

IF THE RISK IS LOW---LET THEM GO

PAROLE BOARD DENIALS AND SOME OF THE FACTORS CONSIDERED FOR THE PAROLE BOARD DENIALS

In order to find out how and the reasons why the Nevada Parole Board is not paroling more inmates to their next consecutive sentence and or to the street we need to **Drill Down** into the Parole Board to find out these answers.

The unchecked discretionary power of the NV Parole Board is the main issue that has created the mass incarceration industry that exists in Nevada. Until the legislature takes responsibility for mandatory minimum sentencing laws and the NV Parole Board's actions by creating mandatory statutory language for the release of prisoners plus defined timed release mechanisms that set specific release time in law, mass incarceration will perpetuate.

Parole Board denials result in inmates serving more time and costing the taxpayers millions of dollars each year. We need to look at the following to have a better understanding for the denials and ways to fix the problems so that the Parole Board will grant more paroles and save the taxpayers millions of dollars per year.

If you take a look at Attachments I have provided to you it will answer some of questions and concerns that have been raised during the ACAJ committee hearings.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS INMATES FILES;

NOTIS NDOC 00027-00036 File aka Nevada Offender Tracking Information System – Attachment 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 17

This files contains the Inmates Summary from the time the inmate enters the Department of Corrections and when the inmate leaves the Department of Corrections.

NOTIS reflects the inmate's "Offense in Custody History", "Result of Offense", "External Movement History", "Move Type", "Move Reason", "prior felony convictions/hold & detainers", "Case Notes".

The "Case Notes" would include the following;

Disciplinary charges, hearings and decisions, investigations, Inspector General's Office investigation, Grievances, Parole and Release information, telephone communications between the inmate and their attorney, telephone communications between the inmate's pro se class action litigation with other pro se inmate Plaintiff s, religious practices, education, programming, charitable fundraisers, health and medical history, enemy list.

It should be noted that when NOTIS was installed on June 5, 2007 for some unknown reason the NOTIS documents begin with year 01/14/1999, thereby, missing the previous

10 years of Mr. Klein's incarceration. Why? And WHAT does "RESTRICTED CASE NOTES HAVE BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS REPORT" mean and why are they removed?

It is uncertain at this time if other inmates NOTIS files are similar to Mr. Klein's NOTIS file and if the information that is favorable or unfavorable to the inmate is missing too.

It should be noted that there appears to be ongoing problems with NOTIS. See Attachment Board of Parole Commissioners Quarterly Report January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015 (Q3 – FY15)

Page 14 **"The NDOC NOTIS database was not available at the time of the hearing or a database issue resulted in a lack of access to information necessary to conduct the hearing or make an action recommendation."**

NOTIS NDOC 00001-00008- Inmate Issue History - Attachments 2, 5, 8,

This file contains "Issue ID", "Date Reported", "Issue Type", "Issue Reason", inmate's grievances, Settlement Agreements,

Inmate I-files – Inmate C Files Attachment 3, 4, See Attachments 7 (4), 4, 8, 17, 18

The Inmate's I-file contains Parole Board confidential information, PSI reports, which are prepared for the original Court that follow the inmate throughout their entire prison sentence and are nearly impossible to correct, dispute or change, Parole and Probation Data, Physic Panel, and the entire history of the inmate while incarcerated.

The C-files are completely confidential and the inmate is not able to access any information to check for accuracies. Unless the inmate has pending litigation against the state and the court has ordered confidential information to be turned over, then and only then will the inmate see his file.

Inspector general Files – Attachments 4, 5, 7, 8 (d) (1), 17, 18

These files are completely confidential. At times the Investigative Reports are not followed through to the end. When this happens, irreparable harm to the inmate and others connected to the investigation result in punishment being imposed.

At times when this happens the inmate will file litigation against NDOC and the inmate will then have access to his files.

INMATE GRIEVANCE REPORT: Attachments 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18

Grievances are filed by Inmates. The inmate's grievances will go through a process by a member of the Nevada Department of Corrections. If the inmate loses he can appeal to a higher level and at times will take their grievance to court for violation of their protected rights. This information is provided to the Parole Board, however, the litigation brought against NDOC is not given to the Parole Board, nor the final judgment if the inmates win.

Grievances procedures fall under the Administrative Regulation 740 that is set by the Nevada Board of Prison Commissioners.

DISCIPLINARY; Attachments 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 9,

Inmates can be disciplined and disciplinary actions can be imposed.

- a. Disciplinary actions can result in such things as being transferred to another institution, being placed in segregated Unit, being locked up in isolation, denied visitation, and credits that are used towards an early parole hearing(s) to be taken away. Disciplinary actions can lead to litigation.
- b. Retaliatory behavior by NDOC employees can result in Disciplinary actions without proper Due Process .
- c. Disciplinary actions are factored in when determining to grant or deny a parole.
- d. Untrained officers, retaliatory behavior by NDOC Staff, are a major concern for the need of a NDOC Independent Ombudsman.
- e. To reduce the amount of monies the taxpayer is paying for litigation to defend these types of lawsuits filed by the inmate(s) is a major concern for the taxpayer.

LITIGATION; Attachments 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

The inmate can file a suit against the NDOC and its employees for what he or she believes violated their protected rights

- a. The grievances and disciplinary actions against the inmate remain in the NDOC and NOTIS files and then are submitted to the Parole Board.
- b. An inmate who files suit against NDOC and wins; the outcome is not reflected in the NDOC or NOTIS files that is submitted to the Parole Board.
- c. Breach of Settlement Agreement and ongoing litigation are not reflected in the NDOC or NOTIS files that are submitted to the Parole Board.
- d. The Office of the Attorney General does not track the costs of inmate litigation separately.

RETALIATION; Attachments 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 At times some NDOC employees will retaliate against an inmate or inmates for filing suit against them or somebody they personally know.

Some NDOC employees will retaliate against an inmate just to cause problems for the inmate.

- a. NDOC and its employee's retaliation can result in a transfer of an inmate to another institution, being placed in segregated Unit, being locked up in isolation, losing their jobs, loss of their credits to an early parole hearing, having their religious protected property destroyed, denied visitation from their loved ones and their attorney, and interference with receiving their medical treatment.

SEGREGATION; Attachments 1, 6, 9

Inmates who are placed in a NDOC segregated Unit for the following reasons will lose credit time and this can play a factor in Parole Board denials.

- a. Transfers
- b. Enemy List
- c. Retaliation by NDOC staff
- d. Court order
- e. Investigation(s)
- f. Disciplinary sanctions
- g. Medical treatment
- h. refused to sign a waiver
- i. Inmates can lose days, weeks, months and even years of credits

MEDICAL; Inmates who are normally incarcerated at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center, or are transferred from another Institution for medical treatment to the Regional Medical Facility located at NNCC, or have on going medical problems and cannot go out into the general population are placed in a NDOC segregated Unit.

- a. These Inmates do not receive any credit(s) to be used towards an early parole Board hearing that is normally afforded to other inmates who are not in need of medical treatment. These Inmates serve day per day for simply needing medical treatment.

COMPUTER GLITCH; Attachment 1, 10, 13

On June 5, 2007 the NDOC NOTIS software was installed and when it was installed it "flipped" and placed false felony charges in inmates files. This information was disseminated to the Parole Board and Pardons Board and still remains and is unbeknownst to the inmate.

- a. check for accuracies and question the inmate about any new felony charges after they have entered the prison system that appears in the NDOC NOTIS files. Ask questions about any disciplinary charges and see if the inmate has litigation pending and the result of any litigation.
- b. **Allow the inmate to introduce evidence that disputes any of the new charges or disciplinary charges against them. .**
- c. check for any false Information in NDOC inmate PSI Report, "I" File (Institutional File), "C" File (Confidential File) and NOTIS:
- d. Correct and Remove all false and inaccurate documents still remaining in the inmate files, Inspector General, Parole board and Pardons Board Files,
- e. Define specifically the deadly weapon used in the PSI report.

PAROLE AND PARDONS: REPORT REQUIREMENTS ; Attachments 1, 11, 13, 17, 18(a), 18(c)

Nevada Department of Corrections Administrative Regulations 537.02. The Parole Board has held a parole hearing(s) when no Progress Report and Related Release Documents have been submitted to the Parole Board, the inmate is then seen in absentia and the inmate is denied a parole. Parole Board violates inmate's Due Process, by the Parole Board retaliating against inmate because of prior suits against them. This leads to litigation.

PSYCH PANEL; Attachment 12

Nevada Department of Corrections Administrative Regulation 537.03 . Prior to the Legislative removal of the Psych Panel an Inmate who was convicted of a sexual offense must pass the Psych Panel. The inmate must be certified that they have passed the Psych Panel in order for the Parole Board to grant their Parole. The Psych Panel decision is submitted to the Parole Board. The Psych Panel report still exists in the inmates file.

The Psych Panel has raised Risk Assessment to a higher level because of the inmate's refusal to attend the evaluation based on his litigation.

- a. It is common knowledge that an inmate who has maintained their innocence must admit guilt in order to pass the Psych Panel. This forces an innocent person to make a false confession in order to get a chance at their freedom.
- b. If an inmate is appealing their criminal conviction and their conviction is overturned, this could be detrimental to any future new trial they have been granted by the court, because , they have now made a false confession to the Psych Panel in order to seek their freedom through the Parole Board and the prosecution can use it.

5

- c. Remove the inmate's certification(s) that he or she has passed the Psych Panel from the Parole Board and Pardons Board files.
- d. Removal all notes, and all information regarding any decisions that pertain to the inmate appealing their conviction from the Parole Board's file on the inmate.

INMATE'S CONCERNS REGARDING PAROLE BOARD DENIALS WHEN THEIR PREVIOUS PAROLE WAS GRANTED TO THEIR NEXT CONSECUTIVE SENTENCE; THEY CONTINUE TO IMPROVE ; ARE DISCIPLINARY FREE,;A MODEL PRISONER AND ARE NOW BEING DENIED A PAROLE WITH THE FOLLOWING REASONS; Attachments 1-18

Inmates concerns- Discussion(s) of the June 23, 2010 Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice dealing with Credits, Disciplinary actions, OML, Aggregated sentences, Psych Panel and how it still effects them and their paroles when they are not able to see their files.

- a. Inmate has not completed his programming,
- b. Is a threat to society.
- c. based on new information,
- d. "has an Appeal pending" 2007 AB 510.
- e. The seriousness of the offense, "nature of crime", and "abnormal nature of crime"
- f. Psych Panel changed the inmate's risk assessment to a high risk to re-offend.
- g. was not certified by the Psych Panel when previously certified and nothing has warranted not to be certified.
- h. life sentence w/parole- denied to EXPIRATION aka when inmate dies
- i. June 5, 2007 computer glitch and the "NDOC NOTIS database was not available at the time of the hearing or a database issue resulted in a lack of access to information necessary to conduct the hearing or make an action recommendation." pg. 14 Board of Parole Commissioners Quarterly Report January 1, 2015- March 31, 2015 (Q3-FY15)
- j. When credits are misapplied it results in more time the inmate must serve on their sentence and a longer period of time for them to be seen by the Parole Board. When inmates lose days, months and even years of credits because of pending litigation against NDOC it results in a longer period of time to be seen by the Parole Board.

- k. Nevada Department of Corrections Administrative Regulations 537.02
- l. Retaliation
- m. Disciplinary actions

AGGREGATED SENTENCES - 2015 ASSEMBLY BILL 267; -Attachment 14

Crimes being committed under the age of 18.

- a. Inmates who have committed crimes under the 2015 Assembly Bill 267 are being denied parole and have been disciplinary free for years and even decades.
- b. Inmates who have committed one crime of sexual assault have several (4) consecutive life sentences for the one and only sexual assault.
- c. Studies have concluded that the male brain does not mature until the approximate age of 25 years of age. The person they were 20, 30, 40 years ago, in most cases, are not the same person now as they were then.

Inmates who committed crimes under the age of 25 years old Research that has been presented to the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice has shown that the male brain matures at approximately 25 years of age.

- a. The Parole Board is aware of the research on those convicted of murder and the recidivism rate for murder is low to reoffend.
- b. The Parole Board continues to deny inmates with (1-5) life sentences parole. Some of these individuals have been disciplinary free for years, have completed their programming, completed their education and in some cases even received degrees and are still being denied parole.
- c. **California has increased the age to 23 years of age and under when the crime was committed, for consideration for parole release.**

Inmate(s) sentences are not being aggregated under AB 267

VICTIM(S) verses INMATES RIGHT TO RECEIVE A FAIR PAROLE HEARING; Attachment 15.

Victim's Testimony:

- a. Inmates who have victim opposition appearing at their Parole Board Hearings are more likely to be denied parole than inmates who do not.
- b. Victim's are instructed by the Parole Board in writing, how to have a private meeting with the Board and keep their testimony and documents secret.
- c. During parole hearings if the victim, family or friends request time to speak

9

the hearing room is cleared including the inmate. The victim's testimony, given directly to the Board without the inmate's knowledge or any oversight opens the door to the possibility the parole board's decision may be based on false testimony that the inmate or his representative have no opportunity to refute resulting in an unfair parole hearing.

- d. Transparency has been extinguished for parole hearings especially regarding victim testimony and documents because the Board claims NOT to be under quasi-judicial standards or the Open Meeting Law. In Witherow (See Attachment 18 (f) Pgs. 1, 14 and 15) the NV Supreme Court (NSC) provided four required practices and procedures of Quasi-Judicial Standards:
1. the ability to present and object to evidence
 - 2.. the ability to cross examine witnesses
 3. a written decision from the public body
 4. an opportunity to appeal to a higher authority
- e. Witherow, (Id. Pg. 16) NSC states, ". . . because the parole hearing does not afford each party the minimum . . . [four quasi-judicial standards]" . . . " . . . a parole board hearing is not a quasi-judicial proceeding, and the Board must comply with the open meeting law when conducting such hearings." THEN the parole board was declared to be Quasi-Judicial by the NV Legislature. In so doing the law was established that the Quasi-Judicial \ standards set forth in Witherow should apply as standard procedures for Parole Board Hearings.

BUT WAIT the NV Parole Board fails to follow any of the standards established by the NSC regarding quasi-judicial government bodies. The Board claims they are quasi-judicial in name only and entitled to disregard the quasi-judicial standards in their day-to-day operation and parole hearings. The Board also has claimed exclusion from following the Open Meeting Law which applies to all other state agencies and boards; except the legislature and judicial divisions of government. Prior to 2001 the Parole Board operated under the Open Meeting Law. The Board changed their Operating Procedure Manual in 2001 without any legislative direction, labeling themselves "open and public" in its operation including parole hearings. After five legislative sessions of PB Analysis David Smith testifying repeatedly, the Parole Board was exempt from the O.M.L., Assemblyman and Judicial Committee Chair Bernie Anderson told Smith during one of Smith's testimonies, "We are not going to codify what you [Parole Board] are doing." The NSC has rendered many decisions changing positions on how the Board is to operate. Now, the Board leans on its interpretation of NRS 213 to justify its actions of being the ONLY Board (agency) in NV exempt from both the quasi-judicial standards and the Open Meeting Law. The Parole Board of NV is not TRANSPARENT and answers to no-one except the Governor every four years when their reappointment is almost always renewed without any visible questioning.

In Witherow vs. the NV Parole Board,(See Attachment 18 (f) pages 14,15,16 attached) the NV

Supreme Court (NSC) provided four required practices and procedures for Quasi Judicial Standards. The NV Parole Board was declared to be Quasi Judicial by the NSC. And in doing so defined 4 standards of practice procedures for the transparency of the Parole Board Hearings:



1. the ability to present and object to evidence
- 2.. the ability to cross examine witnesses
3. a written decision from the public body
4. an opportunity to appeal to a higher authority

Note: None of the above are followed by the Board. The Board claims their hearings, like no other board or agency in Nevada, are exempt from the Chapter 241, the Open Meeting Law just like the legislature. No oversight. No transparency.

The inmate has no way of knowing and is unable to defend him or herself from any false and inaccurate information that has been provided to the Parole Board by the victim(s).
Parole Board Oversight committee

PAROLE BOARD GUIDELINES- OBJECTIVE RISK ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET; ATTACHMENT 16

- a. The current Board's Guidelines contain the recommendation to "Consider Factors". There is no recommended action or direction provided on the , "Consider Factor Worksheet" for the Board to follow in granting or denying parole. The majority of cases heard by the Board fall into the "Consider Factors" category. Therefore, for most of its cases the Parole Board has no objective direction to follow, as required by NRS 213.10885.
- b. The Parole Board's Objective Risk Assessment Worksheet has both mitigating (Inmate able to change) and aggravating or static (not ever changing) items listed. *On In. Russell Crew's 2014 P.B. Objective Risk Assessment Worksheet the Parole Board scored him one point. which identified him, as "low risk to reoffend. Of all the mitigating factors. which Crew has the power to change the only one unchecked was work release program, which his sentence does not allow. Only one aggregating factor was selected out of the many on the Board's form, "nature of crime", which is **static** and unchanging. Crew was only 19 years old when this crime was committed.*

The Parole Board's sole use of a **static** factor as their sole reason for denial of parole causes many of the repeated denials of parole.

(Aging Inmate article excerpt from Harwood Parole Board Chair New York)

RAPP New York Release Aging Project, "The age group, elderly (over 50) cost triple to incarcerate..."

VIOLATING INMATE(S) DUE PROCESS TO RECEIVE A PAROLE HEARING AND REVOCATIONS BY THE PAROLE BOARD LEADS TO LITIGATION;

Attachment 17

- a. Violating inmates Due Process leads to litigation against the State's agencies.

- b. Retaliation against Inmate's Constitutional Rights who seeks redress through appeals and the courts .
- c. Litigation, Breach of Settlement Agreement and ongoing litigation against the Parole Board is not reflected in the Parole Board files for any new future Commissioner(s) to review. The new Commissioners will refer to the Parole Board's previous decision and will not know that the Parole Board had violated the inmates rights.

INMATE LITIGATION; Attachment 18

It is an interesting fact that the inmates who have litigated against the Parole Board have received numerous parole denials for many years which seems to go against the common sense evaluation of the Parole Board's Objective Risk assessment for those inmates, who score "low risk to reoffend".

b. Inmate litigators who received multiple parole denials:

1. Nolan Klein, died in prison after 21 years of claiming his innocence and successfully litigating against NDOC and the Parole Board. Through litigation in Nolan Klein vs. Jackie Crawford USDC 3:04-cv-00049-ECR-RAM. Inmate Klein was offered on June 5, 2007 a parole if he would drop his current suit against the Parole Board, he declined. The Parole revoked his previous granted paroles that had already expired years earlier to place him back on to his 1st life sentence.

Klein's next parole hearing was held on September 27, 2007. At which time the Parole Board had Klein escorted down to the parole Board hearing room at NNCC. Klein informed them that he was appealing their July 10, 2007 decision in the Klein v Crawford case. A progress Report was not submitted to the Parole Board as per required by the Administrative Regulation. Klein was seen in abstention and his parole was denied.

Klein filed his letter with the Parole Board Chairman Dorla Salling. Klein was denied a parole.

In 2009, Klein filed suit in **Nolan Klein vs. Connie Bisbee USDC 3:09-cv-00221-LRH-RAM** . Klein died while his case was pending.

- 2. **Jesse Anderson vs. Connie Bisbee USDC 3:15-cv-00465-MMD-WGC**, his Court Order Feb. 24, 2016:
"Defendant may proceed with claim against Bisbee on 14th Amendment Rights." Although this is a parole revocation case the Court still has found that the inmate has standing against Chairman Bisbee.
- 3. Norman Crew was paroled in 1996 by a previous parole board from a life and its use enhancement after 15 yrs of incarceration with Williams goodtime credits correctly applied. In 2006 he won his lawsuit against the Parole Board and was deemed eligible for parole custody to

the streets, 3/2008. He has now served 20+ years on his 2nd life and its use with repeated P.B. Objective Risk Assessments rating him as “low risk to reoffend” but the static unchangeable “nature of crime” is always listed as reason for denial. Since winning his lawsuit against the P.B. he has been repeatedly denied parole with the maximum allowable by law 3yr. “dump” wait period before future hearings.

4. Russell Crew’s parole in 1995 from a previous Board has satisfied his 1st life and its use enhancement by actions of both Parole and Pardon’s Boards. In 2007 Russell won his lawsuit against the Parole Board. According to Russell ‘s Court Order he has been eligible for parole custody to the streets since 9/2007. Russell’s parole hearing denials mirror his brother, Norman’s set forth in #2 above.

Note: P.B. Chair Bisbee has stated she won’t apply any goodtime credits to Norman’s or Russell’s sentences because of her interpretation of recent legislative intent even though Norman’s sentence began in 1981 and Russell’s in 1983 under Williams and their Ct. Orders reaffirms their sentences are to be reduced by goodtime credits per Williams. In a letter Bisbee wrote “Norman and Russell had to serve 40 years minimum or flat before they would be eligible for parole” According to Chairman Bisbee’s “40 yr. flat statement” the parole hearings the Board holds for them every three years, are for appearances only. What the Board is doing is just to satisfy the law requirement, but not actually considering them for real parole to the community. Norman and Russell have at least 10 years each of goodtime that Bisbee refuses to apply to their sentences.

5. Brian Kamedula

PAROLE BOARD DENIES INMATES WHO MAINTAIN INNOCENCE.

Inmate(s) have been informed by the Nevada Parole Board Commissioners that unless you admit guilt and remorse for your crime, you will not be granted a parole to the street, or unless you stop appealing your conviction you will not be paroled to the street.

- a. Over the years studies on wrongful convictions through eyewitness identification have been presented to the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. There is a need in Nevada to have a Public Integrity Commission Unit established to look into wrongful convictions.
- b. 80% - 90% of the applications the Rocky Mountain Innocent Project receives are declined because the applicant has no DNA available to test. In some cases, the Nevada Courts are denying Petitioners (inmates) DNA testing to even be conduct testing on their own DNA.
- c. **Tonja Brown, Advocate for the Innocent, presented to the 2016 Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice information as to why Nevada needs to establish a PUBLIC INTEGRITY UNIT COMMISSION to look into wrongful convictions.**

By establishing a commission to look into wrongful convictions, it will reduce the prison population, it will reduce the cost to incarcerate

them. It will lessen the Parole Board hearing's Agenda. This will save the taxpayers money and result in freedom for the innocent.

WAYS TO IMPROVE THE PAROLE BOARD GRANTING MORE PAROLES.

- a. Remove all prior sex offenders Psych Panel information from the Parole Board files and Pardons Board files,
- b. 2007 AB 510 "In determining whether to grant parole to a prisoner, the Board shall not consider whether the prisoner has appealed the judgment of imprisonment for which the prisoner is being considered for parole."

Remove all prior Parole Board denials notes and decisions that show the inmate has an appeal pending.
- c. Check for accuracies from any new charges in the NOTIS and discuss it with inmate that is appearing before the Parole Board Commissioners .
- d. Check for resolutions to any litigation filed and won by an inmate. This would include the removal of any disciplinary action in the inmates NDOC I-File, NDOC C-File, NDOC Confidential Files, Inspector General's Files, Chrono Entries for Inmate.
- e. Check for resolutions to any litigation filed by an inmate who has filed litigation against the Parole Board for violating his or her Due Process, and the outcome of such litigation to be acknowledged publicly during the Parole Board hearing proceedings, and the litigation win to remain in the Parole Board files of such Due Process violation.
- f. All Inmates must see their files and reports case worker that have submitted documents to the parole board and check for accuracies, allow the Inmate to produce any new information to be able to support the correct accuracies and have this new information remain in the NDOC and the Parole Board files.
- g. The Parole Board must define exactly their reason for a Parole Board denial and ways for the inmate to improve in order to be granted a parole.
 - 1. Russell Crew's 2014 Parole Denial recommended he stay discipline free, a mitigating factor that he can control, to be considered for parole in the next three years. This direction seems nonsensical and useless because the only aggregating factor noted by the Board to deny parole is "nature of offense" which is STATIC and unchanging.
- h. Put a twenty year maximum sentence that the inmate must serve on a life sentence given the possibility of parole, and a maximum of no more than 5

years on the second life sentence, third life sentence, fourth life sentence, and fifth life sentence.


- i. Provide funding for Nevada 2011 Senate Bill 201 that established an Ombudsman under the Attorney General's Office.
- j. Establish an Independent Ombudsman for NDOC.
- k. Dissolve the Parole Board and conform to federal guidelines for parole.
- l. Establishing an Oversight Committee for the Parole Board.
- m. Put the Parole Board under the Open Meeting Law.
- n. If a Court finds that a Parole Board Commissioner has violated an inmate's Due Process, or retaliated against the prisoner the Parole Board Commissioner must be terminated by the Governor.
- o. Establishing a PUBLIC INTEGRITY UNIT COMMISSION to look into wrongful convictions, it will reduce the prison population, it will reduce the cost to incarcerate them. It will lessen the Parole Board hearing's Agenda. This will save the taxpayers money and result in freedom for the innocent.**

These denials cost the taxpayers money at an average cost of \$40,000,000.00 per year.

Denials are leading to more years added to the inmate(s) incarceration and civil litigation costs each year at an expense to the taxpayer.

*"The continued imprisonment of a group of people who have significantly aged out of crime, who pose little public safety risk and could in fact contribute to our communities, expresses clearly the revenge principle. Many long-termers convicted of serious crimes, people who constitute the bulk of the over fifty prison population, have taken responsibility for their crimes, transformed their lives, and developed skills and abilities they lacked before incarceration. **They could be released from prison with no risk to public safety.**" Soffiyah Elijah, ESQ. Ex. Dir. N.Y. Correctional Association.*

AGING IN PRISON WWW.CENTER.FOR.JUSTICE.COLUMBIA.EDU/AGING-IN-PRISON



TONJA BROWN, Advocate for the Inmates and Innocent
2907 Lukens Lane
Carson City, NV 89706
775-882-2744

B