

CENTRAL OFFICE

1677 Old Hot Springs Rd., Ste. A
Carson City, Nevada 89706
<http://parole.nv.gov>
(775) 687-5049
Fax (775) 687-6736

CHRISTOPHER P. DERICCO, *Chairman*
SUSAN JACKSON, *Member*
MARY K. BAKER, *Member*
SCOTT WEISENTHAL, *Member*

KATIE FRAKER, *Executive Secretary*

STATE OF NEVADA

STEVE SISOLAK
Governor



LAS VEGAS OFFICE

4000 S. Eastern Ave., Ste.130
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
<http://parole.nv.gov>
(702) 486-4370
Fax (702) 486-4376

CHRISTOPHER P. DERICCO, *Chairman*
ERIC CHRISTIANSEN, *Member*
DONNA VERCHIO, *Member*
LAMICIA BAILEY, *Member*

NEVADA BOARD OF PAROLE COMMISSIONERS

MINUTES

Meeting of the

Board of Parole Commissioners

April 27, 2022

NOTE: The following minutes have not been approved and are subject to revision at the next meeting of the Board.

The Board of Parole Commissioners held a public meeting on April 27, 2022, beginning at 1:00 PM at the following locations:

Conference room at the central office of the Board of Parole Commissioners, located at 1677 Old Hot Springs Road, Ste. A, Carson City, NV, and video conference at the Parole Board Office, 4000 S. Eastern Avenue, Ste. 130, Las Vegas, NV.

I. Open Meeting, call to order, roll call 1:00 PM.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman DeRicco. Present in Carson City were Commissioner Jackson, Commissioner Baker, and Chairman DeRicco. Present in the Las Vegas office were Commissioner Christiansen and Commissioner Bailey. Commissioner Weisenthal and Commissioner Verchio were absent, excused.

Support staff in attendance:

- Katie Fraker, Executive Secretary
- Kelly Mellinger, Hearings Examiner II
- Darla Foley, Hearing Examiner I
- Forrest Harter, Hearing Examiner I
- Mary Flores, Administrative Assistant III

Members of the public present in Carson City included:

- Katie Brady, Deputy Attorney General
- Paul Corrado

Members of the public present in Las Vegas included:

None

II. Public Comment. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken pursuant to subparagraph (2) of NRS 241.020.

Public comment – Carson City, NV

Paul Corrado – see submitted public comment documents

Public comment – Las Vegas, NV

No public comment.

III. For possible action: Review/Approval of minutes from the March 31, 2022, Board meeting.

Motion:	Approve the minutes from the March 31, 2022, Board meeting.
Made:	Commissioner Jackson
Seconded By:	Commissioner Christiansen
Votes in Favor:	DeRicco, Jackson, Baker, Christiansen, Bailey
Votes Opposed:	None
Results:	Motion passed

IV. For discussion and possible action: The Board will discuss and may take action to update and or modify the “Operation of the Board” document that outlines the procedural functioning of the Board. This document may be updated and modified in the future as needed.

Chairman DeRicco stated this agenda item is being removed from the agenda as this project was completed at the meeting last month. He stated this agenda item was placed on the agenda as a placeholder should something have been missed. He stated after review, nothing had been missed, and no new sections need to be reviewed.

V. For discussion and possible action: The Board will discuss and may take action to update and or modify the Aggravating and Mitigating Factors Definitions.

Chairman DeRicco stated that at the last meeting the Board adopted regulation R115-21P that has now been sent to the Legislative Counsel Bureau to finalize. He stated that the proposed regulation revised and reorganized the language of the aggravating and mitigating factors that the Board may consider; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. He stated that now is the time that has been set aside to review and discuss the aggravating and mitigating definitions to determine if they need to be revised, or if they are good as they are worded now. He stated this will give greater clarity to not only the Board, but also the inmates, the public, or anyone else that wants to know why a certain aggravating or mitigating factor is applied. He stated this project was initiated by the Hearings Examiners and referred to the suggested changes as noted in the handout “Nevada Parole Guidelines Aggravating and Mitigating Factors Definitions Rev – 2022.” He stated that he will be reading through the document in its entirety, section by section, and entertaining discussion on this document. He encouraged the members of the Board and Hearings Examiners to include their input toward anything they felt might be missing or that would provide greater clarity, and to ask questions. He then began to read through the document.

Chairman DeRicco stated that he would be updating the word ‘prisoner’ to ‘inmate’ throughout the document.

Under the section ‘Disruptive institutional behavior,’ Commissioner Christiansen questioned whether ‘Propelling’ was limited to bodily fluid, or if it could include all forms of propelling. Chairman DeRicco asked Commissioner Bailey, due to her corrections experience, if the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) had different disciplinary distinctions for different types of propelling. Commissioner Bailey

responded that it could be propelling any type of fluid. Commissioner Bailey stated that the section read, “examples include, but are not limited to,” so the list is not all inclusive. Commissioner Baker suggested changing ‘Propelling of Bodily Fluid’ to ‘Propelling.’ Commissioner Christiansen agreed with Commissioner Baker. The Board agreed.

Under the section ‘Nature of criminal record is increasingly more serious,’ Commissioner Baker gave the following example for clarification; if an inmate had four prior convictions for domestic battery and then the felony for domestic battery, which is mandatory, that would not be increasingly more serious because it required those priors to get the felony. Chairman DeRicco stated that was correct. Hearings Examiner Darla Foley wanted to clarify that the Board was not using a punishment as increasingly more serious. She then gave the example of a person committing a few violent offenses and then they committed a violent offense that ended up being a felony, that may be because of his history he was given the felony even though the offenses were the same. She wanted to clarify that the Board was not treating it as increasingly more serious even though the punishment was more serious. Chairman DeRicco stated that if a person had a misdemeanor domestic battery, misdemeanor battery, and then a new felony violent crime, that would be increasingly more serious. Ms. Foley stated that she was under the assumption that because there was a harsher punishment that it did not mean it was a more serious crime. Chairman DeRicco responded that statutorily that is why we have crimes listed as misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor, and felony. Chairman DeRicco stated that if statutorily the law makes the 3rd time a felony, then no, that crime would not be increasingly more serious, such as in the case of DUI or Domestic Violence/Battery. He stated they could have other violent crimes in their criminal history that may make it increasingly more serious and that is a call the hearings examiners or the Board will have to make. Ms. Foley stated that in her original example, it must have been more serious in order for the crime to be a felony. Chairman DeRicco stated that was correct.

In the same section, Hearings Examiner Kelly Mellinger stated that in the past, this aggravating factor has been used if a person has zero criminal history and now has a violent felony, such as a robbery. Chairman DeRicco stated that in his opinion this factor does not apply if the person has no criminal record prior to their instant offense. Commissioner Christiansen asked what if a person had a ticket for jaywalking and now has committed a robbery. He stated in that case it is subjective because it is increasingly more serious. He asked at what degree should the Board apply this factor. Commissioner Baker stated that the section read, ‘criminal conduct of the person has escalated over time to include violence towards victims or others, or the scale of criminal activity has increased over time.’ She stated she would not see jaywalking to robbery has criminal activity increasing over time. Chairman DeRicco agreed and stated that he would not apply that factor either in the example that Commissioner Christiansen gave. He stated he would not apply it in cases of a traffic offense or shoplifting, but rather in cases that showed violence towards victims increasing or the scale of criminal activity increasing over time. Commissioner Christiansen stated that he looks for a pattern or a crescendo or criminal activity. Chairman DeRicco stated if there is no criminal history then there is no pattern or escalation, so this factor should not be used.

In the next section, Chairman DeRicco and Commissioner Baker suggested changing the title to ‘Crime was targeted against a child, or person *of* greater vulnerability, because of age or disability.’

For the section ‘Impact on the community and each victim of the crime,’ Chairman DeRicco provided clarification by stating that this factor would not be included when only considering enhancements due to this factor being considered on the primary conviction.

Chairman DeRicco read the next section, 'The extreme or abnormal aspects of the crime for which parole is being considered' in its entirety. He suggested adding the word 'or' on the last sentence, to make it read, "...serial sexual assault or numerous victims of a sex offender; or the torture of a person or animal." The Board agreed.

In the next section, 'Removal from a correctional program for reentry or program of work release on current period of incarceration,' Chairman DeRicco changed 'Northern Nevada Transition Housing' to 'Northern Nevada Transitional Housing.'

Under the section 'Commission of a crime while incarcerated, on bail, on escape status, eluding, or while under parole or probation supervision,' Hearings Examiner Kelly Mellinger asked if gross misdemeanors needed to be included in the first sentence. Chairman DeRicco agreed that it should be included. Commissioner Baker suggested the wording of, "This factor may be indicated if the inmate has ever been convicted of a crime while incarcerated, on bail, on escape status, or while under gross misdemeanor or felony probation, or felony parole." The Board agreed.

In the next section, 'No prior or minimal history of criminal convictions or delinquency adjudications,' Commissioner Baker stated the suggested changes clarify the mitigating factor. She also suggested removing the comma after gross misdemeanor in the first sentence. The Board agreed to the grammatical change.

In the section 'Participation in programs specific to addressing the behavior that led to their incarceration,' Chairman DeRicco fixed a typographical error changing 'let' to 'led.' Chairman DeRicco stated that this mitigating factor can be added even if the individual has not completed a program that has given them a reduction of points on their risk assessment. Hearings Examiner Darla Foley asked if this mitigating factor can be included if the inmate has completed programs not provided by the NDOC, such as Hope for Prisoners or other correspondence programs that they have sent in their certificates for. Chairman DeRicco stated yes. He stated that he believes if they are working a program and trying to better themselves, even if it is not a certified program that will take a point off the risk assessment, he would include that as a mitigating factor. Commissioner Bailey and Commissioner Christiansen agreed that any betterment should be counted as a mitigating factor. The Board agreed.

In the next section, 'Positive adjustment to a correctional program for reentry or program of work release on current period of incarceration,' Chairman DeRicco changed 'Northern Nevada Transition Housing' to 'Northern Nevada Transitional Housing.'

During the section 'Stable release plans,' Chairman DeRicco provided that the hearings examiners may not always have this information when they are working up a file. He stated if this information comes in later or is provided at the hearing and the panel is satisfied with that information, they should apply this mitigating factor. Commissioner Jackson stated she is seeing this information included more with the Parole Board Reports from the NDOC. Chairman DeRicco stated he believes this is due to the passage of AB236 that the release plan is being worked on earlier by the Division of Parole and Probation. Commissioner Christiansen stated that many times stable release plans and family support bleed together and he will give the inmate the benefit of the doubt and apply both mitigating factors. Chairman DeRicco stated stable release plans is when the inmate has a verified job and residence. There was no further discussion on this section.

Chairman DeRicco reiterated during the section ‘community or family support,’ that the Board may not always have this information before the hearing, but the panel may include this mitigating factor if support shows up at the hearing. Chairman DeRicco also asked the Board if the term ‘church’ was acceptable in this section, with the understanding this includes all religious organizations. The Board agreed.

Under the section ‘Case history demonstrates remorse,’ Chairman DeRicco changed the word ‘himself’ to ‘themselves’ in the second sentence and added ‘of’ in the third sentence to read, “...and not as a result of any negotiation or other impending action.”

After going through all the sections, Chairman DeRicco proposed instead of adopting the document at this meeting, cleaning the document up with the suggested changes and revisions, and review and approve at the next meeting. The Board agreed.

VI. For possible action: The Board may act to adjourn the meeting.

Motion:	To adjourn the April 27, 2022, meeting of the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners.
Made:	Commissioner Baker
Seconded By:	Commissioner Bailey
Votes in Favor:	DeRicco, Jackson, Baker, Christiansen, Bailey
Votes Opposed:	None
Results:	Motion passed

Chairman DeRicco called the meeting back to order after it was brought to his attention that there was no second public comment put on the agenda. He stated this was an oversight on his part and it unintentionally left off the agenda. There was no public comment in Las Vegas, NV. There was no public comment in Carson City, NV. The meeting was adjourned.

22 April 2022

TO: Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners

From: Paul G. Corrado, 4100 Meadow Wood Road, Carson City, NV 89703

RE: Meeting of the Board April 27, 2022 Public Comment

Dear Members of the Board,

Whereas your "Operation of the Board" document, has had no input from the very people whose lives are directly affected by your actions, is it always necessary to have the Legislature direct your every move and action? From your Item IV on the agenda, on this agenda of April 27, 2022 and previously agendas, the answer would clearly be a resounding, "NO"!

"The Board will discuss and may take action to update, modify or approve the 'Operation of the Board' document that outlines the procedural functioning of the Board. This document may be updated and modified in the future as needed."

Again, I believe it is not necessary to go to the Legislature for statutory authority to institute the following:

1. Provide an inmate a plainly written guideline as to what to expect at his/her Parole hearing, and suggestions on how to prepare for it. See attached as an example.
2. Have inmate representatives review all changes you propose to the Operation of the Board document. How this is fairly and impartially organized would be left up to you in conjunction with inmate reps and Correctional staff representatives.
3. Keeping in mind the goals and objectives of the practice of parole, where are these articulated for inmates and their families to know and understand? Have the inmates state how their release will fulfill these clearly identified goals and objectives? Make sure the Parole Officer has a copy of this statement.

Please amend your document to facilitate not only the operation of the Board, but to include implementation of the issues elucidated above.

Very truly yours,



Paul G. Corrado

Nevada Parole: Your Next Job Interview

Preface The Nevada Parole Board is made up of a seven members. A parole board hearing is generally attended by 2 or 3 members of the board who recommend to the other board members if a person should be paroled. There is a considerable amount of research that is done by Parole Board staff prior to the hearing. Primary among the information developed is a risk assessment. There is also research associated with prior arrests, including those as a juvenile, if any.

The following is an impression of the process by a volunteer. It was review for accuracy by two of the Parole Board members, and changed to reflect their corrections.

Nevada Parole Board Meeting Notes

Background. The Nevada Parole Board meetings are open to the public. The reason for the visit was requested by the two Commissioners in attendance at the hearing. The reason given was to assist inmates with preparation for their parole hearing. These observations are considered typical, since all nine parole hearings that afternoon were similar in format and administration. These notes are not to be considered complete and representative of all issues that can be raised, they are meant to help the process and ultimately the inmate to keep from returning to prison.

Process. Two hearing Commissioners or a Commissioner and a Hearing Representative are in attendance in matters other than the most serious crimes, like murder. For those crimes, three Commissioner are in attendance. The Commissioner(s) in attendance make recommendations to the full Board, which in turn makes the final ruling on the case. The hearings are conducted via closed circuit TV, with Commissioner(s) in attendance in Parole Board Offices, located in Carson City and Las Vegas, with the inmates in attendance from their individual institutions. There are a total of 7 Commissioners including the Chair, 3 in Las Vegas, and 4 in Carson City. (Please see Attachment 1)

Meeting. Inmates are greeted, and asked to verify their signature on a document that was presented to the Board, namely, the Notice of Hearing. It states the date and time of the hearing, and lists certain rights the offender has in regards to the scheduled hearing. A risk assessment, an instrument that chronicles their arrest record and convictions, with a score is also part of the information given to the Parole Commissioners. (See Attachments 2 & #) This document includes crimes committed prior to an inmate's 18th birthday. One inmate acknowledged that he was first arrested when he was 13 years old. The Commissioners go over the issues identified on the Risk Assessment and ask questions related to it. This is a critically important document. The Commissioners will go over it with the inmate to validate its accuracy. Listen carefully and make sure it is accurate. For most hearings, the inmate is then asked if they wish to make an opening statement. (See Attachment 4)

Opportunity. This is critical. Your opening statement is an opportunity, in a succinct and summary manner, to make your case, acknowledge past mistakes, identify what you learned from them, how you have taken advantage of educational/personnel

development opportunities afforded you during your incarceration, without write-ups, if possible.

Also, refer the Hearing Officials to documents in your packet that:

- Identifies your life goals and the objectives needed to attain them,
- Presents them with a work resume, identifying your talents, skills and abilities
- Contains a step-by-step plan of what you intend to do upon leaving the institution. This later plan can be developed using the "who, what, when, where, why" approach to your intentions upon release, as well as checklists from the NDOC and/or the US Bureau of Prisons.

Caution. Make sure you have kept your write-ups to an absolute minimum, none would be the target. It is up to you to make sure all of the previously identified documents are part of the packet of information given to the Parole Board.

Questions and Issues. The Commissioners will then ask you questions associated with your record and how you intend to conduct yourself in the future. Questions could include, "Why did you commit the offense?" Responses would best be thought out, accurate, and having had time to consider them and their consequences to others, and " I am truly sorry for what I have put my victim through, and I acknowledge their long suffering and lingering effects." Gang affiliation will be brought up, together with your employment record in the year prior to your crime(s). Anger management, victim empathy, how you intend to break the cycle of incarceration, if there is one, how you intend succeed when you leave, and how you will keep away from bad company. The Commissioners may point out that if you have a number of felony convictions on your record, if there is a next felony, the judge could target you as a habitual offender, with significant and dire consequences.

You will be graded on the risk assessment with a point system, work hard at the time it is prepared to keep the score as low as possible. After the hearing, deliberation by the Board is confidential, so important information was left out of what can be reported herein.

Opportunity. Suffice to say, before the hearing ended, the inmate was given another opportunity to make a statement. This opportunity should NOT be missed. Have a statement prepared. Thank them for their time, acknowledge they have an important decision to make, and if they decide in your favor, you have not only every intention not to reoffend, but to make something of your life by finding a career that uses all of the talents, skills and abilities that you have to offer, recognizing that you may have to start in a less than ideal situation in order to work your way up, with education, the support of family and dedication to becoming a productive member of your community and society.

Rules of the Road. When you come to the Parole Board meeting, treat it as a job interview. Identify what you have to offer, and give the Board a level of comfort about your ability and dedication to making your life better, and how you intend to do it. Remember they may do over 20 hearings that day, so you need to pay close attention. Acknowledge your mistakes and characterize them as significant and a life long

learning experience. Show maturity, honesty, and make it easy for them to say YES!

Outsider Notes. Observing some of the inmates' behavior was shocking. Answers to questions from the Board were a mumbled, yea. . . If you treat others, especially the Board Members, with dignity and respect, you will get it back. Know their names, address them as Commissioner (their name). Sit up straight, look them in the eye, come with prepared statements, both opening and closing along with copies of your Goals and Objectives, resume, and a plan for your future, and ask them if they have any questions about those documents. Take a couple of seconds to organize your thoughts prior to responding to their questions. Give a careful, measured and clear response to the question asked. That means you have to listen very carefully. IF necessary, ask them to repeat the question, and answer THAT question to the very best of your ability.

In your opening and closing statements, if you are allowed to make them, remember the "sandwich". Just as an interview on the outside, when the topic of your crime comes up, tell the good that you did before you made the mistake(s), tell them the particulars of the crime in no more than 10-15 seconds, then tell them what you have been doing since then to improve. What programs you have attended, certificates earned, and what you learned since you have been incarcerated. Use the word incarcerated, it is perceived more positively than prison.

Major Issues: There are two major issues for Parole Board Members.

First and foremost, protection of the public and society as a whole is considered paramount. You have to address this and be convincing by stating why and what you intend to do when released is going to work, especially if there is a history of recidivism. Tell them why it is going to be different this time.

Second, know that how you present yourself and what you say matters. Parole will be granted if there is a reasonable likelihood that you will be successful post incarceration. They will listen carefully to your answers to their questions, sometimes tough questions.

For example, how do you intend to keep off drugs? What are you addicted to? Why did you commit the crime? Practice the answers, get your goals/objectives, resume and work- life plan for after you leave completed in the very best manner. Get help developing these. Practice, out loud, the answers to questions you can anticipate. Preparation will give you confidence. Do your best, you can do no more. Do not accept less than your best effort from yourself for yourself. Thank them for their efforts on your behalf.

Summary. Prepare, Practice, Perform.

1. Make the experience a win-win by treating it as a job interview.
2. The Sandwich- tell them the good you did before you got in trouble, what went wrong, then tell them what good you have done since being incarcerated, classes, certificates, GED, whatever is applicable, do not be humble.

3. Seal the deal – be sincere what you say you are sorry for what you did to your victim, and your family. Mean every word of it. Take responsibility for your actions. If you don't have remorse, do not expect a favorable outcome from the Hearing.
4. What will be your response to the Board's Decision? Make it a learning exercise.
5. Mock Hearings – Before you go to your hearing, have several practice hearings. Even if it costs you 2 soups each. . .
6. Make sure you take advantage of your opportunity to make an opening statement and a closing statement.
7. Have family there, if you can, to show the Board you have family and community support, and that they are willing and ready to provide a path to success for you by taking care of your housing, food, transportation and emotional needs, so you can concentrate on finding and keeping good work.
8. Make sure you understand that the minds of the Commissioners are **NOT** made up prior to the Parole Board Meeting. YOU can affect the outcome. BE Prepared!
9. The Risk Assessment is key. Make sure it is correct before you attend. For example, have employment verified, especially for the year before you were arrested.
10. Posture, how you answer, Yes or Yes Sir or Yes 'Mam, never "yea", remember their names.
11. Treat this as a job interview.
12. If you are a repeat offender, what will be different this time? Be specific. For example, I have a job waiting for me at my last employer, I'll live with my Mom at (address) or name of the half-way house, be clear and decisive and specific.
13. Tell the Board why you scored high on several of the measurers, what mitigating circumstances lead to that high score on your risk assessment.
14. If battery or assault has been an issue for you in a domestic situation, tell how this situation has and will change. For example, when was the last contact with that individual? What classes did you attend, and graduate from, like Anger Management, The Phoenix Program, etc.
15. Come prepared. Practice, practice, practice. Write down questions you may be asked associated with gang affiliation, number of domestic violence cases, parole violation. Be contrite, specific, and forward thinking with your responses.

Exercise.

Role Play. Taking turns at different positions, for the first exercise, there will be 3 Parole Board members asking questions of a parolee. Each of you are to:

1. Prepare/write 4 questions based on the information contained in this report, to use to question a prospective parolee.
2. Prepare/write answers to each of these questions.
3. Prepare/write an opening and closing statement you wish to make at your Parole Hearing.
4. Prepare a "sandwich" answer to two questions of your choosing.

References

1. Attachment 1. Photo of the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners
2. Attachment 2. Nevada Parole Guidelines Aggravating and Mitigating Factors Definitions
3. Attachment 3. Nevada Parole Risk Assessment
4. Attachment 4. A Brief Guide to Parole Board Hearings

Nevada Parole Guidelines Aggravating and Mitigating Factors Definitions

Aggravating Factors

Prior Prison term did not deter future criminal activity:

Indicate this factor if the inmate served a separate period of incarceration not related to the current period of incarceration. 'Prior prison term' does not include periods of incarceration as a result of parole violations on the current period of incarceration. A 'period of incarceration' includes sentences that are served consecutively.

Prior Sex conviction:

Indicate this factor if the prisoner has a prior sexual conviction. If the prisoner has a combination of violent and sex convictions, apply this factor and do not apply the factor related to prior violent convictions.

Prior violent conviction:

Indicate this factor if the prisoner has a prior violent conviction. If the prisoner has a combination of sex and violent convictions, apply the factor related to prior sex convictions, and do not indicate this factor.

Repetitive Similar Criminal Conduct

Indicate this factor if there are two or more prior convictions resulting from separate periods of similar criminal conduct. The prior repetitive conduct need not be similar to the instant offense. Do not count the instant offense as one of the prior convictions. Count misdemeanor and felony convictions. I.e., Multiple property convictions, multiple drug convictions.

Significant prior criminal history

Significant prior criminal history is defined as two or more prior felony convictions related to separate periods of criminal activity. For example, three prior property convictions related to the same crime spree should be counted as one event.

Commission of a crime while incarcerated, on bail, eluding, on escape status, or while under parole or probation supervision.

Indicate this factor if the prisoner has ever been convicted of a crime while incarcerated, on bail, on escape status, or while under felony parole or probation supervision. Indicate this factor if the prisoner eluded or attempted to elude capture during a prior or current offense. Count misdemeanors and felony convictions.

Disruptive institutional behavior

Indicate this factor if the prisoner has engaged in disruptive institutional behavior within 36 months of the hearing month as defined as follows:

- Aggravated Escape
- Use of Weapon in Custody
- Propelling of Bodily Fluid
- Rioting
- Assault

Refuse to participate in, or terminated for cause from treatment

Indicate this factor if there is evidence that the prisoner refused to participate in appropriate treatment, or was terminated for cause from treatment. Termination from treatment due to medical issues, housing change or determination by a counselor that the treatment was not necessary or not appropriate is not considered cause.

5. History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse

This factor is based on any historical use/abuse of drugs or alcohol including arrests and convictions.

- 2 Points: Frequent abuse, or serious disruption of functioning. I.E., Evidence of frequent abuse or disruption, and/or the person has been arrested for a crime involving drugs or alcohol (including possession, even if the person denies use), or indication that criminal behavior is based on the use of drugs or alcohol.
- 1 point: There is evidence that the person has used drugs or abused alcohol, but no evidence that the use/abuse has resulted in other criminal behavior.
- 0 points: No evidence of prior use of drugs, and limited or social use of alcohol.

Notes entries: Common entries for frequent abuse include "prior drug conviction" or "serving a sentence for drug conviction." Others include "inmate was under the influence at time of offense" or "inmate admits to committing crime to obtain drugs." For answers related to some use or no use, generally this will be stated in the PSI and the note can simply be "per PSI."

6. Gender (at birth) - Notes entries: No note is necessary, unless to indicate a transgender issue.

- 1 point: Male
- 0 points: Female

Dynamic Factors:

7. Current Age

Age at month of hearing.

- 1 point: Age 41 or older at month of hearing
- 0 points: Age 31 through 40 at month of hearing
- 1 point: Age 21 through 30 at month of hearing
- 2 points: Under age 21 at month of hearing

Notes entries: No note is necessary.

8. Active Gang Membership

Street or Prison Gang, based on NDOC validation or indication in the Pre-Sentence Investigation.

- 0 points: No gang affiliation or validation at time of hearing, or the person is participating in a program to disassociate with gang involvement. Validated as a suspect should be scored as "0" points.
- 2 points: Any validated prison or street gang association or membership. Do not count "suspect."

Notes entries: When the PSI indicates involvement with a gang, but they are not NDOC validated, indicate that information in the notes section.

The following is the list of achievements which qualify for the points reduction under programming. These achievements must be completed on the current term of incarceration. "The current term of incarceration" means that period of time since the inmate was received into the DOC after sentencing for a felony conviction. If the inmate was released on parole and convicted of a new felony, credit would be awarded only if the program achievement occurred after return to the DOC subsequent to sentencing on the new felony.

1. Receiving a GED, High School Diploma or College Degree.
2. Completion of STARS, PHOENIX and TRUST programs.
3. Completion of a formal ESL program.
4. Completing a certified vocational program. The approved vocational programs are as follows:
 - a. Automotive Technology I, II & III
 - b. Construction Technology I - 8550
 - c. Welding
 - d. Air Conditioning/Refrigeration Technician - 8130
 - e. Building Maintenance Service - 8610
 - f. Culinary Arts - 9600
 - g. Welding
 - h. Information Technology Skill Standards
 - i. Braille I, II, III
 - j. Dry Cleaning
 - k. Photovoltaic Systems

NEVADA PAROLE RISK ASSESSMENT

Name _____ ID Number _____ Location _____ Date _____

Static Risk Factors	Pts	Dynamic Risk Factors	Pts
1. Age at First Arrest (juvenile or adult)		7. Current Age	
24 years or older	0	41 and above	-1
20-23 years	1	31 - 40	0
19 years or younger	2	21 - 30	1
2. Prior Prob/Parole Revocation (juv. or adult)		Under 21	2
No parole or probation revocations	0	8. Active Gang Membership	
One or more (including gross misdemeanors)	2	No (none or suspect)	0
3. Employment History (prior to arrest)		Yes (member or associate)	2
Satisfactory full-time employment >1 year	0	9. DOC certified edu/voc/treat program	
Employed less than full-time/full-time < 1 year	1	Yes (during current term of incarceration)	-1
Unsatisfact. employment/unemployed /unemployable	2	No	0
4. Offense for Current or Prior Convictions		10. Disciplinary Conduct - Past Year	
All others	0	No Misconduct of any Kind	-1
Any Property Offense, Robbery, Forgery, etc.	2	One Misconduct of any Kind	0
5. History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse		Two Misconducts of any Kind	1
None	0	Three or More Misconducts of any Kind	2
Some use, no severe disruption of functioning	1	11. Current Custody Level	
Frequent abuse, serious disruption of functioning	2	Minimum	-1
6. Gender		Medium	0
Male	1	Maximum or Disciplinary Segregation	2
Female	0	Total Dynamic Risk Score	
Total Static Risk Score		Total Score (Static+Dynamic Score)	

_____ Low Risk = 0-5 points _____ Medium Risk = 6-11 points _____ High Risk = 12+ points or 8 points on Dynamic factors

The risk assessment is based on the static and dynamic factors that are applicable at the time of a parole hearing. A change in status following the hearing that may impact the risk factors shall not be the basis for an appeal for re-computation. A prisoner will only be granted a re-hearing if a factor is misapplied at the time of the hearing, and a correction would cause a deviation from the guideline recommendation.