

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS, PAROLE, AND
PROBATION**

**Seventy-Fourth Session
March 20, 2007**

The Select Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation was called to order by Chair David R. Parks at 3:55 p.m., on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman David R. Parks, Chair
Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter
Assemblyman William Horne
Assemblywoman Kathy McClain
Assemblywoman Valerie E. Weber

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Craig V. Hoeffcker, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Marion Miles, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant
Deanna Duncan, Interim Committee Manager



OTHERS PRESENT:

Howard Skolnik, Director, Department of Corrections
James J. Jackson, representing the Nevada State Education Association
Honorable Archie Blake, Senior Judge of the Specialty Courts Division, Second Judicial Court for the State of Nevada.
Honorable Peter I. Breen, Senior District Judge, Specialty Courts Division, Second Judicial Court for the State of Nevada, and the Western Regional Drug Courts.
Honorable Cedric Kerns, Judicial Council of the State of Nevada, Clark County Region
Dorothy B. North, Chief Executive Officer, Vitality Center

Chair Parks:

[Roll called.] Today is going to be a continuation of the reports we have been receiving during our last two meetings. I will ask the Director of the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) to come forward and present his revised numbers.

Howard Skolnik, Director, Department of Corrections:

I know that this Committee and others have been waiting for Mr. Austin's reappearance. We have received some new projections from him and have applied those numbers to our future needs. I am afraid I do not bring good news as a result of that. We are showing no reduction, at all, in our projected number of inmates within the NDOC. In fact, in some cases we are showing slight increases. Specifically, at Casa Grande, if you assume the 200 beds that are not filled, cannot be filled because there needs to be some change in statute, that leaves the NDOC approximately 600 beds short. That includes putting every bed that can be double celled into that condition and placing inmates in gymnasium and prison industry areas without endangering the operation of our institution. It is the maximum number of people we can safely place in our institutions, including placing them in gymnasiums and prison industry areas. At that point, we will be 600 beds short.

Chair Parks:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Anderson:

There have been some discussions about possible ways to reduce the present inmate population by some members of the Supreme Court. Are you saying you do not believe that those suggestions are likely to happen?

Howard Skolnik:

We have had a series of meetings with representatives of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) of Nevada. At this time we have identified approximately 47 inmates who could be immediately deported. We identified them and had them cleared through ICE. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has recently restructured its deportation areas, moving them into a new division effective the first of this month. They are still wrestling with internal procedures so those 47 inmates are still in our institutions. I do believe their deportation will have an impact, unfortunately, I do not think it will be significant enough to solve our problem.

Assemblyman Anderson:

What if it were ten times that number?

Howard Skolnik:

We would still be 200 beds short.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Can you move inmates into the gymnasium and prison industry areas you mentioned without having the federal government intervene?

Howard Skolnik:

We have asked the Fire Marshal and the Public Health Department to review the number of individuals we can safely place in these locations and what requirements we would have to meet to do that. We have been given the information from the Public Health Department, for the gymnasium area only. We have received a preliminary response from the Fire Marshal that gives us approximately 400 beds, but we are waiting for confirmation of that number through their office from their engineers. If we do not get those approvals, then I do not know what we will do. At this point it looks very good that we will be allowed to do that since it is a temporary solution. I do not think it will create any problems at the federal level.

Assemblywoman Weber:

I understood James Hardesty, Associate Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court, to say that there were approximately 1,036 illegal aliens currently in the system and perhaps over 400 of those could be deported. Does it seem likely that you will be able to deport those inmates out of our facilities on a regular basis?

Howard Skolnik:

We have met with ICE and we are on an approximate 21-day intake cycle, which means the inmates are in the intake areas of our facilities for 21 days

during which an ICE representative will meet with and interview all those individuals to quickly identify who is illegal and see which ones might be moved out most expeditiously. It is estimated that it will take ICE approximately one year to truly get everything in place and have the kind of response that we are asking for. Like us, they are understaffed and overworked as well. They currently have no detention facilities available to take these people, which means the inmates will still have to serve their minimum sentences under our truth-in-sentencing laws. We do not see that as an immediate impact, we do see it helping long-term, but what we are facing in the next year is not going to be changed by anything other than a deep examination of current sentencing and good time statutes, and not only modification of those statutes, but modification retroactively where you feel you can do that. These are the numbers that we are looking at as of today. Unfortunately, the numbers for our female population are even worse than those of our male population. We may well be looking at putting some of our women in tents until we can get some construction completed.

Assemblywoman Weber:

The impression I got was the illegal half of that population could be moved out. But, one year could be considered short term considering all that we are looking at today. I appreciate the efforts to give some temporary relief until we can get some long-term solutions.

Chair Parks:

Thank you, Ms. Weber.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

When would the first units under construction be available?

Howard Skolnik:

We are going to be asking for the bill on the modular units to be modified slightly to include language for a "sole source," and emergency expedition, because if we have any kind of challenge at all at the front end on going "sole source," we are looking at an untenable delay. If we can get "sole source," we can begin to bring the units on line by the end of November 2007. If we start construction in July 2007 and the inmates see that there is construction and that we are making efforts to solve these problems, it will help us manage our institutions.

Chair Parks:

In a meeting one week ago, we were informed that Arizona is sitting on approximately 6,000 inmates that are eligible for deportation in some form. Arizona has been unable to move any of those inmates, so we should not be

too optimistic until we start to see some signals from ICE indicating that progress has started.

Howard Skolnik:

I agree I do want to put on the record that to date our relationship with and support from ICE has been good and the local ICE people have been working very hard in assisting us in resolving our problems.

Chair Parks:

Thank you, I appreciate it.

James J. Jackson, representing Nevada State Education Association:

According to some statistics that we have from 2004, it costs approximately \$17,676 to incarcerate an inmate in the State of Nevada, yet we are spending \$7,085 in the year 2006 on our public school students. I think it is worth saying there appears to be at least an argument, if not a direct correlation to the lack of education in not only offenders but recidivism rates. Based on a Bureau of Justice report published in October, 2004 somewhere between 40 and 42 percent of all inmates had less than a General Equivalency Diploma (GED), if not less than a high school diploma. On behalf of the Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) we want to point out the vast difference in the cost of incarcerating somebody as opposed to educating them. The idea is that by educating people and providing educational opportunities we could turn recidivism rates around and reduce the prison population that Mr. Skolnik has so vividly and dramatically described for us today and in other testimony that he has given.

Nevada's incarceration rate remains above the national average, so I think it is a particularly acute issue that needs to be addressed.

Assemblywoman Weber:

I think we would all agree with those statistics. How many inmates are in the education programs?

James Jackson:

I cannot answer that specifically. I know there are programs available, based on my own experience with having clients in prison and knowing that they are taking advantage of those opportunities. Hopefully, those programs can be expanded and made more available.

Assemblyman Weber:

Thank you, we will probably get those statistics at a later date.

Chair Parks:

Are there any further questions? I see none.

I would like to now move our discussion back to drug courts, mental health courts, and specialty courts.

**The Honorable Archie Blake, Senior Judge of the Specialty Courts Division,
Second Judicial Court for the State of Nevada:**

Thank you for letting us expand on what we presented last week. I will briefly describe the Western Regional District Drug Court (WRDDC) and Judge Breen will describe the Washoe Drug Court and we will answer any questions that you might have.

I have distributed a handout ([Exhibit C](#)) which shows a flowchart analysis and tables. The WRDDC consists of six counties: Carson City, Churchill, Lyon, Storey, Douglas, and Mineral counties, which encompasses three judicial districts. I would like to point out the growth that we have had in the WRDDC. In September, 2001 we anticipated for and actually started with 120 participants and today we are running approximately 250 participants and we are increasing by 7 to 10 percent each year. We have integrated a mental health component into Carson City and at this point we are working with the Washoe County Mental Health Court to transfer some of our clients to Washoe County.

We have received great cooperation from the Division of Parole and Probation. Over half of our drug court clients are probationers. I would like to emphasize that when we get the probationers in the rural areas, these people are going to go to prison if we do not take them and keep them out of prison. We are dealing with 120 of them at a time. We have a re-entry program in rural Nevada, now with longer programs. We started with an average program of 12 to 14 months and now we are running a program of 18 months.

We need more residential treatment beds, and more money to compensate these treatment providers.

Chair Parks:

Are there questions from the Committee? I see none. You referenced the treatment providers, and one of our concerns deals with if we were to divert individuals into these various programs, are there sufficient treatment providers presently available or presuming that the cost was not the factor, would they be available?

Judge Archie Blake:

In our part of Nevada, just the Western Region, we have sufficient providers. The only thing that really hurts is that we do not have the funds to adequately pay them. They do not do this for free, but they are very underpaid. If we had the funding, we would add a minimum of 20 more beds right here in Carson City. Those beds are available for Washoe County and for everywhere else in the State of Nevada. One of the things I would like to do is to invite all of you to come to a drug court session in Carson City. We meet every other Monday afternoon at 2:00. We are processing between 80 and 100 people on each Monday afternoon.

If you want to see something spectacular, please go to Washoe County and visit the mental health court. They run at 9:30 and 12:00 every Friday. If you are not a believer in specialty courts this would change your mind.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

If you could get all the money needed how much total money are you talking about and how many people would it take care of?

Judge Archie Blake:

In our part of rural Nevada, at adult drug court we are looking at \$3,200 per person. I can tell you that right now we will take everyone that we can. We started out taking only those with certain drug offenses. We are now taking all persons who have a drug problem who are not dangerous drug traffickers, or who do not have a violent background. We take all theft and fraud related cases that have a drug component. We have expanded and now take re-entry people also.

Chair Parks:

You have indicated that you have taken your program from 12 to 14 months up to an 18 month program. What happens to the individual after that 18 month period?

Judge Archie Blake:

Drug courts traditionally have four phases. We ran the first three phases in one year and have just added the fourth phase, which is 6 months, taking it to 18 months. In Washoe County they call it an after-care program. At the end of the drug court cycle, we know where they are and what they are going to do. They are on their own with our supervision to a certain extent. When we do liberate them, they have a good chance to succeed. We do not have the money to follow up with surveys. I would like to point out that in rural Nevada, the services of the District Attorney, the Public Defender, the court clerks, and the clerical personnel, are all donated.

**The Honorable Peter I. Breen, Senior District Judge, Specialty Courts Division,
Second Judicial Court for the State of Nevada, and the Western
Regional Drug Courts:**

We get our funding from two sources and all the money we receive goes into our treatment programs. The money is collected through levies from misdemeanor assessments. A great majority of the money comes from Clark County but the money also comes from Washoe County, and the small counties. Clark County subsidizes, to a large extent, the funding of the drug courts in our State and I am happy to say there is a drug court in every district.

Our drug court has been in existence for 12 years. As a result of that we have had some changes. We have attempted to copy the drug court model in Clark County which is a phased-care program. We have added a few things, such as a required six month after care program after a person graduates. The minimum term is one year. We engage in testing through oral fluids, that is, saliva rather than urine testing. We have been doing that for four years. It is more expensive, but it is a more dignified manner in fighting a disease that has no dignity to it.

We also have a life skills component to try to help people get jobs, complete their high school education, and get some vocational training. We engage in the usual sanctions and incentives. We rely on community service for sanctions. I wrote a letter to Judge Hardesty in February, 2007, and at that time we had 737 people in drug court and just last year we took in another 317. I would like to explain why we have so many people still in the program.

One reason is that it takes 16 to 18 months to complete the program. There are a fair amount of relapses in drug court and we require perfect attendance at counseling, court, and drug testing. Many people do not make it until the last session. We have the six-month after care requirement, and we also have a "fee review." People have to pay on their bill. It takes them a long time to pay it off. They do not get their charges dismissed and their records sealed until after they pay their bill. We do have people coming back to court on a monthly basis for quite a while, even after they have graduated.

The formal after-care part has just been added in the last three years, primarily due to the difficulty that methamphetamine abuse and addiction causes. We also have a diversion court, which is a fully operational drug court. It has testing on a random basis; the clients are allowed to obtain their own professional counseling, they pay for it themselves, and are required to

engage in three 12-step meetings, or the equivalent, per week on their own, which we verify. That program is 18 months long.

On February 15, 2007, there were 222 people in that diversion court. It was formed because we did not have enough money to service our needs for drug court, and so we created the diversion court and transferred all the people who are in what are called 453-458 Diversion. If you recall, there is a statutory scheme that allows people with nonviolent drug offenses and other types of offenses to go through a formal diversion process, where their sentence is diverted and they are placed on probation for three years. Those people are all put in our diversion court which is conducted like an adult drug court. It has required no funds. That program has grown so large that we are in danger of losing our effectiveness because we cannot properly monitor and check the program.

There were 180 people who went into that program last year. It is the most successful drug court that we have. The Diversion Court graduates have a 96 percent success rate. One of the reasons is because the people who are placed on diversion by the judges are usually less involved in addiction and usually they have jobs and families. If we find a person who is in need of more attention, we divert them into drug court. The more difficult people are sent to drug court.

We also have the mental health court. Last month there were 222 people in Mental Health Court and as Judge Blake mentioned, we have had a 10 to 12 percent increase in our courts over the last few years. Mental Health Court has had an even higher increase. It is a one-year program, and individuals are assigned a case management officer. They are also assigned a court services officer from our court and are required to follow through with all of the medical services to which they are entitled because they are disabled. We require them to take medications if prescribed by a doctor. The benefits of mental health court participation may be dismissal, sealing of the record, or an early release from probation.

We have felons and misdemeanants in Mental Health Court. A co-occurring drug problem is presented in 70 percent of all mentally ill people. Our success rate is close to 90 percent. The clients have less jail time when they are in Mental Health Court, less hospital confinement, and there is less starting and stopping of the services because of the disability. It is very easy to show cost savings in Mental Health Court.

We have a prison re-entry program which has been in effect for several years, and is operated within the Adult Drug Court. When inmates come out of

prison, they are required to spend four months in a halfway house, which is voluntarily provided by an entity known as Crossroads. We believe we can integrate them into society much better with this initial stay in this halfway house. They are required to get a job and we assist them with that process. Our prison re-entry court at one time had 90 people in it, because we were previously funded through a federal grant, but now, in order to keep the program alive, we can take only two people a month. At one time we had a 92 percent success rate. That means that prison inmates graduating from our prison re-entry court had not had a felony or misdemeanor conviction for three years.

I have described, in a general sense, the programs themselves. We have outstripped our ability to adequately manage, monitor, and deal with our growing population. There are just too many people in our courts for us to be able to monitor what our clients are doing. The success of these courts depends on our credibility. The lawyers saw how tough our drug court was and kept trying to get their clients into the diversion court program. In order to accept more clients in Diversion Court we have to show that we can perform. Our credibility in Mental Health Court depends on whether we can provide housing for the clients. If we do not, they are out on the street. We give them identification cards, bus passes, and other little things that allow them to get around.

Chair Parks:

Thank you for your comments. Are there questions from the Committee? Did you say some of the clients had to pay on their bail?

Judge Peter Breen:

No. They need to pay on their bill. It costs about \$3,000 to put an average person through our drug court. It is necessary for them to make a contribution to their own recovery. We allow them to pay on a sliding scale. Our county collections department advises us as to what each individual is able to pay. The county is one of our team members.

Chair Parks:

I have one last question relative to Diversion Court. You indicated that it was extremely successful. Is that a program that can be significantly expanded, or, are there only a limited number of individuals who can go the self-pay route and cover their own costs.

Judge Peter Breen:

Diversion Court participation is not based on their financial ability. The criminal court judge conducts a sentencing hearing and decides that this

person is entitled to diversion. We take them when the judge sends them to Diversion Court.

Chair Parks:

Thank you. In Las Vegas we have Judge Kerns signed in to speak.

**The Honorable Cedric Kerns, Judicial Council of the State of Nevada,
Clark County Region:**

I apologize for not being here last week, but I sent Officer Bill Gibbs of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in my place to give you an idea of what the Las Vegas Municipal Court offers. Our specialty court is not the same as a drug court; however, it does receive funds.

In 2003, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department came to me about a habitual offender problem in downtown Las Vegas. It took until 2004 to get started with the court. Originally, there were 25 defendants who had been arrested more than 8,114 times in their combined careers. They were arrested 2,662 times from the year 2000 to 2003 and at that time the lowest number of arrests was 10 and the highest was 202. Although they were arrested and were in my court for a misdemeanor, I assure you that the majority of these defendants had felony convictions. We took these defendants and put them into the specialty court. The specialty court requires that defendants begin by going into a clean and sober living house. They are given urine tests as well as saliva tests for drugs. They then go to WestCare for evaluation, and are treated. Of the original 25 defendants, there were 15 graduates. Of those 15 graduates, only one of them has been rearrested in the City. I do know that four have died.

These individuals went from being arrested an average of 33 times a year, to an average of 3 arrests a year. For every arrest there is an average stay in jail of 10 days. Being arrested 33 times a year means that they spend 35 days on the street and the rest of the time in custody. We have been able to help a majority of these defendants through specialty court.

The Metropolitan Police Department informed me that an arrest takes about 2 hours to process. That is a savings of approximately 1,200 actual man hours, by the arresting officers alone. When you add that to the 15 graduates that I spoke of earlier, you have a savings of approximately 2,100 hours annually.

A report I received in 2006 from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department showed that petty crimes had gone up in all precincts except the downtown area. That is where the Hope Court is focused. The graduates of

the Hope Court become successful members of the community. I have one individual who was arrested 257 times in his lifetime before joining the Hope Court. Through the help of WestCare, Metro, and the court itself, the individual is now married, he has not been arrested once since joining Hope Court and has never tested "dirty." He is now a productive member of the community. I have sat through mental health court and drug court for the County and Hope Court is an experience one really has to see for themselves to understand the true impact it makes on a community.

I was asked one time if this specialty court is an acceptable alternative to jail. I can tell you that the Hope Court for the defendants I deal with is the only alternative to jail. This is a court that is partially funded through the citizens and taxpayers of Las Vegas. Although they are only dealing with misdemeanors in the City, these are people who are committing felonies but are only getting caught on misdemeanor charges, because the possession and use of the narcotic itself is a felony. Some do end up in prison, but we try to address the ones we can.

Because of the success of the Hope Court, North Las Vegas has started a habitual offender's court of their own. Other courts throughout the country have visited me with regard to starting their own habitual offender court. The reason why I think the Hope Court should be addressed is because we are receiving additional funding that has allowed us to expand with regard to the drug testing, the workbooks completed, and the treatment offenders receive. If I could, I would have Hope Court every day. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources to do that. I hold it three times a week. Because of the case load in Las Vegas, we start early in the morning and my staff does not get lunches.

Chair Parks:

Thank you. Do you have any final remarks?

Judge Cedric Kerns:

I would like to thank you for allowing me to be here and to share with this group how I think specialty courts can help with regard to incarceration.

Assemblyman Horne:

I appear before Judge Kerns on a semi-regular basis. I would like to say that I have been a proponent of these programs. I know the judges really put in time and effort beyond the time they sit on the bench on other matters. These numbers are real, they sound astronomical, but they are real. These offenders are like a turnstile in our jails. I appreciate all the work that you do. You have my support.

Judge Cedric Kerns:

I appreciate that.

Assemblywoman Weber:

Could you explain the funding? Was that a demonstration grant or is it continuous? Is there any jeopardy that funding will change?

Judge Cedric Kerns:

The funding is a continual \$7 assessment that comes from all the guilty pleas to a misdemeanor. Unfortunately, there is just not enough money that is coming in through this funding to serve the current demand. I know that every court in every jurisdiction has tried to offer an adequate specialty court for their jurisdiction, but we believed it would bring in more funds than it has.

Assemblywoman Weber:

Do you happen to know where North Las Vegas is getting its money for its Hope Court?

Judge Cedric Kerns:

I could tell you that a lot of what they are getting comes from my jurisdiction. We have worked closely with them and I monitor some of their defendants as well as the workbooks that they have and the drug tests that they use.

Judge Peter Breen:

To answer Ms. Weber's question, this funding was passed six years ago by the Nevada Legislature and it will remain in effect unless it is repealed.

Assemblyman Anderson:

I was going to remind Judge Breen, since he was part of this original funding formula done in 1995, that six years ago we changed it over to a permanent level of assessment. The specialty courts had to come to each legislative session to try to get funding. There were suggestions of a different formula that would have produced a better funding stream, but since this program has become so successful and has exceeded everyone's expectations, we find we are short of funds to offer this program to more individuals.

Chair Parks:

Are there any further questions? I see none. I see we have Dorothy North signed in to speak.

**Dorothy B. North, Chief Executive Officer for Vitality Unlimited,
Reno, Nevada:**

A gentleman by the name of Malcolm Gladwell wrote a book called, *The Tipping Point*. This book discusses a place where something occurs that makes something go in a different direction. It would appear to me, just from the hearings that I have attended this year, that we have reached a point in Nevada where we are starting to realize that we have done a little here and there, but we never seem to do enough of anything fast enough to keep up with what is going on. I think the prison system in the State of Nevada is the most expensive and is the biggest homeless shelter in the State. In listening to the judges talk about how little funding they have to run these courts and how many of the people they are able to take out of the system, I believe there must be a better way to do what we are doing.

It is cheaper to do this at the front end than it is to do it at the back end. We need to spend some time talking about how we can take this Committee and some of these other committees that are talking about the same thing and spend the time that is necessary to bring all of this together. We know what the budget will be if we have to continue building more prisons and more hard beds. It will not be long before we will be spending more doing that than we will be educating our children. I would be more than willing to help anybody on this Committee that would like to work on this between sessions to see if we cannot come up with some better ideas about how to do this.

I commend all of you and I hope something positive can come out of this Committee that will take us in a different direction.

Chair Parks:

After listening to Director Skolnik's projection numbers, we do not have the luxury of waiting for the next interim. We have some challenges that need to be resolved right now.

Assemblywoman Weber:

It is interesting how this works. Changing concepts is difficult. I applaud your efforts to keep coming here, Ms. North, we do want to see things improved.

Dorothy North:

We have 41 inpatient beds in Elko, Nevada. We treat people first in our own community and after that from all over the State. Every day we take 20 to 25 calls asking for a bed. There is no way we can treat all of these people. When people get to a point where somebody is calling and asking us for a

bed, it is similar to someone showing up at the emergency room, bleeding to death, and you are saying to them, "Could you come back next week?"

We try to keep the waiting list short; we lose about half of those people before we can get them in a bed. What happens to those people? We know some of them die. We also know that some will end up further into the criminal justice system, something awful will happen to some of them. I can tell you that we need to consider, as a State, what we need to do to create a social safety net for everyone that lives in the state.

If you have insurance and money, you still could not be treated. The staffing in rural clinics was cut in the early 1990s. They have never been able to find people to fill those positions since. Elko is 300 miles from Reno and almost 500 miles from Las Vegas. There are no psychiatrists that come to our area. There are no direct flights. You have to fly to Salt Lake in order to get to Reno. We need to get some good ideas on the whole health care issue and particularly the mental health and substance abuse issue. We have passed the point where we can put a band aid on the problems.

Chair Parks:

Thank you. We will be putting a calendar together and there will be bills referred to our Committee. We will review them and in the next day or two we will have a list as to the scheduling.

There being no further business to come before this Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Patricia Blackburn
Transcribing Secretary

Rachelle Myrick
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Select Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation

Date: March 20, 2007

Time of Meeting: 3:55 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Honorable Archie Blake, Senior Judge of the Specialty Courts Division, Second Judicial Court for the State of Nevada	Charts