

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 2, 2017**

The Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation was called to order by Chairman James Ohrenschall at 8:04 a.m. on Tuesday, May 2, 2017, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B 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/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chairman
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Keith Pickard
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6
Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3
Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, M.D., Senate District No. 12



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Karyn Werner, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County
District Attorney's Office
Kevin Burns, Chair, United Veterans Legislative Counsel
Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Christine Adams, Administrator and Victim Impact Panel Manager,
Vice Chairperson, Northern Nevada DUI Task Force
Gerard Mager, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Natalie Wood, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas
Metropolitan Police Department
Magnolia Drew, Re-entry Program Officer, Clark County Detention Center,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Maria L. Allen, Corrections Officer, Detention Services Division Inmate Programs,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Bonnie Polley, Chaplain, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan
Police Department
Jude Hurin, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division,
Department of Motor Vehicles
Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Clark County Department of Administrative Services
James Ringel, Intern, Senate Minority Caucus

Chairman Ohrenschall:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] I will now open the hearing
on Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to court programs for the
treatment of veterans and members of the military. (BDR 14-1059)**

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6:

I am here today to present Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint), which would expand the veterans
court option to justice and municipal courts.

Why is Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint) important? Up until just a few years ago, the pace of deployment for both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom was significant. Today, most of the service members who bravely fought in these military operations have returned home; however, the battle scars remain. Those with physical wounds are easily identified and treated. Yet the scars of battle are not always physical, and more and more military leaders and policymakers understand that exposure to combat can damage the mental, emotional, and cognitive abilities of service members—even if their bodies remain intact.

There have been dozens of studies that provide evidence of depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and traumatic brain injury among our military service veterans. In fact, according to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), between 11 and 20 percent of veterans who served in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have PTSD in any given year. For the Gulf War (Desert Storm), this figure is roughly 12 percent, and for the Vietnam War, it was estimated that about 30 percent of those veterans had PTSD at some point in their lives. Finally, according to the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, the rate of PTSD among veterans was 3.5 percent higher than the civilian population.

The prevalence of depression among service members ranges from 2 to 10 percent, and it is estimated that perhaps as many as 7.5 percent of deployed troops have suffered some sort of traumatic brain injury. Moreover, veterans are overrepresented in the rate of homelessness. The National Alliance to End Homelessness reported that, in January 2014, communities across America identified nearly 50,000 homeless veterans during point-in-time counts, which represented 8.6 percent of the total homeless population. Fortunately, this represents a substantial 67 percent decrease from 2009; however, the rate of homelessness remains higher among veterans than nonveteran populations.

These alarming statistics clearly put our veterans at a distinct disadvantage when they attempt to navigate our legal system. While we may never know for sure, one question that must be asked is, how many veterans who suffer from PTSD, traumatic brain injury, depression, and homelessness cycled through our justice system? Moreover, if a veteran ends up in our court system, are we providing enough support to help him or her rehabilitate and, eventually, become a productive member of society?

What does Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint) do? Prior to 2009, in the unfortunate event a veteran ended up in our court system—often for a low-level offense—our legal system was largely inadequate when it came to supportive programs to get veterans back on their feet. For these reasons, the Legislature first authorized the creation of veterans courts in 2009 to provide a treatment option to eligible defendants who are veterans or members of the military. Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint), quite simply, allows this same program to be developed by a justice or municipal court, so nonviolent defendants in those courts can have the option of a treatment program in lieu of criminal proceedings. Veterans courts recognize that too many of our returning service members are suffering from PTSD, alcoholism, drug abuse, and homelessness as a result of their military service. If the defendant's crime does not

involve the use of force or violence, district courts may suspend the criminal proceedings and place the defendant on probation while he or she undergoes an approved treatment program.

Once the program is successfully completed and he is released from probation, the defendant's criminal record will be sealed. The veterans court programs have been very successful at the district court level and have proven to reduce recidivism and provide important services such as job training, mental health counseling, and drug treatment, all of which are so desperately needed by our veterans and help veterans become productive members of our communities.

The one thing that I will add is that there has been a recent disagreement in at least some court systems as to whether, under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), veterans courts are eligible to operate in our justice and municipal court systems. With that said, some of these programs have been operating for quite some time and have been successful. I had the opportunity to view at least one veterans court program out of Justice Court Department 4 in Las Vegas, which is headed by Judge Saragosa. It is really a unique experience because, in that program, they are able to pair, not only resources at the VA, but other resources for job training, finding housing, and any peer support they may need throughout the course of their criminal proceedings. It allows them a different way to address some of the issues that result from their military service.

One of the reasons the Senate Committee on Judiciary—and the reason I am sitting here today—wanted to bring a bill that addresses veterans court jurisdiction is that this is the least we can do for our veterans when they find themselves in our court system. This is a way for them to get access to benefits that they frankly deserve and may not know how to access. It also gives them an alternative to simply sitting in jail for these offenses. I will note that there are other bills that deal with veterans courts, and this is simply one suggestion. I am hopeful that, during this legislative session, there will be at least one of them that passes.

In the bill before you today, one of the things that is highlighted in the language is that there would be an exception for crimes that involve DUI or domestic violence where the offender would still be able to enter the program and complete it, and then the proceeding would be dismissed, but that case would remain something that could be used for enhancement purposes. The purpose of the language in this bill has to do with testimony that we heard on a separate bill about whether we are still taking DUI and domestic violence offenses seriously, and whether this is something related to military service or something that is a greater problem.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I was looking at the Uniform Law Commission website and they promulgated a Model Veterans Court Act to try to promote legislation throughout the states because so often veterans courts have been the creatures of local rule but not established in statute.

In order for a veteran to participate in a program pursuant to your bill in either justice court or municipal court, would the veteran criminal defendant need to enter a plea or will this be prior to him entering a plea?

Senator Cannizzaro:

I believe this would require them, in some cases, to enter a plea, but in most cases it would just go to the veterans court.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

We had testimony on Assemblyman Anderson's bill from the municipal judge, whose name escapes me, and the success rate in his program that he testified to was over 80 percent nonrecidivism. There are great results from these therapeutic programs.

Assemblyman Yeager:

We heard a bill in this Committee that was very similar to this from Assemblyman Anderson, which was Assembly Bill 286 (1st Reprint). I was taken aback that some of the opposition was from the Nevada District Attorneys Association. They seemed to have a real problem with the Committee giving them discretion to be the gatekeeper when it comes to certain offenses for veterans court. In working this bill, did you have the same opposition from the District Attorneys Association, and if so, how was that resolved?

Senator Cannizzaro:

I have not had any direct conversations on this bill. I do not know—and I will not speak for them—whether they are supportive of this bill, but I understand what some of the concerns are from some of those offices. Part of the reason I am sitting here today saying this is a good program is that it exists in our justice and municipal courts. There are a lot of benefits for veterans and members of our military whom we have put in a position where it is almost inescapable for them to find themselves in our criminal justice system. When we talk about how our criminal justice system effectively works, one of the ways the system can work better for folks who have served our country is to say to them, "If you are suffering from PTSD or traumatic brain injury, or you have issues that are related to your military service, and you find yourself in the court system for a low-level misdemeanor offense, there is a program that can help you get set up with the VA, can help you get benefits, and can help ensure that you are able to access everything you should be able to access." I will say from personal experience—and not on behalf of the District Attorneys Association—Department 4 in Las Vegas has seen substantial success with this program. We cannot take this program away, so it will not be an option for some folks.

This particular bill treats DUI and domestic violence offenses a little differently. Those offenses are different than other misdemeanors that we have. I have not had those conversations directly, but I am aware of those concerns. I do not know if this bill addresses all of the concerns, but this is a good program.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I am supportive of this bill. I am trying to wrap my head around the adamant opposition to the bill previously heard here by certain district attorneys who did not want to be the gatekeeper for domestic violence and DUI. I am encouraged that, for whatever reason, they may have decided to abandon that opposition. Everyone else was in support of the bill. Perhaps we will hear from them, but to make it clear, I am very supportive of the bill. Offenders should have those opportunities when it comes to domestic violence and DUI. The way the bill is structured makes sure the record is not sealed for 7 years, so the enhancement remains.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Under section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (a), there is a list of possible issues that the veteran may be going through, like military sexual assault and problems readjusting to civilian life. One of the things that I mentioned during Assemblyman Anderson's hearing for his bill was traumatic brain injury. Would you be willing to add that to your bill as well?

Senator Cannizzaro:

Yes. I think that is something that obviously needs to be there. We tried to be as expansive as we could. I will note that the military sexual assault victim language came as a result of our hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, so I would certainly be open to that change.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

In section 11, subsection 8, are we accounting for veterans who might have had a first offense before we had a program available to attend?

Senator Cannizzaro:

Are you wondering if this accounts for the fact that this program was not in existence at the time they had committed the offense?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Right, or any other kind of program. There was reference made to the court granting veterans court if this is someone's first offense. I was wondering about veterans for whom this may be a second or third offense, but previously there had not been a program for them to go through. Even though it is a second or third offense, we did not offer them anything before, so now they are coming to us for help.

Senator Cannizzaro:

This bill does not account for it being a second or third offense. There might be merit to adding something like that. I know the intent of the bill and the way it treated domestic violence and DUI offenses was to ensure that those offenses were still being treated. Obviously, they are a little different than other misdemeanor crimes that we would see like trespassing, petit larceny, disorderly conduct, or any of those simple misdemeanors. We did not want to preclude anyone who was charged with domestic violence or DUI from going into a veterans court program. It did not take into account whether there was one available

for those offenders. We would be happy to have that conversation if there is a way to structure the language so the intent of the bill is still that we are treating those offenses seriously, but offering a chance for some of these individuals to get into those programs.

Assemblyman Pickard:

When Vice Chairman Yeager was mentioning Assembly Bill 286 (1st Reprint), I did a brief comparison last night as I was re-reviewing this. I noticed they are very similar, but they are different in some respects. Have you gone to the effort of making the comparison? As I read them together, it looks pretty expansive, and there may be some unintended things that come out of the reconciliation if they both pass. Was that effort made on your side of the fence?

Senator Cannizzaro:

I did not go through them and compare the bills. In our conversations with the Senate Judiciary Committee, we wanted to ensure that this issue was addressed because it is important. These programs should continue to operate and should operate in all jurisdictions of justice courts and municipal courts. It is important since we are talking about both bills to complete the comparison.

Assemblyman Pickard:

We all agree that this is an important thing to do. It passed out of the Assembly with 42 votes for the bill and no one against it. I think we are all on board, but I want to make sure we do not have any unintended consequences as we get through this. I do not know what the reconciliation process is, but I know it happens.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I am a little confused. The bill is greatly needed; the results that we have seen so far are terrific, and the two bills merged together should be wonderful. I appreciate you bringing this forward.

I looked back at my notes on Assemblyman Anderson's bill and I see that the district attorneys actually came out in favor of that bill. I wonder if my notes are wrong. I have written, "In favor with a friendly amendment."

Assemblyman Yeager:

What happened was the Clark County District Attorneys supported the bill, but the District Attorneys Association, represented by Mark Jackson, testified in opposition to the bill, so there was a split in the Association. My understanding was that it was only the Clark County District Attorney who was in support, and the other 16 district attorneys were opposed to Assemblyman Anderson's bill when it was presented.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I do not see that here.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

At the end of session, we do have a reconciliation bill which tries to harmonize legislation on different topics. If you have more questions, I can ask our legal counsel to address that now or off-line.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I think it is okay. I know that something happens. I just do not know how deep in the weeds they go and how decisions are made. If we are making policy decisions, I think it should be done at this level rather than by staff.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

If there were any substantive differences, the Committee would be aware of them.

Senator Cannizzaro:

I do not have any specific witnesses. I think there are some folks who want to testify in support, so I will leave it to the Committee.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will open up testimony in support of Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint), and I will start in Carson City, then go down to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building.

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Clark County District Attorney's Office:

We are here in support of this bill. I want to thank Senator Cannizzaro for working on this bill. It is very similar to the bill that we worked on with Assemblyman Anderson. There are some slight differences.

I want to say for the record that the version that is before you now is very different from the bill that came out of the Legislative Counsel Bureau at drafting. You might see a different approach to these bills as we move forward. The bill that is in front of you now is doing a much better job of using a subsequent offense as an enhancement. There is a lot that has gone into these bills, and I think they are much better in terms of DUI and domestic violence. I just wanted to put that on the record.

Kevin Burns, Chair, United Veterans Legislative Counsel:

We wholeheartedly support this bill. We thank Senator Cannizzaro for bringing the bill, as we do Assemblyman Anderson for the reasons that Assemblyman Pickard brought up. We are hoping that there is some type of reconciliation at the end that combines these bills. Both of them have done a superb job of working with all of the stakeholders, including the DUI and domestic violence folks. As you just heard, the enhancement on subsequent offenses is included in this and addresses all of the concerns.

During the off years of the Legislature, the veterans community gets together in both Las Vegas and Reno so we can get the sense of what the important issues are for the veterans community. This one came in as number 3 out of 30 issues. It is a very important bill for us

because we look at it as an early intervention for those veterans who are in desperate need of intervention and have all of a sudden become enmeshed in the legal system within the state. Hopefully, we can get to them before anything becomes more severe. As you heard when the Senator made her presentation, drugs and alcohol are usually the issue here. They are misdemeanor offenses, not felonies. Before this individual gets into something serious, we can intervene. We in the veterans community think we have given enough to this country to earn that.

Sean B. Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I want to register our support for this very important measure. It is a privilege for me and the rest of the Washoe County Public Defender's Office who represent the veterans in the north. We appreciate this measure being brought forward, and we wholeheartedly support it.

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

We are here to register our support as well.

Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

We also support this bill. We also support Assemblyman Anderson's bill, and we hope they are reconciled. We think this bill is a little more generous. We think the program works, so we prefer this version.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who wishes to testify in support of S.B. 449 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to testify in support?

Christine Adams, Administrator and Victim Impact Panel Manager, Vice Chairperson, Northern Nevada DUI Task Force:

A colleague of mine, Laurel Stadler, initially stood in opposition to this bill because of the DUI piece, but the amendment has allowed for the enhancement if there are subsequent offenses on that crime, so we are now in support of this piece of legislation.

Gerard Mager, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am an Air Force and Vietnam veteran, and I am conditionally in favor of this bill. I am concerned about some issues of public safety, especially for violent crimes, which DUI can become. I would like to see stronger wording in the bill, so it does not allow for DUI or domestic violence to be included in this. I also would not like to see it reconciled with the other bill without going through a hearing, instead of having staff do something that the public does not get to speak on. I think we have to be very careful about public safety in doing this. I agree veterans need as much assistance as they can get in these situations. I would also like to see the bill state specifically how they are going to verify that the issue the veteran claims he has actually exists. I see wording in there that does not state there has to be any proof that they have PTSD or proof that they have a mental illness or an injury or whatever it is. I would like to make sure that is in the bill.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I want to clarify that, at the end of session, there is a reconciliation bill that does not make any substantive changes to anything that we have passed. It makes technical changes to harmonize different bills as they would be codified in statute. Staff cannot make those types of changes. If two bills contradict each other, that is something that we have to face in the Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation, or Committee on Judiciary.

Is there anyone else in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral who wants to be heard?

Natalie Wood, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety:

For the record, we are neutral, but we do support reentry programs. I thank the veterans for their service. My only concern would be in regard to the probation aspect. Obviously, it is not part of our current budget, so it would be an unfunded mandate. We have submitted an unsolicited fiscal note at this time.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

That is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, correct?

Natalie Wood:

Correct.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I do not expect you to have this data here, but do you have any idea how many veterans you are supervising? I may be able to get that information.

Natalie Wood:

I do not have that data for you right now. I want to say it is somewhere around 40, but I can provide that number to the Committee.

Assemblyman Yeager:

The veterans you are supervising, are they in the district court level or in the justice and municipal court level?

Natalie Wood:

They are just in the district court level at this time.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else who is neutral on the measure? [There was no one.] Is there anyone opposed to Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint)? I see no one.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Is there anyone here from either the Nevada District Attorneys Association or the Office of the Attorney General who could weigh in on this bill? We heard from the District Attorneys Association earlier. We also heard testimony this morning from the Clark County District Attorney, but we did not hear from the Association. If there is someone here, please come forward, otherwise I will take my questions off-line.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

There is no one. Senator, do you have any closing comments you would like to make?

Senator Cannizzaro:

I would like to add that I am going to continue my conversations with the Division of Parole and Probation. This bill is intended to get at misdemeanor offenses and not to place these individuals on probation, but rather to have suspended proceedings in a justice court or municipal court level, which is common practice now for individuals who do not serve a sentence in a local jail facility. I will work that out and hopefully the fiscal note will get resolved.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 449 (1st Reprint) and open the hearing on Senate Bill 268 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 268 (1st Reprint): Revises various provisions relating to corrections. (BDR 16-546)

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senate District No. 3:

This is a simple bill that allows the county to provide identification (ID) cards when people leave jail. We had a similar bill that passed several years ago that provides for an ID when you leave prison, but this allows the same thing for the jails. Officer Drew, who is down south, is the one who came up with this idea in conjunction with Mr. Callaway.

Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

I will give you a very brief, high-level overview of what the sections of the bill do, and then I will turn it over to Officer Drew to provide you with details as to the practicality of it and how the logistics will work.

As you know, early in the session I gave a presentation before this body on the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and a portion of that presentation talked about the Clark County Detention Center (CCDC) and how one of our goals is to reduce recidivism by reintegrating offenders into society when they are about to be released. One of the programs that we have partnered with is HOPE for Prisoners. You have heard about that program a lot, and it has been very successful. The purpose of the bill is to allow us to provide information and assistance to certain inmates who are involved in the HOPE for Prisoners program, so they can get an ID card or a driver's license from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

upon their release, which helps them get a job and be successful when they are released back into the community. On the other side of the coin, it also helps law enforcement when we encounter folks who have been released without identification. They say they are John Smith, and they have no way to prove who they are. It can be difficult for officers in the field. It is a win-win situation for both sides—from the recidivism aspect and from the law enforcement in the field aspect.

Section 1 has some language in it that I believe came from the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, which refers to the Director verifying the documentation and identity of an inmate in the Department of Corrections (NDOC). That was not our language, but it is in the bill. Section 2 is the part that allows the sheriff to provide assistance and information to certain inmates upon release. It is permissive. The goal was not to make it mandatory because we do not want to force any agency or detention center to have to provide this assistance. It is strictly permissive for us to be able to assist those inmates who are actively engaged in these programs that help them.

Section 3 is the part that talks about credits for completing certain vocational programs. This language is meant to mirror what is in the statute for NDOC because a lot of these inmates who are participating in HOPE for Prisoners are involved in vocational studies or programs, and we want them to be able to get credits for early release based on those programs.

Before I turn it over to Officer Drew and the folks from CCDC down south, there is a friendly amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) that came from my discussion with Clark County. It was never our intent to include juvenile facilities in the language. It was supposed to be strictly for CCDC or other detention centers in the state that may want to participate in a program like this. The amendment would strike out the language in section 2 that refers to juvenile detention and the release of children.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Does the CCDC do anything now to try to help people get IDs? Since many people may have been born in another state, trying to get a birth certificate involves having a computer and a credit card to order the birth certificate. There are a lot of hurdles for folks to jump over, and they may not be able to jump over them once they have been released.

Chuck Callaway:

I think that is the perfect segue down south to have Officer Drew provide an answer to that.

Magnolia Drew, Re-entry Program Officer, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

Yes, we currently have a form that has been approved for some of our initiatives, particularly for the workforce. In general, we do not have the staffing in place. This bill would assist us in building our reentry program, so we can network throughout the community. The DMV has been onboard to assist us many times. We can transport inmates to the DMV facility. We are just developing a computer department, so that will play a role in our reentry efforts.

We have many things going on in our facility to build the foundation for a great reentry program in the state.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I notice another officer is there. Do you wish to speak to the bill before I open it up for questions?

Maria L. Allen, Corrections Officer, Detention Services Division Inmate Programs, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

I am here to speak in support of section 3 of the bill that has to do with inmate program credits. The reason that section is important to us is to address a disparity between NDOC and local program incentives. This could result in disparity in sentencing. For instance, if an inmate was sentenced to 18 months in NDOC, he has access to 69 programs that can earn anywhere from 15- to 180-days credit each. If inmate B was sentenced to 12 months of county time, his only access is to two programs that can earn up to 5 days of sentence credits each. This could mean that an inmate, who was sentenced for a more serious offense to a longer term, could end up doing a shorter actual sentence. This gives the local detention facilities and local governments the option to expand their program credits and offer credits for job skills and other programs that address other criminogenic needs other than just substance abuse and a high school equivalency diploma.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there a large percentage of inmates in CCDC that are going to spend between 6 months and 12 months there?

Maria Allen:

We have inmates serving sentences anywhere from 30 days to 12 months. The *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) for program credit only allows inmates who are sentenced to 90 days or more to earn program credits. Due to the time frame that it takes to earn the program credits themselves, inmates who are only sentenced to 90 days would only be able to complete a few programs. However, we do have quite a few inmates who are sentenced anywhere from 6 months to 12 months. This would give them the opportunity to complete other programs, especially our job skills programs. They tend to run up to 8 weeks long, plus it takes us time to vet the inmates and place them in the programs. This would allow them sentence credit incentives to participate in those job-training programs.

Assemblyman Pickard:

I have been a fan of figuring out how to get people on their feet. As I was going through the bill that you resolved for me by the elimination of the juvenile piece, I tried to pay attention to definitions. In section 3, there are a number of things that I do not know about since I do not practice in that area, but they appear to be fairly novel: things like defining a "serious infraction." I do not see any definition for what is "serious." As we go down to subsection 2 of section 3, it is "exceptional achievement," which is not defined. What is the intent and are there guidelines to be adopted through regulation that will define these terms? How do we define a "serious" infraction or what "exceptional" is? Two minds could disagree.

Chuck Callaway:

I believe the folks down south can probably provide a better answer, but my understanding is that we already have regulations and rules in place within CCDC. A serious violation of those rules would constitute, under definition 1, disqualification. For example, a serious violation of the rules could be getting into a fight with another inmate.

Maria Allen:

Most detention facilities already have definitions in place for what constitutes a serious infraction. For our facility, we have level 1, level 2, and level 3 offenses. Level 1 offenses are dealt with in place by the officer in the module. Level 2 and level 3 offenses would result in the inmate having to be transported to disciplinary housing in most cases. That is what we would consider a serious infraction: a level 2 or level 3 offense.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Could you give us an example of what a level 2 or 3 offense would be?

Maria Allen:

A fight would be a level 3 infraction and would qualify as a serious offense. There are also provisions for things such as contentious behavior. If an inmate had five or more low-level infractions within a short period of time, that would qualify as a level 2 offense for contention. They would go to disciplinary housing for a level 2 offense. Some other things could be a sexual assault, which is a level 3 offense; sexual harassment would be a level 2 offense; or refusing to work is a level 2 infraction because they are required to work when they are sentenced.

Assemblyman Pickard:

We have heard a lot of testimony about section 7 and some of the reentry problems that many inmates have, particularly the homeless problem when inmates have no place to go. In section 7, we are waiving the fees to obtain the ID card or driver's license for a homeless person. I do not have a problem with that except there does not seem to be anywhere for them to go. What is the next step? Does this plug into another program that may be escaping me at the moment?

Senator Segerblom:

This is a work in progress. It started in 2011 or 2013. I was shocked to find out that people were getting out of prison without an ID. How can you have someone who has been incarcerated for over a year and not give them the ability to go out and get food stamps or anything? We started that with NDOC, then we discovered that the DMV was charging them. Even though they were eligible, they could not get one. The state and the DMV were not talking to each other so there was a bureaucratic fight. We came back a couple of years later and found Officer Drew and discovered that the same thing was going on there. This is a fundamental start, and after this, we can start to really help people. If you cannot get food stamps or cash a check, the ID card is the fundamental place to start.

Chuck Callaway:

I will defer to legal counsel, but as I read that section, my understanding is that the part regarding the homeless fees being waived is existing language. Is that correct?

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I am getting a nod from our legal counsel, so it is correct that it is in existing statute.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Regarding the term "reasonable assistance," it is used in NRS 209.511. I assume you intend that term to be consistent, but can you give me some legislative intent as to what the term "reasonable assistance" means?

Chuck Callaway:

From my understanding, it is what a reasonable person would believe—the reasonable rule in general. That is a reasonable effort. For example, if someone had to apply through the state of Indiana to get a birth certificate, and it is not that difficult, that is reasonable. If the person's records have been lost and now you have to jump through hoops—and it may take months—it goes beyond what would be reasonable effort. That is my understanding. If one inmate's identity cannot be verified through regular avenues, it would not require us to go to extra lengths to try to obtain their information, just to the normal lengths.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

That answer encourages me. I am glad that you are anticipating actually helping people get birth certificates. For the record, the reasonable person does not exist, and if he does, he is a total buzzkill and no fun, so I do not like that guy. It would obviously create some type of fiscal note. Do we have any requirements that the Office of Vital Statistics or other birth certificate holders—I think the Southern Nevada Health District may be a birth certificate holder—provide birth certificates for free? That would destroy the problem. Is that the hang-up?

Chuck Callaway:

Our intent with this bill was not to require or force anyone to do anything. I understand what you are saying and agree with it philosophically, but when you get into the fiscal notes and try to force people, you run into a lack of cooperation. If we have that dialogue with the different entities, however, we find that they often cooperate with us in those efforts. I do not know if Officer Drew has anything to add as far as her efforts when it comes to going through the procedures. I believe we usually get cooperation from the entities that we deal with in that regard.

Senator Segerblom:

The problem is not the people who were born in Nevada, but most of the offenders who were born somewhere else. If you contact another state for a birth certificate, they want a form of ID from you before they will give it to you. That is a Catch-22. How do you get the ID if

you do not have a birth certificate, and how do you get the birth certificate if you do not have an ID? You have to get some kind of ID first to contact the other state. You then come back with the birth certificate to get a formal ID. It is incredibly complicated. Since 9/11, all of the federal rules make things much tougher.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Do you have any problem now in Nevada? I think that needs to be part of the conversation on this bill while we have this open.

Chuck Callaway:

I believe Officer Drew was getting ready to say something in response.

Bonnie Polley, Chaplain, Clark County Detention Center, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

Senator Segerblom covered this; however, in lots of cases you are not able to get a birth certificate without an ID. That presents a real problem. Without a birth certificate, you cannot get an ID, or vice versa. We are on a merry-go-round.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

What I am looking for in my question is, do we have problems getting birth certificates from a Nevada Office of Vital Statistics? That is what I am looking for. If we are having trouble getting them now, we need to fix it this session.

Bonnie Polley:

To be frank, most people with whom I deal at CCDC need birth certificates from out of state. We very rarely deal with people here from Clark County or Nevada.

Assemblyman Thompson:

I know that it is permissive, but I want to see the day where we require it. There are needs out there, and everything we talk about regarding birth certificates is true. There are some situations where you can get the birth certificates online, and there are leading questions that, as long as you can answer them, will let you get it. Those resources are limited. A lot of the community groups are really working hard. I would like to say on the record that Officer Drew—and I know it is a whole team—lives and breathes this, which is her life's work. She has done amazing things around this.

When I was here for the last 40 days of the legislative session in 2013, we had the bill that dealt with prisoners being released and getting identifications. Is the DMV here to speak? When we passed the law and came back all excited, we found there were snags in place. It would really help us with this bill if the DMV could say what the partnership is with this.

Jude Hurin, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

You are correct. It was in 2013 when the NDOC card came out. If that is submitted to the DMV as an inmate is released, it is an acceptable document of ID and allows that individual to acquire an ID or driver's license in our state.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Now, in 2017, I am glad that has been mended. With the homeless IDs that are floating around, some of the people who are coming into CCDC are coming in with homeless IDs. Are you allowing them to use those homeless IDs to transfer those over to Nevada IDs?

Jude Hurin:

We do have a program in place and have had it for a while. If you are homeless, we have a one-time waiver, but I am not familiar with the homeless ID, so I would need clarification.

Assemblyman Thompson:

There is an ID that people in Corridor of Hope have—which is the homeless corridor in southern Nevada—in order to get certain assistance. You cannot get federal assistance because you have to have real identification, but to get some key services like shelters, et cetera, you have to have that ID. This includes the person's name, and their picture on it. Since you are using the one from prison, which is not official, would you be using the same from homeless service providers? That is a big challenge for people who are in and out of the systems that we are talking about today.

Jude Hurin:

I appreciate that question. Per statute, the NDOC card is an allowable ID card. The homeless ID card that you speak of is not at this point in time anything we could receive with authority because of the requirement for full legal name and age. The DMV is always willing to work with others.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Then I would like to talk to you off-line so we can see what we can do. That would be a huge win if we can close that gap.

Jude Hurin:

We would be happy to work with you. Our biggest challenge is making sure the integrity of the cards that we produce is accurate. We cannot compromise on that, and I stress that because we are an agency that, when we create a driver's license or ID card, people rely on our vetting process. They rely on the fact that we receive documentation that has, for the most part, been vetted with due diligence to ensure that person is who he says he is. When we see those documents, whether state or federal, we can issue that driver's license or ID card with confidence of who that person is. We are more than willing to work on that, but it would have to be something that is in statute for us to actually allow for that to take place, otherwise, we would not have the authority to move forward with that kind of ID card.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

To be clear, you are not accepting those homeless ID cards, but the ID that someone gets upon leaving NDOC is acceptable for the DMV?

Jude Hurin:

That has been since 2013. The language in section 1 even strengthens that further. I believe it requires the Director of NDOC to make sure the vetting process is completed before they issue the card. They have been doing this by policy, but this clarifies it even more.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Maybe I am not seeing it in here, but what is the procedure that you would go through for people who are born out of the country, whether they are here legally or illegally? In this position, when they get out, how would you go through the procedure of getting a birth certificate or verify identity before you can issue this card?

Jude Hurin:

Regarding an individual who was born outside of the United States? Usually, when we receive those types of applicants, they have to provide certain federal documents from the Department of Homeland Security that allow them to be here legally, whether temporary or permanent. There are sets of documents on our website that are referred to as I-551 and I-94. All of those documents are issued by Homeland Security to individuals who are here legally. If they do not have that, they have the option of going for a driver's authorization card, which allows them to have a birth certificate and a consular ID card. If they do not have the credentials or documentation from Homeland Security through the proper federal process, they would not be able to get a standard license or ID card; however, they could if they have a foreign birth certificate and other documents under a driver's authorization card receive a driver's authorization card, which is not an ID, but it is a driver's privilege card.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

In relation to this bill, when someone gets out on parole and wants to get an ID card, someone who was not here legally would not have that documentation since they just got out of prison. Would they be eligible for this card after this bill?

Jude Hurin:

My understanding of the intent of this is that, under section 1, NDOC would not create an ID card unless they had that proper vetting. If the individual is here legally with Homeland Security documents and was incarcerated, I would assume NDOC would review the documents that the individual had to see if that individual could go and have the federal documents extended to allow that person to stay. It depends on the program within NDOC as to how far they will go into the weeds. That is my intent.

Chuck Callaway:

From a law enforcement perspective, it has always been a concern of ours to balance the need to get someone an ID card and get them back integrated in society. It is also to ensure that we are not creating an avenue where people can get a false identification and create

a new fake identity for themselves. I believe it is addressed in section 1 of this bill with the new language as stated by the gentleman from the DMV. Also, in section 2, subsection 2, it says that the sheriff has to verify the legal name and age of the prisoner before providing this assistance. To that point, the vast majority of folks who get booked into the CCDC are fingerprinted. Many of them have previous criminal history with us, so in the vast majority of cases, we know their identity and can verify it when they are booked in. In fact, I am told in many cases these folks have had an identification card in the past but lost it. They do not have it any more. That is one of the issues, and now they need to get another one reissued to them so they can get a job or get help when they get out.

We are very concerned about verifying through all means necessary to ensure we are not providing an avenue where someone can get a false identification. That is why those homeless cards have been a concern because of verifying the authenticity of who that person is.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I read this ahead of time and then came to the hearing feeling like I had a clear understanding of what this bill does. Then I got confused in the middle of the hearing. As I read section 1, subsection 2, "The Director shall not provide an offender with a photo identification card . . . unless the Director has verified the full legal name and age of the offender by obtaining an original or certified copy of the documents required" I read this bill as strengthening this process, so thanks for clarifying that this actually strengthens our verification and we are not issuing false IDs.

My question is about section 2, and I was excited when I read that we were applying this to juveniles because it is my understanding that, for example, a trafficking victim under the persuasion of the trafficker may be instructed to utilize the juvenile system process to legally change her name by going in and giving a false name, then leave there with a fake ID, and start using this new alias that has now been stamped. I am curious why we pulled the juveniles out. By pulling out section 2, are we pulling out the same protection of verifying the real name of a juvenile before we issue an ID and before they leave our juvenile justice system?

Chuck Callaway:

Regarding the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) that I received, it does not strike out all of section 2. I sent this to the Committee yesterday afternoon when I received it, and I am not sure if it went through or if it was received. It strikes out the references to juvenile detention facilities throughout that section but does not repeal the whole section. The requirements in subsection 2 to verify the legal name and age are still intact within the language.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I know that we are a policy committee and not a fiscal committee, but I want to reconcile that there were some fiscal notes, but then in the amended version online, it crosses out the language that this is an unfunded mandate. Can you let us know which direction we are heading with this?

Chuck Callaway:

The original bill when it was drafted by the Legislative Counsel Bureau had language in it that mandated all detention facilities to do this. That was never our goal. Our goal was to make it permissive. When the bill was amended to reflect the permissive language, those fiscal notes went away. That is my understanding.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I want to piggyback on my colleague's question regarding the juvenile detention centers. I know they are referred to a couple of times in the bill in section 2 and section 6. I assume they have been removed from both sections. Why are we removing them? Do those who are 16, 17, and those turning 18 years old when they are released not need this type of assistance if they are not in possession of an ID? Would they not also need identification and assistance in obtaining a driver's license for them to succeed post release?

Chuck Callaway:

When we reached out to Senator Segerblom to bring this bill forward, it was never our intent to include the juveniles. We were strictly focused on the Clark County Detention Center. When the language was drafted in the original bill, it included the juvenile detention centers. I think the county raised some concern about that. With the language being permissive, I believe it would still give them the ability to say that they are not going to do it since it is not a mandate. I do not want to speak for the county, but I think there were concerns that it might eventually become a mandate and apply to those facilities as well. The funding issues were probably a problem and everything associated with it.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Did they come in opposition and say they would support the bill if the section was removed?

Chuck Callaway:

I do not want to speak for the county, so if they are here, they should answer that.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

The current language would make it permissive for a juvenile detention center and not tie their hands.

Senator Segerblom:

The language is permissive, so I do not know why they are worried about it.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Often in juvenile court, I have seen youth who are 17 years and 10 or 11 months old, and have seen the juvenile hearing master sentence them to 30 or 60 days in juvenile detention rather than send them up to Nevada Youth Training Center in Elko or Summit View Youth Correctional Center in Las Vegas. They turn 18, and they are out. A lot of times their parents wish them well and tell them good luck and have a good life. If they need to have ID, they could be in the same pickle as some of our adult offenders find themselves in. Maybe we will hear about that amendment later.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I have a question about section 3 and the days being deducted. When it discusses the deductions, it says, "... a deduction of not more than 5 days ...". It used to just say 5 days, but now it is changed to not more than 5. Are we changing that for discretionary reasons?

Chuck Callaway:

My understanding based on the feedback I got from our folks at the detention center—and again they can pipe in if I say something wrong—was that in some cases inmates earn credits, but they may be getting out in 3 days anyway. They want to give some flexibility to the language where, if they were very close to being released anyway, they did not want it to say that you have to give them 5 days' credits if that situation did not apply. That is my understanding. If you have an inmate, for example, and he gets out in 3 days and has just earned five credits, the five credits do not apply because he gets out in 3 days anyway, so they want to say "up to 5," if that makes sense. It is more of a flexibility technicality.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Please go ahead and address that because it confused me as well. I thought we were trying to expand the possibility of credit, but it seems like we might be limiting it, unless I am misunderstanding it.

Maria Allen:

The reason Officer Callaway gave is exactly the reason we requested the language be worded that way. Otherwise, if we had to guarantee each inmate who completed a program would get the full 5 days, then certain inmates would not be eligible to take the program. Normally, when we set up a session—for instance for a substance abuse program—we include make-up days in the calendar to deal with things such as facility lockdowns. Then we set a cutoff date. If an inmate is very close to the cutoff date and there are no facility lockdowns and no missed classes, they could finish the course and still get 3 or 4 days of sentence credit. With this language, we would be able to allow them to join the program, complete it, and get as many days as they still have left. If the language specified exactly 5 days, we would not be able to allow them to begin the program because we could not guarantee them the 5 days.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Would you be averse to having the language say something that would more accurately reflect that? To say that someone will not be prevented from taking the program due to time restraints or something like that? I want to make sure the language accurately reflects the intent and does not look like we are allowing discretion within the jail. Maybe in the future people will not be given different credits based on the whims of the Director, not that the Director would necessarily do that. We want the language to be precise.

Chuck Callaway:

I think we could work on a potential amendment or some language that says something to the effect of, conceptually, 5 days or the remainder of their sentence, so it captures both scenarios. It gives us the ability so that, if they only have less than 5 days at the time they complete the program, it would still apply.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Thank you. That sounds more like what I am trying to say.

In section 1, subsection 2, I am reading the paragraph that there might be people in detention whom we might not know if we have those people's identity correct. Do we have people in detention right now that we do not actually know who they are? Is that an issue that we are having?

Senator Segerblom:

That is. When we first started this, there were people who had spent five years in prison, and we did not know who they were. They all had social security numbers. I was shocked to discover that you could go to prison and the officials would not know who they were after spending that many years.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Is there anything that can be done about that? I know that is not exactly this bill, but can you give us a little more information on that?

Chuck Callaway:

Again, I do not want to speak for the Director of NDOC on the prison side, but we make every effort possible to identify someone, such as through his fingerprints. If they are arrested now for a felony crime, their DNA is taken. Like I said, in the vast majority of cases, the people we book are repeat visitors to our facility; we have had them in our facility in the past. I do not remember what the current numbers are, but I think 65 or 70 percent of the people who are booked into the CCDC have been in our facility before. In most cases, we know who they are, but we do have occasions where someone is arrested without identification. Sometimes they do not cooperate and refuse to tell us who they are. They may say that they are not going to tell us who they are, so we book them in as John Doe or Jane Doe. We run their fingerprints, and they come back with no record of that person at all. In those cases, we have no choice but to process them through the system as John or Jane Doe. It is not very common, but it does occur.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I am looking at the amendment that says they do not have to provide a photo identification or a driver's license upon release. However, it says that if it is requested, they will. Assuming most people request it, how can there be no fiscal note? Obviously, there are going to be fees and money incurred to the state.

Chuck Callaway:

I am not sure where you are looking. Are you looking at the actual bill or an amendment?

Assemblywoman Krasner:

The amendment to the bill.

Chuck Callaway:

The one from Clark County that removes the juvenile language?

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I think the way the bill is written as being permissive, that takes care of any fiscal note if I understand that correctly. A county jail or detention center has the option of implementing this or not, so it would be up to the local facility.

Chuck Callaway:

That is correct, but I am not sure what section or area you are referring to. If I missed something, I will put it on the record now it is our intent; this is permissive and nothing is a mandate. This would be for those inmates who are in our facilities and are participating in programs, such as HOPE for Prisoners, or programs that help them get reintegrated back into society. This is not intended for the guy who gets a trespass charge from one of the hotels, spends 72 hours in the CCDC, and then says he wants an ID card. This is geared to those folks who have been sentenced to our facility, are going to be released, and we are trying to get them jobs and get them back as functional members of society.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I am looking at page 1 of the bill, and the language is struck out. It no longer says the Director of the Department of Corrections is to verify the legal name and age of the offender who is being released by obtaining certain documents before providing a photo identification card to the offender requiring (it changes it to authorizing, so it is permissive) a sheriff, chief of police, town marshal, or director of a facility, upon request, to provide certain information and assistance to a person who is being released, which of course is the photo ID or the driver's license. Even though it is not required, it is just authorizing them to do it upon request. There is still going to be a fiscal note when someone requests it, so I wonder if there is a way to assess that amount of money.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

We are not a money committee. We are a policy committee, but if there were going to be a fiscal impact, the agency would submit an unsolicited fiscal note.

Senator Segerblom:

It is true that, if they go through with this, there will be. It is going to cost them money. All of the effort that they have already put in will still take more effort. This is what they have requested, but they have not said to us that they do not want us to give them the authorization. They said they would like the authorization and if they can afford to do it, they will do it. Maybe someone will know how much it is going to cost.

Chuck Callaway:

We project in the CCDC's budget our cost for these reentry programs as part of our budget. My assumption is that the potential cost for us to help provide this information and assistance to an inmate is included in the budget that we submit to the county regarding those costs for reentry. Then, in addition, on the backside, the fact of the matter is that we can keep some of these folks from coming back if we get them a job and an ID card. The HOPE for Prisoners program has been very successful in reducing recidivism with the folks who have participated, so it saves us money on the back end because we are not tying up a bed with the \$140-a-day cost on average to put someone in a bed at the detention center.

Again, our intent is that this is permissive and not mandatory. There will be some cost on our side associated with this. We are not trying to put a mandate on any other detention center or any other facility. If there is something you see in the bill that is a concern to you about "at the request of the inmate," let me know and we can address that language because that is not our intent.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Are there any comments regarding this? Is this something you think you can do down at the detention center?

Magnolia Drew:

We have a commissary fund in our facility, and we are going to budget for this need. For those whom we cannot capture in time to assist them, we can at least give them the ID, so they can go to the DMV. It will already be budgeted with the state to help them if they are homeless. For the population who are getting out who we do not have time to assist, and the window of opportunity to get the ID while they are in prerelease has closed, once they get out they can go through regular means with the DMV.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

This investment can pay off dividends exponentially in terms of people who might be able to land on their feet and not end up homeless or end up back at CCDC. Are there any more questions?

Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Clark County Department of Administrative Services:

The reason we proposed the amendment was that the intent of this bill was geared toward adults and not juveniles. Therefore, we requested to remove the juveniles from this bill. In addition, this bill, as written with the juveniles in it, combines adult processes in NRS Chapter 211 with juveniles who are actually captured in NRS Chapter 62. We wanted to remove juveniles from this bill for those reasons. It is permissive so, if juveniles remain in this bill, we request the juvenile portion of this bill be moved to NRS Chapter 62. Juveniles do not actually stay long in our facilities. They may come in and are there for just hours or only a day or so. As you heard, Chuck Callaway stated that this is geared to folks sentenced to a facility. Juveniles are not sentenced for a long period of time in our facilities, plus they have their parents who can assist them in obtaining an ID if they need an ID prior to becoming 18 years old, or even afterwards.

Assemblyman Yeager:

We heard testimony in a previous bill about a number of juveniles being housed at the detention center for a period of time. Is there some way to make sure those offenders, to the extent they get released to the street, could have these provisions apply to them?

Chuck Callaway:

My understanding is that the juveniles who are in our facility have all been certified as adults. They are treated as adult inmates. If they were sentenced to our facility, which means in most cases their crimes are category A and maybe some category B offenses, they would be eligible to participate in these programs since they are in our facility as adults.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

What if you have a child who has been certified as an adult but is acquitted at trial or the charges are dropped; would they be eligible for help with IDs and such?

Chuck Callaway:

If their charges were ultimately dropped, they are not sentenced to our facility, so they would not be taking part in these programs like HOPE for Prisoners vocational training programs, but would be released out the door. In that regard, they would not be participating in these programs, so we would not be assisting them with ID cards.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

To circle back to what the correctional facilities are willing to absorb in terms of the administrative side of implementing this, there are some savings in facilitating some of these inmates to leave five or ten days cumulatively early because they have completed these programs successfully. Would that not also bring in some savings?

Maria Allen:

I am glad you brought that up. Per NRS 211.316, any profits from inmate commissary sales has to be dedicated to the benefit of the inmates. All of our programs and reentry efforts, as well as the efforts to help inmates obtain their IDs, would be paid for from the inmate commissary funds. However, the savings from allowing inmates increased access to program credits and getting them out of custody a few days early would go to the budgets of the local detention centers and, therefore, the local governments.

If I could add a quick note to the previous question, our juvenile offenders in our juvenile offender unit who are certified adults are already served by a program called the Embracing Project, which is an arm of the Center for Peace. They concentrate on youth who have grown up in traumatic environments. Because all of our youthful offenders are required to attend programs, it is not optional if they are juveniles. Some of the things that the Embracing Project does is help them obtain IDs, ensure they have housing, and make sure they complete their education.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I am familiar with that project down at juvenile detention. I did not realize they try to help those kids at the adult part of CCDC. Are there any additional questions?

Chuck Callaway:

I would like to make a final comment on the record to clarify something that was raised just now by the DMV. I want to put on the record that, at CCDC, we will not be issuing someone an ID card like NDOC does. We will just assist them with getting the documentation they need to go to the DMV. The DMV will be issuing them the ID card. I wanted that clarified on the record.

Assemblyman Thompson:

It truly would be the best world if you could do that before they are released. A lot of times it just may not happen. It is like giving someone a job referral: if you can help them right then and there, the likelihood of being hired is greater than telling someone to go on down there because it just may not happen.

Senator Segerblom:

I thought I heard Officer Drew say they were actually transporting the person to the DMV before they are released to help with that process.

Magnolia Drew:

That is correct. In our original conversation with the DMV, we did talk about an ID generated from the detention center, so maybe we could discuss that more. Yes, we will assist the individual with getting down to the DMV and getting an ID prior to release.

Jude Hurin:

Officer Drew and Officer Callaway are correct, and we have worked with them in the past to get inmates to the DMV facilities. We are not opposed to the counties or cities issuing an ID card, but we want to make sure our interpretation of the amendment was clear. We are always there to help in any way we can and to help the agencies as well.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else who is in support of the bill, either in Las Vegas or Carson City?

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

We want to register our support for this bill, and we supported it on the Senate side. There are a couple of things I want to say after listening to the conversation. Normally, when fingerprints are taken, an inmate does not remain a John or Jane Doe for very long. If we are having trouble getting birth certificates, fingerprints are usually used to identify these offenders for the criminal charges. Fingerprints are usually good enough to take a case to trial, so I do not see why they would not be good enough to identify a person in order to help get an ID in this state that will identify them if the fingerprints are in the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) and have been verified.

Second, juveniles should remain within the statute even if they are moved over to the chapter that talks about juveniles. There was an article about the new Shannon West Homeless Youth Center that is being built, and Nevada is again in last place when it comes to homeless youth. I think there is a problem here that needs to be addressed regarding ensuring that we can get youth the services they need. You cannot even get into Catholic Charities if you do not have an ID. It is important that juveniles remain in this bill.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to be heard who is neutral on the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who opposes the bill, either here or in Las Vegas? I see no one, so you have a well-liked bill, Senator Segerblom. Do you have any closing comments?

Senator Segerblom:

That is excellent. I also want to make a comment about the next bill since I will be leaving. Senator Hardy came up with this bill, and it only covers a few people so far, but I think it is an idea we can build on even though his own colleagues voted against him. It is what it is.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 268 (1st Reprint) and open the hearing on Senate Bill 140 (2nd Reprint). Senator Hardy, thank you for bringing this bill and you have already gotten an endorsement from Senator Segerblom.

Senate Bill 140 (2nd Reprint): Authorizes the residential confinement or other appropriate supervision of certain older offenders. (BDR 16-798)

Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, M.D., Senate District No. 12:

Senate Bill 140 (2nd Reprint) authorizes the Director of the Department of Corrections (NDOC) to assign certain offenders to the custody of the Division of Parole and Probation (P&P) to serve a term of residential confinement or other appropriate supervision for the remainder of the offender's sentence. To qualify for such an assignment, an offender must be at least 65 years old and must have served at least the majority of the maximum or maximum aggregate term of his or her sentence. Offenders not eligible for this assignment are offenders who have been sentenced to death, life without the possibility of parole, or have been convicted of the following offences: a sexual assault, a sexual offense, certain crimes against children, a violent offense, vehicular homicide, or driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol causing the death or substantial bodily harm to another person.

The basic guts of the bill are what I just said from section 1. The rest of the bill is conforming to all of the other statutes that exist. I brought with me the expert on the bill, James Ringel, our intern, who has been working with this and has a presentation. If you look on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, you will see this document [he held up a publication], which is about 100 pages ([Exhibit D](#)). We put some out for the public for those who would like it.

James Ringel, Intern, Senate Minority Caucus:

Senate Bill 140 (2nd Reprint) is a bill that expands the ability of the Director of NDOC. Current statute only allows the Director to grant residential confinement for inmates who are at least 65 years old and must have served at least the majority of the maximum term of his or her sentence and have not committed any of the crimes that Senator Hardy listed. Right now, the Director is only allowed to grant residential confinement for inmates who are in extremely poor health or who are of ill health and are expected to pass away within 12 months.

According to the Vera Institute of Justice, at the end of 2009, 15 states as well as the District of Columbia had provisions for geriatric release. However, these states have rarely utilized these programs and for the most part have not released many inmates. Washington, for example, has only released 22 inmates in the five years of their law that is similar to Nevada's current law. The inmate is only allowed parole if he has a serious medical condition that would be expensive for the state to either treat or manage. Unfortunately, in Washington they have a lot of people who would otherwise be eligible but are not because over 50 percent of them are serving life without parole due to violating the three-strikes law.

If this bill were passed, one of the advantages would be fiscal savings. Some estimates by different groups place the cost of medical care for inmates 55 and over at two to three times the cost for other, younger inmates. North Carolina performed their own study on their prisons and found that aging and elderly inmates cost more than four times as much as younger inmates. Virginia's prisons estimated that releasing 62 aging inmates could save the state up to \$6.6 million per year. Similarly, Washington's Department of Corrections estimated a savings of \$1.5 million for the 2009-2011 biennium if they released 44 inmates. In a study done by the U.S. Office of the Inspector General, it was found that elderly inmates on average cost approximately 8 percent more to incarcerate per year. But these numbers can be even larger. In fiscal year 2013, prisons with the highest percentage of aging inmates spent an average of \$10,000 per inmate per year on medical costs, while prisons with the lowest percentage spent an average of \$2,000 per inmate per year.

According to NDOC, the state spent approximately \$3,300 per inmate per year for medical purposes. During the 2015 budget hearing, NDOC stated that it costs approximately \$20,700 to house each inmate every year. Even if we only free two inmates, we would save \$82,800 in the upcoming biennium.

Additionally, studies have shown that older inmates who are released are very unlikely to reoffend. One study showed that prisoners over the age of 50 who were released in Washington had a recidivism rate of 10 percent, and those over 55 had a recidivism rate of 2 percent. The U.S. Office of the Inspector General found that elderly convicts had a recidivism rate of 15 percent while younger parolees had a rate near 50 percent. In 2010, Ohio did a study of their own prisons and releases and found that 26.7 percent of released prisoners reoffended within 3 years of release. Of the released inmates between the ages of 65 and 69, 5.6 percent returned to prison, and parolees between 70 and 74 had a recidivism rate of 2.9 percent. Although there were only a few prisoners who were released who were

75 or older, none of them committed new crimes or violated their parole. Columbia University's Center for Justice says that, in New York, only 6.4 percent of released inmates 50 and older returned to prison, while it was only 4 percent for those 65 and older. In 2011 in Nevada, inmates who were 58 and older had a 19 percent recidivism rate, which is slightly lower than the younger inmates' average of 30 percent recidivism.

Since it is clear that there is a budgetary benefit to releasing these prisoners and they do not pose a significant threat to society, it is also worth seeing this bill as a humanitarian bill. From 2001 to 2007, 8,500 inmates over the age of 55 died behind bars in America. In 2009 in Ohio, inmates over 55 made up 6.5 percent of the state's prison population but accounted for 48.5 percent of deaths in prison. From 2005 to 2008, New York inmates 65 and older made up 1 percent of the prison population but were 15 percent of deaths behind bars, while 55- to 64-year-olds were 4 percent of the population and made up 23 percent of deaths.

Nevada's statistics are fairly similar. In fiscal year 2013, inmates 65 and older made up 3 percent of Nevada's inmate population, but were 36 percent of the deaths. I could not find inmate resident percentages from NDOC for 2016, but inmates over the age of 65 made up 31 percent of deaths in Nevada prisons in 2016.

Part of this is simply a fact of life. Older people are more prone to health concerns, and the lives these people have lived often take a toll on their bodies. But this is also due to the fact that prisons are not meant to be nursing homes because of structural limitations and the lack of staff knowledge of geriatric care.

Given all of this information, I believe that passing S.B. 140 (R2) would be greatly beneficial for the state of Nevada.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I am looking at section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a), which references the notification requirements that the Director shall notify, "The board of county commissioners of the county in which the offender will reside." I do not understand what the board of county commissioners is going to do with that information. If it were to say the sheriff of a county, that would make more sense than the county commissioners. What is your intent of that language, and what do you require the commissioners to do with that information?

Senator Hardy:

I think it is the polite thing to do to let elected officials know when someone from their district is coming back. Elected officials such as county commissioners are going to want to have this information if someone asks them why a person is out of prison, so I think it is the appropriate thing to do.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Our legal counsel informed me that this seems to be standard statutory language on a lot of these early-release statutes.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

We task the sheriffs with ensuring that everyone is safe. I am not sure what your average commissioner is going to do with that information. I am not even sure they are actually going to get notice of it. I think that notice will be provided by staff to staff, and it will go into a vault somewhere and never get used. Would it make more sense to ensure the people who are tasked with keeping us safe are aware of prisoners being out in the community rather than the county commissioners who set policy for non-criminal justice-related matters?

Senator Hardy:

You are correct, and I suspect that is why it is the board of county commissioners. When you notify a board, it is a board en masse, so everyone gets to know, and it is public record as well. Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b), states that the Director will also notify the Division of Parole and Probation. Those folks are in charge of making sure that person is living in accordance with the requirements that he or she has.

Assemblyman Thompson:

I understand that the offender is elderly, et cetera, but I want to make sure the part that deals with notification for the victim is made whole. I know it says if the person "requested to be notified," so please walk us through that process. Section 1, subsection 3, talks about the notification to the victim that the inmate is being released. How much does it really weigh in if they say that they would like that person to remain in prison?

Senator Hardy:

First, the way I read it is that the victim has requested that she be notified; then when the Director—who has the option to release or not release anyone—assigns that person to P&P, the victim may submit documents regarding the assignment. It still opens the process for the Director to consider those types of concerns.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Is there anyone here from P&P who could answer that in more depth?

Senator Hardy:

I am sure there is someone who could answer it in more depth, but I am not sure anyone is here.

Assemblyman Thompson:

What about the limited space when we are talking about reentry? It becomes the lifeboat exercise that we have all done previously regarding who should survive. Due to the limited space in transitional housing for the Department of Public Safety, should it pass—I like this bill—will it potentially bump those offenders who might be younger and have promised not to recidivate, to do well, to reunite with their families, and to reintegrate into society, et cetera?

Senator Hardy:

That is one of the things that the Director has to look at; how it is going to affect everyone and not just the victim. It is reasonable for the Director to take into account the rehabilitation of all those who are outside now and trying to stay outside.

Assemblyman Yeager:

With your indulgence, I have a couple of technical questions. The way I read the bill, and this is section 1, subsection 3, it seems as if NDOC makes the decision to release someone early, then in the same section and subsection, they provide the notice to P&P, and then it is P&P who notifies the victim. The victim may then submit documentation to P&P regarding the release. The way I read this—correct me if I am wrong or it needs to be reworded—is the victim would only have a chance to lodge documents with P&P after the decision has already been made by the Director for the early release. Was that your intent or did you want the victim to be able to submit something earlier before the decision is made? It looks like the victim does not provide the documents to the Director of NDOC, but rather to P&P.

Senator Hardy:

I will defer to the wisdom of the Committee. I am looking at section 1, subsection 3, which states, "Except as otherwise provided in NRS 213.10915, if any victim of a crime committed by the offender has, pursuant to subsection 4 of NRS 213.131, requested to be notified of the consideration of a prisoner for parole and has provided a current address, the Division of Parole and Probation shall notify the victim that" The impression I get is that the victim, before any of this was considered, wanted to know if that person would ever be considered for parole or probation. That is how I read it, but that may not be accurate.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

We will defer to our legal counsel.

Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel:

Yes, how Senator Hardy explained it is how it works. If the victim wants to be notified of any consideration of parole, that is done ahead of time. If the address is on file, P&P will attempt to find the victim and give the victim the opportunity to submit any comments. This is the same procedure that is set forth for all types of residential confinement. It actually works ahead of time. It occurs before the assignment is actually made. What weight that plays in the decision is up to the Director in making the assignment, but it does occur before the assignment is actually made. That is why the language is that the Director "intends" to assign custody.

Assemblyman Yeager:

In section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (c), it indicates that one of the qualifications is that the offender has to serve the majority of the maximum term or maximum aggregate term. We have talked in this Committee about offenders getting good time credits off of the back

of their sentence so, for legislative intent, when you say "maximum term" do you intend that to be the maximum term given in court? If the court sentenced him to 2 to 5 years, would he have to cross the 2.5-year threshold? Or, in evaluating this, would we factor in the credit that comes off the back end of the sentence, and then, determine whether he has served the majority of time?

Senator Hardy:

My intention was to make them serve the maximum term or the aggregate maximum term. That is how I see it.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I got ahold of Natalie Wood and she said it would be minimal impact, as only five inmates total would potentially qualify. There is no fiscal impact, only five inmates out of approximately 14,000, so I have no issues with the bill. You mentioned Washington State's total was 22. We are dealing with a very tiny pool of potential inmates with all of the screening processes and the hoops they have to jump through. I am curious if you are aware that we are only potentially dealing with five people?

Senator Hardy:

I am smiling now. When it comes down to it, it is actually only two.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Two?

Senator Hardy:

That is all that would be affected.

Assemblyman Hansen:

And you still could not convince your caucus?

Senator Hardy:

I made the statement in the hearing in the Senate that if I were a Republican, I would like this bill. It will save money. If I were a Democrat, I would like this bill because it will show mercy, and the opportunity to get someone who will not reoffend out of prison. I would not have to pay for them, and they can be with their family.

Assemblyman Hansen:

On the Senate side—the district attorneys are not here, and I see one public defender—has there been any opposition from the law enforcement community?

Senator Hardy:

They still have their option.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I got that, but they are not here now. My impression is that they are not too worried about those two people.

Senator Hardy:

I think they can read the statistics as well as James Ringel did.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

As I read this, it says "may" and not "shall", so we still have discretion for the Director. We have ruled out some of the worst crimes. For example, section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b), lists what it does not apply to: crimes of violence, crimes against children, sexual offenses, vehicular homicide, and so forth. Is that correct?

Senator Hardy:

Yes, that is correct.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

The victim notification showed up on my radar. Thank you for including the victim's voice. That is always important. Is it common in the law to write in a time limit? For example, we would give a time frame of 60 days or 90 days for a victim to be notified before that decision is made in order to ensure there is ample time for the Director and P&P to take into account any victim impact statements or concerns before releasing the inmate. I know we are only talking about two currently, but we are also setting policy that will be enacted in perpetuity. Would there be a willingness to consider a time frame to give victims a chance to have input before that decision is made?

Senator Hardy:

I concur with your sentiment. I am not privy to all of those answers. I do see 45 days in section 1, subsection 2. Is that flexible? I would suspect so. I would defer to your counsel on this Committee if that means anything or if that is applicable in this circumstance.

Brad Wilkinson:

Yes. In drafting this bill, it was somewhat patterned after existing law in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 209.3925, which is a residential confinement program for inmates who are physically incapacitated or in ill health and do not pose a threat, or they are expected to die within 12 months. It has the exact same language as the 45-day period of notification. We just copied it from that.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

I had that highlighted, but I did not realize that was connected to the notification. To clarify, my understanding now is that those two sections are connected, and the victims are given a 45-day notice in order to respond.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is that how you understand it, Mr. Wilkinson?

Brad Wilkinson:

Actually, the 45-day notification is to the board of county commissioners and to P&P. The notification that goes to the victim has no period set forth in the statute. That is consistent with the existing law for the other residential confinement programs. I do not know in practice if that actually works or how much time they give a victim to respond. Whatever they do with the other existing residential confinement programs, I imagine they would do the same with this program.

Assemblywoman Tolles:

Perhaps we can follow up off-line.

Assemblywoman Miller:

I am trying to be specific when we look at people being released from prison. One of the greatest barriers is not having housing or employment. If we are now saying that these individuals can be released to residential confinement, and I know the bill says "may" and not "shall," but what do we do if someone has met all of the requirements, but he does not have housing? The bill also says, in section 3, that one of the agreements is that they will look for employment. Seniors are past an age where they would be viable to enter the workforce or to receive training. What happens to those individuals?

Senator Hardy:

When I have attended a parole hearing, those are all the things that they ask: where are you going to live; what will your income be; and how are you going to stay safe? Those are all conditions that the Director has to pull in. If those do not mesh together, they are not paroled. That is one of the things that is contingent on that "may", so the Director does not have to do anything if the person does not meet the requirements. He or she is not going to turn that person out to the street to be homeless without a source of revenue. I would not expect our people to do that.

Assemblywoman Miller:

What happens now to an individual who completes his prison sentence and has reached a certain age and is released? When they are in the same situation, what happens?

Senator Hardy:

I do not know.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

I am looking at section 1, subsection 4 of the bill that says that if an offender "escapes or violates any of the terms or conditions of his or her residential confinement" the offender forfeits part of his or her good-behavior credits that he or she earned previously. It also says that the Director can restore those credits "as the Director considers proper." The decision of the Director regarding the possible forfeiture is final. That seems to put a lot of authority in one person's hands. Why are we not having P&P do that?

Senator Hardy:

I admit that I am smiling right now. I am over 65, and if you escape, you are not moving very fast. The Director, obviously, is going to bring that person "back home" and then figure out what they are going to do. I suspect that there is not going to be much leniency in that position. If that person escapes to go to his grandmother's funeral, that is something that the Director may consider an egregious thing. I do not have the answer for you.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I consulted with our legal counsel, and it seems the Director has that kind of discretion for other kinds of violations in terms of forfeiting credits or restoring credits; that is a power we have vested in the Director. This mirrors that.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

Without supervision or input from P&P, one person is like a king making decisions.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

As I understand this, the inmate is not being granted parole. That is why the power is with the Director. This is a transitional program like our compassionate release program. That is why the statutory structure for a program like this has the vested power with the Director rather than the Parole Board. It is meant to mirror the existing statutes.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

Is the existing statute that the Director has that authority and not the Parole Board?

Brad Wilkinson:

Yes, that is correct.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

It was said that this expands the power and authority of the Director. James Ringel made that statement.

James Ringel:

Yes. By that I meant that the Director is allowed to release other inmates instead of the current rule that it is just inmates who are in extremely poor health or who are in ill health and are expected to pass away within 12 months. This would also allow them to release elderly inmates who are not necessarily ill.

Assemblywoman Krasner:

We are talking a lot about releasing persons who are 65 or older to residential confinement, but it does say ". . . or other appropriate supervision." I am assuming not all of these people are going to go into residential confinement. Some will just be released and have to report back.

Senator Hardy:

The P&P people would look at where the best place is. To Assemblyman Thompson's point, it may be in the Casa Grande Transitional Housing center or some other residential confinement. That would be a decision that would have to be made if the person is over 65 and has family with a stable place to stay. That may be one of the options that the Director takes into account.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I do not know if my question is more appropriate for Senator Hardy or for our legal counsel. I wonder if we are discounting the abilities of a senior citizen. I understand that this is a "may" and not a "shall" for the Director. When we have someone in confinement who is 65 or older, and who has not committed a violent crime but has done more of a financial crime—for instance, someone who has stolen people's life savings—does the Director have an ability to put that person on home confinement and prevent him from having Internet access, so he does not have the ability to continue scamming other people via the Internet? Will the Director have that type of control over that person, or is it all or nothing? If they are at home on confinement, will they still have all of those freedoms or will there still be controls in place?

Senator Hardy:

I will defer to the Committee counsel.

Brad Wilkinson:

It is the Division of Parole and Probation that sets the terms and conditions of the person's release. This is a hybrid thing where you are still technically an inmate but are supervised by P&P. They can set whatever appropriate limits to do exactly what you are suggesting if they think that it is appropriate.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone in support of the bill who would like to be heard, either here or at the Sawyer Building?

Gerard Mager, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am in support of this bill, but I do have one concern. All of my other concerns have been answered, but this one has to do with me being over 65. Giving people this opportunity based on age only could possibly bring in age-discrimination complaints from other inmates. I just thought I would mention that.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I appreciate your comment. I am not aware of that being a problem in other jurisdictions, but it is something we should look at.

John J. Piro, Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office:

We would like to thank Senator Hardy for bringing this bill forward. We supported this bill on the Senate side and support it here today. The young man who presented the bill did as

fine a job as he did on the Senate side. He brings up an adequate point when it comes to criminal justice research. Generally, there is a lifecycle of crime, and the older people get, the more likely they are to age out of committing crimes. That being said, this bill still only applies to two people, so I do not necessarily feel that the community will be in that much danger by allowing this bill to pass, so I urge your support.

Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

We support this bill.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else in support of the measure? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who is neutral on the measure and wants to be heard? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who is opposed to the measure and wants to make comments on the record? [There was no one.] Do you have any closing remarks you would like to make, Senator Hardy?

Senator Hardy:

I appreciate James Ringel for doing such good research, and I appreciate your counsel for presenting the bill for me.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 140 (2nd Reprint) and will open it up for public comment. Is there anyone who would like to make public comment now? [There was no one.] I will close the public comment period. I would like to turn this over to Assemblyman Yeager to make some announcements about the meeting tomorrow.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I just want to let Committee members know that we will be starting at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning for the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. We have two bills on the agenda. Keep in mind that we also have a 6 p.m. meeting tomorrow, which will be a joint meeting of the Assembly and the Senate to hear about the Department of Taxation's proposed regulations for the recreational marijuana program. There are two meetings tomorrow, but we will not start until 9 a.m.

Chairman Ohrenschall:

This meeting of the Assembly Committee on Corrections, Parole, and Probation is adjourned [at 10:21 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karyn Werner
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 268 (1st Reprint) presented by Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

[Exhibit D](#) is a publication submitted by Senator Joseph (Joe) P. Hardy, M.D., Senate District No. 12, titled "Aging in Prison: Reducing Elder Incarceration and Promoting Public Safety," published by Center for Justice at Columbia University in November 2015.