



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
4126 TECHNOLOGY WAY, SUITE 300
CARSON CITY, NV 89706
Telephone (775) 684-4400 • Fax (775) 684-4455
dcfs.nv.gov

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
Full Commission Meeting
September 14th, 2018**

Meeting Minutes

Roll Call: Judge Egan Walker- present; Joey Orduna Hastings- present; Brigid Duffy- not present; Darin Imlay- present; Emmanuel Torres- present; Eve Hanan- not present; Frank Cervantes- present; Gianna Verness- not present; Jack Martin- not present; Jackie Pierrott- present; Jo Lee Wickes- present; John Lambrose- not present; Kaite Hickman- not present; Kierra Bracken- present; Dr. Lisa Morris Hibbler- not present; Justice Nancy Saitta- not present; Mayra Rodriguez-Galindo- not present; Patrick Schreiber- not present; Paula Smith- present; Pauline Salla-Smith- present; Rebekah Graham- present; Ricardo Villalobos- present; Ross Armstrong- present; Scott Shick- present; Deputy Chief Shawn Anderson- not present; Assemblyman James Ohrenschall- present; Assemblyman James Oscarson- not present; Judge William Voy- present; Judge Thomas Stockard- not present; Melissa Sickmund- present; Andrew Wachter- present; Jacob Murphy- present; Heber Bray- present; Holly Welborn- present

Public Comment:

Meeting Minutes:

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this session of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. My cochair and I, Ms. Orduna Hastings, welcome you to this session. Excuse me. Just a few housekeeping rules, when you speak into the microphone, please do what I didn't do, and that is identify yourself for the record so that we

can keep an accurate record of things. If you're joining us on the phone, please place us on mute so that we don't have any background noise bleeding in. Ms. Bellows, would you please engage in a roll call to establish a quorum?

Sarah Bellows: Thank you very much. We do have a quorum based off the full Commission attendance.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Thank you very much for that. Is there any public comment that anyone would like to offer in Clark County? I see no one rising or moving to public comment. Any public comment here in Carson City? Hearing none, the next agenda item then we'd like to take up is the ACLU presentation. And Ms. Welborn, please go ahead and introduce yourself and your colleague.

Holly Welborn: Is it on? Yep. There it is. Thank you so much. My name is Holly Welborn. I'm the policy director for the ACLU of Nevada. I want to thank Cochair Orduna Hastings for inviting me to come today and for all of you for hearing our presentation. I'm sure you've heard about the report that we released in June. I sent it to all of you. Several of you were in attendance at the Legislative Commission on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice in June where we rolled out that report and may have heard our testimony. This presentation is largely the same; just want to make sure that we're speaking to our stakeholders. Many of you—especially Mr. Cervantes, Jack Martin, and several others were very helpful in helping us gather information for our report; letting us come into their facilities and tour them. And we really thank everyone for their participation. So, we think it's time for us to continue that conversation and see where we can go. I do want to let this Commission know that the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Committee did accept a bill draft based on our recommendations to further study this issue. We did not request a bill draft for actually removing young adults or youth from adult facilities, but we need to further study the issue. And that was after really gaining an understanding of the fiscal impact that it could have on our local and regional facilities and seeing how we can make a transition possible moving forward. So, that will be a bill draft from that committee next session.

Judge William Voy: I'm sorry. Excuse me. This is Judge Voy. I'm sorry to interrupt, but I'm getting text messages from folks that are trying to access the phone, saying that the code isn't working, the access code.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Thank you, Judge Voy. This is Joey. We are aware of the issue. And we've emailed the team here to see what we can do to fix that.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Please go ahead, Ms. Welborn.

Holly Welborn: Thank you. Holly Welborn, Policy Director ACLU Nevada for the record. So, our organization has advocated for removing young people from adult facilities for quite some time. We were part of the effort to change certification ages, change direct file ages. And we've been working with the department trying to convince them to use certain regulatory authority to remove kids from the Lovelock Correctional Facility. Youth certification is on the rise in Nevada. Youthful offender units across the state are

overcrowded, and housing for girls is limited or non-existent, and has its own constitutional concerns. Federal and state laws have made it increasingly challenging for the NDOC to meet the needs of their youthful population. We're especially concerned about education and exercise requirements of the boys that are living in the Lovelock institution. So, our hope is that the facility assessment and input from states where young offenders are housed with the juvenile population will convince this group and our legislators that it's time to at least start looking at how other states approach this issue at this critical stage in a child's life. I won't spend a lot of time talking about adolescent brain science. I think these are the experts in the area of adolescent brain science, or the arguments for and against keeping youth in adult facilities. I think that this Commission and the members on it have a thorough understanding of that when it comes to issues like recidivism and mental health and diminished access to services. But just to say when it comes to adolescent brain science and the reforms that we have seen, we're living in an era in the United States and in the state of Nevada where every young person who enters the prison system will have a meaningful opportunity for parole, which means that their programming needs to be age appropriate at that critical stage in their lives. Right now, the Lovelock Correctional Center, based on the restrictions of the Prison Rape Elimination Act, JJCPA, and other requirements, they are unable to fulfill that. So, this group I also feel is very well aware of our statutory exclusion laws, well aware of the direct file certification proceedings, because you deal with that every day. I do want to speak directly about young women and some of the issues that we've had. So, when we embarked on this project, we spoke with the director of the Department of Corrections. It really is a problem. We really see ourselves as partners in this effort to try to find a solution. I do want to make very clear that we do not believe that what is happening with the boys in Lovelock Correctional Center or with young women has to do with any expressed neglect, but it's more of funding, lack of resources, and just inappropriate placement of those young people. And I believe the Department of Corrections is well aware of those issues and is very committed to working with all of the stakeholders to find appropriate solution. But I do know that they do not feel that they are the appropriate placement, and particularly, Lovelock Correctional Center is not the appropriate placement for these young men. As far as women, there is nowhere for young women to go. We've tried to figure out exactly how many young women are pushed into the system. We know that one young woman is living out of state. Another young woman, that her attorney is fighting to keep her in state. There's been some kind of silent, behind-the-scenes agreements with Clark County to keep the young woman in that that regional facility until they kind appropriate placement for her until she reaches the age of majority. But this raises serious constitutional concerns. There's lawsuits in several states because this is a problem that's only affecting young girls, so they're being transferred to other states away from their families. Also, the only other alternative is to place those girls in solitary confinement, away from any other true interaction, which is just not the appropriate placement for those young women. So, we do think that there needs to be an immediate, transparent process between the Nevada Department of Corrections before the Board of Prison Commissioners, and juvenile justice advocates to openly address that issue for those young women. In the past, we have advocated for the utilization of administrative regulations, which allow the Department of Corrections to convene with stakeholders, the folks at this table, the folks on this commission, to determine the best placement for young people. We've gotten to a stage where there are so few that we're dealing with, that regulation really could be utilized. In

my conversations with many of you, my conversations with the NDOC, it's really more of not wanting to have that burden, understanding that there is a problem, but that there is a financial burden because the local juvenile facilities are not set up to maintain a child for extended periods of time. It's really more six months max, not for several years. A child could end up in those facilities for several years. For example, educational programming, it would be very difficult. We concede that it would be very difficult for Mr. Cervantes and Mr. Martin to completely change their educational programming to accommodate an influx of young people who will be there for two, three, four years. That that is something that needs to be looked at, and solutions need to be found to figure out how we could appropriately fund that to keep kids in that facility, if they were to go to a regional facility. So, we do understand that there are those impacts and that that needs to be looked at before we can force people into that; otherwise, that could have detrimental effects for those children as well. But we do think that because there are so few, that the opportunity with young women, that that regulation could be utilized and we make that recommendation today. So, other proposed solutions that we've talked about, I think most of you are familiar with those. There have been conversations about building a facility here in Carson that's focused on young people, youthful offenders, and then also the folks aged 18 to 25. Of course, those fail because the Carson facility had a \$26 million price tag. Other reasons that some of these proposals have failed is because there was some advocacy to and to save NYTC. There was also proposals to move the kids to Summit View Correctional Center, but with security concerns. They didn't end up going there. So, we do understand that this is something that the state has been looking at for a very long time. So, I think where we're moving is: What is the best solution? For a long time, we've talked about it. We know it's a problem. Every stakeholder I've had a discussion with knows and understands that it's time to find that solution. So, on the phone, we have Jennifer Redman from the Green Hill School in Washington State, and we have Heber Bray with the Oregon Youth Authority. Both of those states actually integrate youth. One of the issues that came up when we were going through this project is this sort of idea of juvenile still is the super predator, kind of that mentality that these kids just by even sentencing them or certifying them, even before they've been convicted, just the mere fact that they have any interaction with the adult justice system makes them more violent, and they just cannot possibly be intermixed with other youth. So, I have two folks on the phone that live in states where they have proven that that isn't the case. That they work with youth up until the age of 21, I believe, in both jurisdictions. But they are on the phone today to share how their programs work, what their statutes are like, and the agreements that they have with their departments of corrections. So, I really think that's going to be the most illuminating part of our discussion today. And then once they're done, I could talk a little bit more about our facility reviews. So, Jennifer, are you on the phone?

Jennifer Redman: I am.

Holly Welborn: Wonderful. I will turn it over to you.

Jennifer Redman: Okay. Thank you for having me. It's a little difficult doing it over the phone, so I'll do the best that I can to explain how Washington state manages youth, specifically those that are serving adult sentences. I have provided copies of our relevant RCWs to the folks there in Nevada. And they can certainly share those if requested. But, basically, we

have, in Washington State, evolved over several years. There was a point in time that youth that were serving adult sentences were kept separate are not housed within our juvenile facilities. They were within a Department of Corrections facility, kind of in a separate wing or separate area. And it sounds like some of the challenges that Nevada is experiencing today were some of the things that we were experiencing 15 to 20 years ago, which we're struggling to provide them age-appropriate programming, specifically issues around education and meeting the education requirements. So, when those types of issues and potential litigation started to arise, we had to really rethink how we provide housing and treatment services for people that were under the age of 18. Our jurisdiction in Washington state, juvenile jurisdiction goes up to age 21. So, we do have youth serving juvenile sentences in our juvenile facilities up to age 21. We have an agreement with the Department of Corrections through that evolution that I spoke about where youth, who are tried as adults, so under 18, committed a certain offense, and they receive an adult sentence. If they are under 18 at the time of sentencing, then we will, in fact, house those youth in one of our juvenile facilities. And that would be an institution setting. And so, what that means is they are intermixed with all of our other young people that are servicing juvenile sentences. You can't walk outside on my specific campus, which has approximately 170 youth, I can't tell the difference from a youth serving an adult sentence versus a youth serving a juvenile sentence. They receive the same type of programming. They go to school together. They participate in treatment groups together. They live together. Particularly in my institution, I have ages 16- to 21-year olds. We have our female population at a different facility. So, it works out fine. We do, within that agreement with the Department of Corrections, have some clauses where should be there situations where a youth serving an adult sentence who is well over age 18, 19, what have you, if they're exhibiting behaviors that are repeated behaviors, high-risk, assaultive behaviors, staff assault or what have you, we do have the ability to transfer them on to the Department of Corrections, because they're over 18 to serve out the remainder of their adult sentence. So, there isn't anything that forces them to be here the entire time should they pose as a significant detriment to the rest of our population. We recently had a change in legislation this past session. And it's also in line with adolescent brain development up to age 25, where for certain offenses, juveniles that would have historically gotten adult sentences would now get almost a special juvenile sentence that could actually keep them in a juvenile facility, extend their sentence up to age 25. So, here in the next three or four years, Washington state is actually going to be having older youth with us serving juvenile sentences up to age 25. We anticipate that soon after that, in these next few legislative sessions, we're going to be seeing the same be applied to our juveniles that have adult sentences, meaning that if their adult sentence extends beyond age 21, where currently, we would be transferring them on to an adult prison, an adult facility, now we would be keeping them a little bit longer should their sentence end prior to age 25. And, again, that's all in align with adolescent brain development and making sure that we're matching treatment services, academics with the age of the youth that we have with us. We have community facilities also Washington state. Those are step-down programs, which are considered minimum security. Also within our agreement with the Department of Corrections, and it was adjusted in statute that allows adult-sentenced juveniles, who have an adult sentence release date prior to age 21, the ability to go step down into one of our community facilities to help with their re-entry and transition process. So, that was a change that occurred a couple years ago, and so we continue to evolve in Washington state to

essentially—despite the sentence that a young person receives, we're treating them as a young person based on their age and providing them the access and treatment services that matches to it. Anything else you'd like me to provide? Any other questions?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Ross Armstrong from the Division of Child and Family Service, and I just have two questions that are more about your system and your structure. So, my first question is: Do your juveniles in Washington, do they have determinate sentences or not? And then my second question is: I know that the state of Washington is going through some restructuring in its human services' agencies, and so I'm just curious where your agency fits in that restructuring.

Jennifer Redman: Yes, our sentences are determinate. And as far as our structure, we currently, our juvenile rehabilitation administration, which is our juvenile justice arm, is currently under our Department of Social and Health Services, which includes Child and Family, I mean, anything that would normally be under Department of Social and Health Services type of administration. What we are doing is and it's already halfway done, is we've created a new department, and it's called Department of Children and Family Services, and it pulls us out of the larger DSHS. Our DSHS was very huge. It includes mental health hospitals for adults, special commitment center, child support, economic services, it's very large. And our governor had the desire to really provide more focus and attention on children services, and that by us being a part of that larger department, DSHS; we weren't maybe getting the attention that we needed to get. So, they've created a smaller department called the Department of Children and Family Services, and it includes our Department of Early Learning, Juvenile Rehabilitation, which is us, as well as Children's Administration, which is child welfare, foster care, dependency, all that stuff. And so, that's a new department. It'll be live next July. It's only halfway developed right now. We have not joined it yet, but it'll be smaller. And our ability to just get more attention and spotlight on us and not become clouded by the larger social services department, it should produce better outcomes for us.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Thank you.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Good afternoon. This is Frank Cervantes, Commission. Question on the sentencing, who retains the original jurisdiction? So, if somebody is—are they convicted as an adult and just housed in the juvenile system until- up to 25?

Jennifer Redman: Yeah, So, I'll explain it. There's a couple different scenarios. So, when a youth receives an adult sentence and they—if they're under 18, they come to live and receive treatment services in a juvenile facility. If their sentence—now, the Department of Corrections still controls their sentence, so they have a Department of Corrections case manager, who actually is on my campus, because a third of our population fits this criteria. They still have jurisdiction of the sentencing, because their release requirements are different than juvenile. However, when they do their calculations, if their earned release date is scheduled to conclude prior to age 21, then the statute says that we, meaning Juvenile Rehabilitation, we have placement decision-making power, authority over that young person, even though they're serving an adult sentence. So, what that means is we have the

ability to put them out in a group home, because their sentence ends prior to age 21. Now, if it's a young person who has a sentence that goes beyond age 21, an adult sentence, then Department of Corrections has placement authority and jurisdiction. Those young people remain on my campus the entire time until we transfer them to a Department of Corrections facility. They're seen as higher risk, just because they have a longer sentence.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Egan Walker for the record. I'm one of the Commissioners. What's been the reaction of your judiciary?

Jennifer Redman: About what?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: About any of it. I believe that those pesky judges have opinions on most every subject, and so I'm just curious to know what sort of feedback they've given you.

Jennifer Redman: Yeah. Well, I can't fully say. I think what I'm aware of is we've been housing juveniles serving adult sentences in juvenile facilities for several years now. And we have many a legislative tour groups, which include judges at times, various court attorneys that come to my campus specifically, because we have the larger group of these young people. It's a bit of an "aha" moment for them when they see the types of programming that we have on this campus. And my campus is fenced. So, I think that it speaks to that level of, there's always that security factor, because they don't- even though I see that person as a young person, and the only difference is the type of sentence that they received compared to someone who may have committed the same crime, but maybe they were from a different county and just got a different judge. Ultimately, when they come on our campus and see what we provide them and the level of risk mitigation that we do, they leave pleasantly surprised, I guess. And they have comfort, so that when they go back to their courts and they have to make those decisions around giving the young person a sentence, whatever that sentence may look like, they have a better understanding where they're going. I am not aware of any negative feedback or responses from any of the judges. Judges always have balance. They have to respond to community, community safety. My understanding is they feel like we're being responsive to it. And we've had a lot of judges participating in many forums where we've had youth panels and other kind of juvenile justice experts speaking to adolescent brain development and things like that. And my understanding is they've been very receptive to the research that's out there. That's my understanding.

Judge William Voy: Judge Walker, this is Judge Voy. Can I have a question?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Sure. Go ahead. And then we'll go to Ms. Salla.

Judge William Voy: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Couple questions. Okay. So I understand this correctly, State of Washington, you have determinate sentencing for juvenile offenders, correct?

Jennifer Redman: Uh-huh.

Judge William Voy: And then the facilities you're talking about where you co-mingle, they're secure facilities, fences, things like that, right?

Jennifer Redman: They are secure facilities unless they meet the criteria to go to a group home.

Judge William Voy: Yeah, no, I gotcha. But, as far as the corrections, they'll go correctional placement, when you're intermixing the juvies in the juvenile sentencing and adult sentencing kids together, those are in secure facilities when you're mixing those two. My question then based upon that is: So, if I have a 16-year old in one of your co-mingled facilities serving a juvenile sentence and I've got a 19-year old, who's still serving an adult sentence, has been convicted as an adult, how do you reconcile that with your requirements of PREA?

Jennifer Redman: It's not a PREA finding, so we have had—

Judge William Voy: I don't understand why.

Jennifer Redman: What's that?

Judge William Voy: I don't understand why it wouldn't be, because if he's a convicted adult in an adult sentence and they're over the age of 18, I get it if they're convicted as an adult, but they're under the age of 18, there's exceptions under PREA for that. But once they've reached that magic 18-year age and say they're 19 now, and you've got that 19-year old convicted adult serving an adult sentence with a 16-year old juvenile doing a juvenile sentence, who hasn't been convicted as an adult, I just don't see how you get around the PREA issue without having with all the other exceptions of sound/sight separation, everything else.

Jennifer Redman: Yeah. So-

Judge William Voy: Unless that facility is suited for that or whatever. I don't know.

Jennifer Redman: Right. And we've had that analysis done as far as: Does this still require sight and sound separation? And it does not, because they received their sentence under the age of 18, and our juvenile jurisdiction goes up to age 21. Even if it's a young person serving an adult sentence; it's an adult sentence they received under the age of 18, they come to us. We have an agreement with the Department of Corrections. Our jurisdiction already goes to age 21, so there isn't a sight and sound separation requirement. And we've vetted that through numerous attorneys, as well as national consultants.

Judge William Voy: So, my follow up to that then. So, you've got something from the feds under PREA, who have jurisdiction to administer the PREA program saying this is okay? If you do, and then if you do, can you share that with us?

Jennifer Redman: Yeah. So, basically, we are not being shown as violating a PREA standard, if that's what you're asking. So, we've had PREA audits, and that's not coming up as a finding, if that's what you're asking. We're not in violation of PREA. So, that's correct.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any other questions, first, for the speaker? I didn't understand, or maybe I missed it. And I think Assemblyman Ohrenschall has a question after my comment. Would you be kind enough to send us copies of any of the correspondence you've received from the federal government, and, in particular, any correspondence you've received authorizing this, as opposed to auditing you and not identifying it as a problem, but an affirmative statement saying, this is okay, if you have them.

Jennifer Redman: Yep.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: Thank you very much, Judge Walker. Couple quick questions. So, at your facility, the spectrum of ages goes from 16 all the way to 25, or was it 21?

Jennifer Redman: Yeah. So, prior to July 1st of this year, our jurisdiction was age 21. We had a bill, a law that was passed just this last legislative session that allows us to – with youth use this special juvenile sentence, and there's a title for it, and I don't have it. But it's a—like an exceptional sentence if they meet a certain criteria. It's a juvenile sentence that allows us to—that carries them beyond age 21. And they would be residing in a juvenile facility.

Judge William Voy: Thank you. And Judge Walker, if you would indulge me for just one more question?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Sure. Go ahead.

Judge William Voy: Thank you. Then are you finding, with the kids you've had in your facility who have turned 18 and are now serving their adult sentence commingling with the kids, do you find that most are taking part in the services and classes and trying hard not to lose that placement in the juvenile facility and be transferred to an adult facility, or are you finding more problems with those kids who have the adult convictions maybe. I don't know if it's more assaults or insubordination, Is it working or not working, and do you have any data about recidivism with these kids? Are they doing better because they stayed in the juvenile facility and not getting in more trouble in their future, or is it too soon to have that kind of data?

Jennifer Redman: Yeah. I don't have data on him, but I know that Heber from Oregon has some data that I've seen where they've done some work around this, because they—they have. And we have. I don't have the data available to share. What I can tell you from a behavioral standpoint, as much as I want to say there really is no difference between serving a 19-year-old youth, who's still serving a juvenile sentence and a 19-year-old youth serving an adult sentence. They're both youths just serving a sentence. What I will say though, is there is a level of stability that some of our youth who are serving adult sentences, because they start to mature, that it provides a level of stability on this campus.

So, I don't see the youth serving adult sentences creating a higher risk or showing higher rates of incidences on this campus. If anything, lower rates of incidences. And like aggression and things like that compared to our youth serving juvenile sentences. It's been more positive than negative.

Judge William Voy: Thank you very much. Thank you, Judge Walker.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Again, Frank Cervantes for the record. You mention that they're determinate sentences and they're basically housed in the juvenile facilities. Are there instances where these kids are paroled to the adult corrections parole agents, or do they expire their terms while they're in the detention—or the state facilities?

Jennifer Redman: Yeah. So, if it's a juvenile serving a juvenile sentence, they release to—if they meet criteria, they release to juvenile parole. If their juvenile sentence goes up to age 21, then if they have juvenile, a juvenile life sentence, then, unfortunately, they don't release to juvenile parole, because we wouldn't have jurisdiction. For our youth that are serving adult sentences, they release to adult parole supervision. We don't have our juvenile parole officers providing community supervision for them.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any other questions in Clark County? And I see none here in Carson City. Thank you, ma'am, very, very much for your time and your patience with our questions.

Jennifer Redman: You're welcome.

Holly Welborn: Thank you, Chair Walker. And now I would like to—this is Holly Welborn, ACLU of Nevada, to hear from Mr. Bray from the Oregon Youth Authority.

Heber Bray: Good afternoon. This is Heber Bray from the Oregon Youth Authority. Can you hear me okay?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: We can. There's a bit of an echo beyond your voice, so slow your cadence down, and I think we'll be okay.

Heber Bray: All righty. They're doing some big construction right outside my office, and it's been bothersome. For the record, my name is Heber Bray, and I'm the senior operations and policy analyst for the Oregon Youth Authority. You guys have very good questions. And so, I will try to pillar what I say to kind of answer some of those questions in advance for the Oregon system. Really, there are two issues. The first is: Housing youth that are committed in juvenile court and youth that are committed in adult court together. And then there's this second issue that comes up a lot, especially around Oregon and Washington, because we house those kids together well after their 18th birthday. And so, there were two kind of separate themes, but they can be considered together. I hope that you have the copy of the PowerPoint that was provided. If you can see on there, Oregon Youth Authority, in our secure facilities, we're about 45 percent of our youth—

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I'm so sorry to interrupt you. I just want you to know, we don't have the handout to which you're making reference, just so you know.

Heber Bray: Okay. Okay. I can just explain it. It's just a pie graph. We have about 45 percent of our youth here in our correctional facilities are committed through the adult court. And then the converse of that, 55 percent come through the juvenile court. In Oregon, we have, since 1995, mixed these populations. And the voters in Oregon passed a ballot measure that requires automatic waiver to adult court for certain crimes if those crimes happen at 15, 16, or 17 years old. When that passed is when we also started housing these kids together. Before that, we didn't have adult court convictions for kids in Oregon. So, the other question that is often asked is: How is the behavior? And we even are really kind of trying to find a catch-all metrics for this. And the use of isolation or solitary confinement seems to be a good measure. It catches all the incidents in violence that end up in solitary confinement, all the acts of insubordination, all of those other kind of things in kind of one measure. And if we look at that, our first-time juvenile commitment kids account for about 58-ish percent of all of our behavioral incidences. And then our second-time juvenile commits, so kids that were on juvenile, we have non-determinate sentences in Oregon for juveniles. And so, we have paroling authority, so we paroled them. They failed. We brought them back to the facility. Those kids account for about 25 percent of our behavioral incidences, which means the adult commitments only account for about 18 percent. So, our adult commit kids are actually much better behaved. And that is partially because when they turn 18, if they're not behaving, we have the agreements with Department of Corrections that we call them up, and they come down with their van, and they pick the youth up and they go to an adult system. And so they have that big stick hanging over their head. If you want to stay here and take advantage of our education and all the vocation programs and our treatment opportunities, you have to behave. And that seems to work really well for us. In terms of outcomes, I heard somebody asking that question earlier. We have great data on this, because we've been doing it for a little over 20 years, 23 years now. And for youths that complete their sentences, so their adult sentence. If they stay in and they complete their sentence with us, they are only recidivating or committing new crime at about 22 percent, where if they did that same sentence in the Department of Corrections, they were recidivating about 38 percent. So, the public safety risk significantly goes up when you put an adolescent where there brain is developing in these adult systems that aren't really kind of geared and designed to take advantage of that development. And so if this brain is going to be developing, what can we do with it? How can we shape it to develop how we would like it to develop in these close social groups where this kind of education and these kind of skills and a lot of times, adult systems aren't tailored to do that. When we saw that data, it's pretty staggering, so we went a little bit deeper and broke it apart by risk. And we did find that with very sliver of kids, the very most risky kids in our system, we had pretty good analytic tools so the very most risky kids, the Department of Corrections didn't cause an increase in their recidivism. But for everybody else, it did. So, for our low-risk kids, it caused sometimes up to a hundred percent increase in their recidivism compared to what we would have expected it to be. And so, those of us in Oregon tried really hard to find ways to keep these youth. Again, I think it's two issues. One, that we keep them over 18. We keep them in Oregon all the way to 25. We can also keep our juveniles to 25. But also, the 15, 16, 17-year olds that get automatically committed to us through the adult court, having an opportunity to stay with us regardless of

whether we kept them late. Otherwise, we operate very much the same as Washington does. We have several correctional facilities that are completely fenced, secure, sally port, razor wire, kind of the whole deal where these youth start out at. We have authority to house them where we want, as long as it's inside of one of those secure facilities. If we want to move to one of our transition facilities that are unfenced but still staffed by our staff, and—so they could have work experience and supervised opportunities in the community, we have to then go through a process with the Department of Corrections to have that vetted with tools and say, yes, it's appropriate for this young person to do that. Do you have any questions for me?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Please. In Clark County.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: Thank you very much, Judge Walker. Assemblyman Ohrenschall down here in Clark County for the gentleman from Oregon. The question Judge Voy raised earlier about PREA compliance, have you had any problems with that with the comingling of the kids, or has that not been an issue?

Heber Bray: Well, it's actually not an issue. The Federal Juvenile Crime and Delinquency Prevention Act specifically says in there that this is what makes the juvenile; this is what makes an adult. And then they released a memo, I think, in 1988—or 1998, sorry, that says—and it's defined by how your state defines adult. And there's some other caveats in there. I can give you a copy of that memo. But basically it says, if your state says this youth was a juvenile because he was convicted before his 18th birthday and is getting juvenile services, he can continue to be a juvenile until those services end. And so, if our services for juveniles don't end until 25 and we have no breaks in service, the youth remains a juvenile. The problem is if that young person commits any new law violation while in the facility or in a transition program, and even if they have a misdemeanor or anything really that caused a break in service, or they have any new contact with the court, they're immediately considered an adult, because now they've had court contact after their 18th birthday, and we have to turn around and put them on the bus and immediately move them off to the Department of Corrections. But we can give you a copy of that memo. It's a public record thing and pretty easy to get.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: That would be great. If you don't mind sharing it either with the Committee or with the ACLU, and the ACLU could share it with us. Judge Walker, may I have one follow up?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Sure.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: Thank you. I had asked the representative from Washington State earlier about data, and since you've been doing this since 1995, do you have any data about outcomes and recidivism for the youth who had adult convictions, were in your facilities post-1995, and what levels of recidivism they had versus prior to '95 for young people like that who got those adult convictions and ended up going to adult facilities? Because I'm just wondering are you finding less recidivism for kids who were housed in the juvenile facilities, or kids and young adults and finish their sentences versus prior to '95?

Heber Bray: Yeah, that's an interesting question. Prior to '95 in Oregon, we didn't sentence youth as adults. So, in fact, there were some big crimes that happened in the early '90s in Oregon that caused this ballot measure to go to the voters, because a youth that had committed murder at 15 or 16 was being released on his 21st birthday. And his—the victim's parents were upset, and rightly so. And pushed this ballot measure forward to say, if these kids are going to do adult acts, they need adult sentencing. What those kids were doing prior to '95, they had juvenile sentences. And I don't have very good data on that, because part of that same law—we had a—'95 was a very busy year for us, because we had that law. We started to house these kids together. And Oregon Youth Authority was taken out of Department of Human Services as our own standalone public safety agency in Oregon. And, at that time, we were mandated to have one database, one filing system, one youth, one file, no matter where in the state the kid was or at what level of service the youth was receiving. So, if you had a first-time trespass at 13 years old and then start to file, across the state, that file stays with him in any jurisdiction in our state that he goes to and through his whole juvenile career, which we hope is short, but that database started around '95 as well. And so, the day before that is a little sketchy. After that, though, when we went into this era, we were very, very quick to transfer guys off. You're 17 and you're not engaging in treatment as much as we want you to, you can go to the Department of Corrections. You're 17 and you failed a class in school, you can go to the Department of Corrections. And so, we had this big cohort of kids that we sent to the Department of Corrections for very minor infractions in the facility, or no infractions, just they were slow to engage in their treatment. They resisted to treatment a little bit in the beginning. And so, that's kind of part of a group that we measure against is this group that went to Department of Corrections compared to the kids who didn't go to the Department of Corrections that had similar behaviors; that were resisting in the beginning, but we kind of overcame that resistance with time. And it's changed a lot that in the last year, we've only had, I think, three instances of actually needing to transfer a young person to the Department of Corrections.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: Three out of how many kids?

Heber Bray: We have about 600 in custody today, so about 45 percent of that is adult commits. But with the turn, I would probably call it about 350-ish in a year's time. If they intake and release them as such.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: And only three, that's great. That's great results. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Judge Walker.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Go ahead, Judge Voy, and then I'll come back to you, Frank.

Judge William Voy: I'm curious, because I'm very familiar with the Oregon statutory scheme on transfer, being licensed in the state of Oregon. But anyways, did you have any statistics you could share with us on the percentage of kids under the age of 18 that are transferred to the adult system on a yearly basis and receive adult convictions, even though they may be housed later on in juvenile? And I get all that part, but they still have an adult conviction. Do you have any numbers like that you could share with us, because when I've seen those numbers in the past compared to our own statistics, it kind of was shocking the number of

kids per capita that were being transferred to the adult system compared to what we're doing here in the state of Nevada. I'm just curious to see what those numbers looked like, if you have that kind of information. Appreciate it.

Heber Bray: Yeah, you are absolutely correct. I don't have the numbers at my fingertips right now, but we look at them pretty regularly. And compared to a lot of other states, Oregon's numbers are huge. And that is back to that law in '95, that's where this list of crimes—Measure 11 crimes, it is automatic to transfer. It's not a choice. The DA doesn't have a choice. The judge doesn't have a choice. This is what's happening. You are transferring into adult court. And then in plea negotiations, sometimes they can reduce the sentence out of the Measure 11 crime, but it's removed in adult court, because that transfer was automatic. It's one of those statistics that's maybe in the receiving side of this. I'm not on the front end. We just get the kids that come to the gate. Kind of just makes me cringe a little bit, and we wish that all—because we also have a waiver process. So, for other crimes, we could have a waiver process here to determine whether the court should treat the youth as an adult or a juvenile. But it's those automatics that cause our numbers to be pretty high.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Cervantes for the record. I know that you said your jurisdiction, I think, goes to 24 or 25. Does that relieve the institutions from child abuse allegations? For example, a 23-year old batters a 15-year old?

Heber Bray: That's a good question. It doesn't relieve the youth that does the battering. And we, as an institution, aren't held liable for that. In general, we don't house youth that way. So, we wouldn't put a 23-year old and 15-year old in the same housing unit, in general. We try to house youth by kind of age and maturity and even appearance. I had a 21-year-old guy that looks like he's about 12. I'm housing him more with my 17, 18-year olds, not with my 23 and 24-year olds. And so, we generally don't have those things come up. That's very rare.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Judge Voy, we got an answer off the phone from Dr. Sickmund at NCJJ. It looks like, according to the Juvenile Justice GPS website that's at the NCJJ, in Oregon in 2016, there were 132—oh, I'm sorry, 123 of those transfer cases that you were asking about in '16. I don't know what the number was in '17.

Judge William Voy: Thank you.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Commissioner Armstrong with two questions for you. The first one, again, is: Does your Oregon juvenile system have determinate sentencing? And the second one is, I know you guys went through a very thoughtful facility strategic plan. And so, if the system played into that strategic plan, that would be interesting to know, and just kind of the number and variety of facilities you have as options for placement.

Heber Bray: Those are very good questions. The juveniles do not have determinate sentencing. And so, the Superintendent of the facility has the paroling authority and can release the youth when they feel that they're rehabilitated. We come back for residential treatment in our state, the behavioral health service system. And so, a lot of times, when we believe that criminal risk has been sufficiently mitigated, their skills and other social

trainings and problems, family issues and things, we'll step down to those residential placements, which are open placements with the parole authority by the superintendent. So, we did recently go do a ten-year strategic facility plan, physical plan. And [inaudible] rapidly trying to build new physical plan. Are structures were very old and needed updating. And with the spectrum of youths played very heavily into: How do we make our plan? Everything from designing kind of some specialty units for youth with mental health concerns and serious, complex trauma, we're very reactive. Almost all those kids end up being a little bit younger that come into the system for very small crimes, but in court, they're the kids that flip the table over and cuss the judge out, because they have very limited emotional control. But they hadn't committed a big crime, yet, if you don't get a handle on that emotional control maybe. And then the updated in several places, our vocation programming is—and then we have an array of housing, so we have some units who have individual rooms specifically to keep younger guys safe and to make sure they feel safe when they're sleeping. The older guys sleep in more of a dormitory style where the housing units can be between 16 and 23 guys. And it might look like barracks, two rows of bunks, and then there's a dayroom off of that. We upgraded a couple of our shops. So, we have a welding shop and a mechanic shop, and a wood shop. Places for guys to learn vocational skills and get accreditation before they leave. That's all kind of just enveloped in the whole facility's plan.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Perfect. Thank you. I would say to any Commissioners who are interested in that, Oregon's ten-year facility strategic plan is a great blueprint for strategically thinking about the facilities that we have.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any other questions here in Carson City or in Las Vegas? Again, then thank you very, very much for your insight's perspective.

Judge William Voy: I'm sorry, Judge Walker. Judge Voy. This is a little comment for the record, and since I've got the Oregon representative on the line, he can probably confirm this. I'm not going to put a number on it, but my experience with the state of Oregon is- especially in what he just talked about, you guys spend a ton of money on these kids in these facilities. And I'm not saying that's good or bad, I'm just saying, when we're looking at our state, here in Nevada, for them to get what they do in Oregon, it's a lot of money, guys. Just thought I'd make that comment for the record.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Thank you for that information, Judge Voy. Ms. Welborn, I think we're back to you.

Holly Welborn: Thank you. I do realize- Holly Welborn, ACLU of Nevada. I do realize we're approaching the hour. I know you have a full agenda, so I just want to quickly describe some of the recommendations made and talk a little bit about the facility assessment here. I think Judge Voy is absolutely right. I think Mr. Armstrong is absolutely right. That even we can see that this problem—we're not asking to turn into the Oregon Youth Authority tomorrow. That is not our proposal. It's saying, what steps can we take that are similar? Let's begin that conversation, but there is the immediate need to address the kids living in the Department of Corrections. So, that's the eye that we looked at. We went and looked at facilities, and that's what we were thinking about as we toured. We looked at the Youth Law Center and

the Center for Children's Law and Policy Facility Assessment and adapted that for these very quick tours that we did through a number of your facilities. The general takeaway, of course, is that we're highly impressed by the regional facilities. The programming, we think, is very appropriate, high level of education. It seems to be very individualized for each of the children that are living in those facilities. Overall, we wish that the yard and access to outdoor exercise, et cetera, was more accessible in those facilities. But overall, it's an appropriate placement. We also felt the same about some of you, to a large extent, we have concerns about the construct of Summit View, that it's very kind of a punitive set up for young people, but that they met those legal standards. But I do think that when we looked at our local jails, we toured Parr Boulevard. We toured Elko. And we looked at the Clark County Detention Center's youth pod. So, our assessment is that children simply just cannot be placed in either of those facilities, Parr or Elko. And they haven't been for a very long time. Most of the time, they're staying in other facilities. Elko, for example, we had a staff member during the tour who did not have a thorough understanding of the requirements of PREA. What was said is, once they've become an adult, they're an adult, so they would go with all the rest of the adults. And I'm like, they're not literally becoming an adult upon certification, it's just they're being tried as an adult, so they have to have that sight and sound separation or the additional staff with that person. So, we had to explain that. And now we're on the same page with the Sheriff's department. There currently weren't any children actually living in that facility at that time, but it was a conversation clarification that we had to make with Elko County Jail. As far as Parr Boulevard, it's segregation by default. Kids are living in segregation. And it's just not the appropriate place for them to be. So, we highly recommend that we work—that you continue to work and have those agreements that young people stay in those regional facilities. I also want to mention Clark County Detention Center with a big sigh, because we are very critical of the Clark County Detention Center as an organization. We always have been. They have problems with the food they're serving the general adult population. There is zero real outdoor recreation throughout the entire facility. So, Clark County Detention Center, if it's a facility as a whole, they have trouble meeting minimum standards. But when we went into the youth pod, we were quite impressed with some of the things that were happening there, particularly with educational programming. The high level of commitment that their school administrator had for the young men that were in the youth pod. We also think the construct is acceptable. We do have many concerns that they're not getting any kind of real outdoor recreation at all whatsoever, because of the nature and construct of CCDC. We were also very impressed with the therapeutic programming and services at the CCDC youth pod. So, as far as that inquiry, the reason we went there, one of the main concerns when Assemblyman Ohrenschall sponsored legislation addressing this issue was that that would have been a waste of money going into the CCDC youth pod. So, we're not proposing for initially closing down that facility at this time. So, I do want to make that clear for the record that those are the types of things that we went in and we were looking at. We've sent you the report where we get a lot more detailed. And, again, I want to thank everyone for working with us, being open with us and sharing your policies, procedures, and spending a great deal of time with me while we were out in your communities and looking at your services. So, if you don't have any questions, I can wrap up, and if you do, I'm happy to answer them.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions in Clark County for Ms. Welborn, the ACU—ACLU. Excuse me. I don't see any questions in Clark County. Carson City. I have a couple of observations, if I might. First, we welcome you to the table. We welcome your input in discussion and can--hope you will continue to look at, critique, give feedback to components of the juvenile justice system. A recommendation I have as we go into this legislative session, in particular, and given your lucky securing of a bill draft, when you talk about regionalization, make sure that everybody who's hearing regionalization is hearing the same thing. What I mean by that is, we use regionalization in a couple of different ways. So, we have a commitment, Judge Voy and I, in this commission to talk about regionalizing the services to juveniles in the juvenile system. We also then have conversations about regionally where are things located, so that we can regionalize services for their children. And that can cross into: How do we regionalize the children who have been certified? But I would be cautious about that, because the terms get confused to people sometimes. When I saw the legislative hold on the bill, I overreacted because I misunderstood the regionalization you all were talking about. So, I just offer that as feedback. Any other questions or comments? Again, thank you very much then for your time.

Holly Welborn: Thank you. It was a pleasure.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: So, the next agenda item is to Ms. Brubaker, and that is entitled Nevada Center for Criminal Justice Innovation.

Katie Brubaker: Good afternoon. Katie Brubaker for the record. I did want to let everyone know today about NCJJI; that we do have a live website. Once I receive that link in an email, I will send it out to the Commission. You should also be expecting an email blast directly from the resource center. I am still looking for a Commissioner to discuss our definition of evidence-based practices and programming that will be housed on the NCJJI website. So, if you're interested, I would ask that you contact me directly. I also wanted to say a little bit about funding through NCJJI. And there is an existing work plan that they have created to reach out to private donors, foundations, grants, universities, just various opportunities throughout the state. And we have contacted several handfuls of those donors. We have sent out proposals and overviews of our resource center, and I would ask that if anybody has any leads on funding to sustain our resource center, that you send that directly to me as well. So, we are looking. Thank you.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions for Ms. Brubaker in Las Vegas?

Judge William Voy: Yes, Judge Voy again. I'm sorry. Hey, so you said you're looking for a Commissioner. So, how do you envision that interaction occurring, or what?

Katie Brubaker: Katie Brubaker for the record. NCJJ is creating a script for us. And I would need somebody to be the face to read that script about our definition of evidence-based practices.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Mr. Shick?

Unknown Speaker: I think he just volunteered, did he?

Unknown Speaker: I volunteer Shick for that.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Joey saw it.

Katie Brubaker: I just saw a big smile.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right. Well, you can reach out to Joey and I if you get no active volunteers, then one of us will flip a coin and figure out how to help. Thank you for that. So, the next agenda item then, folks, is Committee updates. And I'd like to take things a little bit out of order in this way. I'd like to go with the State Advisory Group Planning Committee for report back, and then I think they have a request for action. But I need to remind you of some disclosures that Joey and I made at the outset of this Commission, both when the Governor appointed us and populated the Commission and then in the process. So, Joey, of course, is the CEO of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and she's also the CEO of the National Council for Juvenile Justice, for the NCJJ, which is the research arm of the National Council. Until two weeks ago, I was a board member of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, but had no official capacity over NCJJ. I was recently appointed to the advisory board over NCJJ. So, I completely conflicted from action on this item, as is Joey. I think there are other commissioners who may reveal their own conflicts related to this item, but I just wanted to give that at the outset, because other than the process of calling for the report and perhaps action items on the report, I intend to say nothing related to the discussion about the recommendations from the SAG Advisory Committee for the distribution of funds. Any questions about that disclosure or any quarrel with that?

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: If I can add, we will also be abstaining from the vote. So, there will not be a vote from the two chairs of the Commission.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: So, I turn to you then, Ms. Salla and/or to you, Ms. Bracken for the SAG Committee Report.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: Thank you. For the record, Pauline Salla-Smith. I'm going to start with our report, minus the grant funding slate, because then I will need to abstain from that discussion also, as my jurisdiction has a grant application that will be reviewed and discussed today. However, I am going to discuss our meeting with the State Advisory Group, the planning group that we had yesterday. And I'm happy to say that we actually had quorum, and we were really excited about that. That actually took the first five minutes of our meeting to celebrate, so we could get some work done. We actually had several meeting minutes from our previous meetings that we had to approve, so we went through that. We did have a discussion about our SB 107, which is our room confinements report that all jurisdictions with the juvenile detention center and our state correctional facilities report on. There's some interesting information in that report. We've had a significant increase in our numbers with our youth receiving room confinement state-wide; although, they are—most of those confinements are less than two hours, which is what we

look for. But we did have some discussion about our next steps that we could take with that to really make sure that our numbers are increasing for room confinement for valid reasons, and that are facilities have the tools needed to either provide some training on the room confinement, or to make sure that our kids, or our youth are receiving the services that they need. We all know, when you run a facility, we all understand that it's a small number of youth that end up in room confinement, and sometimes it can be the same youth several times. So, we had a lot of discussion about that, which I think was needed discussion and good discussion, and we're going to continue to monitor that and support our facilities, both county and state. We discussed our community corrections partnership block grant report, and then we'll actually take the topic to our next Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice administrators to make sure that we're all reporting on the agreed-upon performance measures and outcomes that we all agreed to. So, I volunteered to take that back to NAJA to have some discussion. And then we talked about our overview of the OJJDP changes that recently rolled out with our formula grant funding. There's a couple interesting topics here. One is that—as we're all talking about evidence-based resource center, that some of those changes include current leadership, federally, may not have the buy-in of adolescent brain development and evidence-based science beliefs that some of us hold. So, that's an interesting assurance change with OJJDP. And, also, that there's an assurance that states will now agree to about formula funding—not utilizing formula funding for youth who are not citizens of the United States. And we had some discussion about how that will trickle down to jurisdictions, who don't even ask that information for the youth we serve, because we want to make sure we're providing all of our youth the services they need. And then that the federal process for grant applications will be broken down into two sections. One is the actual formula grant application. That'd be the first process. And then the next process would be the budget, DMCP, our Disproportionate Minority Contact Plan, and then our compliance report. So, there's a lot of changes that seem to be happening with our OJJDP funding. And we're going to continue to discuss that and make sure that it fits into our vision as the Commission, and how we can keep moving forward on those. And did I mention we had quorum, because that was absolutely wonderful. So, thank you to all my fellow Committee members. That's our report. We did not set a—the next date for our meeting, because we just were waiting for today and to see how—what our tasks are, and we can move forward from that. So, unless there's any questions, that's what our report is from the SAG.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions then of Ms. Salla related to SAG report, excluding the formula block grant applications? Any questions in Clark County? I see no movement to question here in Carson City. I congratulate your quorum. I think I'll turn to Ms. Bittleston for discussion about the formula block grant proposals.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith: I'm sorry, before that happens, I just wanted to put on the record that I need to abstain from this conversation also, because I have a grant application.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston from DCFS for the record. I will kind of give a background about the formula grants. All of the Board members know exactly what this funding is and where it comes from. So, the formula grant is a federally-funded grant though the

Department of Justice, through a division of the Department of Justice called Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP. OJJDP exists to promote the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, which was established in 1974, and to support local and state efforts to prevent delinquency and improve the overall juvenile justice system. Nevada's participated in the act since the 1980's through a Governor's executive order. The formula grant currently has 32 fundable program areas. Those fundable program areas include things like mental health services, the institutionalization of status offenders, after-school programs, gangs, things like that. Currently, Nevada is required to fund a couple of areas. Those areas are the State Advisory Group, which is this body; planning and administration; and compliance monitoring. These areas are required to be funded so we get—the grant is—we are continually eligible for the grant. So, there are certain eligibility requirements that states have to meet in order to continue to receive this grant. Another requirement of this grant is that we sub-grant roughly 66 percent of the amount that the state receives to sub-grantees, which can be local nonprofits or units of local government to provide direct services to the kids in our communities. Every other year, my office conducts a survey of the juvenile justice stakeholders to see what the needs are in the community. The most recent survey was completed in February of 2018, and the top four program areas for that survey include, number one, mental health services; number two, aftercare and reentry; and community programs tied; number three, alternatives to detention; and number four, juvenile justice system—juvenile justice system improvement. Again, remembering there are 32 program areas that can be funded. So, when I send the survey out, I just send all 32 program areas and ask stakeholders to check their top three to five. And based on the results, that's what we had this past survey. The request for application of sub-grantees went out in July of this year with a due date of grant applications on August 10th of this year. The State Advisory Group Committee would normally be the group that would review these grant applications, but due to the fact that we have not had quorum for several months, this body was unable to do this. So, we, internally at DCFS, had to figure out how to review these grant applications. States only have 30 days turnaround time from the time grant applications are received to where a grant slate is provided. So, what we determined to do is, we had two internal DCFS reviewers review all 11 applications that were received. We combine that score into one, and we reached out to JJOC members that did not have conflicts to assist in those reviews. And we did get two members off the SAG Planning Committee, Ms. Bracken and Ms. Pierrott that graciously reviewed those applications in not a very long amount of time. Thank you. Thank you, ladies. So, we took those three scores from the DCFS internal staff as one score and each JJ member as one score each, and we combined those, and we have come up with the grant slate, which has been presented to all of you today. The grant slate is a ranking of all of the grant applications that we received, all 11 applications from number 1 through number 11. And just to kind of go over how these rankings came about, we score applications by a numerical value. Each application can get a max of 80 points. There are seven scoreable program areas. Number one is an overview for a max of five points. Number two is availability of services in that particular community for a max of 15 points. Number three is a statement of need for a max of 20 points. Number four are goals and objectives for a max of ten points. Number five is method of accomplishment for a max of ten points. Number six is a budget proposal for a max of ten points. And number seven is a budget narrative for a max of ten points. So, these rankings are based purely on a numerical

value. So, based on that, this is the grant slate that is proposed today. I am happy to take questions.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions in Clark County. Judge Voy.

Judge William Voy: Yeah. I'm not a voting member, so that's good. But I do have a question on Item No. 9, because that one intrigues me, because it sounds like a vocational program to me, even though it's in Carson City. Can you tell me what the Brewery Arts Program really is?

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston for the record. This is a brand new program that was requested just this year. It was a very interesting program. It was a program that kind of takes the arts and crafts and acting and things and incorporates that in with children that maybe need a little ways to get their emotions out. So, it was really kind of an interesting program. And they were gonna to partner with the Brewery Arts Center, which is a local place here in Carson City for plays and acting and arts, and all kinds of things. So, it was really a creative program, but that's what it was about

Judge William Voy: So, nothing to do with beer, huh?

Leslie Bittleston: Nothing to do with beer.

Judge William Voy: Oh. Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Commissioner Armstrong. Can you remind us what the top five identified needs were based on your survey?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Based on—this is Leslie Bittleston for the record. Based on the survey, number one was mental health services. Number two was aftercare and reentry and community programs those were tied. Number three were alternatives to detention. And number four was juvenile justice system improvement.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Thank you.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions in Carson or in Clark County? Questions here in Carson City? I think at the point at which the conversation is done, and I'm not trying to foreclose it, we should call for a vote, and the vote should be by voice individual tally so that we can record who has voted and who has abstained in that way. I think I'll go ahead then and call for a vote.

Ross Armstrong: I'll go ahead and make a motion. This is Commissioner Armstrong. I move to approve the grant slate as presented by the Juvenile Justice Programs Office and the SAG Committee.

Jo Lee Wickes: Commissioner Wickes. I second the motion.

Sarah Bellows: Based off of this, we have enough to pass the grant slate vote.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: We'll simply acknowledge then the vote of the Commission members related to the SAG proposal and the approval of the distributions as authorized. Let's move then back to the Strategic Plan Committee, Mr. Cervantes, Judge Voy?

Judge William Voy: I'm going to defer to my learned friend up in Washoe County. I'll let you decide who that is.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Thank you for that. This is Commissioner Cervantes. The only thing that we have at this point, since we haven't met, is that it will be the title for the Strategic Planning Committee will be moving to the Strategic Implementation Committee.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any conversation or comment about that? That's farther down the agenda. I'm simply going to move to adopt that change. I don't know that we have to do it now or could do it now, but first, any comment about it?

Unknown Speaker: The only thing I have is that I know that you have it on topic in Section 7, so I will let you proceed at that point on mine.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: And I think at that time—this is Joey Orduna Hastings for the record. We may have to revisit the bylaws and just modify, because I think we named that specific subcommittee in the bylaws. That as we make the motion, we'll just need to be mindful of that.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Okay.

Unknown Speaker: I apologize, I was having a sidebar conversation. What are we talking about?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: We're on the Strategic Plan Committee, and Judge Voy identified Commissioner Cervantes as "learned", which I let slip by. And after that, Commissioner Cervantes said the only comment that he had to offer was that the Strategic Plan Subcommittee, or Committee thinks the name should change to Strategic Implementation Committee. Any other conversation in Clark County? Or here in Washoe County? Thank you for that report then. Let's move to the Data Performance and Measurement Committee. Ms. Duffy, Ms. Verness?

Commissioner Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid Duffy. I'm on the phone, Judge Walker. Good afternoon. We haven't had a meeting since the last full Commission meeting. And I think I **[inaudible]** numbers of the data subcommittee. I'm just waiting for future assignments.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I hear a request for future assignments.

Commissioner Brigid Duffy: No, I'm waiting. I haven't had any.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Commissioner Duffy, this is Joey for the record. I do owe you a phone call so that we can discuss a list of some potential new tasks that I did speak with Commissioner Verness about. So, I will get back in touch with you today or Monday.

Commissioner Brigid Duffy: Okay. Great.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Short version, assignments to come. Any questions of Ms. Duffy or Ms. Verness? Then let's move to the Risk Assessment Subcommittee. Ms. Wickes, Mr. Imlay.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Commissioner Wickes. I'm hoping that Mr. Imlay can cover our meeting that occurred on August 31st. I did attend, but I was late, and I moved that he prepared the minutes for that.

Commissioner Darin Imlay: All right. Thank you.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: I then co-chaired a meeting two days ago, on September 12th. So, once he updates us for August, I can give an update on the September 12th meeting. And I have a proposal to consider.

Commissioner Darin Imlay: I can do that. We met on August 28th. At the time, we had a presentation from Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement—Mr. Clement. And that was regarding the YLS and implementation of it. We also had—Ms. Brubaker provided an update on the YLS implementation work plan. One of the—there was actually a couple things that were brought up. One was the importance of getting buy-in from judges throughout the state to use and implement the YLS. And so there was discussion with regard to training, specifically the judges on YLS, the evidence-base aspect of it; the benefits in following it and using it, as well as other stakeholders, including district attorneys, defense attorneys, training them as well, so that we get full buy-in from all the stakeholders, probation, parole, et cetera. One of the other things that was addressed by Dr. Vincent, and which is important to me, as far as the public defender's office, is with regard to pre-adjudication statements by the youth during the interview. And I think that's something that's gonna need to be addressed. Dr. Vincent said that in some of the other states that she's worked with, there's either been legislation to address that, or at a minimum, agreements between judges, district attorneys, and defense attorneys, as far as what will not be used in pre-adjudication interviews and statements by the youth. And so, that's something that's very important to me, as a public defender. I know that in Clark County, probation is setting up structures for training for the YLS. And one of the things they have in their training is dealing specifically with those pre-adjudication admission statements by the youth, what will and won't be used; what won't be presented to district attorneys or to the courts. And so, I think that's something that definitely needs to be addressed by the entire Commission as how we're going to handle that. And that was it for August 28th. So, any questions

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I don't see any questions here in Carson City, Mr. Imlay.

Commissioner Darin Imlay: Thank you.

Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes: This is Commissioner Wickes. We were lucky enough to schedule a four-hour meeting that included the expertise of Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement. They had given—we were provided when we attended the meeting an eight-page draft of written policies and procedures, which our subcommittee is tasked with developing in order to get those statewide minimum standards in place so that we can proceed with training and kicking off the road show and implementation of the YLS in the pilot counties. So, I was perhaps somewhat energized and perhaps brutal in trying to get us as far down the path as we could go. We easily made quorum. We have a lot of work to do. It took us about four hours to get through the first two pages, which Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement were extremely complimentary of, and I was a little bit disappointed. But, obviously, it took a period of time just to lay some foundational information about the topic areas that would be needed in these minimum statewide standards. So, we are in the process of trying to schedule another meeting, and our hope was to schedule another meeting in advance of this next full commission meeting, which I believe is slated for October the 12th. Unfortunately, I'm not sure, Dr. Vincent reminded us, which I appreciated, that it's important to do our task well, and that sometimes you just need more time to get that done. Dates that are proposed right now may be problematic for some of us on the Committee. It happens to coincide, at least, with fall break in Northern Nevada for school. And so, I think—I personally am having some inability to attend the proposed dates, and I don't know if others will run into the same problem. One of the items that I would like to discuss and suggest this afternoon is that, in the absence of pressing business for the full Commission, that perhaps we consider not conducting an October meeting and waiting until November, in the absence of pressing business. And also, to give our Risk Assessment Subcommittee some additional time to slow down a bit, take Dr. Vincent's advice, and see if we can get through the rest of the eight-page document. We did reach agreement on the items contained in the first two pages, but there's a lot of important policies and practices that we need to consider. We had many of the probation department heads on the phone with us. We're getting a lot of feedback from the state, from around the state. To really kind of consider the variability in our jurisdictions. But I personally would appreciate some additional time. And I think that there is a greater likelihood. Not gonna make any huge promises. I think there's a greater likelihood that if we could be given until November, that we might be able to meet our deadline for Open Meeting laws and have an agreed-upon statewide minimum standard written. That would be my suggestion.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I hear a call for an action item by the Risk Assessment Subcommittee to move the next JJOC meeting to November as opposed to October. Is there anybody would like to make a motion to that effect, and then we can have some discussion about it.

Pauline Salla-Smith: So moved.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right. Discussion. Any opposition to that? Anybody have a quarrel with that?

Unknown Speaker: No objection.

Unknown Speaker: What day are they proposing on?

Unknown Speaker: November 9th.

Unknown Speaker: Would that still be the second Friday of November?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Yeah. It'd be November 9th. Same time.

Unknown Speaker: Yeah, got a Children's Foundation, so that we would not have an October meeting at all then?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: That's correct. That's the motion.

Unknown Speaker: All right.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any other discussion or questions? I'll go ahead and call for a vote. Was there a second?

Commissioner Darin Imlay: Second.

Commissioner Frank Cervantes: Mr. Cervantes will second that.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I heard Imlay and Cervantes' second. So, I'll call a vote. All in favor, say aye.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any opposed? All right. So, we've now ticked off another agenda item, which is to confirm the next meeting date and time. Thank you for the Risk Assessment report. Are there any other comments or questions about the Risk Assessment report before I weigh in? First, Bill, any questions in Clark County?

Judge William Voy: No, we got nothing down here.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right. Here in Las Vegas? I have a request for you, Judge Voy, and it's really for you and Judge Stockard. And I want to discuss with you your thoughts about the idea of us trying to convene. I call it a mini-conference call and a meeting. I don't care what we call it, but getting you and I and Judge Stockard on the phone with our colleagues who do JJ issues around the state, so that we can kind of collectively share with them the why of the MAZE and the YLS and the need to do it with Fidelity, and use consistent training and consistent policies behind it. Is that something you'd be interested in doing?

Judge William Voy: Yes. For sure. I just actually met with the hearing master from Elko County Juvenile Justice, and we had a little discussion about that. So, I think that would be wise to do something like that.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right. So, I'll reach out to you and Judge Stockard, and we'll see—if we can't do a video link—if we can't do an in-person meeting, we'll at least do a video link. And I'll need your help, Bill, so that we can sort of prosthelytize to our colleagues, because I think you would agree with me, unless the judges are on consistently, the wheels are going to fall off of this. All right. Thank you for that. Any other discussion or questions?

Unknown Speaker: I do have a question. I—and this is for the DCFS team. Just want to make sure, if we're not meeting in October that we're not missing any dates that we have to make any particular votes. And we—you don't have to answer that right now, just when you go into your work plan presentation, if you could just highlight anything, just so that we're not missing any deadlines. Thank you.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right. Then next we'll move to the Youth Subcommittee report. Ms. Pierrott.

Commissioner Kierra Bracken: Kierra Bracken for the record. I'll actually be giving the report today. So, we tried to meet last week on the 6th, but we didn't have quorum, so we weren't able to do any action items. We were able to go visit Jan Evans on Tuesday, and we appreciate Mr. Cervantes allowing us to take a tour. We wanted to share some of the things that we liked about the facility and the tour with the full Commission if that's okay?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Of course.

Commissioner Kierra Bracken: Okay. Some of the things that we liked from the facility tour was that it was very clean, and they tried to make it more of a homey feeling, whereas, they tried to bring in natural lighting. They tried to do different colors on the wall. And we thought that was—it probably helped the youth feel more comfortable there. We also liked that there was a big focus on education and encouraging the children to read and go to classes and continue with their education while they were in the facility. They were also trying to adopt new programs related to education, so we thought that was important. We also got to sit in on some court hearings, which was very interesting, and we appreciated that. There was Spanish interpretation offered, which we thought was really important for those families that needed that. Also, during the—during one of the hearings, the judge made sure that the youth understood their rights. And that was something that we thought was a really good—I don't know what the right word to say is. We really liked that. That they made sure that the youth understood what was happening during the hearing.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Do you think the youth did understand?

Commissioner Kierra Bracken: I think so. I think she explained it in a way that he was able to understand. I mean, I'm sure he was very nervous up there. And sometimes when you're very nervous, things go in one ear and out the other. But I think she took the time to explain it to him. One thing that we saw in the facility that they actually said that they wished they saw throughout the state was that the A Plus Program was used statewide. She talked about—that was the online education system that they use. And she thought it would be

more beneficial if the entire state went to that, just so that way if the youth goes to a different facility, they would be on the same program.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: So, an assignment I have for you then, based on that feedback, is for you two to call Judge Voy, because Judge Voy is the Chair of this statewide collaborative committee on education, and discuss with that committee from JJOC Youth Subcommittee perspective that feedback. I think you'd be interested to talk to Judge Voy and hear his thoughts. And I know he'd be interested to hear your thoughts.

Commissioner Kierra Bracken: Sure. Yeah, we'll get with the other members and we'll make a phone call.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right.

Commissioner Kierra Bracken: So, that was kind of what we liked and disliked from the—well, not disliked, but that was what we saw the facility wanting more of. We are going to try and visit Las Vegas in the winter, hopefully to see possibly the Caliente Youth Center and then also Summit View Youth Center. Mr. Munoz and Joe Cesada are trying to identify funding for this trip, so once they figure out funding, we'll hopefully be able to go down there and see those facilities. We're working to ensure all appointed members are still interested, engaged, and committed to improving our juvenile justice system. We have another youth member from Las Vegas, Stanley Rendon, who has submitted all his paperwork and is available for official appointment if and when a spot becomes available. We don't have a date set for our next meeting, but we're hoping for October.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: It's a great report. Questions, comments for the Youth Subcommittee? Here in Carson City? In Clark County? Good job, you guys. That moves us logically, and your comments about challenges with meeting quorum, et cetera, moves us logically to the next agenda item, which is committee membership and focus of committees. So, between Joey and I, I think we've had the opportunity now to speak with all but three of the Committee members. We haven't spoken yet with all the Advisory Committee members. But we've spoken with all but three, I think, of the JJOC Commission members. And the good news I'll report to you all, is the feedback about people's participation in the Commission is positive. They enjoy being on the Commission. I tried to dig for any negative or negative feedback folks would give me. The only thing I would reflect to all of you is, no one told me they wanted to be removed from any committee or assignment. And I just want you all to confirm publically now your silence will be affirmation that you're confirming that you don't want to change committees. Now, let me give a caveat. I spoke to a couple of Youth Subcommittee members, for example, who said, "Well, I'd like to get involved in some of the other committees." And you can be involved in a committee in a public, nonvoting way anytime you want. That's the only way that Joey and I participate in the subcommittees. We're not actually voting members of the subcommittees. And we—Joey and I set it up intentionally that way. So, you can get all the work you want in any committee you want, absent an ability to vote on that committee. But I just want anyone to speak now or forever hold their peace. If they want a different assignment or additional assignment.

Judge William Voy: Kind of related to this whole concept is that going through the roll call vote, I would think that we should probably take a look at members that have consistently not been present and discuss that issue, because I notice some familiar names that have popped up that—I mean, should we be looking at—because I know some committees and Commissions I serve on, if you miss more than three of them, then you're out, that kind of stuff. And I think that there's some members that may not be as—this may not be a priority, they're stretched too thin or whatever. We should have some further discussion as to maybe how those members should be treated. Should we ask them to step down and be replaced by someone that'd be more active, or what? But I would leave that up to you. You can—since you're more—so much more diplomatic than I am in that regard.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: Judge Voy, thank you. This is Joey. The one of the strategies behind us calling all of the Commissioners and soon to be the Advisory members is so that we can actually have those conversations before we make the recommendation to the Governor's office. Per our bylaws, it does allow us some opportunities to make those recommendations, but we wanted to give everyone the opportunity to volunteer first. So, we will be following up on that. Thank you.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Other questions or comments? I don't think we're going to take any action at this time. Joey and I did specifically want to get voice-to-voice with every single member of the Commission and Advisory group; give people an opportunity to say, hey, there's a misfit or a mismatch between my assignment and what I want to do, kind of weed through any issues like that that may cause attendance issues. I want to emphasize, I've missed Commission meetings. Joey's missed Commission meetings. We understand everybody's busy, and so there's no black mark on somebody for missing a meeting or being on a subcommittee and missing a meeting. But, in order to work, we've got to have quorum. And without quorum, we can't move the work forward, and we can't lose any time. So, I think we're all on the same sheet of music. I've heard no one request another assignment; correct? Silence is golden, and a form of voting. And the next agenda item then is work plan updates. Ms. Brubaker.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: So, this is Joey. I think we need to go back to Item 7 before we move on, Judge. We just need to take the vote on changing the subcommittee title for Strategic Planning to Strategic Implementation. and with the caveat that we have to revisit the bylaws and amend the bylaws to reflect the same.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: So, I move to change the name of the Strategic Plan Committee to the Strategic Implementation Committee, and to amend the bylaws to reflect that change. Any second?

Pauline Salla-Smith: Commissioner Salla-Smith. I'll second it.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Discussion? Any questions in Clark County, or discussion? Any questions in Carson City? All right. So, I hear no discussion then. I'll call for the vote. All in favor, please signify by saying aye. Aye.

Judge William Voy: Okay. And I forgot one of the items we discussed in a subcommittee when we went to change the name was also to open it up again for new membership, because we had a very narrow focus on what we were doing. And we accomplished that. And our intent by renaming isn't just to rebrand, but also expand into those other areas that we've talked about over various different meetings about other items that weren't on the statutory list of things that we needed to resolve or present. With that being said, we were looking to open it up for other members since we're going to be tackling hopefully some of the meatier issues out there that we've dealt with over the last six, seven years. To open up to other—the members that were on the other committees, maybe like the data committee that is not doing as much anymore, things like that, so we can expand our pool of people, because we are going to be broadening our focus on the issues that we're going to be discussing in that subcommittee.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I have a couple of reflections, Judge Voy. First, you have two potential subcommittee members. I forget which one or both Jackie and Kierra said they were interested either in the Data Subcommittee or the Strategic Implementation Subcommittee. And I would invite you to draft them in. The only other comment I had is, pretty much my understanding of your relationship with Ms. Duffy is she keeps you out of trouble as long as you do what she says. And so, I would invite her to join the committee. And the final thing I was going to reflect, Bill, is now is your time, in my view, to really run with ideas of regionalization and some other things that have been parking lotted, because now the Strategic Planning Committee can really get into that and then bring it to the Commission as a whole, so we could vet those things.

Judge William Voy: Yeah, that was the intent. I think I just heard Brigid hang up too. But anyways, that's not—

Commissioner Brigid Duffy: I did not hang up. I just [inaudible] that but that's my reputation.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Well, I think you both would agree, I accurately described that relationship. I'm sorry. Any other comment in response to Judge Voy's entreaty? And if—Joey was just suggesting, if you have people you'd like, Bill, just send us some names, and we'll draft them for you if you don't feel comfortable asking them yourself.

Judge William Voy: Fair enough. Thanks.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: All right. So, we're then back to the work plan updates. Ms. Brubaker.

Katie Brubaker: Katie Brubaker for the record. We heard from our Risk Assessment Committee about the probation policy that we've been working on. I'd like to offer an update about the corrections policy that DCFS is working on with Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement as well. We have met several handfuls of times it feels like, and we are probably about on page 2 or 3, as well, in terms of our policy. We did have an online training for DCFS parole mental health counselors. It was an overview of the YLS, as well as a brief training on how to administer the YLS. They were then given the task of taking the next 30 days to test it out

on any new youth coming in. And then we are reconvening in two weeks to talk about the process. Our goal in doing this is to test out parts of the policy that we are writing so that we can make changes as we move along. We are also hosting pilot county webinars on the YLS. And that will be an overview for all of the individuals and their supervisors, who will be administering that instrument, and so that we can start to get familiar with what that looks like and how to administer it. And those will be taking place September 17th and September 20th. My goal then is to create webinars with Dr. Vincent and Mr. Clement for the remaining stakeholders and Commission members, so that there is an overview of the YLS, so that we all have a greater understanding. And to piggyback on that, they will be joining part of our road show, so that we can continue to gain buy-in for our process. My second update is regarding the correctional program checklist. As you may remember, eight of us went to Summit View as part of our training. And there is a draft report that was given to Summit View about their findings. And that report was given to them on August 30th, and they have until October 1st to read through and make any recommendations or suggestions about information they felt was incorrect or misrepresented. If there is none that they have—that we receive, this will be considered a final draft and then it will be available for review. Spring Mountain is scheduled to be assessed with the CPC September 20th and 21st, and China Springs will be October 3rd and 4th. This will complete the certification for those eight individuals who were trained back in June. Some of you may have received an email about CaseloadPRO, and I wanted to offer some updates about the acquisition of CaseloadPRO from Tyler Technologies. And what that essentially means for us is that we will have more staff, and so, hopefully a better response time in hearing back from those individuals at CaseloadPRO. They will also have access to resources to help us with projects, so more individuals who will help programming, converting data as well. So, I think that's good news for us. I can also let you know that Elko was scheduled to go live September 7th with CaseloadPRO. Churchill was scheduled to go live September 10th. Washoe County is still in the conversion phase. The 7th Judicial District is working with CaseloadPRO regarding their request to create three separate systems, one for each county in their district. And Clark County was scheduled to have a meeting with CaseloadPRO earlier this week. And I have not heard the outcome. Regarding DCFS updates, all of our policies are with our JJ Deputy Administrator, as well as Mr. Armstrong for review, and then we will be able to bring back the remaining policies that commission has not seen for the opportunity for feedback for us. DCFS is also working on our roll-out plan to reach our entire state about AB 472 and our policies, and we should have that work plan overview completed by the end of this month. I did want to highlight something about our road show. I have created a PowerPoint, so when we are ready to go, it will highlight information regarding requirements in the legislation; funding information regarding the YLS and the MAZE are evidence-based programs and practices, definition, and the goals that were outlined in the strategic plan that we approved. I do have a proposal out that we do this road show via webinar, so that we can reach additional people, and also, since we all have very busy schedules, I think that would be the easiest for us all to coordinate. So, look for additional information really soon. Thank you.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions for Ms. Brubaker from Clark County? Or here in Carson City? Good report. Good work, Katie. We'll look for the email inbox blasts.

Commissioner Scott Shick: Judge Walker, I just want to make a comment. This is Scott. I just want to commend Katie for her unbelievable organizational skills and keeping us on task and keep—the communication and the interface with everybody. It's exceptional. Thank you.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Soak that in, Katie. We public servants rarely get that, so soak that in. Any other comments? Questions? Concerns? Thank you, Ms. Brubaker. The next item is for information. And that's the 2017 Juvenile Justice Facility Training Report. Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston, DCFS for the record. On September 21st, 2016, NAC 62B.100 was updated to require that each department of juveniles services that operates a detention facility and each juvenile state correctional facility provide a training report to the DCFS programs office, which is my office. The first training report was due in February of 2018, which covered the calendar year of 2017, January 1st to December 31st. All seven detention facilities and all three correctional facilities provided that report.

In your packet, there is a document titled 2017 Training Report. On page 3 of that report, you will see a list of all of the training requirements for detention staff new hires. All detention staff new hires and staff that have direct contact with youth are required to be trained in these topics within 90 days. Supervisory staff are required to have two additional trainings. The training topics are: How to report suspected abuse and neglect; proper reporting and investigation of sexual harassment or sexual misconducts, consistent with the requirements of PREA. Conditions and limitations of room confinement; the facility's disaster plan; data collection; trauma informed care; controlling the behavior of children; policy and procedures concerning the use of force and restraint; the rights of children in an institution; suicide awareness and prevention; the administration of medication to children; applicable state constitutional and statutory rights of children; policies and procedures concerning other matters affecting health, safety, and welfare, and civil and other rights of children; and working with gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and questioning children.

Those are for every individual that has direct contact with youth, within 90 days of hire and annually thereafter. Supervisory staff are also required to be trained annually in the provision of the juvenile detention facility standards, adopted by the Juvenile Justice Commission and disproportionate minority contact. As you move on to page 4, the layout of each facility is laid out individually. The first facility is Murphy Bernadeeny [phonetic] And as you can see, all of the basic trainings were satisfactory. They, on average, provided 28 hours of training to new staff. Their supervisory staff was still in pending status, so, at the next training court, we hope to see that is no longer pending. And then, of course, Clark County is next, all the way through each facility, I said, is listed individually. And then going on to page 10, what was really interesting about this first training report is the amount of time that each facility provided their new hires, from a minimum amount of 22 and a half hours to a maximum amount of 49 and a half hours. Each facility did provide the required training. They just did it—some did it differently, and some used national standards, some used homegrown types of training. But from the report, all training has been—was successfully completed for new hires. I think three or four facilities were still pending that supervisory training. And they have until next year, which would be the next report, to get all those supervisory staff trained. Any questions?

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Questions for Ms. Bittleston about training in Clark County? Or here in Carson City? That's a really good report. The only thing I thought as I read this, Leslie, is across the board, I would say about the juvenile justice professionals that I've had the privilege of dealing with now, and Washoe County and to a lesser degree across the state, they're remarkably well-trained, thoughtful, kind professionals. It's a really good system. And I think that's reflected in how much is invested in the administrations and training, which obviously pays off.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Mr. Shick. I just think—correct me if I'm wrong, but this is the first time that we have ever seen a report like this in the state of Nevada.

Leslie Bittleston: And that is correct.

Commissioner Scott Shick: That's kind of question and statement. Yeah.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. That is correct. When the NAC 6—NAC—I forgot what it was. Whatever it was. Anyway.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Leslie, I can tag in.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: This is Commissioner Armstrong. So you're correct, this is the first time DCFS has done this report. And it's helpful to remember what triggered this report. And that is, a few years ago, I want to say right when I was shifting from being the DAG for the Juvenile Justice Commission to the deputy, there were concerns by many stakeholders about—especially the use of restraints in a number of our facilities. And so, we took a look at what we could do as a commission and what statutory—could we actually create standards everyone had to follow across the state? The answer to that was no. But we found that we could, through the statute, DCFS could enact regulations to require training. And so, the Juvenile Justice Commission at that time did a lot of work in saying, these are the golden standards in the State of Nevada for how we treat children in our facilities, whether those be the county detention centers or our state facilities. And then through the administrative regulation process, we've required everybody to train on those standards. So, this is kind of the end result of that work. This is our first attempt at this report. So, if anybody has feedback on the report and what's in it, certainly send that Leslie's way, and we can do that. But that's just some history in how we got those this report. There were those concerns. We tried to figure out what we could do. And this was the best way we had some teeth to say, we want these standards in our detention facilities. We added some stuff in there that we thought would be best practice. I think it'll also be helpful—I know just from doing the legislative session last year, there's always one or two bills that talks about, well, you need to train on this and you need to train on this. This report makes it clear, we train on that already, or we're spending 20 to 40 hours of training. Let's have some give and take. So, you're right, Commissioner Shick, this is the first report, and that's just some of that background. What is really probably a three-year process to get here, but we're here, so that's great.

Commissioner Scott Shick: This is Scott again. I just think it speaks to our administrators in our jurisdictions and our networking with the state. I think we all hold this valuable and see it as something very necessary to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of kids in our care.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Other questions or comments? Again, thank you, Ms. Bittleston for that report then. The next agenda item is new business. I don't have any update for legislative commission collaboration or parking lot items at this time. Ms. Orduna Hastings? Any questions or comments anybody wants to weigh in on legislative action or items? I'm looking to you Assemblyman Ohrenschall, you're going to have no end to the extra times come February.

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall: Well, Judge Walker, thank you very much for your confidence. I still have one more hurdle trying to get there, but I think it'll be a productive session. I think that all the good work here and the Legislative Commission Chairwoman Moreno produced a lot of good results.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: I have great confidence in you, Assemblyman Ohrenschall. I don't want to jinx you in any way. I know it's dependent on other things to come. Then moving to 11, that's—we've already decided the next meeting date and time. We'll have the continuing agenda items we have. Is there any additional agenda item anyone would like to add at this time? We can add items up until the week before, but any item that comes to mind to any of you right now while we have the opportunity to talk about it? I don't see any.

Unknown Speaker: I'm sorry. You could start down there.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: In Clark County? I don't see any down there. Commissioner Armstrong?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: Yes. I think it would be good to have a discussion. Today, we had to do—we got the slate done on the federal formula grant, but I think it would be good to have a robust discussion about how we utilize the federal formula grant. And with apologies to Commissioner Salla and Ms. Bittleston, but you have—since we have a wider gap, it would be interesting to see how other states approach this. There were two items that were identified in our top five as a community that aren't funded at all. And so, are other states using it? Some of these programs I know we funded year after year after year, and so, is that an approach that is normal, or do some state advisory groups take that big lump of 250 and say, this is going to be our single focus, and let's attack it this year. This is going to be our focus with all that money. So, I think a discussion and maybe an informational item about how other states approach their federal formula grant. And then the discussion for us as we approach the next process, I think, would be helpful.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Can I think that's a great idea, speaking only for myself. I was going to ask, Ross, if you think Ms. Bittleston has time on her plate to do the research to do that, because there—I think we should have a robust discussion about the SAG. For example, when we were discussing who could vote on the SAG or when we've talked about

SAG issues in the past, Ms. Bittleston's volunteered her own comment that, her salary is paid out of the grant formula funds. Other states may do that differently. We should talk about whether or not we should go to the state and say, hey, this is really a state task. Should it not come out of your dollars? Honestly, we should have a wide-open conversation about it. I think that's a great idea. My question, again, I guess, was: I don't know if you have—if you think it's appropriate to ask Ms. Bittleston to kind of bring us that information?

Commissioner Ross Armstrong: So, I know there's a national coalition of Ms. Bittleston's. And so, I would say that, yes—and I would volunteer, we can get that done. If it's not doable by the November date, we'll let you know, and we can pull it from the agenda.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Perfect. Perfect. So, we'll add that as an agenda or a parking lot item, as the case may be then. Any other future agenda items like that anybody would like to bring up? Is there a motion to adjourn? I move to adjourn.

Commissioner Joey Orduna Hastings: I'll second it. This is Joey.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker: Any discussion? All in favor? Aye. Any opposed? Any abstentions? Have a great afternoon. Travel safe, to those traveling.

Committee Report and Other Notes:

Commissioner Ross Armstrong moved to approve the grant slate as presented by the Juvenile Justice Programs Officer and the SAG committee, Commissioner Jo Lee Wickes seconded this motion. The grant slate vote was passed.

Commissioner Pauline Salla-Smith moved to move the next JJOC meeting to November as opposed to October. Commissioner Darin Imlay seconded, and the motion was approved.

Commissioner Judge Egan Walker moved to change the name of the Strategic Plan Committee to the Strategic Implementation Committee, and to amend the bylaws to reflect that change. Pauline Salla-Smith seconded, motion was approved.