

# State of Nevada

## Department of Indigent Defense Services

### Executive Board

### Meeting Minutes

Friday February 28, 2020

1:00 PM

#### Meeting Locations:

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Capitol Building	101 North Carson Street Carson City NV 89701	Old Assembly Chambers
Video Conference @ Grant Sawyer Building	555 East Washington Avenue Las Vegas NV 89101	Suite 5400

#### 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chairman called the meeting of the Department of Indigent Services Executive Board to order a little after 1:00 PM on Friday, February 28, 2020.

A roll call was conducted, and **quorum was established.**

**Board Members Present:** Mayor Robert Crowell, Chris Giunchigliani, Professor Anne Traum, Laura Fitzsimmons, Rob Telles, Julie Cavanaugh-Bill, Joni Eastley, Jeff Wells, Drew Christensen, Justice William Maupin.

**Board Members Not Present:** Dave Mendiola, Kate Thomas and Lorinda Wicham.

**Others Present:** Director Marcie Ryba, Deputy Director Patrick McGinnis, Deputy Attorney General Sophia Long, Jarrod Hickman, Cindy Atanazio, Franny Forsman, Lexy McCurley, John Lambrose.

#### 2. Public Comment #1

There were no public comments from either North or South.

#### 3. Approval of January 29, 2020 Minutes (For Possible Action)

There were two corrections. On page 8, Lorina Dellinger's last name should be with an "e" – "Dellinger." And on page 1, the spelling of Rob Telles' name needs to be corrected.

**Motion: Approve January 29, 2020 Minutes with corrections noted**

**By:** Joni Eastley

**Second:** Julie Cavanaugh-Bill

**Vote:** Passed unanimously

#### **4. Report from the Executive Director of the Department of Indigent Defense Services (For Possible Action)**

- a. Update on Staffing
- b. Introduction of Patrick McGuinness, Deputy Director

Director Marcie Ryba provided the report for Agenda Item 4.

Director Ryba introduced the Department's new Administrative Assistant, Lexy McCurley, who was attending the meeting in Carson City. Director Ryba said their new Management Analyst, Jason Kolenut, was hired to help them with their budget build. He will start March 2<sup>nd</sup>. And there is still one open position for a management analyst for the data collection position.

Director Ryba then introduced their new Deputy Director, Patrick McGinnis. He's in charge of traveling to the rurals and he hit the ground running.

Mr. McGinnis said in the three weeks he's been on the job; he's covered almost 900 miles. He's been to Mineral County, Pershing County, and to Humboldt County. The Humboldt County and Pershing County meetings were very productive. Mr. McGinnis met with the judges, justices of the peace, public defenders, and with the prosecutors. They are receptive to the idea of the Department and the Board. They recognize that it's an important step in the future events in Nevada. There were some valid concerns, as reflected in the email Judge Shirley sent to Members.

Mr. McGinnis said they have scheduled a meeting with Judge Shirley on the 13<sup>th</sup> of March at 10:00 a.m. Mayor Crowell is going to be attending that meeting along with Jarrod Hickman and Director Ryba, and the Board Members are cordially invited to join them. Mr. McGinnis said they have a number of other meetings scheduled: next week it's Churchill County, the week after that it's Lyon County. March 17<sup>th</sup> it's Ely, and April 8<sup>th</sup>, it's Elko County.

Mayor Crowell said the Board was very appreciative that Mr. McGinnis jumped right in and got to work. Many thanks were due to him for his work in the rurals.

#### **5. Presentation of Proposed Regulations and Minimum Standards of Indigent Defense Services (For Possible Action)**

Mayor Crowell prefaced this Agenda Item by saying if they are going to get standards and regulations done, they have to participate in a workshop. That's the formal way to kick these things off. The Mayor said he hoped they could agree on whether or not they could open up a workshop to put out some of these regulations that they've got drafted. They're not necessarily in regulation form right now, but they'd like to put them out because that will get it started. With that, he introduced Jarrod Hickman to detail Agenda Item 5.

Mr. Hickman said they have provided the proposed minimum standards and regulations to all Board members. As Mr. McGinnis identified, they are making substantial efforts to solicit feedback from all interested parties in the rurals. Given the timeframe with respect to the rulemaking process, Mr. Hickman's request to the Board is approval to begin that rulemaking process by setting a workshop at the next meeting on March 26<sup>th</sup> to craft the actual language for the regulations. The workshop would be part of the normal Board meeting. They are

anticipating that at the conclusion of our meeting that same day that the Board would be in a position to vote upon any changes and then move this to the next stage in the proceedings.

## **5. Presentation of Proposed Regulations and Minimum Standards of Indigent Defense Services (For Possible Action) (continued)**

Mr. Hickman said they have to have the proposed regulations to the Legislative Council Bureau by June, and August is the deadline. Anything after that, they get into next year's legislative session.

Ms. Cavanaugh said her understanding with the workshop was that they were going to also get some input from stakeholders in the rurals. They got comments from Judge Shirley, and they also got comments from Humboldt County, White Pine, Elko, and Eureka. There's a lot of discussion happening over the standards, and it's going to impact those areas. Would it be possible to do some kind of workshop out in the rural areas?

Mr. Hickman replied this initial workshop is not the end of the process. This is the first of two workshops. In terms of the rural counties, they are making significant effort to get out and understand the jurisdictions' concerns. They will encourage them to place comments or any significant concerns in writing so that those can be provided to the Board. That way there is a record of it.

Mayor Crowell asked about video links and/or access to internet streaming and the group discussed possible options to make that happen.

Professor Traum asked Mr. Hickman if he was taking this draft with him when he meets with the rurals to kind of explain the process to them? And what was general timetable for the three meetings so that the rurals could provide their input?

Mr. Hickman replied a copy of the draft is posted on the website under the Standards and Regulations tab. When they send out their emails either requesting or confirming a meeting with the stakeholders in the jurisdictions, they are including a copy of the Proposed Standards and Regulations as well. And when they get out there, they will be reviewing and explaining the regulations with the stakeholders and will be explaining the rulemaking process as well to make sure that those three opportunities for comment are well defined and explained.

Ms. Cavanaugh asked are they going to have that rulemaking process in the general timetable set forth in writing ahead of time? Mr. Hickman said if that is something that is useful, they can certainly work with Ms. Long and get that timeframe written out and published so everyone has a copy of it.

Ms. Giunchigliani said that makes good sense around the timelines. And they probably should have a cutoff period for comments so those comments can be organized before the meetings. If something comes in after the deadline, they can include those, but at least they will have something compiled to reflect what's come up to a certain date.

Ms. Eastley asked if they could send this document to the public defenders also? They would be interested in hearing what they have to say about this. Mr. Hickman said absolutely, yes.

## 5. Presentation of Proposed Regulations and Minimum Standards of Indigent Defense Services (For Possible Action) (continued)

Ms. Cavanaugh said she doesn't want them to forget anyone, so could the Department share their contact lists? Director Ryba said they are planning on sending a letter from their department to all the District Court Judges, and they want to make sure that they send it to everyone that would have an interest in this. So, that's ultimately their goal.

Mayor Crowell asked if Members were ready to send this to a workshop? And if so, he would accept a motion.

**Motion: Send proposed regulations and minimum standards of Indigent Defense Services to a workshop**

**By: Chris Giunchigliani**

**Second: Laura Fitzsimmons**

**Vote: Passed unanimously**

## 6. Complaints and Recommendations Update (For Possible Action)

- a. Discuss how Board Members should deal with complaints made directly to them from individuals
- b. Discuss how to bring awareness of [dids.nv.gov](https://dids.nv.gov) complaint/recommendation process
- c. Update on any complaints
- d. Update on any recommendations

Director Ryba stated that several Members asked her to put this item on the meeting agenda. They don't know how they should respond when they receive a complaint from a member of the public.

Director Ryba said for the record, their department has a website, [dids.nv.gov](https://dids.nv.gov). If you go to that website, there is a "Contact Us" tab where you can scroll down to complaints or recommendations. From there, you can reach a form where you could send in a complaint or recommendation to the department. If Members receive letters, they can forward them to the department to handle.

Director Ryba asked if Members had any possible guidance as to how to get the public to be aware of the complaint and recommendation process? Ms. Eastley said if the Department was going to be sending out a letter asking for input on the minimum standards, why doesn't staff let recipients know about the complaint procedure and the website? It wouldn't be bad to maybe include that in the letter or have a separate letter.

Ms. Fitzsimmons said what about courthouse bulletin boards? The Department could create a colorful flyer to post.

Professor Anne Traum suggested posting in the state bar magazine, the *Nevada Lawyer*.

Ms. Giunchigliani suggested counties post the information on their county websites.

## 6. Complaints and Recommendations Update (For Possible Action) (continued)

Director Ryba said Mr. McGinnis put together a survey that he sent out to all the attorneys that provide indigent defense services asking questions about if the Department were to put together a training, where would they want it, etc. That survey is on the Department website. There's a specific link called Survey and they are asking for everyone that practices in indigent defense to fill that out so staff can collect that information as well.

Mayor Crowell asked in regard to workshop items, was there a place where people could upload their comments and potential revisions?

Director Ryba said people could contact staff. They are setting up a general email address for that purpose. They are also able to contact staff through the complaints and recommendation process or send them letters.

## 7. Update on IFC Request. Approved for BOE (4/14/20) and IFC (4/16/20) (For Possible Action)

- a. Request of funds for software, contracted research director, training, and Delphi Study
- b. Discuss software proposals

Director Ryba stated that as the Board gave them authority to go to the IFC to request funds, they did get approved for the Board of Examiners Agenda on April 14<sup>th</sup> and the Interim Finance Committee agenda on April 16<sup>th</sup>. They are requesting \$250,000 to perform a Delphi Study, \$100,000 to contract with the research director, \$20,000 to provide for training for indigent defense service providers and \$118,000 to contract with a legal server to have a uniform case management or caseload tracking system throughout the rural counties.

There are multiple case tracking programs to consider. Right now, the Department and some other counties are using JustWare. JustWare will no longer be supportive as of June of 2021. The agency that provides JustWare gave the Department a quote of \$300,000 to \$400,000 for new implementations. So, staff also reached out to Legal Server and Defender Data for their quotes. They felt that Legal Server was likely the best fit for what the Department was looking for and the reports that it could provide, and so they are going to be asking for in \$118,000 for implementation of a software system throughout the rurals.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked who was using JustWare? Director Ryba responded that Elko, Clark County and Washoe County were using it.

Director Ryba said the other software systems they've become aware of are AMICUS, that's what the State Public Defender uses. And then each attorney also has their own software system that they use as well. Many attorneys they contacted love the idea of having a case management system because they couldn't otherwise afford to have something like that.

Ms. Giunchigliani said if the urbans have invested in something that's going to be going away no matter what, there should be some contact or discussion about helping to offset the cost for them to have to transition over. If they've invested that money, there should be something to ask IFC to change out that for those three counties.

## 7. Update on IFC Request. Approved for BOE (4/14/20) and IFC (4/16/20) (For Possible Action) (continued)

Mr. Wells said when the JustWare folks contacted the Department, they were trying to get them to move to a system called EDefender. Has that been checked out yet?

Director Ryba said yes, she contacted them. They informed her that implementation for a one-time cost would be \$300,000 to \$400,000. Conversion, depending on the data coming in would be \$30,000 to \$60,000. Interfaces would be \$15,000 to \$60,000. There would be annual reoccurring costs of licensing, support, maintenance and warranty of \$75,000 to \$100,000 depending on the number of users. And there's hosting of \$50,000 to \$75,000. So, it was more than Legal Server.

Mr. Christensen said Clark County had a meeting with IT. Their hands are tied a little bit. A lot of people have been with JustWare for decades, and so the amount of data that's already in the system is going to be hard to recreate if they went outside. Journal Technologies that now owns JustWare is moving to what they call eDefender. They also have an eProsecutor. That's probably where the DA's office is going because the goal with all this with JustWare was that someday at least in Clark County their JustWare links between the DA and the Defense Bar would allow for the integration back and forth of electronic discovery and filing and all the writing things that we'd like to someday get to. That path is still ongoing with JustWare and if they go with eDefender and the DAGs go with eProsecutor, they've committed to continue the support JustWare until the integration is up and running with eDefender, eProsecutor. The decision is not final, but most think that's probably where they have to go in Clark County because of the amount of data and familiarity they've had with JustWare over the decades. Clark County IT is in the process of providing more information about the costs and chargeback to all of their departments.

Ms. Forsman said she has done this on a national basis and worked with folks implementing timekeeping programs on a national basis. One of the most important considerations is that the timekeeping function and case tracking function numbers can be compared even if departments have to have different software. They have never been able to compare numbers between rurals and urbans because they recorded their time increments in different ways. Ms. Forsman said they are going to want to have time from everybody because the whole issue of caseload and case management and all of that can't be done without timekeeping. And so, they have to have everybody in the state keeping time in a similar way.

Mr. Christensen said he didn't know what the costs ultimately would be for all the various licensing. When the Office of Appointed Counsel in Clark County decided to go with JustWare ten years ago, there was a consideration to have each one of their private counsel have licensing. Currently they have 162 private lawyers, and the cost would be astronomical if we had to support all those various licenses. What they decided was they got licenses in-house and the data was submitted to them from the private attorneys. That's just one consideration to maybe save money, and then you can control the type of information you want to receive.

## 7. Update on IFC Request. Approved for BOE (4/14/20) and IFC (4/16/20) (For Possible Action) (continued)

Director Ryba said they are planning on providing this to the contract attorneys. That's actually a possibility with this Legal Server. Her understanding is that Washington State is moving their public defender's office to Legal Server. Colorado is also moving their offices to Legal Server as well, and they're actually building a software system for Colorado. They are able to receive information from the DA's office. Each file is created with an email address, you send it to the DA, and you say please upload any discovery to this email address if it goes to the file. It also has some various advanced texting capabilities where attorneys can contact their clients through texting. So, it provides a lot more access and it appears that in reading some emails from other agencies after an extensive search they felt Legal Server was the best fit for them and also the price fits into something that staff is hoping they can get with IFC. It's doubtful that they could get approval for the \$300,000 to \$400,000 amount.

Ms. Giunchigliani said if they want this to work, they want as much capability as possible. They need to make sure that whoever transitions that they do look at either a component or an add-on for a time management system. And they should check about getting assistance for the two urban areas to at least offset some of those costs for transitioning.

Director Ryba said Legal Server is timekeeping software in addition to a case management. They can set it up where the attorney's time will automatically upload to the office after whatever period they feel is appropriate. Staff would be able to get that information almost immediately.

Ms. Eastley said \$488,000 worth of total asks is a lot of money. On the list that Director Ryba gave them, what was the number one priority? Was it the Delphi Study?

Director Ryba said that they need to have the Delphi Study to create a caseload. They need to have the uniform time tracking software so that they know in a consistent uniform manner how much time every attorney is spending on cases so that staff can try and get them additional people if they need to have the additional people. They need to have the \$20,000 for the training because they want to be able to assist the attorneys with their travel, provide them with the training, and get them up to speed. The amount of money for their data analyst is a necessity as well, so that person can pinpoint staff to where the true problems are and where they really need to focus. So bottom line is that all the listed priorities are extremely important. They wouldn't be going to IFC and BOE if they didn't feel that these things were important.

Justice Maupin said it is a valid concern over the amount of time that it takes to document what you've been doing in terms of providing legal service to your clients. There are a lot of ways to do this from a tech standpoint, but the reality is you're not going to be able to develop any kind of weighted caseload for your caseload standards without a standardized timekeeping component.

**Motion: Authorize Director Ryba and her staff to move forward with the request for IFC contingency funds as set forth in the memorandum dated February 13, 2020**

**By: Joni Eastley**

**Second: Laura Fitzsimmons**

**Vote: Passed unanimously**



## 8. Discussion on Donation (For Possible Action)

Director Ryba said there is an individual who wants to make a \$5,000 donation to the Department. They are requesting permission to recommend legislation to create a special account so that the Department can receive donations, gifts, grants, and bequests. Right now, in the statutes they don't have a gift account. And without a gift account, are they able to accept the donation? And if they can, will it go back to the general fund if they don't spend it by the end of the fiscal year?

The Director said she was requesting permission from the Board to submit the bill draft request to get that special account set up for their Department. They don't know how many BDRs they are going to have, so at this point they are trying to prioritize what needs to be done. This is a definite go forward.

Mayor Crowell asked if the Director had been told that there's only a certain amount of bill draft requests that they can request? Was she told that from part of the administration?

Director Ryba said they still have to find out who they can submit their bills with. She will have that information at the next meeting.

Professor Anne Traum asked if there was any background on why this donation was made? The Director said she would send the Professor the paperwork. It was basically a negotiation where charges would be dismissed if this donation was made.

Ms. Fitzsimmons said she thought all Members needed to see that paperwork. If this is a negotiating thing for dismissal of criminal charges and they're paying the Department, they might need to think that through.

Ms. Giunchigliani said they needed to decide if they should ask for a BDR for the Department to be able to accept gifts, and that's pretty standard through most of the agencies. They missed doing that legislatively to give them that authority, so it's almost a housekeeping piece. In her view, they probably should have a policy about gifts/donations.

Ms. Sophia Long reminded Members that the Dental Board got in trouble for taking contributions given to offset discipline measures.

Mayor Crowell said it's something they "have to kind of keep an eye on" but from an administrative standpoint, it doesn't hurt to put into law that they have the right to accept donations, because there may be donations from others that are not related to ongoing litigation.

Director Ryba said it would also cover grants as well. Mayor Crowell said that would be a good discussion too. They ought to all be looking for grants. Not a bad idea.

Ms. Eastley asked how the Director was going to respond to the Chief Deputy Special Public Defender?



## 8. Discussion on Donation (For Possible Action) (continued)

Director Ryba said she provided everyone on the Board with a letter from the Office of the Special Public Defender, James Vitali. It says that they have a case in which there was an agreement entered between the State of Nevada and their clients, requiring a payment of \$5,000 to the Indigent Defense Fund. The Board was not involved at all in any of this negotiation, and they were only told after the fact of when it was signed. It appears from the agreement that this individual will submit a \$5,000 payment to the Indigent Defense Fund, \$2,000 to victims of crime and some other conditions in an exchange for a Category A Felony being dismissed.

There was a discussion about the number of BDR's the Department would be allowed, and if they were limited to just a few BDR's, would this be a big issue? The Mayor asked could they put a BDR in and then withdraw it?

Ms. Giunchigliani said maybe the discussion is do they approve and accept this or is there a way to allow this piece to move forward, maybe not even act until the Director is able to find out the BDR allocation. This could be a cleanup piece of legislation that a legislator could tack on. They may not want to waste important bills on something that's standard within NRS and could be easily fixed by someone just doing cleanup language in one of the committees.

Director Ryba said she is compiling a list of legislative changes that they would like to make, and they will put them in the appropriate locations. She did not intend to submit just this as their bill draft request. She has to get permission from the Board before they do any sort of legislative changes. So, once they're approved, she's putting them on a list and then they will submit them hopefully all together. Her understanding is that there are two different types of deadlines. One is a policy deadline for bill draft requests and the others have to do with financial.

Mayor Crowell said that they should make a motion to review all the bill drafts, including this subject. And if they're running out of bill drafts, they can hopefully find a legislator who will carry it for them.

Ms. Giunchigliani said she would suggest making a list of policy changes that they just missed last session that are needed for the Department to function. Those can all be put in one bill. And there's no problem in that. That's probably the best approach to list those to come forward as one BDR.

Mr. Christensen said he would reach out to Mr. Vitali. He said on behalf of the client who Mr. Vitali represented, they should get some resolution and not have this check hang out there so that this individual can get his case dismissed. He offered to look into it to get more information about the circumstances behind it.

Mr. Wells said at worst, he thought they should table it until Mr. Christensen can check with Mr. Vitali.

Ms. Fitzsimmons said they don't want the defendant left hanging out there. Maybe they could inform Mr. Vitali that they are not statutorily authorized to accept donations. Amend the deal and give it to somebody else. It's an issue moving forward that they can deal with. But they don't need to table this or anything else. The donation can go to another worthy organization.

## 8. Discussion on Donation (For Possible Action) (continued)

Professor Anne Traum said the reality is that they resolve convictions every single day with money, and people who don't have money don't have the same opportunity to resolve convictions the same way. And that's not an indigent defense problem. So, part of their responsibility is to just contribute transparency. For this particular check, they can't accept it because they can't deposit it. That's the answer to this problem. And then in the future, they should probably have a policy but also to be transparent about what it is.

Mr. Christensen said he would talk to the attorney in question and let them know he agrees that they can both have the case resolved by just transferring the \$5,000 to another entity. The county actually has an indigent defense fund within Clark County, so if they had the check cut to Clark County, there should be no concerns or problems.

Mayor Crowell said the way he understood it was they are going to advise defense counsel, thank you for thinking of the Indigent Defense Board. We're not in a position to accept a donation yet. See if you can find another organization that fits your needs. And at the same time, they can put a BDR in for contributions with the rest of them that they might be able to pull back if they have to. They should be able to add to the law the ability to accept a donation without getting involved in somebody else's individual case.

**Motion: Authorize Director Ryba to proceed with the request to the legislature for DIDS to accept money from donations, gifts, grants, or bequests**

**By: Laura Fitzsimmons**

**Second: Professor Anne Traum**

**Vote: Passed unanimously**

Ms. Eastley had a question for the Deputy Attorney General. This item was agendized only as a discussion on the donation, although it is marked for possible action. Since its limited to the donation itself, is it appropriate to include language in the motion that introduces a completely separate topic which is to move forward with the bill draft request? Or is that a violation of the OML?

Ms. Sophia Long replied that she thought it was fine because it's on the same topic regarding the donation as well. The language included donations. They met the minimum requirements of the Open Meeting Law concerning a complete description of the requested action.

Justice Maupin said he checked the IRS website and it says here donations to Federal, state and local governments are deductible if it's solely for public purposes. It seems that it would probably be wise to adapt whatever language in this bill draft request or in this proposed statute on deductions that it marry up with the Internal Revenue Code.

Ms. Giunchigliani said she thought that all the bill draft will seek to do is just simply have a line item to allow for grant acceptance and grant donations. The policy that would then delineate for staff what they wanted could reflect the IRS language. It would be more appropriate there.

## **9. Proposal for Future Agenda Items (For Possible Action)**

Director Ryba said their game plan at this point is to hopefully have the bill draft request at the next Board meeting as well as set the workshop for their regulations so that they can get those finalized. Members did not discuss specific language for agenda items.

## **10. Discussion and Announcement of Dates for Future Meetings (For Possible Action)**

- a. Proposal to set next meeting date of March 26, 2020 at 1:00 PM
- b. Request to bypass April Meeting: DIDS Staff will be appearing at BOE (4/14/20) and IFC (4/16/20). DIDS Staff will be attending an Executive Leadership Institute training through the National Association of Public Defenders (NAPD) on April 26-29 in Frankfurt, KY
- c. Proposal to set following meeting May 28, 2020 at 1:00 PM
- d. Proposal to schedule June meeting in Tonopah NV on June 18, 2020 at noon.

Professor Traum said she tentatively wanted to have her students who have been volunteering this year on the law school's proposals related to the Board come to a meeting. It would be March or May. She will look into that and get back.

Members discussed the workshop scheduled on March 26<sup>th</sup>. Some thought a 1:00 start date wouldn't give them enough time. The Director said it was scheduled for 1:00 because that's when the room was available. Members discussed how much time was needed, factoring in travel times. Members with long travel times said they could stay overnight if necessary.

Ms. Eastley asked why couldn't they meet over at the legislature? The Director said because they had to pay for that. Laura Fitzsimmons asked what about the Nevada Supreme Court facilities? Justice Maupin said they needed to call the AOC and they would reserve the room for DIDS. They use that room for a lot of stuff, and they have reliable internet access.

Director Ryba said she would investigate the various facility options, and what's available at what times. She said she would get back to everyone with that information.

Mayor Crowell said they will start at 1:00 on the 26<sup>th</sup> unless there's an objection to that. They will deal with the workshop at the same time. They will try to "move things along" so they can devote an entire four hours, if not more, to the workshop.

Mayor Crowell said their next meeting after that would be May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2020, at 1:00 PM, hopefully at the Supreme Court's facility.

The meeting after that will be in Tonopah on June 18<sup>th</sup> at noon.

## 11. Public Comment #2

Mr. John Lambrose said he wanted to personally give his thanks to the folks who have given their time to such a worthy cause. Mr. Lambrose said he spent 13 years working on indigent defense, and there are three people who really deserve thanks. **Chief Justice Bill Maupin:** had the foresight and the courage, along with his colleagues in the Nevada Supreme Court, to enter an order in March of 2007 that got this ball rolling. **Franny Forsman:** dedicated and tenacious and still involved in the Indigent Defense Commission. **Chairman/Mayor Crowell:** thanks for undertaking the task of chairing this very important Commission. Mr. Lambrose said the Department staff is outstanding. With their help, this thing can move forward in a way that really will bring life to what they all had hoped it would do starting with the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

Ms. Forsman said that she has worked for well over 40 years with indigent defenders and with indigent programs, and she is “completely impressed” with their staff. They have gotten more stuff accomplished in a short period of time than she would have ever expected. Many kudos to them.

## 12. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

Chairman Crowell thanked everyone and said he would accept a motion to adjourn.

**Motion: Adjourn February 28, 2020 DIDS Meeting**

**By: Laura Fitzsimmons**

**Second: Joni Eastley**

**Vote: Passed unanimously**