MINUTES

NORTH CAROLINA SENTENCING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

June 5, 2026

The North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission met on Friday, June 5, 2026, at the North Carolina Judicial Center in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Members Present: Chairman Charlie Brown, Dr. Heidi Bonner, Jonnell Carpenter, Lindsey Granados, Tammera Hill, Judge Greg Horne, Joe Houchin, Honorable Jim Mixson, Luther Moore, Haley Phillips, Caitlin Poe, Calvin Suber, Nicole Sullivan, Honorable Michael Waters, Elizabeth Watson, Patrick Weede, and Chief A.Z. Williams.

Guests: Kim Quintus (for William Lassiter), Kristin McCrary (for Sherri Lawrence), Marie Evitt (NCSA), Cortney Goodman (NCSA), Amber Barwick (NCCDA), Will Crozier (CJJDP), and Emily Mehta (AOC, RPP).

Staff: Michelle Hall, John Madler, Ginny Hevener, Tamara Flinchum, John King, Julio Cazares, Mel Lugo, Madison Sholar, and Shelley Kirk.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Brown called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and asked members and guests to introduce themselves. He presented the minutes from the March 13, 2026, meeting and called for a motion. Luther Moore moved to adopt the minutes as written. Lindsey Granados seconded the motion, and it carried. Chairman Brown reminded Commissioners of the remaining 2026 meeting dates of September 11 and December 11 and then reviewed the agenda.

SESSION UPDATE AND LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

Chairman Brown began by explaining that the Legislative Review Subcommittee met on May 15 and reviewed bills that had been introduced or amended since the Session began. He presented the Legislative Review Report #1 which contained the findings from that meeting and called for a motion. Mr. Moore moved to adopt the findings in Legislative Review Report #1. Ms. Granados seconded the motion, and it carried.

Chairman Brown recognized John Madler, staff, to provide an update on the 2026 Session (*see* Presentation). Mr. Madler stated that the General Assembly was in the second year of its biennium, when the members consider new issues, take up bills that crossed over but did not finish last year, and make adjustments to the second year of the budget. The Session began on April 21, and the Crossover deadline was May 5. Mr. Madler listed the number of felony and misdemeanor bills introduced this Session and several bills of interest. He stated that the Governor had presented an updated budget, and that the

Legislature has announced they will introduce their budget the week of June 15. Chairman Brown pointed out that the bills containing the criminal law changes were different, they were collections of unrelated provisions as opposed to single-subject bills.

Mr. Madler next reviewed the duty the General Assembly assigned to the Sentencing Commission to review proposed legislation that either created a new offense, reclassified an existing offense, or changed a punishment (*see* Handout). He then reviewed the Offense Classification Criteria that the Commission used to perform this duty and the policies established for guidance.

Dr. Heidi Bonner asked if intent has ever been considered since it is not in the Offense Classification Criteria. Mr. Madler replied that the Commission focuses on the harm that results, or tends to result, from an offense. The Commission has informed the legislature when the specific intent required to commit an offense is absent. Chairman Brown added that intent is considered to the degree that it indicates the harm from the offense.

Mr. Madler presented a packet of provisions that were identical to provisions that the Commission had reviewed in other bills (*see* Handout). Ms. Granados moved to adopt the previous findings and Mr. Moore seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Madison Sholar, staff, next presented the bills introduced in the House of Representatives that would affect felony offenses and punishments (*see* Handout). The members reviewed each provision and made the following recommendations:

HB 308 – 2026 Criminal Law Changes [Ed. 5]
(G.S. 14-72.13(a)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class I felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Patrick Weede seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-159.4(c)(5)) Mr. Weede moved to find the proposed reclassification to a Class C felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that it would be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class F felony. Joe Houchin seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-159.5(a)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class H felony for a second or subsequent offense inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria because the Structured Sentencing punishment chart takes the defendant's prior record into account through the Prior Record Level. Mr. Weede seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202.1(a)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class C felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria because there is no element requiring that the proposed offense result in serious long-term harm to the victim. The members discussed the potential harm from this conduct. The motion died for a lack of a second. Mr. Weede moved to find the proposed Class C felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Tammera Hill seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202.1(b)) Judge Greg Horne moved to find the proposed Class D felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that it would be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class F felony. Ms. Hill seconded the motion. Mr. Weede asked if Judge Horne would amend the note to his motion to recommend a Class E felony instead of a Class F felony. Judge Horne accepted his amendment. Ms. Hill seconded the motion as amended, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202.1(c)) Mr. Weede moved to find the proposed Class E felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that it would also be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class F felony. Judge Horne seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-202.1(d)) Mr. Moore moved to find the proposed Class F felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Mr. Weede seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202.1(e)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class B1 felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria with a note that the Structured Sentencing punishment chart takes the defendant's prior record into account through the Prior Record Level. Judge Horne seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Julio Cazares, staff, presented the bills introduced in the Senate that would affect felony offenses and punishments (*see* Handout). The members reviewed each provision and made the following recommendations:

SB 310 – Criminal Law Changes [Ed. 3]
(G.S. 14-72.13(a)) Mr. Moore moved to find the proposed Class I felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria. Mr. Weede seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202(i)(1)) Mr. Moore moved to find the proposed sentence enhancement inconsistent with G.S. 164.41. Haley Phillips seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202(i)(2)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed sentence enhancement inconsistent with G.S. 164.41 with a note that there is currently an aggravating factor that applies to offenses committed where the defendant took advantage of a position of trust or confidence, including a domestic relationship, to commit the offense (G.S. 15A-1340.16(d)(15)). Mr. Weede seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202(i)(3)+(i)(1)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed sentence enhancement inconsistent with G.S. 164.41. Judge Horne seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-202(i)(3)+(i)(2)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed sentence enhancement inconsistent with G.S. 164.41 with a note that there is currently an aggravating factor that applies to offenses committed where the defendant took advantage of a position of trust or confidence, including a domestic relationship, to commit the offense (G.S. 15A-1340.16(d)(15)). Judge Horne seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
(G.S. 14-288.4(a)(7) and (c)(2)) Ms. Granados moved to find the proposed Class H felony for a second or subsequent offense inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria because the Structured Sentencing punishment chart takes the defendant's prior record into account through the Prior Record Level. Mr. Weede seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

FY 2025 FELONY CONVICTIONS

Chairman Brown recognized John King, staff, to present the highlights from the FY 2025 Felony Conviction data (*see* Presentation). Mr. King pointed out that the *FY 2025 Structured Sentencing Statistical Report* would be sent once it was printed.

Mr. King stated the purpose of the Statistical Report is to monitor convictions and sentences under Structured Sentencing. In addition, the report can inform potential recommendations for modifications to Structured Sentencing. The unit of analysis in the report is based on offenders' most serious conviction on a given day in court. Mr. King pointed out the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has finished its transition from its long-time data management system, the Automated Criminal Infraction System (ACIS), to Odyssey. The FY 2025 data include convictions from 87 counties using Odyssey; the FY 2026 data will have Odyssey data from all 100 counties.

During FY 2025, there were 26,798 felony convictions, a 1% decrease over FY 2024. Mr. King noted that felony convictions have been relatively stable over the past 3 years and remained below pre-pandemic levels (28,526 in FY 2019). Caitlin Poe asked how the felony conviction numbers compared to the state's population over the past 10 years. Mr. King mentioned that at the staff's annual forecasting meeting, the state demographer has reported the state is growing at about 1% per year, although much of the growth comes from older age categories.

The overall median time to sentencing for FY 2025 felony convictions was 11 months and decreased as the seriousness of the offense class decreased, with convictions in Class G through Class I taking less than 1 year to sentence. Judge Horne noted, in his experience, smaller counties are likely pulling the median time to sentencing down. He pointed out that even Class E and Class F at 13 months is encouraging, given that controlled substance testing labs used to take a year to return results. Mr. King shared that time to sentencing for Class I convictions has decreased from 10 months in FY 2022 to 8 months each of the past 2 years. He attributed this to an increase in Class H and Class I pleas accepted in District Court. Ms. Granados asked if data are available on how many districts accept Class H and Class I pleas in District Court. Mr. King said the Commission's *Statistical Report* has a section on this topic, as well as an appendix dedicated to it.

Next, Mr. King offered information on the personal characteristics (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, and age) of offenders with felony convictions last year (*see* Presentation). He noted that the median age at conviction was 31 in FY 2016 and 36 in FY 2025. Ms. Hill asked if we know whether the increasing age at conviction is because the same people continue to commit crimes. Michelle Hall, staff, said that staff hopes to be able to examine that question once criminal history data requested from the Government Data Analytics Center (GDAC) is received. Mr. King explained that Class H and Class I felonies comprised the highest numbers of convictions; property and non-trafficking drug convictions were the most common crime types. He noted that "Other" offenses have increased in the past decade, moving from 15% of all felony convictions in FY 2016 to 24% in FY 2025. He then highlighted the changes in the top five convicted offenses between FY 2016 and FY 2025.

Mr. King stated that, over the past 10 years, the distribution of prior record level (PRL) has shifted toward the more serious levels. For example, in FY 2016, 57% of offenders were in PRL I and II, but this decreased to 49% in FY 2025. He mentioned that 40% of felony convictions resulted in Active punishment and that 67% of those sentences were in the presumptive range. He shared additional information on active sentences, including active rates by offense class, PRL, and crime type. He noted that, in FY 2025, a higher percentage of Class A-D convictions involved offenders in PRL I than in FY 2016 (41% compared to 33%) and that active rates in discretionary cells have returned to pre-pandemic levels. Shifting to non-active (e.g., probation) sentences, Mr. King compared the average length of probation to the average length of suspended sentences and noted that, as offense class decreased, so did the lengths of both probation and the suspended sentence.

Mr. King concluded with information that appears in the "Special Issues" of the *Statistical Report*. He noted that life without parole sentences (n=86) and drug trafficking convictions (n=775) were the highest in recent years. In addition, habitual felon convictions decreased in FY 2025 and were still below pre-pandemic levels. Mr. King then shared some overall key points regarding FY 2025 felony convictions, pointing out how the Felony Punishment Chart has contributed to stability over time and the shift over time in offense class and PRL to more serious levels.

FY 2026–FY 2035 PRISON POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Chairman Brown recognized Mr. King again, to review the current prison population projections (*see* Presentation and Handout). Mr. King stated that producing prison projections is part of the Commission's original mandate to develop a tool to be used for accurate long-term correctional resource planning. The projections are prepared annually in conjunction with the Department of Adult Correction (DAC) and are used for multiple purposes including determining whether existing capacity is adequate for the current and future population, assisting with the determination of future staffing needs and inmate housing needs, and allowing for consideration of correctional policies within the context of available resources.

Mr. King noted that FY 2025 felony convictions and sentences imposed provide the foundation for the projections and are used to project new admissions across the projection period. The projections also take into account the release of the prison population at the beginning of the projection period. The projections include all offenders in prison and those awaiting transfer from local jails (i.e., jail backlog).

Mr. King next reviewed the prison projections and capacity, indicating that the prison population is projected to increase from 33,183 to 38,354 (16%) across the ten-year projection period. He noted the current projection is higher than the previous projection because the current resident prison population was over 1,000 offenders higher than it was last year. Standard Operating Capacity (SOC) is projected to be 31,721 and Expanded Operating Capacity (EOC) is projected to be 36,680 for the first year of the projection; however, Craggy Correctional Center is scheduled to close this year which will draw the capacity down to 31,272 (SOC) and 36,093 (EOC) for the other 9 years of the projection period. The prison population is projected to be above SOC for all ten years and below EOC until FY 2032.

Mr. King shared historical information on the prison population before noting that it has increased 13% since its lowest point during the pandemic in July 2021 (29,033) and December 2025 (32,915). Nevertheless, the monthly average prison population is still below pre-pandemic levels (35,106 in March 2020). He also reminded the Commission that the previous projection was within 900 beds and that they are typically within 2% for the first year.

Mr. King then summarized the key assumptions used to develop the projections. He noted that the accuracy of the projections largely depends on how well FY 2025 data on felony convictions, prison admissions, and prison releases represent future years. He pointed out that efforts were made to account for reclassifications in the projection, but the removal of the presumption of concurrent sentencing was not something that could be modeled this year because the law did not go into effect until December and data were not available. Ms. Granados and Mr. Houchin both mentioned they are making sure concurrent is spelled out in their plea negotiations. Mr. Weede asked about the effect of the jail backlog on offenders' length of stay and Ms. Granados followed with a question about whether DAC is having discussions about applying earned credits to offenders who are in the backlog. Ms. Hill said DAC is more focused on making arrangements for offenders with 6 months or less to exit from jail onto post release supervision (PRS); adding they have 2,500 beds offline because of staffing alone and, if those beds came back online, the backlog would disappear.

Mr. King concluded with a discussion of how the prioritization of resources for violent and repeat offenders under Structured Sentencing is reflected in the prison population. Class A-D convictions account for the smallest proportion of convictions per year but comprise over half of the projected population as a result of their mandatory active sentences and long sentence lengths. Most low-level felons (Class H-I)

who receive active sentences are repeat offenders and impact the prison population through their high volume; however, they comprise only 18% of the prison population due to their shorter sentence lengths.

2026 ADULT RECIDIVISM REPORT – PROBATIONERS AND PRISONERS

Chairman Brown recognized Tamara Flinchum, staff, to present key findings from the 2026 Adult Recidivism Study – Probationers and Prisoners (*see* Presentation). Ms. Flinchum first shared some key definitions for the study, including the outcome measures of interest (fingerprinted arrests) and the time periods examined. She noted the breakdown of the sample, which included probationers who exited supervision (66%) and prisoners who exited prison (34%) in FY 2023. Ms. Flinchum reviewed the recidivist arrest rates for the FY 2023 sample. Recidivist arrest rates remained the same for the current sample compared to the pandemic sample. Recidivism rates slightly increased for probationers but continued to decline for prisoners. Meanwhile, recidivist incarceration rates returned to pre-pandemic levels for the FY 2023 sample.

Ms. Flinchum focused on the key findings for the probation release sample. By capturing events that occur during probation (e.g., programs, sanctions, arrests), a probation release sample enables a more comprehensive analysis of how these factors affect outcomes after probation. Half of probationers (50%) exited for positive reasons (such as satisfactory completion), 29% for negative reasons (such as unsatisfactory termination), and 21% due to revocation (almost half due to absconding). Chairman Brown suggested that failure to pay money owed is not necessarily a negative consequence and wondered if there could be a better label for that group. Probationers had slightly higher recidivist arrest rates during supervision (26%) than during the two-year follow-up period (24%); for each time period examined, the positive group had the lowest recidivist arrest rate, and the revocation group had the highest (*see* Presentation).

Outcomes examined during the supervision period included violations and responses to violations. Ms. Flinchum reported that 77% of probationers had at least one violation during supervision. The positive group had the lowest percentage with a violation (58%), while nearly all offenders in the negative group (94%) and, by definition, all offenders in the revocation group had a violation. The positive and negative groups were most likely to have a technical violation as their most serious violation; the revocation group was most likely to have a criminal violation. Ms. Hill asked if the probationers included Class 3 misdemeanors. Ginny Hevener, staff, confirmed that Class 3 misdemeanants (3%) were included but reminded Commissioners that they would have had a suspended sentence. The largest group of misdemeanants had a Class 1 conviction (33%).

Ms. Flinchum indicated that there were four nonconfinement responses for noncompliance (delegated authority, additional probation conditions, modified probation conditions, and continued probation supervision) and two confinement responses for noncompliance (quick dip for all offenders and confinement in response to violations (CRV) for felons only) that were examined during supervision. Nonconfinement and confinement responses were infrequently used. Recidivism rates by the responses to violations were close to the overall recidivist arrest rate for all probationers (24%) except for offenders who received a CRV (34%). This finding was confirmed by multivariate results.

A probationer's supervision level is determined by the intersection of their risk and needs assessment. Ms. Flinchum shared that the recidivist arrest rates followed a stair-step pattern of decreasing recidivist arrest rates from the most restrictive to the least restrictive supervision level – a finding that is expected. Some of the strongest predictors of recidivism were risk and probationers who had a recidivist arrest

during supervision. Age (older probationers) decreased the probability of recidivism. Probationers had higher employment rates two years prior to their probation entry (57%) compared to two years following their probation release (49%) with employment rates much lower than NC's working population (75%). Annual median wages were also much lower two years after probation release compared to NC's working population (*see* Presentation).

Summarized below are data trends of probationers that Ms. Flinchum provided:

- The sample size continued to decrease (-7%),
- The percentage of criminal violations and criminal revocation have increased, while the percentage of absconding violations and absconding revocations have decreased, and
- Recidivist arrest rates increased slightly for all probationers and the negative group; however, the revocation group's recidivism rates continued to decrease. The positive group remained stable.

Chairman Brown then recognized Dr. Mel Lugo, staff, to present the findings for the prison release sample and overall conclusions for the study. Dr. Lugo noted that the prison release group was smaller compared to probationers, with nearly 12,000 prisoners. Prisoners were analyzed in three offense class groupings based on their most serious conviction, Class B1 – D, Class E – G, and Class H – I with the largest group being Class H – I prisoners (45%). Ms. Hill pointed out the younger average age at release than expected for Class B1 – D prisoners; Mr. Houchin added the average ages were compact across groups despite varying sentence lengths. Ms. Hall noted that staff could look at age at entry compared to age at release.

Dr. Lugo highlighted that for both recidivist arrest and recidivist incarceration, Class B1 – D prisoners had the lowest rates (32% and 28% respectively) and Class H – I prisoners had the highest rates (45% and 43% respectively). She also noted that this difference was further supported in the multivariate analysis with the probability of arrest being 7% lower for Class B1 – D felons compared to Class H – I prisoners. Dr. Bonner questioned whether the lower recidivism rates were because Class B1 – D prisoners were older (i.e., aging out of crime) and Ms. Hill noted they are in prison for longer so there is more time for programming while Class H – I prisoners have shorter sentence lengths which limits interventions.

Dr. Lugo reported that most prisoners entered prison due to a new crime (65%); however, recidivist arrest rates were highest for prisoners who entered due to a Post-Release Supervision (PRS) revocation; with recidivist arrest rates ranging from 49% for Class B1 – D prisoners to 51% for Class H – I prisoners. She noted that prisoners assessed as extreme risk had the highest recidivist arrest rates (49%) and prisoners assessed as low risk having the lowest (13%). Despite the stair step pattern in recidivism rates related to assessed risk, the high percentages of prisoners assessed in the most serious risk levels could be impacting the tool's predictive validity. Multivariate analysis also showed that risk level was not a significant predictor of recidivist arrest.

Findings related to correctional jobs and programs indicated that almost half (49%) of prisoners had both a job and program and these prisoners had the lowest recidivist arrest and recidivist incarceration rates (*see* Presentation). Dr. Lugo emphasized that Class B1 – D prisoners had the highest percentage with both a job and program (91%), noting that the report expanded previous analysis from 8 categories from the previous report to 20 categories for the current study. For the most frequent jobs – Unit Services, Food Services, and Maintenance – and for all other correctional jobs, recidivist arrest and recidivist incarceration rates were lower than the rates for the prisoners as a whole. Except for Diversionary programs (e.g., Therapeutic Diversion Units), Substance Abuse programs, Academic Education programs, Vocational Education programs, and all programs had lower recidivism rates than the overall rates for

prisoners. Ms. Hevener noted that additional information about specific jobs and programs could be found in Appendix G and Appendix H.

Dr. Lugo stated that the multivariate model for prisoners did not have as many significant predictors as the probationers model. Prisoners aged 50 years or older and prisoners who served 24 months or more had the strongest and lowest probabilities of recidivist arrest. There were the mixed findings for the job and program variables suggesting a more tailored analysis may be needed to unpack these correctional interventions. Ms. Hevener added that an analysis of Work Release was done, in partnership with DAC, and the results revealed that Work Release decreased the probability of recidivist arrest.

Findings related to employment revealed that prisoners had a higher percentage of employment during the two-year follow-up (50%) compared to employment prior to prison entry (42%). The differences between prior employment and follow-up employment were the most pronounced for Class B1 – D prisoners who had the lowest prior employment rates (38%) and the highest follow-up employment rates (58%). Annual median wages in the second year of follow-up ($9,664) were substantially lower compared to the NC population ($37,500).

Trend information on the prisoner sample included a decreased sample size (-8%), increasing percentage of prisoners with no job or program, and decreasing PRS revocation entries. Nicole Sullivan asked if there are truly any prisoners without a job or program, Ms. Hevener noted that these prisoners are mostly Class H – I and this may also include those with medical interventions. Dr. Lugo also shared that both the recidivist arrest rates and the number of recidivist prisoners have declined. Conversely, recidivist incarceration rates increased, however, there were minimal changes in the number of recidivist offenders except for a 14% increase in Class B1 – D recidivist prisoners. Ms. Hevener added that the recidivist incarceration rates are likely driven by PRS revocations and Chairman Brown clarified that they would not be captured in the recidivist arrest population.

Dr. Lugo summarized the key findings for prisoners highlighting recidivism arrest and incarceration rate trends, Class B1 – D prisoners having the highest percentage in correctional jobs and programs, the small number of prisoners assessed as minimal and low risk, and the key predictors of recidivism (i.e., demographics, restrictive housing, prior criminal justice contacts). She also provided concluding comments for the study as a whole which included:

- The recidivist arrest rate remained stable and at its lowest point in 20 years, however, the recidivist incarceration rate increased.
- The need to reevaluate the risk and needs assessment both prisoners and probationers.
- Probationers had better recidivism outcomes compared to prisoners.
- The key predictors in multivariate analysis across all models for probationers and prisoners were sex, substance use, prior arrests, and age.

SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

Chairman Brown recognized Michelle Hall, staff, to present the subcommittee updates (*see* Presentation). Before beginning, Ms. Hall informed the members that staff had published the Justice Reinvestment Implementation Evaluation Report and there was a copy in their materials. Staff had presented preliminary findings at the March Commission meeting and included some new content in the report.

Ms. Hall stated that the Commission has two subcommittees operating and both are focused on one of the core principles of Structured Sentencing, that sentencing policies should be consistent. Beginning with the Drug Offense Classification Subcommittee, Ms. Hall reviewed the reason the Commission created the Subcommittee, the work it has done so far, and the decisions it has made. For the next meeting, staff is exploring possible criteria options based on factors the Subcommittee identified and discussed. The meeting date will be set in the near future.

Next, Ms. Hall reviewed the history of the Sentencing Practices Study, the reason the Commission created the Subcommittee, and the areas the Subcommittee has examined so far. She explained that the Subcommittee has found that sentencing outcomes are generally consistent but members want to know more about criminal history to further understand how it may be affecting sentencing outcomes. Commission and Subcommittee members have raised a number of questions about the composition of criminal history; the Commission has data on the number of prior record points, but not the specific offenses that comprise the history. To overcome this limitation, staff has been working for over a year to get criminal history information from the Government Data Analytics Center (GDAC). In March, the Commission signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the GDAC for the data and it is expected by mid-June. Ms. Hall stated that it will take time for staff to prepare the data for analysis once they receive it. Staff will begin presenting preliminary analysis of the dataset at the next Subcommittee meeting (date to be determined).

UPDATE FROM NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SENTENCING COMMISSIONS

Chairman Brown recognized Ms. Hall to present an update from the National Association of Sentencing Commission (NASC) (*see* Presentation). Ms. Hall reminded the members about the mission and focus of NASC. She stated that this year's annual conference will be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, August 12-14. The theme is related to states leveling up their sentencing commissions or equivalent agencies (*see* Presentation). She next highlighted a few of the sessions of interest from the draft agenda, including a workshop on criminal history.

INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Brown thanked the Commissioners and guests for attending and reminded them of the remaining 2026 meeting dates for the Sentencing Commission: September 11 and December 11. Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 3:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley Kirk
Administrative Secretary