

**MINUTES OF THE  
ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**

**MARCH 17, 2008**

The meeting of the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice (NRS176.0123) was called to order by Justice James W. Hardesty, Chair, at 9:04 a.m., March 17, 2008, at the Legislative Building, Room 4100, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, and via simultaneous videoconference at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Agenda is included as [Exhibit A](#) and the Attendance Roster is included as [Exhibit B](#).

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT (CARSON CITY):**

Justice James W. Hardesty, Nevada Supreme Court, Chair  
Assemblyman John Carpenter, Assembly District No. 33  
Larry Digesti, Representative, State Bar of Nevada  
Gayle W. Farley, Victims' Rights Advocate  
John Gonska, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation  
Phil Kohn, Clark County Public Defender  
Arthur Mallory, Churchill County District Attorney  
Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General  
James Miller, Sheriff, Storey County  
Dorla M. Salling, Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners  
Richard Siegel, President, ACLU of Nevada, Inmate Advocate  
Howard Skolnik, Director, Department of Corrections

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT (LAS VEGAS):**

Senator Steven A. Horsford, Clark County Senatorial District No. 4  
Raymond Flynn, Assistant Sheriff, Las Vegas METRO  
Phil Kohn, Clark County Public Defender  
Assemblyman David Parks, Clark County Assembly District No. 41

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Mark Amodei, Capital Senatorial District  
Douglas Herndon, Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court

Advisory Commission on Administration of Justice  
March 17, 2008  
Page 2

**OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford, Clark County Assembly District No. 6

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Janet Traut, Senior Deputy Attorney General

Angela Clark, Secretary  
Olivia Lodato, Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Terrance P. Hubert, President, Board of Directors, The Ridge House  
Steven Burt, Executive Director, The Ridge House, Inc.  
James Palombo  
Jackie Glass, Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court  
Peter Breen, Senior District Court Judge  
Archie Blake, Senior District Court Judge  
Andrew Puccinelli, Judge, Fourth Judicial District Court  
Emilio Parga, Founder of the Solace Tree  
James Austin, Ph.D., JFA., The Council of State Governments  
Jay Parmer, Satellite Tracking of People LLC  
Mark Fierro, Technology Based Tracking LLC  
David DeGeorge, Satellite Tracking of People LLV  
Florence Jones-Crew  
Pat Hines  
Edward Smith  
Michelle Ravell  
Anne Marie Palmer  
Maureen Flansberg  
Nancy Gentis  
Audrey Gabriel  
Lee Rowland  
William Murphy Sharp, Alternatives to Violence Project  
Teresa Werner  
Rita Reed  
Rachel Braunworth

Chair Hardesty, Nevada Supreme Court, called the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice to order at 9:04 a.m. He asked Ms. Clark to call the roll of the Commission members.

Ms. Clark said twelve members were present.

Chair Hardesty opened with remarks dealing with the agenda schedule. He said the presentation from the Ridge House and then the specialty courts were the first items discussed. He said Dr. Austin would be present at the noon subcommittee meeting dealing with the Truth in Sentencing Statutes from 1995. He said the subcommittee would be addressing the scope of the study. He encouraged members of the Commission to attend the meeting.

Chair Hardesty introduced Terry Hubert and Steve Burt from the Ridge House.

Terrance P. Hubert, President, Board of Directors, The Ridge House, Inc., said he had a prepared statement discussing the Ridge House community and their involvement with reentry programs for the last 26 years ([Exhibit C](#)). Mr. Hubert read his testimony.

Steven Burt, Executive Director, The Ridge House, Inc., discussed what the program did to effect change with their clients, ([Exhibit D](#)). He said by assisting the client through My Journey Home, Inc. and the Ridge House, the person coming out of prison was helped to reenter society as a productive citizen. He said the programs took three to four months of residential treatment and up to one year of out-patient and after care. He said those with substance abuse addiction, alcohol and drug addicts, needed extra help in gaining sobriety skills. He said the Ridge House had evolved into a substance abuse treatment program. He said everyone coming out of prison needed re-entry assistance. He said the organization was working on employment grants, veteran grants and various other grants to expand the group of people they assisted. He said the program reduced the recidivism rate to nine percent for the Ridge House graduate. He said they effected significant change in the people they were able to treat. He referenced the graph ([Exhibit D](#)) showing 79 percent of the funding for the fiscal year, 2002 to 2006 was from federal sources. He said until the last legislative session, no funding was received from the State to support reentry programs. He said without after-care, treatment, support and re-entry services changes did not remain in effect. He said support was needed in and out of prison in order to stay out of prison. Mr. Burt said his program needed funding in order to reduce the prison population.

James Palombo discussed the proposal the Ridge House filed with the Interim Finance Committee. He said the program was entitled the Nexus LP Project, ([Exhibit E](#)). He said the proposal drew together things mentioned by Mr. Hubert and Mr. Burt. He said it was clear there was a need for reentry and transition help for people released from prison. He said there was also a need for a special focus on the incarcerated veteran population. Dr. Palombo read a brief statement from the proposal.

The Center, in cooperation with the Ridge House Inc., a well-established prison re-entry program in Reno, along with the VVA will provide multiple offender counseling services. The Center (the Nexus LP Program) will provide individual and group 'community counseling' and re-entry services.... Also offers opportunities for mediation, public meetings/gatherings and discussion. The Center will develop in its first year into a comfortable coffee house setting similar to the very successful Delancey Street model in San Francisco. The ambiance of the center will focus on integrating ex-offenders into a positive and productive lifestyle, which provides them a viable chance of "staying free," which was really the focus here. Eventually, primarily ex-offenders, both at the service and administrative levels, can operate the Nexus process, similar to the Delancey Street and Ridge House Models by using Nexus.

Finally, the program will involve a strong UNLV research component. A multi-disciplinary approach will engage faculty and students from the sociology, psychology, social work and the criminal justice departments, including two paid internships. The program will be able to provide data/analyses as to the issue at hand. This link will be valuable not only for program evaluation but also for the development of new projects and for future funding efforts as well. In sum, by providing direct services for the ex-offender population as well as access to relevant data, the center can be seen as a "one stop" source for individual, agency and/or public assistance as well as a clearing house for future idea/project/funding developments that speak to the re-entry process.

Dr. Palombo said the project continued the focus of the Advisory Commission in a more practical application. He read the last paragraph in [Exhibit D](#) as his conclusion.

As a final note to our proposal...it is obvious by the initiation and language of AB510 that the public is concerned about the issues tied to incarceration and the re-entry processes. Although a significant amount of funds will be allocated to NDOC, it is clear that attention also needs to be focused on efforts put forth in the community. We believe that Nexus represents a plan that, on cost and program levels, can be effectively employed to assist the ex-offender and our community at large. Said another way, with a structure and

organization that speaks to accountability, expertise, cost-effectiveness, community support, viability and future efforts, we are providing a program consistent with both public interest and the concerns of the IFC.

In closing, Dr. Palombo said the project spoke to the integrity of the Ridge House and its interest in continuing its efforts working with the ex-offender population. He asked for the Commission's support in the programs efforts.

Chair Hardesty asked if they had a written proposal and when did they appear before the Interim Finance Committee (IFC). Dr. Palombo responded a written proposal was submitted in January to the IFC. Assemblyman Park and Senator Titus had also received copies.

Mr. Burt said the Ridge House might appear on the April agenda of the IFC. He said the Ridge House had an independent proposal to provide additional funding for their services also. Chair Hardesty asked for copies of the proposal for the Commission. He asked if there were any questions for the testifiers from the Commission members.

Commissioner John Carpenter asked Mr. Hubert to elaborate on his comment that addiction was preventable.

Mr. Hubert said he had also said it was very difficult. He said the use of alcohol and controlled substances was quite prevalent. He said some statistics indicated at least 20 million Americans use some sort of controlled substance on a daily basis. He said on a philosophical level he believed people could control themselves. He said they could not stop it, but educational programs needed expanding. He said education was a primary weapon to go with prevention.

Commissioner Carpenter said in Elko there were many programs, but it did not seem the programs were working. He said a different model was needed.

Mr. Hubert said there were more effective methods to pursue.

Chair Hardesty said one area the Commission was pursuing was how and where to direct the resources available. He said the needs had to be evaluated and met. He asked Mr. Hubert for additional data; such as the amount of state funding and where did it come from specifically. He said state funding was not substantial. He asked the basis of their request to the IFC and what additional needs would be satisfied with more and better resources. Chair Hardesty said the Legislature benefitted from having an understanding of the demand. He said Commissioner Amodei said the Commission was in the "money/fiscal olympics." He said there were a number of organizations attempting to provide support mechanisms for the overall problem. Chair Hardesty asked for information between incarceration dollars and

treatment dollars. He asked what the savings were. He asked for any information they had and requested it in writing.

Mr. Hubert said there were statistics and figures available that addressed the questions and he would provide them at a future meeting. Chair Hardesty said he would put them on the Agenda for the May meeting.

Chair Hardesty said the next item on the Agenda was a presentation concerning specialty courts in Nevada. A key component of AB510 and a key charge to the Commission was consideration of the status of the State's specialty courts. He requested the specialty court judges provide a presentation to the Commission.

Jackie Glass, Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court said Judge Hardcastle was delayed and she was opening the discussion from Las Vegas.

Peter Breen, Senior District Court Judge, said he presided over the specialty courts in Washoe, Churchill, Lyon, Mineral, Douglas, Storey Counties and Carson City together with Judge Archie Blake.

Andrew Puccinelli, Judge, Fourth Judicial District Court, said he supervised the Specialty Court in Elko County and also in the Seventh Judicial District of White Pine, Eureka and Lincoln Counties.

Chair Hardesty mentioned Judge Dan Papez and Judge Steve Dobrescu supervised the specialty courts in White Pine; Judge Iroz and Judge Wagner in Pershing and Humboldt Counties; Judge Robert Lane supervised the specialty courts in Pahrump and Tonopah District. He said the State had both Drug Court and Mental Health Court. He said the presentations would deal with both courts.

Judge Glass opened the discussion with a PowerPoint presentation, ([Exhibit F](#)). She said the topic of specialty courts had been on-going for several years. She said today's discussion included programs that currently existed and the potential specialty courts and needs for funding those courts. She said an impact analysis was included in the presentation. A discussion on changes needed for a better impact of specialty courts was also included under the section involving the statutes.

Judge Glass said currently in the Eighth Judicial District Court there was an Adult Drug Court with nearly 600 participants. They had an Adult Reentry Drug Court program with 30 participants, a Juvenile Drug Court with 81 participants, a Dependency Drug Court with 102 participants, a Mental Health Court with 76 participants and the Felony DUI Court had 245 active participants. She said all the programs were funded through AB29 money except for

the Mental Health Court, which received eighty percent of its funding through the General Fund and twenty percent through AB29 funding.

Judge Glass said potential service levels of the Eighth Judicial District Court showed the numbers of where the court should be. She said the numbers were significant. She said, for example, another 1000 participants needed to be accommodated in the Adult Drug Court. She reiterated the statistic shown in the exhibit. She said the Dependency Drug Court needed significant increases, up to another 500 people.

Judge Glass explained the next slide. She said the graph represented “ball park figures.”. She said under “Service Level Gap” the numbers were the ones being added. “Annual Current Costs” represented the current cost of specialty courts in the Eighth Judicial District Court. She said costs for infrastructure, housing, counseling, personnel costs and capital expenditures were represented in rough estimates subject to change.

Peter Breen, Senior District Court Judge, expressed appreciation for the chart and projects. He said the specialty courts Programs-Current Service Levels, as applied to the second Judicial District Court, reflected the current levels of clients. Judge Breen said the Felony DUI Court had eight participants but had only been in operation since January. He said the current active participants in the Adult Reentry Drug Court were fourteen. He said the next chart, Potential Service Levels, represented the numbers the courts estimated they could eventually service. He said the Adult Drug Court had a potential service level of 1000 clients. The court never recruited because there was never enough money to handle the current load of clients. If they were able to recruit through the public defender’s office, the district attorney’s office and other sources, the client level could increase to 1000. He said the Adult Reentry Drug Court could be 100 clients. He said the estimate was based on a time when 75 people were in the reentry drug court. The specialty courts had received a federal grant which increased the client base from the prison. He said they received money from the AB29 committee, substantial funds from the clients and Washoe County provided employees. He said the Juvenile Drug Court’s potential service level was 90 clients. He said the Mental Health Court capacity of 250 clients was a reasonable estimate.

Judge Breen asked the Commission to reference the financial estimates. ([Exhibit F](#)) He said Judge Glass had analyzed the columns earlier. Judge Breen addressed the housing costs on the chart. He said Washoe County had no place to send people for in-patient treatment. He also commented on the re-entry housing. He said he talked to prison reentry clients and they talked about two things that had helped them. He said one important thing was the half-way house, called Cross Roads, and the other thing was seeing the young people who were not in prison yet and it reminded them of where they were and it was a benefit to them. He said the Mental Health Court housing was based on a certain amount of money for sixty percent of the clients. He said housing was absolutely necessary for a mental health client. He said the

clients needed a safe place and the courts needed credibility as a mental health court. Judge Breen said there was one probation officer in Mental Health Court for 180 people.

Archie Blake, Senior District Court Judge, said the Western Region Specialty Courts included Carson City, Storey, Churchill, Lyon, Mineral and Douglas Counties. He said the western region courts also received AB29 money. It was a primary funding source. Judge Blake said they received contributions from the county's staff; and in-kind contributions. He said the current Adult Drug Court had 209 active participants and approximately 600 people had attended since 2001. He said 400 had graduated from the program. He said the cost of participation was about \$1800. He said the retention rate was 76 percent and recidivism was slightly less than 18 percent. Judge Blake continued the discussion of the specialty courts program. He said the Juvenile Drug Court in Carson City was the only formal court. The other courts were run by the judges at no cost to anyone. Judge Blake said the Felony DUI Court was a problem. He said in the rural counties there was no money to operate the court. He said it was mandated by the Legislature but was not funded. He said Churchill, Lyon, Mineral and parts of Storey Counties do not have Felony DUI Courts. He said there was no personnel to monitor the felony DUI defendants. He said a solution might be changing the legislation so it included the option of State Parole and Probation monitoring the defendants.

Judge Blake referenced potential service levels for the Western Region. He said 20 percent of the Adult Drug Court clients could be better treated in the Mental Health Court. He said the Felony DUI Court was dealing with six counties. He reiterated the money issues had been discussed by Judge Glass and Judge Breen.

Andrew Puccinelli, Judge, Fourth Judicial District Court, said he supervised the drug courts in Elko County. He said he also supervised the ones in White Pine County in terms of funding. He said the drug courts were started with a federal implementation grant of \$450,000. He said they received \$150,000 a year and this year was the final one. He said they had some supplements from AB29 money. He said without more money from some source, services would be none-existent in Elko County. He said the Adult Drug Court had an ever-changing number of participants.

Judge Puccinelli said Elko County had a huge problem with drugs especially in the border towns such as West Wendover. He said half the people in Juvenile Drug Court were Hispanic, methamphetamine addicted and from West Wendover. He said they started using the drugs at the age of 12 years old. He said there was no Mental Health Court in Elko County. He said rural counties often combined Adult Drug Court and the Dependency Drug Court. He said that was not a good way to do it. He did not have funds to treat all the adults in the criminal Adult Drug Court in Elko County. His drug court team had decided to treat the most heavily addicted people. He said the Felony DUI Court did not exist in Elko County.



because of lack of funding. He said the offender cannot afford the cost of Felony DUI Court. He said the program for the DUI Court needed funding from another source. Judge Puccinelli said the potential service level was contingent upon enough treatment providers in the rural counties. He said there was only one treatment provider in the County and she had sixty clients. He had to shut the program down. He said Elko County needed access to psychiatrists and he included Battle Mountain, Winnemucca, Lovelock, Pahrump, which was Nye County, White Pine County, Lincoln County and Eureka County in the need. He said the potential service levels could be doubled.

Judge Puccinelli said the Juvenile Drug Court clients were from Elko and Wendover and were "meth" addicts. The Adult Re-entry Drug Court needed a half-way house to be successful. The people needed to be in a supervised transitional housing situation. He said all the other estimates with regard to the other rural counties not in the Western Regional Drug Court had been obtained by discussing the issues with the other judges in those areas. He said Felony DUI Court needed front-end funding in the rural counties. He briefly went over the other courts. He said the Fifth Judicial District was Judge Lane in Pahrump. The Sixth Judicial District was the I-80 corridor and included Humboldt, Lander and Pershing Counties. He said the Seventh Judicial District included Eureka, Lincoln and White Pine Counties.

Commissioner Kohn, Clark County Public Defender, asked Judge Puccinelli to clarify an earlier statement concerning 15 or 20 people he sent to prison. He asked if the offenders were DUI's and Judge Puccinelli replied they were third offense DUI's. He said the law needed to be changed to allow Parole and Probation to supervise Felony DUI Court clients.

Commissioner Kohn asked Judge Glass about the discrepancy between 597 participants in Drug Court in Clark County and 830 participants in Washoe County.

Judge Glass said she did not have a good answer for his question. She said there was an ebb and flow when there were more or less participants. She said Clark County was working on standards for admitting people to the Drug Court. She said she did not know why Washoe had more people than Clark County.

Judge Puccinelli said there were more justice court level drug courts in Las Vegas than in Reno or Sparks. He said some of those people were diverted into those courts. He asked Judge Glass for conformation. She replied Clark County had a justice court drug court program and it could skewer the results. She said Mental Health Court in Washoe County was also much larger than in Clark County. She said the Mental Health Court Program reflected a matter of money.

Commissioner Kohn said his concern was Clark County had been doing Drug Court since the early 1990's, even with the numbers showing, it did not compare to Washoe with a population four or five times smaller than Clark County.

Judge Glass said she agreed with Commissioner Kohn and Clark County should have more people in the drug courts.

Judge Breen said it was difficult to directly compare any drug court in any area to another drug court. He said there were differences in local and legal culture. He said, for example, the Mental Health Court in Washoe started three or four years earlier than Clark County. He said the Washoe drug courts took misdemeanors and felons which increased the numbers. Judge Breen said Clark County wisely required housing for their clients. He said that slowed the entry of people into the Mental Health Court. He said the Drug Court had over 1,000 people at one time. He said Washoe County had certain categories in their drug court; regular treatment, formal after-care of six months and an area called fee review. He said the clients were required to pay for all of their drug court costs.

Judge Glass told Commissioner Kohn she was informed Clark County had 120 clients participating in the Clark County Justice Court Drug Court Program. She said another part of drug court operated out of the district court. She said Clark and Washoe ran their programs differently. She said she agreed there should be more participants in Clark County.

Commissioner Kohn said he did not doubt there were differences in the programs. He said Judge Breen mentioned in his presentation that probably one percent of the beds needed for drug and alcohol treatment were available.

Judge Breen said he did not really know about putting people into in-patient treatment. He said it was very low because the people were in jail or out using and he probably should not have said one percent.

Commissioner Kohn said he suspected the number was even lower. He said last year he found 186 beds in Clark County for indigent people for drug and alcohol treatment. He said there were 2.4 million people in Clark County. He said he suspected the problems were statewide and needed addressing.

Commissioner Siegel, President, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada (ACLU), Inmate Advocate, said Judge Breen made a compelling case for the needs of the courts. He said the State was spending \$165,000,000 a year to build prisons in Nevada. He said the State was spending \$18,000 to \$30,000 an inmate to operate the prisons. He said the Legislature was coming into a financial biennium worse than most in the last decade or longer. He asked if the judges had discussed the question of less prison expenditure from the Legislature to

create the kinds programs they were present to support. He asked if there was a significant difference between judges running the programs being discussed today and the judges who are more separated from the prevention programs.

Judge Glass said she did both specialty courts and a regular criminal calendar. She sent people to prison and also saw the benefits of the alternative programs and not sending certain people to prison. She said when sitting in regular court she wished for more resources. She said because of successful specialty courts throughout the State, most judges saw the wisdom of the alternatives of sending people to prison.

Judge Puccinelli agreed with Judge Glass. He said he also ran specialty courts and a criminal calendar. He said he saw the value in specialty courts and knew they worked. He said by putting methamphetamine users in the drug treatment court model, approximately seven or eight out of ten graduated from the program. The graduates had a recidivism rate of five to fifteen percent.

Chair Hardesty asked Judge Glass to comment on the impact analysis.

Judge Glass referenced the Nevada specialty courts to scale. She said it coordinated all the previous information discussed earlier. Judge Glass said funding the gap for the 3639 people would cost \$42 million with total annual costs of \$46 million. She said the proposal for the capital construction of an additional prison was \$180 million. The prison would house 1,770 inmates. The biennium cost was \$80 million. She said funding specialty courts as outlined by the judges was approximately \$42 million dollars. Judge Glass stated prisons were necessary, but the judges believed a significant number of people could be diverted from prison. She said money could be put off or delayed for capital construction and the money funneled to the specialty courts. She said many people in specialty courts paid for their treatment. She said these people often became responsible, productive citizens. Specialty courts were expensive, but it was an investment in people's futures, she stated. The courts work well and have a high success rate.

Chair Hardesty requested Judge Glass skip forward to the statutory and sentencing recommendation section of the presentation. He said he wanted the Commissioners to have an opportunity to study the materials they had received. He asked Judge Glass and Judge Breen to present the material on Mental Health Courts at a future Commission meeting.

Judge Glass referred to the Review of Nevada Revised Statutes/Sentencing. She said there were things in legislation in need of change in order to give judges more flexibility. She said Judge Breen would address the issue of convictions.

Judge Breen said in some cases the statutes provided for dismissal and sealing of records. He said in regular drug court years ago there were no sentences. He said many people had their charges dismissed and record sealed. Judge Breen requested when a person completed the rigors of a drug court, a specialty court judge was able to seal that person's record. He said it gave a great incentive to people trying to return to society. He reiterated his major request of the sentencing commission was to try to find a way to dismiss or seal the records of successful specialty drug court graduates.

Judge Breen said he wanted the courts to have discretion in allowing the clients to come into drug or mental health courts. He said there were statutes that required an agreement with the district attorney before being allowed into the program. He said judges needed to be able to make the decision as to who should be allowed into specialty drug courts, within statutory guidelines.

Judge Glass agreed with Judge Breen. She said the decision on who should come into the Mental Health Court needed to be within the purview of the judge and the mental health court team. Currently in Clark County, the district attorney had pulled out of all the specialty courts. She said there were people who may deserve or qualify to be in Mental Health Court. Judge Glass said frequently because of the mental illness, the person who ordinarily took the medications would not be a violent person. She said greater latitude was needed in regard to those people.

Judge Glass said the other issues were fairly general. She said "Boot Camp" worked for her. She saw great successes from it. She said the courts needed more beds for people and more in-patient counseling. Another important issue was having a specialty court probation officer who was part of the court team. She proposed probation officers working with the specialty courts become part of the court team and be removed from traditional parole and probation.

Judge Glass referred to the recommendations for the specialty courts programs. She said specialty court specific statutory language needed to be created and imbedded within the appropriate places within the statutes. Create sentencing authorization to include specialty court placement in Judgment of Convictions. Create statutory "true name notification and filing" to increase expediency transitioning from prisons. Remove other statutory barriers to entry into specialty courts. Increase statutory incentives for completion of specialty courts. Create specialty court statute in dependency cases. She said funding was the primary need. Judge Glass said the State had unique problems. Clark and Washoe County had the majority of the population and in the rural counties there were no people to deal with mental health issues. She said everybody worked together in the specialty courts. She said given the chance and the funding, specialty courts made a significant impact in many lives.

Chair Hardesty summarized the important points he had gleaned from the data and

experience of working with Judge Glass. He said the specialty courts in the State had proven to be successful. He said there was a recognized potential service level of two to three times the current level provided. He said in the case of mental health there was a gross disparity between need in Clark County and availability of services. In the rural counties there was a lack of service for both mental health and felony DUI courts. Chair Hardesty said the other issue highlighted in the presentation was that prison re-entry programs were under-utilized. He stated the reason he deferred the mental health discussion was because it required additional education for the Commission. He invited the judges to the May meeting of the Commission.

Judge Breen and Judge Glass said they would appear.

Chair Hardesty added one other item which he wanted to discuss with Commissioner Horsford later in the meeting. He said the numbers provided by the judges in the juvenile and dependency areas were particularly troubling. He said Judge Puccinelli summed it best as having "inmates in waiting." He said the numbers showed the juvenile and dependency areas of the court system were underutilized.

Judge Puccinelli agreed with Chair Hardesty.

Commissioner Siegel said it was helpful to hear from representatives of the Mental Health Division concerning issues such as availability of mental health services in rural Nevada. He said he did not know who to ask to appear before the Commission.

Chair Hardesty said he would ask Judge Glass and Judge Breen to bring in other experts.

Commissioner Carpenter wanted to discuss the mental health situation in rural Nevada, especially Elko County. He said for years there was money in the budget to hire people, but they were unable to hire them. He said because they were unable to use the funds, the Governor removed the funding. Commissioner Carpenter said if they were able to hire someone now, all of the funds were no longer available. He stated the Legislature changed the law so someone with a license to practice in another state was able to practice in Nevada. He said the change was placed in the Marriage and Family Health Counselors category. He said if the change was made in the Administrative Code, it would help the rural counties. He said he spoke to the Chairman of the Board and the Attorney General's Office and they said it would take over a year to arrive at the regulations. Commissioner Carpenter said it was too long a time period. He asked Commissioner Cortez Masto to assist in speeding up the process. He said it was difficult to find people in the mental health areas in Elko.

Chair Hardesty said he had one other summary he wanted to raise with the judges. He asked if on the impact analysis schedule the total annual cost of \$46 million included the existing

funding. He asked if it was the new funding plus existing funding. Judge Glass replied it included the existing funding. Chair Hardesty said the service level could be increased by 3639 individuals and the current service level was approximately one third of that number.

Commissioner Horsford commended the judges on the presentation. He said it was extremely helpful to see the total needs throughout the State broken out by specialty courts. He asked if there were any independent evaluations of the effectiveness of the specialty courts that could be used to add to the funding argument. He asked if there were funding mechanisms the Commission should consider based on actions in other states. Commissioner Horsford's final question asked if a state-wide bond had been considered to fund the increased capacity areas.

Judge Breen said Judge Blake had his regional drug court evaluated by a highly reputable person.

Judge Blake said in 2006 the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the Western Regional Drug Court contracted with Glacier Consulting, a firm that performed court evaluations throughout the country. He said they had in-depth numbers and demographics, retention rates and many other things of great use. He said the AOC had the entire evaluation available. Judge Blake added they were doing an independent study based on that data and other independent comparative data.

Chair Hardesty asked Judge Glass or Judge Breen to comment on the funding issues. He said the judges had not considered bonds for funding. Chair Hardesty stated there needed to be a shift in the dedication of funding from incarcerating people and into programs that worked. He said the Commission needed to maximize the tax payer's dollars in dealing with these issues.

Judge Glass said in regard to independent evaluations Clark County had none. She said they needed to keep statistics to present to the Legislature. She said she could not talk about a bond referendum. However, she said they needed to look at the best use of the money and the most efficient use of the General Fund dollars. She said investing in making changes that help people change their lives rather than being incarcerated was necessary. She said it was an educational process because not everybody understood what the specialty courts did and how they worked. She said specialty courts helped people change their lives and become productive members of society again. She said that was a different model from crime and punishment. She said a therapeutic model was very different.

Commissioner Carpenter said specialty court worked and the community needed to change their way of thinking.

Judge Puccinelli said his drug court was not easy. He said participants in his program said the reason why they graduated from the drug court was because they were supervised, drug tested, provided with treatment and given praise from the judge.

Chair Hardesty said Nevada was lucky to have the personal dedication and interest of the judges. He said it was one of the most difficult tasks in the judiciary. He added Judge Blake and Judge Breen were senior judges. Without their services and their funding being provided through the Senior Judge Program funded by the Legislature, the western regional community would be without mental health and drug court judges. He said the funding was a crisis for the State and emphasized the need for the continued funding of the senior judge program.

Chair Hardesty reconvened the Commission and said he would open with Item VI on the Agenda. He stated Commissioner Gayle Farley would introduce Emilio Parga.

Commissioner Farley, Victims Rights Advocate, said before she introduced Mr. Parga she had letters she had been requested to read into the record. The letters were from Madeline T. and Marisa G. Zappa.

To whom it may concern:

My name is Madeline T. Zappa. My only son Theodore A. Zappa, Jr. was brutally and senselessly murdered on March 2, 1981 by Norman and Russell Crew. I cannot put into words the sorrow and pain I've been living with every day since my son was taken from us. No one knows what it is like to lose a child, especially one that was so loved. My husband died shortly after my son's death due to a broken heart. My husband and I raised our children to have respect for others and with good morals and values, something the Crew brothers obviously do not possess. I do not understand how my two daughters have the strength to come face-to-face with these murderers every time a parole and pardon hearing comes up but they find the strength and determination due to the love they had for their brother.

My son had a brilliant future. He had just been accepted into law school. Then in one moment of greed and insanity, my only son lost everything, especially his life. My son was not a part of the twisted drug deal between the Crew brothers and Michael Nasse. He was an innocent victim and at the wrong place the wrong time. His murder was totally senseless. The Crew brothers admitted never knowing my son. They why did they murder him? The Crew brothers and their family have made a mockery of our justice system by being allowed to play the system and they continue to do so. All we have is justice

on our side and we continue to fight to see that justice has been served.

I have been harassed over the years with letters, phone calls and visits from Florence Crew Jones asking for forgiveness for her savage sons but not once has she ever inquired on how I was doing. She has the ability to visit and to talk to her sons. Me? I go to a cemetery, to a marble stone and talk to my son in my prayers. Where is the justice in that? It is still so real and difficult to deal with this tragedy and it is very unfair how my family and I have to constantly relive the worst days of our lives. My beloved son cannot even rest in peace.

We want to make sure that Norman and Russell Crew are punished for the actions because that is what prison is all about. We were originally promised a minimum of forty years behind bars and leniency was granted because a juror was friends of Florence Crew Jones and committed perjury. No morals in that family.

My daughter has been threatened by the Crew brothers and the only comfort that we have is knowing that they are behind bars and we are safe. Who will protect us in society if we ever allowed them to walk the streets? Please let justice prevail and these violent offenders remain behind bars where they belong.

Commissioner Farley read the second letter for the record:

To whom it may concern:

My name is Marisa G. Zappa. I am the sister of Theodore A. Zappa, Jr., a loving wonderful brother who was brutally and senselessly murdered by Norman and Russell Crew in March 2, 1981.

My family and I lived with this indescribable pain for years. My father unfortunately died shortly after his only son's death. Teddy (my brother) was my parents pride and joy. My father died from a broken heart.

It is tragic enough the way my brother was killed by the Norman and Russell Crew [sic]. He was killed like he was an animal. He was pistol whipped beyond recognition, his throat was slit and he was buried and reburied in the desert for days before his body was found. To this day I get sick to my stomach when I have to think about it. My brother was killed over a drug deal between the Crew brothers and Michael Nasse, the other victim in this crime,



which went wrong. Unfortunately, Teddy was not a part of this transaction. He was a good guy at the wrong place the wrong time.

After many weeks of a trial the verdict was life in prison with the possibility of parole. The possibility of parole was due to the fact that a woman juror committed perjury and was a friend of the murderer's mother, Florence Crew Jones. This juror also had the nerve to attend Russell Crews parole hearing last August 2007. We were promised the murderers would be behind bars for a minimum of 40 years. But that was just the beginning.

Over the years the murderers mother Florence Crew Jones has harassed us during our darkest days of grief. We received phone calls (where we would hang up), letters left in our mailbox or through the postal service (which were returned), and visits to our house (I threatened to call the police for trespassing if she returned). I was even followed to work and Florence Crew Jones gave a note to my co-worker to give to me (I filed a police report). We were offered, thru [sic] a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, a monetary bribe of \$20,000.00 if we would agree to leniency towards her sons. Every time there was a parole or pardon hearing Florence Crew Jones would try to talk to me about forgiving her sons. Never once has she asked how I doing or especially how my mother was doing.

During the last pardon hearing Norman Crew turned to look at me and mouthed 'I will get you!' and he and Russell Crew both gave the thumbs up hand gesture to me.

The Crew brothers pretend to have this great support system behind them. Do there [sic] supporters consist of liars and cheaters? Where were these loving supportive parents when they really needed them growing up? Maybe if they had support then they would not be murderers today. Their support will not be around for many more years to come. What then? The Crew brothers will probably go back to the only life they have ever known, Drugs, violence and prison.

These 2 murderers have had more than their share of chances in prison. They have been granted several hearings in front of the pardons board, now they even managed to have 2 life sentences abolished. They have made a mockery of our judicial system. They are murderers in the first degree for the killings of two lives. We are constantly reliving our darkest days over and over. They should not be rewarded for who their mother knows or how many degrees they have earned in prison. That is expected of them. They are in prison to be punished. As long as they are behind bars we all are safe. I just want to make

sure that our justice system prevails and that we victims are not forgotten.

I will be fighting for my brother and all victims rights as long as I am alive

Thank you, respectfully, Marisa Zappa.

Commissioner Farley introduced Emilio Parga. She said he was an author, two-time cancer survivor and former elementary school teacher and counselor. He had a M.A. in School Counseling, a master's equivalency in childhood educations and an MBA. Commissioner Farley read Mr. Parga's biography to the Commission, ([Exhibit H](#)). Mr. Parga was an educator in issues related to grief and death, especially grieving children. She said the Commission had been provided with some of the books and literature Mr. Parga used.

Emilio Parga, Founder of The Solace Tree, spoke about what his organization was doing. He said he first learned of death at the age of ten when his father died and he was unable to attend the funeral. He said he dealt with both death and loss in his youth. He said we learned from the children that there was death, and everything else was secondary. Mr. Parga said he was a pediatric thanatologist and he could explain cancer, suicide, or homicide to a four year old. He said his organization did not lie to children. Mr. Parga stated unresolved grief played a significant factor in homicide, suicide, relationship issues and judicial issues. He said the Solace Tree was started as an educational non-profit to educate professionals dealing with death. He said he was teaching the first class in Nevada dealing with children, teens and death. He wanted to train professionals who work with children to grieve and speak of death. Mr. Parga referred to a pamphlet, The Solace Tree Child and Adolescent Center for Grief and Loss, ([Exhibit I](#)). He said The Solace Tree was a non-profit organization. He welcomed the Commission to come to a house the University of Nevada Reno had donated to his organization.

Mr. Parga said he had been to 43 schools in Washoe Country to talk about his program. He said he presented a program in the high schools entitled "No Child Should Grieve Alone." He said God and religion were an active part of his program. He said the organization was always free and open for people to discuss their feelings. He said the word "solace" meant comfort. He said he wanted a program that could take kids anywhere. He said he found the word stood for Sadness, Overcome, In a Loving and Caring Environment. He said everyone experienced grief but did not experience death everyday. He said the journal "Love Never Stops" [Exhibit I](#) was for children to document their feelings. Mr. Parga said there was no magic ending to grief. He said nobody mourned the same way. He said they were educating the professionals, the community and society.

Mr. Parga said one of his organization's needs was a larger home to bring teens and families together. He showed a nine minute video to the Commission. He said his message was learning to be able to cope with death and grief for all ages.

Chair Hardesty asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Farley asked if the groups were separated by experience. She said many children at The Solace Tree were survivors of a parent's murder. She said that was different than death by a heart attack. She asked Mr. Parga how he dealt with that.

Mr. Parga said years ago he tried separating the children by category of death. The children did not want to be separated; they all wanted to be together.

Chair Hardesty asked Dr. Austin to make his monthly report to the Commission.

James Austin, JFA, Council of State Governments, opened his presentation with a review of the monthly statistics he was monitoring on the prison, probation and parole populations, ([Exhibit J](#)). He stated there was a slight change in the trends. He said the drop in prison population for the past three or four months had slowed down. He said he had expected it to continue to decline. Dr. Austin referred to a chart entitled "Nevada End of Month Prison Population vs. Budgeted Projections" ([Exhibit J](#)). He said a budgeted number for the prison system was added to the chart. He said the next chart looked at admissions and releases in the prison. He said there was a problem with the data as it appeared there were more released people than those admitted to the prisons. He said there were approximately 1,000 cases still not heard.

Dr. Austin said the parole population was starting to go up, as were releases into the parole system. He said the probation population trends were stable and level. There were no projected budgeted numbers at this time. He referred to the next chart concerning parole and probation revocation rates. He said parole revocation rates were down, but there was an uptick in probation violation rates.

Dr. Austin next referred to the chart on admissions and releases by offense category. He said the "B" category was the high volume area of admissions into prisons. He said the current data said there was an increase in released vs. admissions in the "B" category. The number of revocations by type went down with the exception of the technical. The final chart concerning probation revocations by type had gone up by the numbers.

Dr. Austin discussed outstanding issues concerning the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) data, the impact of parole board backup, and the transition of the work by JFA and

the Council of State Government (CSG) which needed consolidating and analyzing. He said there needed to be a place where all the information was gathered, reported and analyzed by an entity in the State. He suggested the universities, a sentencing commission or an existing government agency.

Dr. Austin stated a new projection was forthcoming this spring. He wanted to briefly discuss the Drug Court. He had been involved in a number of states that invested heavily into drug courts. A recent study said the key issue for drug courts was whether or not they actually diverted people from the prison system. He said a lot of drug courts did not have documentation showing relief in the prison admissions for the same kinds of crimes. Dr. Austin said there were ways to structure legislation to ensure that people in a drug court would have likely gone to prison had the drug court not existed. He said without that legislation there could still be a growing prison population.

Chair Hardesty said at some point the State needed to take over the monitoring of the prison statistics. He said it needed collaboration of all the departments in a central repository. Chair Hardesty mentioned the possibility of using the university system through volunteers who were interested in tracking the material.

Commissioner Kohn asked Dr. Austin about the graph showing the A, B, C, D, and E felonies. He asked him to tell the Commission how many people were in a category because of drug related crimes. Dr. Austin replied he would have the answer in two weeks. He said they could get precise details about the penal code under which the individual was sentenced.

Commissioner Kohn said an earlier speaker had quoted Glen Wharton as saying fifty percent of the people in prison were dangerous. He asked if the numbers could reflect people sentenced to prison due to a violent felony. Dr. Austin replied in this State approximately forty percent of the standing population were convicted of a violent crime; homicide, manslaughter, assault or robbery. He added the vast majority of people coming into the prison system were nonviolent drug offenders, approximately seventy five percent of the people.

Commissioner Skolnik, Director, Department of Corrections, said the number of people in prison for drug related offenses was approximately 1,700. The majority of those were in for drug trafficking. He said about forty percent of the prison population today were in prison for some form of a sex offense.

Commissioner Siegel said Dr. Austin referred to structuring the mental health courts for real diversion. He asked for additional information.

Dr. Austin said the number one thing to allow was for the court to control the referral process

rather than district attorney. He said if the district attorney had greater control over the referral process, then the specialty courts tended to receive cases that would not have gone to prison. He said some states had systems set up where people were sentenced to prison and the DOC came to the court and recommended release from prison into a specialty court program. He said the third point was setting up profile characteristics. People going to drug court with no prior felony convictions were probably not prison bound. He said people needed a certain number of prior convictions before being considered for mental health or drug courts. He said all the above items were built in to ensure people were diverted out of the prison system. He said the issue of funding became moot because it was in the prison budget.

Chair Hardesty said there were modifications to the legislation in the last session. He asked Commissioner Skolnik if those changes had been utilized since July 1, 2007.

Commissioner Skolnik said that money was set aside based on original projections from the inmate driven budget. He said approximately fifty percent of the projected reduction was set aside with interim finance. He said the money had funded the cameras and other items to assist the parole board in meeting their obligations. He said the prison population was above the projected figures.

Chair Hardesty said there was change in the legislation that allowed for re-entry.

Commissioner Skolnik said the reentry numbers remained flat. He said they had the authority to put violent offenders and nonfelony sex offenders in the program but they chose not to do so. He said they were looking at changing requirements. He said they do not accept violent offenders into the program. He said that group may benefit from the program more than any other single group. He said they needed an opportunity to transition from prison. He said the criteria applied to those inmates needed to be uniform and fair and that criteria was not yet developed.

Chair Hardesty asked Commissioner Salling about the status of the bubble.

Commissioner Salling, Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners, said the bubble was still the bubble. She said as a result of A.B.510, a number of inmates were eligible for parole sooner than otherwise planned. She said S.B.471 gave the inmates a number of due process rights which required longer hearings. She said approximately 1,000 people were waiting for parole hearings. She said the new positions needed to be filled. The positions were new and had new classifications requiring a long process of hiring. She said they planned to have the examiners make recommendations to the Parole Board. She said they would ask inmates to waive their hearing and proceed with recommendations of the examiners. Commissioner Salling said realistically, the bubble would exist for at least another six months.

Chair Hardesty said the bubble has existed since October 1st and little progress had been made. He said basically that was six months with 1, 000 inmates not heard.

Chair Hardesty called for a recess and the convening of the subcommittee meeting.

Chair Hardesty reconvened the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice at 1:37 p.m. He opened the meeting with Item IX on the agenda, the appointment of a subcommittee to study mandatory sentencing statutes. He said the Commission had discussed the issue of mandatory drug sentencing statutes. He also mentioned prosecutors and defense lawyers had commented about the statutes and how they operated and their concerns with the substantial assistance statutes. He said he asked Commissioner Herndon to chair a subcommittee to study and make recommendations to the Commission concerning mandatory drug sentencing statutes. He said Commissioner Herndon would appoint prosecutors, defense lawyers and law enforcement personnel to the subcommittee. He asked the Commission to empower that subcommittee and authorize it to proceed.

Commissioner Siegel moved to approve the subcommittee chaired by Commissioner Herndon, with appointees approved by the Chair of the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion. Chair Hardesty asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Commissioner Mallory, Churchill County District Attorney, said much of the information Dr. Austin gathered concerning sentencing would be relevant regarding any type of question concerning mandatory sentencing. He said Dr. Austin could tell the subcommittee the reality of what was happening as opposed to anecdotal information. He asked that the hard data and statistics were included in anything concerning mandatory sentencing. He said there were a number of mandatory sentencing laws beside the drug laws.

Chair Hardesty said when he spoke of mandatory sentencing statutes, he meant mandatory drug sentencing statutes. He said other mandatory sentencing such as DUI statutes and domestic violence statutes, needed further review. He said those discussions would not be held before August 1st. The drug sentencing statutes arose during the Legislature in 2007.

Commissioner Parks said mandatory drug sentencing statutes was a priority issue in the previous Legislature.

Chair Hardesty mentioned Commissioner Skolnik developed statistics concerning all the people sentenced under the current mandatory drug sentencing statutes. He asked Commissioner Skolnik the number of prisoners sentenced under those statutes. Commissioner Skolnik said it was approximately 1,700 people. Chair Hardesty said the

subcommittee would be able to look at the demographics of the people and length of sentences. Chair Hardesty asked Ms. Clark to call for a roll call response to the motion. The motion passed unanimously from the Commissioners present. He asked if there were members who wanted to serve on the subcommittee. Commissioner Carpenter wanted to serve on the subcommittee.

Chair Hardesty moved to Item VIII on the agenda. The presentations concerned electronic tracking of probationers. He said he had received innovative information from several companies. He asked the vendors of the technology to make presentations to the Commission.

Jay Parmer, Satellite Tracking of People LLC, (STOP LLC) said the company was an industry leader in the electronic monitoring technology providing services to corrections, parole and probation agencies at the federal, state and local levels.

Mark Fierro, said he was the Nevada distributor for six tracking technologies, Technology Based Tracking LLC. He said he would discuss two of them. He said it was an emerging technology, but the basis had been in use since 1990. He said the technology “came alive” when the person stepped out. Mr. Fierro presented a lengthy over-view of the technology ([Exhibit K](#)).

Mr. Fierro said he would discuss TRACKER PAL and Actsoft programs. He said TRACKER PAL worked off a Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) system. He said protocols could be set by the court or parole and probation for the use of the system. Training and on-going support was provided by the company.

Chair Hardesty asked if the Commission had any questions.

Commissioner Mallory inquired about the approximate cost of tracking device.

Mr. Fierro said the equipment was leased and cost about \$10. or \$11..

Commissioner Salling said she saw the slide mentioning a monitoring center. She asked if the company had an actual monitoring center or was it contracted. Mr. Fierro said it was a monitoring center. He said there were two centers, one in southern Utah and the other in Florida.

Commissioner Salling asked if the monitor evaluating the alcohol level was available at this time. Mr. Fierro said it was available right now. She asked if it was skin to skin monitoring. He replied it was skin to skin. He said alcohol monitoring until now had been gathering data for the day. He said in the technology available now, within five minutes of off-gassing the

alcohol, it detected and notified the monitors. He said it would clear up false positives.

Commissioner Salling asked if it was satellite based. She said one of the problems in Nevada was all the mountains. She said line of sight was an issue. Mr. Fierro said that was not an issue with the Actsoft monitors, they were GPS. He said the concerns currently were with very large buildings, such as casinos. He said elevator areas might be a problem, much like cell phones.

Commissioner Miller, Sheriff, Storey County, asked Mr. Fierro if they actually installed the devices on the inmates. Mr. Fierro said the installation can be done by law enforcement or the contractor. Commissioner Miller asked how the device worked if it were submerged in water. Mr. Fierro said the device can be submerged up to three meters. Commissioner Miller asked how the device stayed on the leg. Mr. Fierro said the band had optic wire running through it as well as two stainless steel bands and if it was cut off the monitor would know.

David P. DeGeorge, Western Regional Sales Manager, STOP LLC, gave an overview of electronic monitoring, ([Exhibit L](#)). He gave a PowerPoint presentation. He said there were a number of different technologies utilized within the electronic monitoring industry. He said GPS technology was line of sight technology. He said someone had to be outdoors to see it. He said inside a building it would monitor but not be able to track someone. He said STOP, LLC's form of electronic monitoring had three types; active, hybrid and passive technology. He said he provided the Commissioners with a packet of information and a compact disc (CD) describing technology utilized by his company. Mr. DeGeorge said in California there were currently 4,183 sex offenders wearing his product. He said everything was Web-based technology and near real time. Mr. DeGeorge continued his presentation. He provided everyone with a report from the PEW Charitable Trusts entitled One in 100: Behind Bars in America. He said it cost an average of almost \$24,000 a year to incarcerate a person. He said utilizing GPS monitoring made fiscal sense. He said the technology held offenders accountable and compliant to the court's orders.

Chair Hardesty asked if there were any questions for Mr. DeGeorge.

Commissioner Kohn asked if the monitor determined if someone had drugs in their system. Mr. DeGeorge said no, it was strictly GPS and told the location of a person.

Commissioner Siegel asked if the gang members he mentioned had been previously arrested or convicted of a crime. Mr. DeGeorge responded they were all parolees in California.

Chair Hardesty thanked both companies for giving presentations to the Commission. He asked Commissioner Salling if she had further information on Agenda Item VI regarding the Parole Commissioners and their activities.



Commissioner Salling said the Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) raised some questions about the risk instrument. She said when it was developed with Dr. Austin they did it based on studies showing females tended to be a better risk for parole. She said females tended not to commit as violent offenses. She said the females had a different risk path than the males. She said LCB said there was an interest in making the male and females score out the same. She said it was important to recognize the vast majority of inmates in the prison were males. She said changes would result in the females not getting the benefit of having a lower risk rate.

Commissioner Siegel raised the initial question. He said he did not disagree with the pragmatic argument that Commissioner Salling made on the points of women and men. He said it was Constitutional and it was the main issue he wanted to discuss.

Commissioner Salling said that was why she raised the subject. She said it was a risk instrument developed with Dr. Austin and the Parole Board did not have an internal bias either way. They were open to all input. She did say women would be statistically paroled at a lesser rate unless they deviated from that instrument.

Chair Hardesty suggested for present purposes Commissioner Salling bring in sites for Commissioner Siegel and Commissioner Herndon to study. She said she would bring the case law to their attention.

Chair Hardesty asked Commissioner Gonska for an overview of Item V on the Agenda. He said the audit had been circulated to the Commission, ([Exhibit M](#)).

Commissioner Gonska, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, said he would not present a detailed explanation because on May 23, 2008, an official report was due to the Director of the Department of Administration. He said the report would address all the problems. He said the auditors were professional and discussed the audit everyday with him. He said his division started making corrections before the audit report was completed. He said the audit addressed high risk. He said the Governor did not have anything to do with the audit. He said it was a lack of oversight and break down of supervision at a certain level. The problems were not because of funding or shortage of staffing. He said it was an internal problem with the Division of Parole and Probation. He said his division intended to be in full compliance. Commissioner Gonska said twenty three new officers had graduated last week from the Academy and were being placed in the system. He said deferred positions were deferred for six months, but there was still an issue with vacancies they were unable to fill. He said this division historically had difficult times filling all its vacancies. He said recruiting, hiring and retention were important issues for the division. He said the current Director had made it a priority to fix the issue with the division. He said starting the next day the division would be

correcting the issues. His concern was making sure the corrected deficiencies stayed corrected in the future. He said the entire country had heard about the audit. He said many people were upset about the audit because they had worked hard to do the necessary tasks. He said as the head administrator he took the blame and would fix the problems.

Chair Hardesty asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Miller asked Commissioner Gonska how many positions were down in his organization. Commissioner Gonska said forty seven positions were open and thirty one of those were newly funded positions which had been deferred for six months. He said there was always a problem filling their positions.

Chair Hardesty asked Commissioner Gonska if he thought the salary level hurt his division in recruiting and filling positions. He said it seemed there were salary disparities between state and county employees and city police departments. He asked if the people were underpaid compared to the other groups.

Commissioner Gonska replied two years ago it was a major factor. He said it was a factor in hiring. He said personnel said at the end of the hiring process the division hired less than five percent. Chair Hardesty asked for the beginning pay range. Commissioner Gonska said it was approximately \$48,000 a year. Commissioner Flynn said Las Vegas METRO's starting wage was \$52,000 a year. Commissioner Skolnik said starting correctional officers made \$38,000 a year.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if there were people who had quit but wanted to return. Commissioner Gonska said if they quit in good standing they would take them back.

Commissioner Horsford said Commissioner Gonska outlined his response to the audit effectively. He said he expected the issues identified in the audit to be addressed. He said the audits were extremely important in identifying areas of oversight. He said the issues regarding the inability to fully staff needed to be addressed. He said it was making the State weak in its ability to provide the necessary oversight the State was charged with doing. He requested some type of update of the actions being taken so the Commission stayed informed. He said if there continued to be areas of weakness due to funding or under staffing the Commission needed to be informed. He said State Government in Nevada was under-resourced, under-staffed and not able to fully meet its obligations to the people of the State.

Chair Hardesty said Commissioner Horsford made a very good point and his comments were exactly within the legislative charge to the Commission. He said they were expected to provide recommendations or comments on each of the agencies to the Legislature.

Chair Hardesty said one of the areas included in the report were the specifics of what each

agency was unable to accomplish. He asked Commissioners Salling, Skolnik and Gonska to continue to advise the Commission on staffing issues. He said there was a clear nexus between the failure of the goals of the 2007 Legislature to reduce prison population by at least 1,000 inmates and the lack of staff and burdensome procedures under which the Parole Commissioners were operating. He said even with the addition of \$780,000 from IFC the bubble had not been released. The prison's number one issue was the staffing shortage, 234 positions that were not filled.

Commissioner Skolnik said the problem had been addressed with the reinstituting of the position of correctional assistant. Those people were being utilized for parts of the department that did not require sworn officers, such as the mail room or property room. He said those assignments were handled by individuals who had not yet gone through the certification process or were not yet 21 years old. He said their staff vacancy rate had substantially declined.

Chair Hardesty asked, in follow-up to Commissioner Horsford's comment, was Commissioner Skolnik able to identify objectives of the DOC that cannot be fulfilled because of staffing and resource shortages? Commissioner Skolnik said they were not adequately staffed. He said an audit showed they were 300 to 400 positions short to operate the department safely. He said his division had been generally underfunded and understaffed. He said they had some good instruments they could not use because they lacked staff to administer the application or staff able to interrupt the findings.

Chair Hardesty said in June, 2008, the Commission needed an inventory of staffing and resource shortages. He said they could be reported in the August meeting.

Commissioner Kohn said tomorrow the Supreme Court was looking into defense in the State. He said the lack of funding should include the State Public Defender also. He said Commissioner Mallory indicated only two counties still used the State Public Defender. He said they also needed to study the specialty courts before June.

Chair Hardesty moved to the reports of the subcommittees, Item X on the Agenda. He said there had not been a steering subcommittee meeting since the original one. He said there would be a steering subcommittee meeting before the April meeting. He said the "Truth in Sentencing" study would be heard and the objectives of the study, the timeline for the study and the appointment of the consultant would be considered. Chair Hardesty asked Commissioner Horsford if he had a report on the subcommittee to Consider Issues Related to the Juvenile Justice System.

Commissioner Horsford announced they would have their meeting on Monday, April 7 at 9:00 am. He said it would be video conferenced between Las Vegas and Carson City. He

said the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators was meeting on March 25 in Reno. They were working on a State-wide plan and would submit a report to the Subcommittee.

Chair Hardesty said Commissioner Cortez Masto stated the subcommittee on Victims of Crime met on February 27, 2008 and scheduled a second meeting for April. He said she indicated the subcommittee meeting was well attended and so many issues were addressed they had not yet gotten to the funding issues. He asked Commissioner Farley if she had additional comments on the work of that subcommittee. Commissioner Farley said it was well attended and lasted over three hours. She said it was going to be a successful committee.

Chair Hardesty said the April meeting of the Commission would include groups of the Commission receiving tours of the Southern Nevada Correctional Facility and the High Desert Facility. He said the meeting was scheduled for April 14, 2008. The commission members would tour in the morning so the Commission would not conduct its meeting in the morning. The meeting would be conducted inside the prisons and video conferenced so the public may attend. He said the Commission meeting would begin at noon. He requested the steering committee catalogue the various activities over the past several months and identify a series of areas where the Commission can begin to start taking votes on recommendations for the Legislature. He said the Agenda needed to reflect areas where the Commission debated and voted some recommendations from all the material and data gathered over the past several months. Chair Hardesty said a head start was needed on drafting reports in certain areas.

Commissioner Mallory said he was interested in receiving an actual report on the numbers of people involved in "Boot Camp." He said it was a very effective tool. He wanted information on how it was doing, what the capacities were for boot camp and how it was being used.

Chair Hardesty received a report from the head of the program. He said it broke down the cost, the amount of funding, its capacity, how many beds available and their recidivism rate. He said it was a well done report.

Commissioner Siegel stated the Commission was ready on specialty courts. Chair Hardesty said the challenge on specialty courts was the funding. He said there needed to be a direct correlation between money spent currently on incarceration and money that could be spent on specialty courts. He said further testimony from Dr. Austin was needed to be sure specialty courts actually produced savings in the prison system.

Chair Hardesty opened the meeting for public comment.

Florence Jones-Crew said she needed to direct her comments to the letters Commissioner Farley read for the record. She submitted a report from the Clark County District Attorney's office, ([Exhibit N](#)). She said the letters Commissioner Farley read were not factual. She said her family had remorse and sorrow, her sons had written letters to the Zappa family which they refused. She said in the court her sons were given life sentences with the possibility of parole. They had served 27 years and were now eligible for parole this year. She said Ms. Zappa's letters were a personal attack. She said she did not know or had done anything about which Ms. Zappa was speaking. She said the first paragraph on the second page of the report from the District Attorney's office said Theodore Zappa agreed to go on the drug deal. She said there was the issue of the amount of marijuana in his car. She directed the Commission's attention to the last page of the report. She said her sons had served 27 years of hard time.

Ms. Jones referred to the report with regard to the jury's special verdict. She said the jury took into consideration mitigating factors such as the young age of her sons, they had no criminal history and the victims were involved in an illegal act. She said Commissioner Farley read a letter that was not factual and said defaming things about Ms. Jones. She asked the letter be stricken from the record and Commissioner Farley be censored in the future to work toward the betterment of the whole situation and not attack one family or unit. Ms. Jones stated the Parole Board needed to be under the Open Meeting Law. She said victims families had opportunities to speak to the Parole Commissioners. Ms. Jones said at the last parole hearing the victim's family was allowed to speak about twenty minutes before and twenty five minutes after the hearing.

Chair Hardesty asked if there was further testimony from Las Vegas.

Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford, Clark County Assembly District No. 41, said Ms. Jones had contacted him on several occasions. He said many of his constituents had issues with the State correctional institutions. He said Ms. Jones asked him to write a letter on behalf of her two sons. He said young people made mistakes in life and did not always know the consequence of decisions they had made. He said the letter he wrote was presented at one of the parole hearings. Ms. Zappa, the victim's relative, requested a copy of the letter. Assemblyman Munford denied Ms. Zappa's request. He said he finally did release it to her. He said he wanted to share Ms. Zappa's actions with the Commission. He said he thought people could change and become productive people later in their life.

Commissioner Parks said five other people had signed in to speak.

Pat Hines said she was from Yerington, Nevada. She said she promised Mr. Smith she would speak first. Ms. Hines stated Commissioner Farley usurped her privileged position in a negative and obtrusive way. She thanked Commissioner Horsford for his statement that

oversight rules needed to be adhered to. She said oversight had not been a part of the government's procedures and policies. Thirdly, Ms. Hines said she saw a lack of statistics and "nuts and bolts" from Dr. Austin and the three departments represented. She wanted to know how many people were paroled to the streets, how many were paroled to consecutive sentences, how many people were put out on mandatory sentences and how many were coming back into prison on parole violations. She wanted to know how many parolees were sex offenders. She said sex offenders seemed to be the scapegoat of society. She said better statistics, both negative and positive, were a right of the public.

Ms. Hines asked the Commission to give sex offenders a time frame to make a presentation on what was working and not working with sex offender laws. She said the Adam Walsh Act, passed in 2006, made the testimony a matter of urgency. Ms. Hines said the last legislative session repealed parts of A.B.579 and added some things to try to be in compliance with the Adam Walsh Act. She said the State did not have to be in compliance until 2009. Ms. Hines said some other states decided not to comply with everything in the Act. She said anything to do with sex offenders was confusing and the laws were difficult to understand. She said the Human Rights Watch and the Adam Walsh Act had a lot of information. She said the State had a forensic research person and ordained minister with good ideas on how to correct the criminal justice system. She said one of the biggest problems in the sex offender area were how the "psyche panel" was evaluated. She said the panel was given the task of certifying sex offenders as to whether or not they should be released. She said she had been told the "psyche panel" was an extension of the parole board and also that it was an individual separate entity. Ms. Hines requested an operational audit on the "psyche panel." Ms. Hines gave the Commission a copy of revised statutes and the change made in the last Legislative Session, ([Exhibit O](#)). She said section (d) and (e) of the bill related to minimum security facilities and the access inmates have to the facilities. She said she thought the intent was to let more inmates have access to minimum security facilities. She questioned the word *ever* in section (d) and asked if these people should never have access to a minimum security facility. She said the second page was a letter from a newspaper. She said sex offenses, sexual deviations, like any other bad habit, or impulse should be looked at as a health problem. She quoted Steven Ing as saying sexual crimes were public health problems, like AIDs, cholera, smoking and other public health problems. He said the best tools were information, education and rational thinking. Ms. Hines requested the Commission give time in the next meeting for a presentation concerning sex offenders.

Edward Smith read a letter for the record from Willie Bargas, ([Exhibit P](#)):

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Willie Bargas, this is my second time before you to ask your help to review and change some of the sex offender laws in our state to less stigmatizing and fairer considerations. These laws need to be reviewed from

sentencing, to non discriminatory opportunities while incarcerated and on to an offender's return to a community.

I live in Las Vegas and am on my 9th year of parole with a sexual assault conviction classified as a community notification Tier Level II. I was working and looking forward to going back to court and getting my tier level lowered after being violation free for 10 years....

Chair Hardesty informed Mr. Smith the letter had been distributed and read by the members. He said the letter was part of the record and each commissioner had a copy of it, ([Exhibit P](#)).

Mr. Smith said he had never met Willie Bargas. Mr. Smith said he was also a sex offender. He said he lost jobs and had been kicked out of places he lived because he was a sex offender. He said he had been out for 6 ½ years. He said he had 11 years of therapy. He said he planned to continue therapy as long as he lived because he knew he had a problem. He said a lot of the education about sex offenders was incorrect. He said he was not an animal; he was a human being who made a bad mistake. He said he was trying to put his life on a better course. He added he had lots of restrictions already as he was on life-time supervision. He said he could not comprehend these laws.

Michelle Ravell said the Commission had the letter she submitted regarding the parole board laws being changed, ([Exhibit Q](#)). Ms. Ravell said she hoped someone would notify her of the actual law. She said the parole board had been aware of the revised statute since July, when it was enacted. She said the procedures that needed to be done should not be circumvented by the board. She asked about the discretionary release guidelines received in the last meeting. Ms. Ravell said the guidelines said the board cannot ask if an inmate was appealing a conviction. She said there were two other issues that did not make a lot of sense. She said if appealing a conviction cannot be used, how can remorse be used as a guideline. If the person were innocent of the crime and appealing because they were innocent how could they be remorseful for a crime they did not commit? She said the details of the form made it a little bit skewed for people who were innocent or appealing their conviction.

Anne Marie Palmer said Mr. Donald Hinton would not be speaking today. Ms. Palmer asked about mandatory drug testing of prison inmates. She said she understood a lot of the drugs were coming from the prison guards. She asked why there was no mandatory drug testing for prison guards. Secondly, Ms. Palmer said 40 percent of the drugs entering the system came from those in charge of the inmates and she wanted to know why there were no drug charges against them. Ms. Palmer asked why each substation within the jurisdiction of place that had been forfeited, a house, a car or whatever, taken from a person's home the substation received the monies collected from the sale of those items. She asked if that was included in the audit. She said there was a need for more public defenders. Ms. Palmer submitted

Mr. Hinton's testimony, ([Exhibit R](#)).

Maureen Flansberg said she was asked to present a statement to the Committee from Glen Crew, a retired highway patrol man, ([Exhibit S](#)). Ms. Flansberg asked what procedure or process was in place to detect offender management errors in inmate sentencing, such as the ones documented in Russell Crew's case. She said the NDOC did not catch the errors. Russell Crew was housed at the High Desert State Prison. He had an audit letter issued January 25, 2008 from the Nevada Department of Corrections to the Parole Board correcting an NDOC sentencing error stating he was immediately eligible for parole. Ms. Flansberg said she had been told a number of times parole was not a right but a privilege. She said all she asked as a parent was her child be given a chance in front of the parole board.

Nancy Gentis said she was concerned about the appeal process. She said victim's families were not notified when appeals were granted to inmates. She wondered how to change the system so families were notified when there was going to be a retrial. She said Washoe County had forms for notification to victims of parole hearings and if there were any appeals. She said the notification system was not statewide. She said she understood the appeals process was a legal thing. She asked for information from the Commission on how to get notification for victim's families.

Chair Hardesty said he would refer her inquiry to the Subcommittee that addressed victim's rights and concerns. He said the next meeting would be posted on the LCB site. He also suggested she give Commissioner Farley her name and number for future notification. Chair Hardesty said the subcommittee could make proposals regarding the practice of informing victims about the appellate process and postconviction being made uniform throughout the State. He said Washoe County had an active victim's rights group within the district attorney's office. He asked Ms. Gentis to address her concerns to the subcommittee.

Audrey Gabriel asked the Commission to read a letter she submitted when they had time. (Letter not received.)

Chair Hardesty asked if there were people in Carson City who wished to make a statement or comment.

Lee Rowland, attorney for the ACLU of Nevada, said her comments were similar to what Ms. Ravell spoke about earlier. She said she had no written comment, but wanted her remarks on the record.

She said she was happy Ms. Ravell included a copy of the State Board of Parole Commissioners LCB File No. R18-08 dated March 11, 2008, ([Exhibit Q](#)). She said LCB issued a regulation that governed parole that states... "the



Board will conduct a meeting to consider a prisoner for parole not sooner than 150 days before the date on which the prisoner must be released.”

Ms. Rowland said there had been an interesting progression, even within the Commission, about the mandatory date a prisoner must be considered for parole. She said it was mandatory at 12 months. Ms. Rowland said in the fall an emergency regulation was entered. She said there was pressure on parole and probation to process the inmates with the two new regulations. She said they were moving from a situation where they had to implement an emergency regulation, while acting in good faith towards meeting a goal. She said the language of the proposed regulation said someone will not be considered sooner than 150 days before the date. She said that established an upper limit, meaning they would not consider someone more than 150 days before their release date. State law clearly states someone will be considered 12 months prior. She said she was confused as to how this regulation, which directly contradicts the enacting State law that is relevant to it, is going to withstand any challenge by a prisoner. She said they had every right to challenge under the state statutes. She said she was wondering why the regulation was productive and if the Commission was aware and concerned about it. Ms. Rowland said the State law that required people to look at parole 12 months before the release date was passed at the recommendation of people like Dr. Austin in order to reduce the population and deal with the issues the Commission was considering. She said it goes against everything parole and probation said at the last meeting, which was they were honoring State law. She said they codified the opposite in the language of “not sooner than 150 days.” She said she thought it was bizarre in light of the presentations parole and probation had made before the Commission and the Board of Prison Commissioners. She said it did not seem in line with what the Legislature had urged them to do. She urged the Committee to place the item on the agenda of a future meeting. She said she did not see how it was legal or how this Committee can affect the legislative intent of the Committee if parole and probation pass regulations that directly contradict the legislative intent to deal with this system.

Chair Hardesty asked if she were referring to LCB File No. R18-08. Ms. Rowland replied he was correct. She said it was the first time the regulation had been available to the public and before the Commission. She said from her notes the people from parole and probation made a representation that the emergency regulation was passed as a stopgap, but they were moving to a permanent regulation that would honor the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). She reiterated she was confused as to how LCB could have approved a regulation in direct contravention of the State statutes.

Chair Hardesty said he was unaware of the adoption of the March LCB regulation. He said the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) referred to consideration of a prisoner for mandatory parole. He asked if the statutory provision for 12 months dealt with the same subject.

Ms. Rowland replied it was a mandatory look at parole 12 months before the release. She said she could be misunderstanding the language, but the phrase “mandatory parole” was used in both sections. She presumed it was building off the NRS dealing with the parole release date and the NRS cited for authority for this regulation did not authorize changing this. She said it was odd it did not mention NRS 213.1215, the statute dealing with the time provisions. She said it was possible she was misreading the LCB section. She said the regulation was causing public concern.

Janet Traut, Senior Deputy Attorney General, said the administrative staff from the LCB would be looking at it. She said the heading said it was a proposed rule and they were trying to establish if it came out of the emergency process or a new notice of regulation under the Administrative Procedure Act. She said since it was titled “proposed legislation” there would generally be a rule-making workshop and other procedures. She said that was where Ms. Rowland’s comments needed to be addressed.

Commissioner Salling said there was a lot of misinformation. A workshop was scheduled for the end of the month. She said it was the Parole Board, nor Parole and Probation doing this. She said the announcements had been released and if Ms. Rowland missed them, there would be a workshop.

Ms. Rowland asked Commissioner Salling if it was intended to be a permanent regulation. Commissioner Salling said it was intended to be a permanent regulation, hence the workshops scheduled. She said they would be able to answer all her questions.

Commissioner Horsford said he wanted to be notified of the hearing. He was more concerned with why the regulation had to be adopted through emergency executive order. He wondered why the regulations were not vetted before, as well.

Commissioner Salling said they would notify Commissioner Horsford.

Chair Hardesty asked Commissioner Salling for an update on the status at the April meeting of the Commission.

William Murphy Sharp said he worked with a volunteer organization called Alternatives to Violence Project. He said it was part of a national non-profit organization in existence since 1975. He said the organization provided conflict management and nonviolent training for

prison inmates. He said they also provided workshops in communities and schools. He said they provided workshops in Nevada since 1999. Mr. Sharp said his organization had graduated approximately 240 inmates. He said the program was staffed by volunteers and each volunteer was required to donate approximately 40 hours of time to do one workshop. He said the program required inmates to take a 20 hour workshop. He said after completion of the first workshop, they were eligible to take advanced workshops. He said the workshops lasted 3 days. He said if an inmate took the first 40 hours of workshops and wanted to become a facilitator, then they took another 20 hour workshop about how to participate on a team. He said they found if they were able to keep an active program on yards, incidents of violent interactions among inmates were reduced.

Mr. Sharp said in previous years NDOC had a volunteer training program for everyone who was going to work in the prisons. He said they were informed that all volunteers had to take the program before they could start to volunteer in prisons. He said previously volunteers had one year to take the program. He said the problem he had was they were dependent on skilled facilitators from outside the State. He said the next training for volunteers was scheduled for May and he was scheduled to offer a workshop in May. He recommended the Commission consider amending the policy as to when volunteers have to take training and allow waivers for volunteers who had been approved to volunteer in other state prisons.

Chair Hardesty asked Mr. Sharp if the policy was the prison's policy or a state statute. Mr. Sharp said he was told by Commissioner Skolnik it was the Attorney General's policy.

Chair Hardesty said he was asking the Commission to change something, but they did not know what existed that needed to be changed. He said someone required certain volunteer training by Mr. Sharp's group that was not available until May. Chair Hardesty asked Mr. Sharp to ask Nevada State Prison staff whose policy they were enforcing and then let the Commission know.

Teresa Werner said she was able to attend the Alternatives to Violence workshop in Susanville, CA. She said she was able to attend the class with a phone call. She said within two weeks she was approved for the class in the prison system. She said in Nevada there was a 4 to 6 page form to fill out and be approved. She said it took 3 months and then if they were approved they were scheduled for the next NDOC workshop. Ms. Werner said she understood the need for people who had never been in a prison situation before. However, she said the volunteers had many years with prisoners and knew how they interacted with each other.

Ms. Werner said the Alternative to Violence Program was hugely successful. She offered written comments for the Commission, ([Exhibit T](#)).

Ms. Werner said she wanted to quickly discuss statistics in prisons. She said she was concerned about the jump in the number of women with kids from Fiscal Year 2005 to 2006. She said in 2005 it was 26 percent and in 2006 jumped to 73 percent, ([Exhibit U](#)). She said she did not believe 7.8 years was the average length of stay in prison for a life without parole sentence. She supported Ms. Hines request for statistics, but said they needed to be factual. She added she had seen Flo Jones on television express her remorse for the family of the victims. She said Flo and her family were also victims. She said her husband was in prison because he was in the wrong place at the wrong time. He was with the murderer, but did not pull the trigger.

Rita Reed said she was appearing on behalf of her son who was incarcerated at the Nevada State Prison. She said her son was given 70 years for a first offense, nonviolent crime. She said his crime was an addiction to gambling. She said he had been in prison over 7 years. She said he had a job waiting when he was released. She asked that nonviolent offenders be given a second chance.

Rachel Braunworth thanked the Commission for having the meetings. She said it gave the public a chance to speak, ask questions and receive information.

Chair Hardesty closed the public comment section. He said he wanted to make an observation for future people who wanted to offer public comment. He said the public comment portion of the meeting was to allow people to make comment about areas of policy and to clarify issues. He said he had not enforced time limits on people. He asked people make public comments on a policy issue the Commission has under consideration. He said the Commission did not have jurisdiction to try individual cases. He said they could not release people from prison. He said he was going to enforce the rule for 3 minute comments in the future.

Chair Hardesty asked for the number of members attending the prison tour. He said he would send the specific instruction to the members of the Commission. He said the tours would begin at 9:00 a.m. on April 14th.

Commissioner Carpenter moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Farley seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Chair Hardesty adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Advisory Commission on Administration of Justice  
March 17, 2008  
Page 37

---

Olivia Lodato, Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

James W. Hardesty, Chair  
Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name: ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**

**Date: March 17, 2008**

**Meeting Time: 9:00 a.m.**

| <b>Bill</b> | <b>Exhibit</b> |                    | <b>Description</b>                            |
|-------------|----------------|--------------------|---|
|             | A              |                    | Agenda  |
|             | B              |                    | Attendance Roster                             |
|             | C              | Terrance P Hubert  | The Ridge House                               |
|             | D              | Steven Burt        | The Ridge House                               |
|             | E              | James Palombo      | Nexus LP Project                              |
|             | F              | Judge Jackie Glass | Special Courts Programs                       |
|             | H              | Emilio Parga       | Biography                                     |
|             | I              | Emilio Parga       | Books   |
|             | J              | Dr. James Austin   | Justice Reinvestment Project:<br>March Update |
|             | K              | Mark Fierro        | Technology Based Tracking<br>LLC              |
|             | L              | David DeGeorge     | Satellite tracking of People<br>LLC           |
|             | M              | Chief John Gonska  | Division of Parole and<br>Probation Audit     |
|             | N              | Florence Jones     | Personal Letter                               |
|             | O              | Pat Hines          | Copy of Statutes and Letter                   |
|             | P              | Edward Smith       | Letter from Willie Bargas                     |
|             | R              | Ann Marie Palmer   | Letter from D. Hinton                         |
|             | S              | Maureen Flansberg  | Letter by Glen Crew                           |
|             | T              | Teresa Werner      | Alternatives to Violence                      |
|             | U              | Teresa Werner      | NDOC Statistics                               |