



**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission  
State Advisory Group Planning  
Committee Meeting  
December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at 11:00 am**

**Meeting Minutes - DRAFT**

**Chair Pauline Salla-Smith called meeting to order at 11:00 am.**

**Roll Call-** Leslie Bittleston took roll call and confirmed that quorum was made.

**(VOTING MEMBERS)**

**Present by Phone:** Pauline Salla-Smith(Chair), Joey Orduna-Hastings, Rebekah Graham, Jennifer Fraser, Jack Martin, **Absent:** Paula Smith

**(NON VOTING MEMBERS)**

**Present by Phone:** Heather Plager

**(STAFF)**

**Present by Phone:** Kayla Dunn, Kayla Landes, Jennifer Simeo, Leslie Bittleston

**(PUBLIC)**

**Present by Phone:**

**Meeting Minutes:**

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. Let's move to agenda item number 3, public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment? Seeing none, let's review and approve the minutes from October 22nd. Hopefully you guys had a chance to review them and I'll take a motion to approve, or if there is changes that need to be made.

**Jack Martin:** Motion to approve.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you. Can I get a second?

**Rebekah Graham:** Second.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you. Is there any other discussion? All those in favor say aye.

\*Ayes around\*

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Any opposed? Okay. Minutes are accepted as is. Agenda Item No. 5, Nevada Center for Juvenile Justice Innovation update.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, that is me, so Leslie Bittleston for the record. So the NCJJR vendor for evidenced base resource center has run out of money, so they are not going to be attending any more SAG meetings until the funding stream is going again, and what I mean by they have run out of money, is the formula

grant every year provides them roughly \$52,000 through a sub-grant, and they have used their funds for the last -- for the 17 and 18 sub-grate years and our FY19 is frozen and our FY20 is frozen. So I will get to the formula grants shortly on what is going on with those, but so the -- so NCJJ our evidenced base resource vendor will not be attending anymore meetings until we are unfrozen with funds. The last thing that they were going to do was do one last newsletter sometime in the month of December. I have not seen that newsletter, so I assume that is coming. So, that's the update from -- for that.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Do you have any questions?

**Jack Martin:** Does that mean all innovations stop in Nevada?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Not the real innovation.

**Jack Martin:** Right, because --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Not the innovation happening in our offices that continues to go.

**Jack Martin:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Just the --

**Jack Martin:** Does that mean I don't have to come?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** It's your Christmas party, so it's a good day. All right, any other questions on that one? Let's move to Agenda Item No. 6, update on Covid testing numbers. Leslie?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. In your packet or materials, there should be a document titled Covid Testing. It was posted just this week, so if you have that pulled up, I will go over the numbers with you. This is a running total of total youth test, total staff test, total youth positives, and total staff positives beginning in June. So this is just a running total from June through November 30th, and as you can see -- and this is just the juvenile dentition facilities, the two youth camps, and the three state facilities. So a running total for all of those. So out of 698 youth tests, we have had 25 positives for a 3.58 positivity rate. We've had 721 staff tests, 73 positives for a 10.12% positivity rate. We had quite a lot of positives in the month of November, so the little chart underneath the total youth tests tells you how many people, staff or youth. Of course, it is not named specific, it's just numbers, but we did have quite a few. We had four in Humboldt staff in Carson City, two in Churchill. Clark, we had one staff and one youth. Caliente Youth Center was hit hard in November, they had 21 staff out and then they had six youths. NYTC and Summit View had one each. Washoe had two youth and seven staff. So, November was a pretty rough month. So, I will be presenting this same data tomorrow at the JJOC. I have been asked by the JJOC Chairs to share updated Covid testing data at every JJOC meeting and subcommittee meetings. So at every one you will have the latest numbers that I have. So that's our update on Covid testing.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** December is not looking so good either, so --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh dear.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So far.

**Leslie Bittleston:** All right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Any questions on the Covid testing numbers? All right. Go back to my agenda. Leslie, update on formula grant and compliance.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. We'll talk about formula grant first. So the formula grant for those of you who are not aware is awarded annually. Every year in October 1st we get a new formula grant. I do have to apply for it. The application process is usually any time from December through February and then we get notified in September and then our new grant award starts October 1st. We generally have three years of open formula grants at any one time, so I am currently working on the closeout of FY17, so that -- that grant has now closed, that that period is over as of September 30th. FY18 is open. We did receive partial funds from FY18, even though the grant is frozen. We requested partial funds from OJJDP, and received them. We have not received the full grant and I was recently, within the last week, requested by DCFS' chief financial officer to request the remaining amount, which is roughly \$40,000. When I submitted that to OJJDP, I was told it's highly unlikely that we will get another release of funds from any grant. I don't know why. So that's FY18. FY19 is frozen. We have drawn nothing from FY19. FY20, we just awarded October 1st and I just found out last Friday that that grant is also frozen. So -- in finding out the FY20 was frozen, I followed up on our VOCA audit, because that is the reason that this grant -- these grants are frozen, and it seems that staff working on the VOCA audit is still working through the audit processes. They've had questions from OJJDP -- or OJP, not OJJDP, OJP, a different division within the department of justice as recent as December 3rd. I'm not up on all of the questions, I just try to follow up from time to time to see when it is going to be closed so we can get our grants unfrozen, but -- so that is the latest on the formula grants. Are there any questions on that?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So, is there way, Leslie, that we can access to corrective action plan that VOCA submitted to address the deficiencies or the findings, because I feel like they, I mean, we're all having consequences from the VOCA audit findings, yet we don't even know what those were or how they're planning on correcting it, and now we're into a new federal fiscal year, our new grant money is still frozen, and honestly it is like becoming ridiculous.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I agree and I have not seen the corrective action, but I can absolutely ask to see if I can get a copy of it, and, like I said, I don't understand what all of these ongoing questions are. It must be that the corrective action or the actions that the VOCA people are taking are not good enough, I don't know, but I can ask for that. I have not seen it. So --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Well, I mean, I guess the issue is that we should all have some ability to -- to push the corrective action plan since it is affecting our funding also, not just theirs.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So I will ask for the VOCA corrective action plan. Okay. But that's the latest information on the formula grants, and like I said, I did submit a request to draw the remaining FY18 funds of roughly \$40,000, and I am already starting a list for request to draw FY19, but as I was told by our program manager, it's highly unlikely. So, I don't know -- I'm just going to keep trying to -- to get funds and move forward, but that's where we are with the formula grants. Okay. Compliance -- moving onto to compliance. For those of you who are not totally familiar with what compliance means, we receive the formula grant based on our -- based on our compliance efforts as a state with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. There are four core requirements in the act and the state has to be in good

standing with each of those four core requirements in order to get the formula grant funding. One of those states -- once of those cores is racial and ethnic disparities, which we have had a robust subcommittee going this year, thanks to Rebekah and a lot of non-JJOC that have joined that committee. So, RED, racial ethnic disparities is one of the core requirements. The second is the institutionalization of status offenders. We collect that data on a monthly basis from the juvenile detention facilities, so each of the juvenile detention facilities sends Kayla Landes a document with all of the status offenders that they have booked in their detention facility, so we are looking to see if any of those bookings are a violation. A violation occurs when a youth is kept 24 hours or long and so that's kind of what we're looking for. And then the third core requirement is jail removal. That is when we place a juvenile delinquent charged with a delinquent offense in an adult jail. We can do that in a rural area and we have six hours to release that juvenile, or to get that juvenile out. So what we're looking for there is to make sure that the youth was out within six hours. And then the last one is sight and sound separation for those juveniles placed in adult jails to make sure that they are not within sight and sound contact of adult offenders. So this is all data and stuff that Kayla Landes and I do throughout the year, and at the end of the year we send out annual surveys to all of our secured facilities, jails, correctional facilities, juvenile detention facilities, and then we have to visit a portion of them, roughly 20 to 30 percent, and that's the real update that I want to let the group know. In this time of Covid, OJJDP has not approved the use of virtual visits. Even though some of our facilities are not allowing visitors or they are curbing visitations or -- or have additional steps around visitations, so OJJDP has not approved virtual site visits. Basically they are leaving it on the state to determine what to do and I know I've spoken to my own staff and some of are -- that have to do onsite visits are a little concerned, especially when we have to visit adult correctional facilities that are 85 percent positive. So Parson City Jail is roughly 85 percent positive and so basically that is the problem we are facing with our federal partners. They have said that we can submit all of our executive orders and things from our governor to try to address why we are doing virtual site visits, but I just wanted to let this group know that we are doing the bare minimum of onsite visits this year and we are going to try to do them virtually, but if we do have to come onsite, we will. Heather, your facility is one on our list, so -- and so is yours Pauline.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Come on in!

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So I mean -- and that would be me. I'm doing the Elko Winnemucca route, so if you are allowing visitors, I will come and visit you in person. If you are not allowing visitors, I will do it remotely. So -- but I will be contacting you via email separately to talk about that, because I'm giving each facility the option to say, hey we don't want you here or yes come visit us. So that's what I wanted to let you know, is it is going to be very difficult providing that compliance report this year with, you know, with what we're doing visits, and OJJDP has just been very non -- I don't know the right word, they just are not easy to work with, this -- and they haven't over the last four years. So that's my update on compliance. I know that was quite lengthy, but I just wanted to give the folks on here that are not totally up to what compliance means, the kind of the background of what we're doing. So that's where we are.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I think that we might be able to remind OJJDP that when there was budget crises and they couldn't travel, they only did remote audits of states during that time. It didn't affect our compliance. We had to send everything and then we did a Zoom over it, and so they've had that issue come about it to and they were able to justify virtual audits. I do think that that probably should be included in the three-year plan, though, under compliance that -- that because of the Covid and restrictions with facilities and, you know, I don't mind having auditors come in, but I tell them like we have a high positivity Covid rate here, so you can decide, you know, if you want to do that, but I think it should be addressed in our three-year plan, and I didn't see anything when we reviewed that last time about Covid.

**Leslie Bittleston:** You're right and it's up for a vote tomorrow, but with this being said, we could take a vote on it tomorrow at the JJOC with a statement that staff will update or add a sentence regarding site visits for Covid. Do you think that's doable, Joey?

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** I think we have to and yes I do think it is doable.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** I was going to ask Leslie, was there a letter issued by OJJDP regarding this issue, essentially saying that they weren't going to compromise, because I didn't see any written guidance from them speaking to this or not.

**Leslie Bittleston:** No. They're -- they put very little in writing and so we had a mandatory OJJDP conference two weeks ago, remember that? So I sat in a lot of the breakout sessions on this and Administrator Harp was in some of those breakout sessions, and there was a lot of questions from a lot of states, and that was where we were told how to do it and that they would not be issuing guidance in writing, and just to let Pauline know, I think the problem is this current administration. In the past, I think they've been very -- OJJDP has been open, but this person that we've had under this administration has been very difficult. She doesn't even believe in a brain science, so that should tell you something about her.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. I -- I think this is workable though, I mean we have directives from our governor of the state. We have facilities who are getting hit with Covid. I mean I think that it needs to be addressed and I'm -- I'm totally on board with tomorrow for the SAG when we're moving it through the full commission for the three year plan that we add, you know, if it gets approved as it is with the caveat that we add an explanation of why we're not doing onsite visits. OJJDP won't typically put things in writing unless they were pushed consistently about it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I mean, I went through two virtual audits with them and just, I mean, it was their idea, so I guess that's okay, but they have had experience with that too. So -- but we want to protect ourselves by including this in our three year plan and be really clear that our directives from our governor have included these things and because the juvenile detention facilities already have out risk youth and we're trying to keep our staff safe. I mean, there is so much we can put in there about onsite audits.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** And I would agree with Pauline that we also receive a number of grants from OJJDP, and every sections of any report we do, we remind them. We almost have boiler plate language that we use in our grants, because to your point, we have to build the record. So whether they put it in writing or not, we are doing it, so that there is a record of it, but we don't just put it in one section, we put it in any section, especially a new section just to remind them as to why this report might be different than past years, if that helps you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So that's super helpful and if we can remember -- I think that it is a separate item to approve the three year plan, so if we can -- when we do our motion tomorrow, if we can put a caveat that approve as is with some language around virtual site visits due to Covid.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** So Leslie, I believe you have the authority to offer a motion for consideration --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** -- and you can make that note and then one of the commissioners can adopt your motion as stated to start that dialogue so that none of us miss it. Well, I mean, I'm sure we'll also make notes, but --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** But you're -- you're more than welcome to offer up a proposal for a motion to be taken.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And I think the three year plan is under SAG, right, moving the motion for the three year plan to move it through old commission. I think I remember it right, it's on the agenda.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So that's under you, Pauline.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I'll remember, I mean I made a note, I hope I remember. Somebody can remind me if I don't. Now that I said that I'll probably forget.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That is all I have on compliance. Kayla, do you have -- Kayla Landes, do you have anything to add to compliance or anything else you would like to say?

**Kayla Landes:** No, I think I'm good. I think you covered it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Kayla Landes:** Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Sure.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right. Let's -- number 8, didn't we already vote for the three year plan to move to the full commission?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Well we -- what happened for that is since we did not have quorum --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** That's right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** -- we moved it to -- and I just skipped it over to say it is moved to the JJOC.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** That's right. That's right. But we -- but -- but the one that's moved -- the report that is moved to the full commission included the changes that members had like shared with you?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah, I got changes from both you and Mr. Martin. So, thank you both.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thanks Commissioner Martin. Let's move to legislative Item No. 9, legislative bill draft review, Leslie.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. So I have kind myself scrambling earlier this year with the revised governor's report due date. In the past, the governor's report was due around June-ish of every year. With AB472, the due date for the governor's report was moved to January 30th. So with that being said, I found myself

scrambling to complete the governor's report. Unfortunately the SAG, this committee, did not meet in January or February, so I was unable to bring the governor's report to this group for review, which I normally would do, just like I do the three year plan. So when I wrote the governor's report, it had everything that normally goes in the governor's report and also some recommendations for changes for NRS, which would make some things easier for policy interpretation, things like that. So that governor's report went through the CFS internal review and was posted on the DCSF website. With that being said, I was never -- I never knew that anybody read the governor's report quite honestly, but this year they did read the governor's report, somebody in the governor's office did read it and took all of the requested things in the back of that governor's report on requested changes for the NRS and made a Bill draft out it. So without even talking to me or -- or talking to anybody, I wanted to bring this to this group and I will also bring it to the JJOC tomorrow, because what we have to do is we have to talk about as a group and possibly vote on whether the things in those recommendations that this group and the JJOC will -- will eventually support, and then we will follow up with governor's office and say, hey we're supporting these things, but we're not supporting these things. So just to give you a background on where some of the initiatives came from and I think in your packet of materials, there is a -- hold please while I look for that -- there is something called a BDR working documents. So if you all can find that document and I will walk you through what the current BDR says. That's if mine will pull up. It's thinking. Some day. Not responding. Thank you. My documents are not responding. Great, am I going to have to do this from memory.

**Rebekah Graham:** Do you want me to share the screen and maybe you can see it?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, that would be good, because mine is not pulling up.

**Rebekah Graham:** Oh, it was host disabled participant screen sharing.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Kayla Dunn -- yeah, Kayla can you give it to --

**Kayla Dunn:** I'm on it.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you.

**Rebekah Graham:** Of if Kayla wants share the BDR document.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, I have it up too. So whoever wants to share.

**Leslie Bittleston:** My computer said, nope you're not looking at it.

**Kayla Dunn:** Okay, go ahead.

**Rebekah Graham:** There you go. Everybody should be able to --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** -- be there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** The first one, thank you, that helps me immensely. So the first one is Corrective Room Restriction. One of the things that we've talked about over the last couple of years is moving more towards using room confinement for safety security and getting away from using it for behavioral and corrective types of things. As corrective room restriction is right now, that's what the title is in NRS. It's NSR62B, is it 215? It talks about -- the title is Corrective Room Restriction and there are allowances in NRS to use

room confinement for behavioral modification and things like that. So this recommendation is to kind of remove the references to corrective and behavioral, not get rid of room confinement, but to -- and then also to add some requirements around training in de-escalation and then consider a cool off period to match PBS. So that's what that is, and I know there is a lot to breakdown there, but that's the first one.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Before you go on, a little bit of history on that. The reason that we called it that is because jurisdictions were using different titles for it and NRS it includes those different names for the same things, because that was part of SV107, and with ACL use input that we make sure that all of that was included, so people understood even if you called it Corrective Room, if you called it Room Confinement, if you called it a Time Out and they were in a secure cell, all of that addressed in SV107 to make sure that we were all tracking the same type of interventions. Just because we call it something different, didn't mean it was left out of SV107.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So that was the first one. The second one, definition of state money, that came up in one of our public workshops that we held, the DCSF held when we drafting our revision NAC, NACT 62B. So NACT 62B has been drafted and I will be -- and I received it just a week and half ago, or a week ago, and I have it for the JJOC tomorrow, so you will get to see what -- what else to be drafted for NAC 62B, but they defined in NAC 62B state money is -- as used in this section, state money means money received from the state, except money received from state plan for Medicaid. So that is what LCB proposed, so I think we can eliminate Number 2, because we have defined it in NAC. So, if you remember, I wrote this back in January of this year. So, some of the things have been addressed already just through, you know, additional work, and I believe Number 2 has been addressed. Any questions on Number 2? Okay. Number 3, submission of certain reports. If the state can withhold funds from counties for failure to submit data reports, data reports require due dates. So this was something that I kind of pushed for because I do not believe that we, the state, should be withholding any money from any jurisdiction if they do not know when reports are due, and what reports are do. So this was kind of an outline to say, hey this report is due this date, this report is due this date, and it lets the jurisdictions know. So, what has happened since this is NAC 62H, NAC 62H is currently still with LCB, but I have requested we put in NAC 62H some due dates for reports. So I believe Number 3 has now been addressed. Are there any questions on Number 3?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Leslie, this is Pauline. I think that the pending NAC 62H for SB-242, which is the DMC report, that's in NRS also.

**Leslie Bittleston:** That was actually removed.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** The January 31st due date?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes and it was -- that was made obsolete with AB472, and I have no idea why.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah I don't either, because that's a federal requirement.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah, so it was just bizarre. So that's why I talked about or added Number 3 in there, because we do need due dates for those things, but yeah I don't why that was made obsolete. It was NRS 62H-315, or something, I can't remember.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, 62H.315.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. Yeah it was made obsolete with AB472. I have no idea why.



**Pauline Salla-Smith:** No, it was 230 and probation departments to analyze information submitted to standardized system annually and compile reports concerning disparate treatment of children. DCFS to publish reports annually and they took -- and then it says repealed. So --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yep.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. I don't know --

**Leslie Bittleston:** So that's why I requested to add this into NAC 62H. So, okay, any more questions on Number 3? Okay. Number 4, and this probably will not be supported, but Number 4 is problematic because the membership of the JJOC is outlined in NRS 62-B600. It does not match federal requirements as outlined in the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act or the formula grant program, so I struggle to make the JJOC meet requirements of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and the formula grant program made a change a year ago that says if the state advisory group, that's required of the formula grant, it does not meet requirements, the entire grant can be frozen. So this is really a big deal and my understanding in talking to Ross about this is -- my understanding in talking to Ross about this is there is going to be no support for it, because what is currently in there is -- sorry I don't know why my mom is not answering the phone. Anyway, what's currently in there is to allow for the state legislature, the assembly, and the senate, and the Supreme Court to appoint two members each. That's six members right there and they apparently want that ability to do that, even though some of them remain vacant and are still vacant. So, I don't know. I don't know what your thoughts are on this. It would make my life a lot easier if we could have a JJOC that matches fed requirements, but -- and let me tell you what our biggest problem is -- our biggest problem is most of our appointees are state, local or county employees. It's government employees, that's the problem, and Pauline knows what I'm talking about.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So I think that -- I think that this is probably workable if -- because I think that that an individual can actually cover more than one area of expertise for the federal stuff, right. Like I'm a rural juvenile agency and I have my license for alcohol and drug counseling, so I can count as both of those.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I think that what we might consider is, because I'm not sure there would be oversight, there would be interest in doing this either, but it may just mean that oversight commission expands in different areas that were messy, because then that will help with the percentage of state and local government appointed people, like the percentage of that for the overall oversight commission. Because is that where you're running into issues?

**Leslie Bittleston:** No. It's the too many government employees. It's not trying to find people to fit, excuse me, to fit all of the areas, it's the fact that when you look at the JJOC as a whole with 25 members and you've got 20 members as government employees, that's the problem. And for some reason when I talked to OJJDP about this, you know, they say Nevada is a weird state, because we don't have private providers like a lot of states do, and what I mean by private providers, is many states us privatized providers for detention facilities and correctional facilities, but ours are all run by government employees, they're all government operated. So that just -- and I've asked for waivers, I have asked for other things. So the problem is too many government employees. If we can get people appointed that are not government employees, that would be great, like a social worker that is not a government employee, or a lawyer, or whatever, but that falls on deaf ears.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** But I think that's what I was addressing. If we increase the number of people in those areas, it decreases the overall percentage of the commission of government employees, but before our

legislators didn't count as government employees because we don't have a full time legislative system. So even with our -- even with our juvenile justice commission, any legislator that we had didn't count as a full time government employee. There was certain areas where I think if we go through that and then look at what we're missing, I mean, if we're counting all of the, I mean, I don't even know what legislators do we have.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Actually we have nobody right now, no legislators.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Well that doesn't affect us. And still we're -- I'm sorry go ahead.

**Rebekah Graham:** This is Rebekah Graham here. We nominated people like Esther Rodriguez-Brown, and those applications just haven't gone through. So there are like non-governmental advocates who are interested in being on the commission and I don't know where it stopped, you know, but -- but there are people out that would be excellent for the commission.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And Jeremy Sutters who was on the previous commission who is a private licensed clinical social worker would be good. The problem is there is no open positions for these people to go in and without the senate or the assembly nominating these folks, then they -- they're not -- there is no place to put them is the problem. So Pauline, if I'm hearing what you're saying, we can increase the membership by five or six people and just have them be all private folks.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Did AB-472 have a cap on the oversight commission, the number of members?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, it was 25. And that, okay, it was the governor's representative, which is Judge Walker, and 25 people, and the state advisory group under the formula grant can have up to 33.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So we can ask for an increase of seven positions, but they have to all be private, not government employees.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I think there would be more people would have more interest in that than --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I don't know, I mean, that's just my opinion. I think what we can about it too on the full oversight commission, but if you, I mean, the issue is that you still need representation from governmental agencies. You can't like kick those people off and then just --

**Leslie Bittleston:** I agree.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- and have private providers. So there has be a balance somewhere and -- and we always try to have 33 members of the Juvenile Justice Commission. I don't think we, I think we reached that maybe once or twice, because of just turnover, but once we had our -- once we knew that we had too many governmental people on there, then we started like really encouraging people like, hey we need you guys on this, like we don't want any more government people, we want private providers, citizens.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And Rebekah is right. We have interest, we just don't have anywhere put them and we're not getting any support from the state assembly or the senate to nominate people, even though we've got pending applications.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So, we've had meetings with them, I mean, we've like --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, we've had -- yes. Ross and I met with the boards -- a couple of people from the board this summer and basically they shared with us, yeah we have pending applications, but there are no spots, and so --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** But I mean, we've met the assembly and the senate --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh no.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- leadership of them.

**Leslie Bittleston:** No we have not.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** So at one point we had talked about sending a letter to LCB, Brenda Airdos, to bring this to her attention. Judge Walker and I said it during the hearing that we weren't getting the appointments done, that was some time ago, and I know we did our letter to the governor to push the boards and commissions to make the appointments, but maybe we need to do a letter to Brenda, because the governor can't tell them to do -- to make the appointments. So, you know, do we know who is sponsoring, or at this point engaged in BDR-507?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I don't know off the top of my head, but I think Ross will know, if you want to talk about this tomorrow.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Well, I would suggest that maybe let Ross know he should engage whoever this person might be, because if Number 4 made it on the list, then they may either don't understand it or two, they are interested in making the changes, and we can work with this person to help curate the language, because I am also a little concerned about expanding JJOC to try to overcome this issue, because then you deal with what if don't quorum because it so big, you know, those kinds of things. So maybe there is way, whoever the point is on 507, we can start talking to that person and then at the same time send a letter to Brenda and the leadership to bring this to their attention before the legislative session starts.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And maybe that is what we're ultimately looking for, we DSF from the JJOC tomorrow, is to maybe have a letter saying what the JJOC would support. So, I mean, I think that's the best we can do so.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** But I guess I'm struggling what, there's not a lot detail here. So, you know, Number 4 is, you know what, I don't know if you're going get that tomorrow. I think there needs to be more discussion and we need to find out who it is that is looking to push this BDR forward, and if we don't know who that is, then maybe we can engage Speaker Frierson or, you know, somebody to start talking, because I think is pretty, I don't know if it's ready yet for that type of vote, but I mean I'm welcoming if people disagree with me, I just think there needs to be more done here.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I completely agree with you on that. I think that this is, that that's just a reaction to not meeting the federal requirements of OJJDP, and this definitely needs more thought and planning.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Number 5 is quality assurance reviews. Now I don't know where we left, this was expanding quality assurance reviews to the juvenile detention facilities was the intent of AB-472, and also listed in the JJOC strategic plan, so I put this on here because I did not know if that is something we are still

supporting, but it was written into AB-472, and it is a strategic plan. So I think there is some discussion around, do we want to expand these, the use of the correctional program checklist to the county detention facilities.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** This is Pauline. I think this is another one that was moved on before bringing all the counties into it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** We had that discussion at NAJA, at one meeting that the detention facilities have peer reviews through Silver State Detention, plus our LCB audits that are very comprehensive in that there was discussion that is this going to be duplicative, but the quality assurance -- the CCCP program that the state has been using really has been focused on the state facilities and county camps, and how would that translate over to detention centers, and I don't think we had everyone on the same page when this was recommended.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Because we go through audits.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So what's going to be -- what would this, I guess my questions would be, what would this be different, how would this be different than LCB's when they are at out facility for a week auditing everything, what would be the difference?

**Leslie Bittleston:** So, and I don't know the answer to that. This was just, like I said, taken -- because it was the intent, I didn't do any other research around it, so maybe what I recommend from this group is to maybe make a motion on what you think, and it could be as simple as we would like to make a motion to look at -- to do some further research into Number 1, Number 4, Number 5, or whatever it is. Or we can wait until JJOC talks tomorrow and make a motion on what the JJOC will support. I think Ross' intent was to put this in front of both groups, so we can follow up with the person that sponsored this bill and to say, this is what we want in the bill, this is what we don't want in the bill.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** So Leslie, from a point of order, do you need us to do that, I mean it seems to me that this is something that is just preliminary investigation and further research. I don't -- I'm not sure why the urgency of a vote when you have the authority within the department to further engage in this discussion anyways. I guess I'm missing something. I apologize. I'm just trying to make this a little bit easier for you so you can --

**Leslie Bittleston:** I agree with you, I agree with you. I think the biggest thing was to be perfectly honest was when I wrote this in January, the SAG didn't meet for January and February, and I did not get the opportunity to present this in front of you guys. So the biggest thing is we don't want to blindside JJOC members with anything, so I think that's the biggest thing Ross wanted to accomplish with this, to say, hey in our staff reports we put these things in there as potentially problematic for these -- for certain reasons, or things we need to work on.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** So is Ross in a position to explain that tomorrow, because I guess I'm a -- I don't know what the blindside is, because really you're just noticing us that this was in the report for

circumstances, you know. We didn't to get "maybe contribute or approve it", but that you're going to do your due diligence to bring more information back. I mean, I'm sorry, maybe I'm the only one --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, I think that, and Ross isn't here, so I mean I -- I might just be speaking out of turn here, but I think that the concern would be is that the governor's report is supposed to go through the SAG before it's submitted, and it didn't, and so in a way this is blindsiding, I mean, at least me, like I was like what, where did this stuff come from so, I can see that Ross might be a little concerned about that, but I agree with Joey that I mean I'm not comfortable making a motion to move any of these, because this is the first that I've seen of it and we can always have discussion in the full commission over it. I mean, I'm not even okay with saying, like yeah let's do this part or this part, you know, I'm just not. I think there is some other stuff that goes with the NAC revisions. I think that the corrective room restriction really focuses on state facilities, because of PBS and -- Clark County does PBS too, but the rural jurisdictions don't, so we're changing language because of PBS that a lot of us don't do. I mean, there's -- I think there's a lot that comes with this and I'm not comfortable asking this committee to make a motion to move any of them forward. I think, I mean, it's here now, so you guys can present it in front of the full commission and then we can have conversation with Ross there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. And maybe this is more like AB-449 was last time was let's do some research on these things and see what we come up, I mean, maybe that's a better way to look at this, I don't know, but I had no idea that it was turned into a BDR until Ross got back with me, and all he asked was this approved by the SAG, and I said, no because we didn't meet for two months, and that's when he told me to present this.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah, I think that goes back to -- federally it is supposed to go through the SAG before it goes through the governor.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I agree with you and I didn't have the opportunity. So, anyway, but as Joey said, I did my due diligence on the report and, you know, put some things in there that are potentially problematic or things that we might need to work on. That's -- with that being said, I never knew anybody read this. I've never in the five and half years been in my position, ever been asked a question on the governor's reports. This is the first time I've ever seen anything happen from the governor's report.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** And that being said, you know, lesson learned and it's good, great someone read our report, that's awesome, but we also -- I think most of us understand the BDR process. Just because it's a BDR doesn't mean it's going to move forward, I mean, these are place holders sometimes, and so that's why I'm saying, let's go to the source who is interested in this and see what part, because really all your report did was make recommendations. These aren't -- just because -- yes we've seen it, yes it should have been done before, but again I'm uncomfortable making a motion, and I'm not saying others can't, but to say, yes let's go forward, there's just not enough information here, and so I think more information is needed before we can make an educated decision as to a motion.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay, and I think that, and we probably, I won't have time to gather all of that by tomorrow, so --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** You can just present it as, this is it, this is what we have right now. It's not a finished product. It's not -- it's not enrolled. It's a BDR.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Yeah, it's just a BDR.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Jack and I will be there testifying against it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So anyway, so that's all this was, it was just to bring this to your attention what happens, it was just a comedy of errors and yes, this group is supposed to help with that -- what governor's report, but when we don't meet, you know, so that's what happened. So now you've been shown and we can have a discussion tomorrow.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right. Anything -- anybody else on this BDR? We're good to go. All right. Let's move to Agenda Item 10, use of school resource officers, Joey.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** So this is just for discussion, I don't expect a ton of conversation, I just -- I was in that mandatory SAG meeting with OJDDP and the conference, and on the final Friday when they had the SAG meeting, they discussed SROs in a matter of policy discussion, and it was surprising to me really how far apart so many people were on, I guess not surprising to me, but they were very candid publically on how far apart they were on the use of SROs, and our SROs essentially hinder any type of de-escalation or ability to provide wraparound services for youth when there are disciplinary issues that went to law enforcement, and I'll tell you, I abstained from the conversation, because I had not -- we had not this conversation as to what our side has experienced with SROs or any type of position, if you will. They were asking our positions and I abstained. So I want to bring it to this group, because I truly don't know what all the varying opinions are about the use of SROs and I know not every school has one, but I wanted to bring it to your attention for your input. Not to report back, but just that we can kind of keep a pulse on conversations that are happening at a national level.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Commissioner Martin.

**Jack Martin:** We have actually dealt this with extensively here in Clark County. Well obviously everybody knows Clark County school district is a massive school district, 330,000 students. They have their own police force with their own chief and their whole deal. So one of the things we did about four years ago was engaged Judge Tesky from Clayton County, Georgia, who brought the Clark County School justice partnership here. Since we have started that, and obviously with the BR new superintendent, Superintendent Hada, Dr. Hada, is committed to working with us from the juvenile justice prospective in terms of reducing the number of kids who get escalated, acknowledging the school to prison pipeline. So he has been incredible in that space, but we've seen obviously Covid has thrown a sticker in the middle of our spokes in terms of data collection for this year, but we were consistently seeing less and less and less referrals from the school district. We also created the Harbor, which was obviously an intervention that was being used by the SROs. We created methodology in which the SROs could still get their potential pound of flesh with these warning, I forget what we call them, Jennifer, there --

**Jennifer Fraser:** Focus acts.

**Jack Martin:** Yeah, the focus acts, and the warning certificates. Instead of a guy getting a citation the SRO could write this Harbor referral generally from the campus. So, you know, I am a proponent of having adults on campuses, I just don't know if they need to look like SWAT team members and I think they definitely need to refocus their training around supportive interventions versus maintaining an upholding order. In their defense, the opposite side of this has become the principals often times use the SROs in completely inappropriate ways as the hammer, so whenever it becomes a nail, everything becomes a hammer, right. So, you know, I think there's a long way to go in terms of this evolution, but I'm very excited about the direction in which Clark County has taken in terms of looking at -- look at the SRO in a new and different light. I'm a little trepidations right now looking at we're changing over our chiefs. Our last chief was kind of a turkey, so goodbye turkey. I'm hoping that we hire on a new chief that's got a restorative justice mindset, but that kind of how Clark County is that way.

**Jennifer Fraser:** I would just like to echo. This Jennifer, public defender at Clark County what Jack said about what we're doing and what the school district is doing, and I'm also a member at the Ashville Juvenile Center and co-director for the Western Region, and there has been a lot of recent trainings on this and the trend around the country, especially the traumatic impact it can have on children of color of having officers in, especially like younger age, and just understanding that and that there needs to maybe not necessarily completely removal, but diversion of funds and to increase social workers and other resources for kids and families in schools. I think it is an important topic and definitely on trend around the country.

**Rebekah Graham:** This is Rebekah Graham for the record. That's exactly like, and Jennifer is on our commission, and Clark County school district was an excellent participant in our RED Commission, but it was really clear that they don't have a lot of training around interim care or mental illness or dealing with youth of color. So, not to throw the baby out with the bathwater, you know, these are talented people who can be resources, but if they're not getting the right training and their used incorrectly, then it is (unintelligible).

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And Joey for us in Humboldt, we had -- we have seen an increase in our bookings when the state had handed additional money for SROs. At the same time they funded some social work positions, but we saw an increase in our bookings, and quite a big increase, and they were for what I considered level offenses that did not really arrest, but I agree with what Commissioner Martin said too, is that sometimes the principals and our SROs were paid half out of the police department and half out of the school district, so there was really blurring of lines of who could tell them what to do, and so if the principals or the dean of students or whatever, vice principal wanted a kid arrested, it was always this battle back and forth, so we did -- so now the school district no longer pays a portion that comes out of our law enforcement agency, and we've been doing a lot of training with them with our SROs about adolescent brain development, trauma informed care, when we have training for our staff here, they're invested, and we've really had good reception about that, and also just like de-escalation tips, like it doesn't always have to be an arrest, you know, you can bring them through our front door and we can call the parents in and meet with the SRO and them just to provide them some support, but definitely had to do some scared straight doesn't work training and there are other ways we can go about it, besides just an arrest.

**Heather Plager:** This is Heather. Just to add my experiences, I tried to do a lot of training when I first came on with the department because it was definitely, our SROs were very law enforcement focused and a lot of arrests for school issues. I received a lot of push back on that. It has not gone well. Some of the SROs were receptive of that, but, I mean, I think we've probably had -- they just actually put three more officers on our SRO team, so at this point I think I have like seven, and I would say maybe two out of that seven have been receptive to the training on brain development, the training on the assessment tool, the YLS, the how we make decisions that we make at my department. The other ones sort of became a personal issue, so now it's not about the issue, it was me personally, so I'm trying to work through that, but I did notice that it is bigger than just training the SROs, because there is a lot of push from the school. The school has become very reliant on SROs, and so what they traditionally would deal with just the school vice principal saying a disciplinary action, it is now called an SRO, and SROs have pushed very hard back on me for, you know, I think if we could put this truant girl in detention because she is not going to school five days a week, and I'm like, I'm not putting a truant in detention, and it becomes a very personal things, because it's Heather is not holding this kid and I can't get them to see. I've tried to show them the laws. I've tried to explain to them behind, but at the end of the day, they're like, we're getting pressure from the school and she is clearly not doing what she is doing. She's not doing drugs. We know that she is. I'm like then prove to me that she is. We can't because they're just hearing on the street, which is valid, right, we all know that is probably legit what's going on, but I need the proof. So it's just the circular that I'm really having a hard time breaking over that threshold.

**Rebekah Graham:** And this is Rebekah Graham for the record. There's truth to the adage that all you have is hammer, everything is nail, and so when you have -- and the SROs are nice people, well attentions people, the attorneys following up on the tickets have common sense, but the schools need a hammer and why wouldn't they use it when it is right there, and so that -- that speaks to the argument of essentially making the police less available to schools to use as a hammer, you know, when it's unnecessary.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I do think that there's, I mean, we've had -- we had to go through, and I don't Heather if you've tried it, but we, you know, we went through like the chief and the lieutenant of the police department and just said like, hey you guys are frustrated that we're booking and releasing, but we're going to book and release on these charges, so let's figure out how we can all work together, and so one of the things that we did is that we created groups at school with the social workers that kids could be referred to like they need to go into the counselor's office, they're doing a group on this topic, like the effects of vaping and on school grounds, and all, I mean, we really, because we kept seeing certain, like all these citations in certain areas, and then we offered the school, like hey I have staff that are certified in this curriculum, you give us a room, and a set date and time and we'll come do that, and if the kids complete it that citation is ripped up, and they can go on their merry way, stop suspending kids because then they're out for three days causing, you know, whatever, maybe a little more mayhem, and then we're bound to get them again and escalates them in the system, and we really -- I just kept working with the chief, like yeah you guys are frustrated at us, I get it, let's figure this out, because they were -- it was the same with us too, like well you don't even hold them, yeah I'm not going to hold them.

**Heather Plager:** That's a good point. For me, it goes up even bigger. My county commissioners actually passed two ordinances just in the last six months making it a status offense for vaping or tobacco possession in my community. So they're going the opposite way. I went to the county commissioner meetings and I tried to explain to them, guys these are status offenses and we don't need to widen our net, right, like, but they -- I can't -- my community is just a still little like, and with the school district that came and actually put on this whole big presentation about how, you know, vaping and tobacco use is causing all these problems, and of course the SROs were there saying we need tools in our tool belt, so we need to write them citations and there needs to be fines involved, and I'm like, no let's do some educational programming to try to address the underlying, you know, reasons and let's educate kids on why they don't want to use it, but I was the only voice in the room. So I feel like sometimes I'm like, I just can't them to understand.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah. Yeah it took us a good year.

**Jack Martin:** Judge Teste in that program that the school test's partnership is very helpful with that, because the kickoff to that Chief Plager is a two-day, you know, you've got to get all the partners at the table. We had about 75 people around the table, from local assemblymen, senators, you know, commissioners, superintendents, teachers, principals, union leaders. We had a lot of people around the table and Judge Teste, he's got his show ponies and brings out this whole production and then we have to work as a team and then he breaks off the team in like these different work groups and we had to find it, and he brings a lot of evidence, because, you know, I mean I love Judge Boyd to death, but Judge Boyd vacillates the thing on which way the vote is going on depending on where he is going to with the call, right, and I'm not saying I'm not speaking out of school, because we argue about this all the time. You know, the rally was after you see the overwhelming evidence kind of beat on you for two days and it opens up some conversations, so where are some places you will compromise, where are some places that you will do some things. It was really good, I mean, we had the PD, the DA, we had everybody at the table and to be honest with you, I mean, Joey I know you're familiar with the program, I don't think it was really cause for



-- it wasn't super expensive to bring that whole gaggle of folks out there, and I think they even have some scholarship money.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Yeah, if I recall, we had grant money to help support that too, and so Heather I can send you the -- the website that culminated a lot of the resources from only Clark County, but throughout the country, and I would have no problem, I know, I'm sure Jack would introduce to Judge Teste, he's our judge for the NCJSEJ. So, I'm really pleased hear nationally that Nevada is somewhat in sync, except maybe Heather's community with the national movement and the conversation with SROs, I just didn't really feel like I had the words to speak on behalf of our state, because I don't wear my NCJSEJ hat in that meeting, I wear my Nevada hat, so this -- this is very helpful, but Heather if you would like, I'm happy to send you the link to the website and maybe introduce you to Judge Teste if you would like.

**Heather Plager:** Yeah. No, I would really like that, because I would like to try to get the message out there and I just don't think my little voice is enough. The more I can get behind me I think -- I can make the contacts. I can get the people, you know, here this is what we're trying to do, but I think it needs to be a little bit bigger than me.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** What Clark County has done is amazing, I mean, and being such a large community too, it's really a national model, it really is.

**Jack Martin:** And whatever we could do help Heather, don't be afraid to ask. I mean, I would be willing to come up there and have conversations with folks and send some of my teammates, or whatever we got to do help.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Don't do your little dance you did when you were talking about Winnemucca and Elko, that won't go well. Maybe that one was better than the one you did for us.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Thank you all for your input. I don't want to take up too much time on the agenda, I just want to let you know I -- like I abstained and did not speak on behalf of Nevada on that topic.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you. All right. New data requirements, Agenda Item 11.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So Kayla Landes did a spreadsheet and if you would like Kayla to go through it, we are already at the 20 after and I think our meeting just to 12:30, so if you want to skip this and just go to room confinement and we can talk about this at the next meeting, but Kayla did a whole spreadsheet, doing kind of like a crosswalk of federal and state requirements. As you know, there are some additional requirements at OJJDP put on states, so it's kind of how are we going to collect that stuff. So I don't know if you want -- Kayla to go over that now or move it to the next meeting.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I've got a quick question on that, because in our documents there is the new format, data collection, Kayla is that one, because I didn't see the full document you had.

**Kayla Landes:** Yeah, that -- it is the new one, but for -- it didn't come through on Google docs, so I emailed everybody. Basically I took that huge spreadsheet I had originally created and I kept it on the Excel spreadsheet, but I created little tabs at the bottom, so that is not so overwhelming, and I sectioned it off into the tabs for our AB-449, JJOC, and things like that. So that's why it didn't come through on Google docs, because it's under different tabs.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Perfect Kayla, thank you for doing that.

**Kayla Landes:** Sure.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So she just emailed it to us, I just saw it on our email, so let's just -- I'm going to just table this right now and we can, of course, have more discussion tomorrow. No hopes of time here, because we are running a little late.

**Kayla Landes:** And I didn't add any more information from the last time we discussed it, I had just broken it down, so like I said it's not so overwhelming for everybody to look at.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you Kayla, we appreciate that.

**Kayla Landes:** Sure.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay, because we're -- let me just ask this then, for Agenda Item 12, Kayla is there anything in SV-107 since the last time we met that concerned you, is a red flag, it needs our eyes and ears on it right now?

**Kayla Landes:** No. And I'm going to be presenting the same information that I would today tomorrow.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay, perfect.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And the same for me, I'm also presenting the status offender data tomorrow as well. Just to let you know, we had six violations and two uses of a valid court order, and just two days ago I finally got the valid court orders that were used and I would like to bring them back to the SAG or Pauline have you look at them, because I'm a little concerned that those orders are not meeting federal requirements. So the both of them are out of Douglas County. So -- but just to kind of let you know, we had six violations and two uses of VCL.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah and I think VCL has always been an opportunity for a lot of training and that that training needs to be consistent, because I made the mistake when I first started of telling a judge their court orders weren't valid, that didn't go over very well, I learned the hard way on that, but it does help to train, like just to meet with the judges and say, here's the VCL checklist, this is everything that has to go in it, because typically they don't do the steps of where an evaluation has to be completed, where every other opportunity and availability of a community based placement has been, you know, has been afforded to the youth. That they were formally admonished before they were detained, I mean, there's a lot of things that go through there and so I think that that, I mean, I'm more than willing to look them over and, but it really has constantly been just a meeting at the table discussing like, hey, yeah, your court orders are valid. Don't tell them what I told them, but this is what we need to be able to use a valid court order, and we're trying to, you know, phase these out and how can we help you to be able to do that, and so that does happen.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So in saying that, that's probably a better method is to meet with the judge and talk about it, because I can tell you the two court orders that I got did not cover everything that it should.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And they don't know that. If a new judge has been, you know, like if weren't -- if that didn't have that information prior to you starting the or judges change, I mean, that that's what that checklist is for, and judges used to say to me, like yeah, look at my checklist, it's done, hah-hah-hah, and I'm like great, that's a valid court order for the feds, but that little checklist is so helpful to judges when they're doing it, because they're not trying to violate it intentionally, it's just they're use to their court orders and doesn't always address all the requirements.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So I will follow up with the Douglas County judge on that and do a little training.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And then -- and the other thing that's helpful is you pull, like pull in acting Chief Torres and have him set the meeting up like with the judge and you, and have him there too. So, it's helpful to get whoever the chief or director is in that jurisdiction, because they work for the judges most jurisdictions, and it's just helpful.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Other than that, no big deals in the status offender report.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right. Is there any new business? I see none. We have our full commission meeting tomorrow, so -- working on here. Are there any agenda items for our next meeting that we want to add or take off from our current agenda? I think we can probably -- we'll take off the three-year plan, because that will be voted tomorrow, hopefully. You can always email Kayla and Leslie if you need something on the agenda. And then, we'll meet again next month, just because that's appropriate. We've got a lot of tasks we're working on and data we're tracking, so is 11 o'clock working for everybody, better than one?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Jack Martin:** Sure. Chairman Salla, we might want to think about adding that -- another legislative piece just for oncoming BDRs. I think we're going to start getting those hitting pretty quick, I don't know how much we want to jump into that space or if that's even important at all.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Oh, that's a great reminder. Jack, thank you. Yes, because we did track legislation through the SAG last year and it's helpful, if we're tracking it through the SAG, then we share that with NAJA and NAJA shares those with ours too, so we make sure we're not missing anything. So that's a great idea. So if we could add just legislative -- upcoming legislative session as a standing item, because we can track BDRs in there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Will do.

**Jack Martin:** And do we have any bills or can we -- can we host or -- or recommend any bills out this -- out of this committee or, how does that work? I mean, obviously your governor is not going to carry any of them, but is there something that we see that had some value from here, maybe we could find -- I know there's a lot of legislatures texting me looking for stuff that I'm interested in, so.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And this is Leslie. My understanding is yes, you can, if there's something you want to support, it can go through the JJOC to the -- to a legislator, that is my understanding.

**Jack Martin:** Right. Just of a point of because, I mean, honestly being in Clark County I could care less what the JJOC, I mean I don't want to say it like that, I mean, obviously we do care, but I mean if I differ from the JJOC, like I -- I had to give for a couple of years ago against the supreme court division, because it was going to have adverse effects on Clark County. I'm afraid that I have to, you know, I can't align with one or the other, and I wouldn't be testifying as a member of JJOC, I assume that would be Judge Walker or Ms. Joey. My thoughts, right, because you're the Chair, right Ms. Joey?

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** It would just determine on, yeah, I don't know the exact answer, it depends on the legislation and what we can and can't do, because Judge Walker can't testify on everything, neither can I, so --

**Jack Martin:** It gets so dicey, right. When we get to legislative session, I mean, I don't want to bad mouth this group or have this group bad mouth me, but, I mean, a lot of competing interests, especially with some of this stuff, so it can get crazy.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Yep.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** And it does Jack and -- and because the SAG is -- is -- feels the spot for the federal state advisory group, we can't lobby either, we can testify on facts and information and data, but we can't lobby either, so I'm not sure that there would be anything coming out of -- of this committee, because I think that really is in conflict with our federal requirements, but we always have the ability as -- as for you, the Director of Clark County, to testify however your county sees fit, and it happens, I mean, you know, NAJA has spoke out against bills too and some jurisdictions were in support, and so they could testify and all, I mean, I just think that, I'm not so sure it can come out of the SAG bill -- the SAG committee.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** I don't think it can, I think you're right Pauline.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** I would also just though if we are -- if we do find ourselves, and this is what we did with Governor Sandoval, if the -- if the cabinet members all disagreed, we at least just gave each other a heads up, you know.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Right.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** So we're not, again to use Leslie's term blindsided by contrary testimony, so but you, I mean, everyone has an independent voice.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Commissioner Martin will always tell us, we are never blindsided.

**Jack Martin:** This is true. Tourette's has its advantages.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I just appreciate the honesty, so at least I know what's coming.

**Jack Martin:** Heather doesn't appreciate it so much, that's all another thing.

**Heather Plager:** Whatever.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** All right. So let's keep our meeting the same -- the same time for next month and if we're looking at, is it the second Thursday of the month? Is that what we're looking at? Is the second -- is the second Thursday of this month? Let me look. Just a minute guys.

**Kayla Dunn:** This is the second Thursday of the month.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay, let's -- how about, oh I just moved the third --

**Kayla Dunn:** Thursday of the month.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** What is it?

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** This is the third Thursday of the month. Isn't today the 17th?

**Kayla Dunn:** Oh, sorry -- sorry.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** That's okay. So that would be the 21st of January. Does that work?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Joey Orduna-Hastings:** Yes.

**Kayla Dunn:** Looks good.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Of 2021, which will be a brand new year, things will be better, it will just be a great time to come back together, hopefully.

**Jack Martin:** Absolutely. Happy Holidays.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Merry Christmas you guys. I'll see you -- I'll see you tomorrow. See you all tomorrow. Thank you guys. Thank you everyone that stayed the whole time. You guys did awesome. Thank you. Bye everyone.

Meeting adjourned.