT MET)

2. **Public Comment**

**Chair McCormick:** All right. Thank you very much. The next item on our agenda is public comment. Which is the first period of public comment. There are two periods of public comment, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end. Members of the public have two options for submitting public comment. First, members of the public may do so in writing by emailing the Department of Sentencing Policy at sentencingpolicy@ndsp.nv.gov. Public comment received in writing will be provided to the subcommittee members and will be included by reference in the minutes of the meeting. Members of the public who wish to testify may do so by telephone as well. Due to time constraints, public comment will be limited to two minutes. Any member of the public that exceeds the two-minute limit may submit your comments in writing to the Department of Sentencing Policy. Callers, as a reminder, please mute the device on which you are watching the meeting. All sound will come through the telephone.

DRAFT

At this time, I will ask staff to manage and direct those who wish to testify by telephone. Ms. Felipe.

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

3. **Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of the NSC Misdemeanor Subcommittee held on: April 28, 2026, and August 26, 2026.**

**Chair McCormick:** All right. Thank you very much. With that, we will move on to our third agenda item. Being that we don't have a quorum, we are unable to approve the two sets of minutes that we have here. We will have to table that for a future meeting, unfortunately.

4. **Review Poll Results**

**Chair McCormick:** Item four: You should all have received a document from NDSP titled *NSC Misdemeanor Subcommittee Poll Results*. This was the poll that was sent out by NDSP to gather feedback from the group after our last meeting where we discussed limited availability of data. Maybe we should be focusing on doing some other stuff that isn't necessarily tied that closely to the data request, etc. The poll was sent out. Thank you, everybody who replied. From that, we have a list of the seven items that were on the poll that have been prioritized. Just to quickly go over that, the number one that respondents suggested we focus on is repeal of old, unused, and inappropriate misdemeanors. The second item would be formalization or reform of misdemeanor probation, including possibly requiring counties to provide personnel for misdemeanor probation, limiting the term of misdemeanor probation to six months, and limiting perpetual court status check hearings. That's the second item. The third item in the ranking from the poll is revising the definition of community service to include other prosocial activities, like getting a GED, parenting classes, therapy, etc., and looking at how community service is monitored. The fourth item was our current misdemeanor penalty thresholds. And examining that, the current maximum six months in jail and $1,000 fine, and also examining should some

DRAFT

misdemeanors be non-jailable, non-arrestable offenses. The fifth item in the ranking is supporting expansion of community-based substance abuse and mental health treatment. Item six was reviewing administrative assessment fees attached to misdemeanor convictions. And these also apply to civil traffic infractions in 176.059. And there are three additional in 176.0611, 176.0613, and 176.0623. And then the last item on the ranking was explore a statutory threshold for indigence for use in determining fines for misdemeanors. So that's the order that the group put them in. And I would like to open for discussion and get folks' feedback, any additional thoughts on this poll, and if the subcommittee is comfortable with maybe moving in this direction.

5. **Solicit Additional Non-Data Based Recommendations for Topics/Work**

**Chair McCormick:** And the next item on our agenda, item five, segues with this nicely in terms of looking for other areas that are not necessarily tied up so much with data for areas for the subcommittee to examine and make recommendations on. So I'd like to open it up to the subcommittee to hear their thoughts, if there are additional areas that we should be or could potentially be examining. And also, I think, to talk about how we may want to, you know, what areas of focus we want to determine to see about going forward so we can have some, so we can make some recommendations here that are not data-based. Happy to hear from committee members as much as I enjoy hearing myself talk. Um, and as far as repeal of old, unused, and inappropriate misdemeanors. Oh, Ms. Grosenick.

**Ms. Evelyn Grosenick:** I was wondering, we can certainly discuss this, but without a quorum, it doesn't seem like we can take any action on it. Would it be better to digest the results of those polls and then hopefully have more of a discussion next time?

DRAFT

**Chair McCormick:** We could certainly potentially do that. I think one thing that would be valuable in that respect would be, are there other areas that we should be looking at here? I think that we could possibly look at that.

**Captain Joshua Martinez:** Hey, John, this is Josh.

**Chair McCormick:** Hey.

**Captain Martinez:** So, looking at the past minutes, I know we talked about, I don't think it's included in this when I reviewed it, was the, you know, NOC codes and the NRS codes not matching up. I don't know if that's something, I know that was mentioned as a big task, and there was some mention in the minutes about LCB was already looking at some of the misdemeanors that are there, but the reason I bring up the NOC code and NRS is, I don't know if it's just rumor or not, but we had heard that NOC code, they're going to run out of NOC code numbers soon where they wouldn't be able to keep up with the NRS or new charges because my folks usually, when there's a new law passed, and then also at the local level, when we pass new ordinances, we have to get a NOC code for it, and that was one of the rumors that one of the guys in my office heard.

**Chair McCormick:** I have not heard that either. I'm happy to reach out to DPS and see if that's a thing.

**Deputy Director Buonacorsi:** We had heard that this is, they are going to be keeping the existing NOC codes and just switching to and adding an extra digit, and so all the existing NOC codes would stay and just have a leading zero in front of it, and then the new NOC codes would be, I believe, they'd be under a six-digit instead of a five-digit, and so five digits would just add a leading zero. Probably would be good to get a more confirmed statement, but that is what I had heard the plan was for the NOCs, just because, like license plates, they're running out on the current system that they have.

DRAFT

**Chair McCormick:** Thank you, Jenna. Ms. Jones-Brady?

6. **Determine Focus Areas**

**Ms. Christine Jones Brady:** Were there, have there been any discussions on like the misdemeanor corridor courts? I know that there's one that's down in Las Vegas, and I think there was a bill that was passed, and there's some talk about having one up north, and I was just wondering, I don't know if those two approaches from the north and the south are going to be similar, or if that's something that the courts ought to be thinking about, is how those are handled. So, I don't know, that's just one idea that maybe this subcommittee could tackle.

**Chair McCormick:** Thanks, Judge, or Judge, see you can tell I'm used to...anyways. Ms. Jones-Brady, on the corridor court, currently my understanding from discussing with Las Vegas Justice Court is they're in the planning stages and implementing. We did, the AOC did go with them to IFC at some point after the special session, I don't remember which meeting, to get, there was some funding set aside there for Las Vegas Justice Court for the data collection on the corridor court, and certainly we could discuss that, and I would be happy to invite representatives from Las Vegas Justice Court to talk about that if the the group is interested in sort of looking at that as well.

**Ms. Jones Brady:** And is it a rumor, or is it true that they're looking at establishing one up north as well, do you know?

**Chair McCormick:** To the best of my knowledge, it's still rumor stage, but I will, I can reach out to the particular justice court there on that, and I can't remember if the enabling legislation from the special session had a population cap threshold on it. I think it might, so I don't know that the authorizing language is applicable, but that we would have to go ahead and look that up.

DRAFT

**Ms. Jones Brady:** Thank you.

**Chair McCormick:** Thanks. Mr. Martinez, saw you had your hand up.

**Captain Martinez:** Yeah, I was gonna, you know, chime in a little bit on the corridor court, but it sounds like you covered it, you know, we're just, from everything that I'm hearing right now, you know, they're just looking at possibilities, just because what we've heard after the bill was passed, you know, they just don't have an appetite for it, and until one's established, we wouldn't know how those misdemeanors that are specific to a resort area are being tracked, because they're all over the place right now, assigned to all the justices.

**Chair McCormick:** Right, right, so great, thank you. Any other comments from the group? All right, so we've got those additional areas, and as far as the NOCs, I did comment at the traffic safety summit last week, when somebody said something about NOCs, that they were volunteering for the subcommittee to rewrite all of our criminal code, so there's only one offense per statute, and I don't think anybody found that particularly funny, so, but kind of where we are there, again, since we don't necessarily have a quorum, we're kind of in the midst of agenda item five, and agenda item six, and I think as Ms. Grosenick indicated, that the group would like some time to kind of digest these misdemeanors, and determine if these are, in fact, the focus areas that we would like.

7. **Establish Working Groups**

**Chair McCormick:** And I think that the next agenda item there, agenda item seven, establishing working groups, is something that follows on after we determine, and if everybody can agree on the focus areas, so it seems if the will of the group is to perhaps digest and think about this, that.....

DRAFT

8. **Schedule For Working Groups**

**Chair McCormick:** .....maybe we should schedule another meeting relatively soon to go, maybe in a couple weeks where everybody's gone through that, and then we can come together and determine the focus areas, and then determine the working groups, and how we're gonna go ahead and begin working on that.

9. **Report to Sentencing Commission in November**

**Chair McCormick:** We do also have a report due to the Sentencing Commission on the subcommittee, regarding the work of the subcommittee, rather, in November, which at the November Sentencing Commission meeting, which I don't know, have we scheduled that yet, Jenna?

**Deputy Director Buonacorsi:** Yes, that is scheduled, I believe it's November 19th, but let me double check on my calendar- November 20th.

**Chair McCormick:** Okay, all righty, so that would be November 20th, so if this group could meet the week of November 9th to formalize the focus areas, and develop the planning for the working groups, we can include that in the report to the Sentencing Commission on the 20th, so that would then just be contingent upon the members of this group being willing to come back together in a couple weeks, that week of November 9th, to determine the focus areas, and determine how we're going to start approaching these non-data-based sort of issues, so we can actually achieve something, and have something to report to the committee, rather than spinning in circles.

DRAFT

**10. Discussion on Future Meeting Dates**

**Chair McCormick:** So, is there any particular day, the week of November 9th, that works better for people, that doesn't work, anything like that, or should I just work with Sentencing Policy to go ahead and set that? Ms. Jones-Brady?

**Ms. Jones Brady:** I think that's a holiday week, November 11th is Veterans Day, so probably we want to have it Monday or Tuesday, I think Veterans Day falls on a Wednesday this year.

**Chair McCormick:** Yeah, I just pulled the calendar, the 11th is that Wednesday, so maybe Tuesday the 10th, I know Monday meetings are not everyone's favorite endeavor.

**Captain Martinez:** Tuesday, if we did it Tuesday, I'm only available in the afternoon, or the morning time, because I have a standing appointment from one to three.

**Chair McCormick:** All right, would 10 a.m. on Tuesday the 10th, to determine the focus areas work for folks? And then, I'm seeing some general nodding.

**Captain Martinez:** That works for me.

**Chair McCormick:** All right, cool. Well, we will schedule it for maybe 10 a.m. on the 10th, and make some effort to get a quorum, so we can determine our focus areas. If everybody wants to review the poll, think of what you got, we do have that list of old misdemeanors that was put together at the beginning of this endeavor that we can send back out.

**Captain Martinez:** Yeah, if you could, that'd be great.

**Chair McCormick:** Sure, for sure, I will get it over to NDSP to send that out. All right, I mean, kind of a short meeting, give everybody back a half an hour, but just ask everybody to review what we've got,

DRAFT

come up with the focus areas, so we're ready to have that discussion on the 10th. So, that again takes us through agenda item ten. I've been bad about noting that, which is future meetings.

**11. Public Comment**

**Chair McCormick:** So, I guess that will bring us to item eleven, which would be the second period of public comment. So, I'll ask Cecilia if we have any callers waiting.

**Ms. Felipe:** Chair, we have no callers.

**12. Adjournment**

**Chair McCormick:** Awesome, thank you very much. With that, we will close the second period of public comment and move on to adjournment, unless anybody has anything else, but let's come back together on the 10th and pick our focus areas and start moving this forward. All right, thanks everybody, appreciate your time today.

DRAFT