

Steve Sisolak
Governor



Richard Whitley, MS
Director

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES
Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



Ross Armstrong
Administrator

Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission Strategic Planning Committee Meeting October 25th, 2021 at 11:00am.

Meeting Minutes -

Chair Elizabeth Florez called meeting to order at 11:03am.

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

(VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Elizabeth Florez (Chair), Jennifer Fraser, Brigid Duffy, Egan Walker

Absent: McKenna Finerty

(NON VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Pauline Smith-Salla, Mike Whelihan, Jo Lee Wickes

(STAFF MEMBERS)

Present in Person: Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Dunn, Kayla Landes

(PUBLIC PRESENT)

Present by Phone: DaShun Jackson -Children's Advocacy Lives, Lea Case, Valerie Balen

Meeting Minutes:

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Excellent. Thank you. So, moving on to item number three on the agenda, public comment and discussion. Do we have any members of the public who wish to make comment at this time? Seeing that, we will close that item and move on to item number four, review and approval of the August 24, 2020 meeting minutes that were just attached with number four. I was not present for that meeting, but provided everybody has reviewed them, we could move to this point for a motion to approve and second unless there's discussion. Do we need time to review the minutes?

EGAN WALKER: I move to approve. Egan Walker.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And the second?

MIKE WHELIHAN: Leslie --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So we need -- we need somebody from the JJOC to second, either Brigid, Jennifer.

BRIGID DUFFY: I'll second. This is Brigid for the record.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Thank you.

MIKE WHELIHAN: Leslie, can you tell us who the voting members are so we know because I don't believe -- I know Pauline is not. I don't believe I am either.

LESLIE BITTLESON: Liz Florez, Jennifer Fraser, Egan Walker, Brigid Duffy, and McKenna Finnerty are what I have for voting members.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And Ms. Finnerty is not present, correct, Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That's correct.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So, with the first and the second motions, the minutes are -- from the 8/24/2020 are approved.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Madam Chair, you want -- you may want to ask for all in favor.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Oh, I apologize. All in favor?

UNIDENTIFIED: Aye.

UNIDENTIFIED: Aye.

UNIDENTIFIED: Aye.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Are there any opposed? So, I don't get to unilaterally just make that decision. Thank you for reminding me.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: You're welcome.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Especially since I wasn't there. But I did read them. Item number five, COVID testing update. Leslie --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: ... will go over attachment number five.

LESLIE BITTLESON: Yes, I will. Attachment number five, COVID testing update. Just to update the members, we -- DCFS does request updated information on a monthly basis for COVID testing for all of the facilities and the state. That includes the state facilities, China Spring and the detention facilities. So, attachment five, table 1 and 2 are a 12-month period from June '20 to May of 2021. That has not changed. It's just historical. Starting with table number three is a new 12-month period. Currently, we have data from June of 2021 through September of 2021. And as you can see, we do have 58 youth positives out of 1,649 tests provided for positivity rate of 3.52. And we do have 36 staff positives out of 2,088 tests for positivity rate of 1. -- 1.27%. Table number four is a breakdown of where those tests and positives are with all of the facilities in the state. You will not see Spring Mountain. Spring Mountain is included with

Clark County Juvenile Detention, but you will see China Spring as a -- as a separate line. So, that's where we are with COVID positives to date. I can take questions. No questions? Okay. Thank you.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you for that, Leslie. So, moving on -- oh, do we need to approve that report?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No. It's just informational.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you. Number six for discussion, the big item here, strategic plan next five years 2023 through 2028. And shared with everybody was attachment number six, which is the status update August 2020, if I'm reading that correctly. Leslie, is that right?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Madam Chair, do you want me to get a little history on this?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Yes, please.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Thank you. So, Leslie Bittleston for the record. The Strategic Plan Committee met a few times last year in 2020 to go over the strategic plan that was in place from FY '8 through -- or is it FY '19 through '20 -- maybe that's FY '19 through '23. What the committee did last year was they went through each item and they identified the items that were completed and some of the items that were remaining. Through this process, the committee started talking about some other things they wanted to add to the list, but that was never formalized. Basically, what the committee did is they just went through and identified what was completed. And as you can see, just as an example on Page number 4 of the attachment, you'll see in red if you have color that all of those items were completed and that there was an update on why they were completed. And then going on to Page number 5, everything was completed. And then as you move down to Page number 7, you will see your first not completed item and then ongoing. So, just for history, the completed items are things that, you know, were easily completed within the stages of doing 8472 and all of that onboarding around that. Some of the non-completed items were really because of lack of funding. So, that's kind of the history of where the Strategic Plan Committee left off. This was the last document that was discussed in the Strategic Planning Committee from last year.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So, for purposes of trying to catch up to all the work that's been done, my understanding is this body has to submit a report, correct, with an update on this plan and we need to also discuss the new requirements for Senate Bill 398. Is that correct?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. That's correct. And also start building the strategic plan for the next five years. So, there's kind of three phases. Phase number one, a report on this plan and then doing a new next five-year plan and including all of those Senate bills that are relevant.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And so -- Ms. Florez for the record. And so, do -- and there's a timeline for that, right? Is the timeline for this report August, is that correct, of 2022?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I believe so, yes.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So, this will be -- I'm sorry. One more clarifying. I imagine that this -- this report makes its way to the full commission for review prior to release?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. So, part of AB398 allows the JJOC one overarching bill that can be presented to the legislature and that is when it's due August of 2022 or the report is due August of 2022. Not sure about the bill itself.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Yeah, so part of this is identifying some of the things in NRS that need to be included, changed, removed, whatever.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. So if I may, it looks like in your bullet points, it says identify incomplete items for removal, an example of which would be lack of funding or because items have been completed. I'm not sure how this group has done it in the past. Is this something where you go line by line through the plan and have discussion?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Yes, that's how we did it in the past. But maybe a recommendation, since a lot of the work has been completed is maybe discuss, you know, removing or -- removing all the items completed, and then discussion around what's left and see if you want to leave them or get rid of them.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Does a group -- yes. Judge Walker.

EGAN WALKER: If I may, this strategic plan was built with the assistance of strategic planning professionals. So this five year plan was the result of about 20 hours of meetings between Joey, myself, Ross, and a strategic planning firm. And I would like to request that this strategic planning committee request of the JJOC and of the state funds to do the same thing again. The process was very laborious and it only worked because we had strategic planning professionals, in my opinion, to help us build this plan. And it was contemplated, at least in the discussions that I was party to, that this -- the new strategic plan would -- would result from a similar process.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Well, I think that's a grand idea and I certainly recognize -- I appreciate you reminding me at least of that, Judge Walker, because having been part of strategic planning in Washoe County for a long time, I know that we've had to do the same because it is such a massive project. So, from a process standpoint, this is something that this group would recommend it the next JJOC, is that how that works. If this group were -- would that have to be a voting point then for this group in attendance?

EGAN WALKER: I don't think it would have to be a voting point, Liz. I think as the co-chair of the JJOC, and more importantly, you as chair of this subcommittee could simply make the request, which I think we just did through Leslie, for those funds and for that access. I don't recall what it costs before, Leslie, you may have that at the top of your head.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I don't.

EGAN WALKER: But money -- it was money well spent.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah, I don't. Yeah, I do not have that at the top of my head. So, what we would do here, Liz, is this will be part of your report to the JJOC. And then we will agendaize it for the JJOC with a

motion, possible motion for the JJOC to request and approve or to approve a request to DCFS for funds for the creation of a new strategic plan.

EGAN WALKER: Liz, if you want I'll put it in a letter with Joey and my signature as well.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: That would likely hold far more weight than anything that I work with -- right.

EGAN WALKER: I don't -- I don't know that that's true at all. You know that in five bucks will get you a cup of coffee at Starbucks.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: I would appreciate that, Judge Walker. I think that's a great idea and will really help this group move this process along, especially in light of the new requirements. I think we're gonna have to be very thoughtful about that. Thank you. So as far as the timeline associated with that the next meeting is for the JJOC, the full commission I believe is -- can you remind me Leslie? Is it December?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: December 10th I believe.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So recognizing that there is a process associated with that that will take time, I would like to get some guidance from the group about how we can -- if there is still -- knowing that that process will take place, we still have to provide guidance to that group, if indeed it were approved to come in and assist us. How do we best accomplish providing them a document that they can then pick up and work with us on? I'm wondering if we should create a different document that pares it down to what's remaining. If the group would think that that's helpful.

JO LEE WICKES: This Jo Lee Wickes. Can I ask a question?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Certainly.

JO LEE WICKES: So one of the items that I think is marked -- let me see what page I'm on -- page five. It's marked as completed for fiscal year 2019-2020, is secure sustainable funding for the EB -- EBP Resource Center. I hate to be dense, but is there a secure sustainable funding?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: I will do [inaudible] on that.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. This is -- this is Leslie for the record. Yes and no. Yes, we are providing roughly \$52,000 per year to the resource center out of the formula grant. Other than that, there is no funding for the Resource Center. There was initial funding just to remind all of the members there was initial funding of around 100 and something thousand when 8472 was created, and those were startup costs only. There were no ongoing funds for the resource center. So we had to scramble and look for some other -- for some other mechanisms of funding. And really what we've got is about \$52,000 per year out of the formula grants and that's it.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Does that answer your Jo Lee? Or do you have...

JO LEE WICKES: My next question is, is that sufficient to keep the Resource Center going?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: That is a really hard question because, yes, it will do some things, but it's not going to do the robust work that maybe we would want it to do. Yes, it will cover the bare minimums, is really

what I'm trying to say. And that -- and that's up to the group. I mean, the group can request additional state funds for this. You know, I know the Resource Center, the vendor, basically we had a meeting. When was that last week, Pauline? The SAG meeting where the vendor said only about 15 states have resource centers and some of them are very robustly funded and they are, you know, capable of doing a lot of things. However, what we have is just touching the bare minimum.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And this is Liz for the record. So, Jo Lee, I'm sorry, Leslie, that the resource center is operated by -- can you -- I apologize. Is it -- is it Andrew Wachter?

EGAN WALKER: It is CJFCJ.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: NCJFCJ.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. It's the resource -- Research Division, NCF's -- you know what I mean.

EGAN WALKER: NCJJ. So NCJJ is the -- I'm sorry, Leslie. This is Egan for the record. I don't mean to step on you. But NCJJ is a sub part of NCJFCJ and it's a contract through NCJFCJ for NCJJ to stand up the Resource Center. Sorry.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right. Yes. And they are the research division of NCF. The one I can't say, so.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And so if I'm understanding correctly the -- and I -- I haven't looked at it recently, but a few months ago, it looks like what you're indicating is that it's not -- it's not as interactive. It's not as robust as when it could be based on the amount that the state is able to contribute to or propose to.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Correct.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Correct. Also, please note that the formula funds were frozen for close to three years. So the research -- the Resource Center didn't do any work when the funds were frozen because they couldn't float that. So now that the funds are available again, they will be starting work again. So, there was a big gap of they did nothing because they couldn't.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you for that. Okay. So as I look through -- as I look through the plan, Leslie, there's a lot of yellow highlights. Can you explain what we should be thinking of when we see the highlighted areas?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Those highlighted areas are really, as Commissioner Wickes just brought up. Yes, we got the resource center off the ground. However, the reason that it's highlighted is funding.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: The lack of funding.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And then you'll see the next one. So on page five, there is two highlighted. I put completed because it's off the ground, but it doesn't mean it's where it should be or where folks envision that it would be because it is seriously lacking funding.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So Miss Salla as a -- you are part of the state advisory group, and in that group, the work of the Evidence Based Resource Center is -- that falls under that subcommittee. So is that -- is that what you were going to be reporting on today?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I wasn't planning on reporting on anything.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: But.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: But when you indicated you were asked to be present. I wasn't sure.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Oh, yeah. We did -- we did fund them additional funding with, I think with the, with the over -- we had some additional funding and the unfrozen fund went directly to them. So we're actually behind with them just because the funds were frozen and what we had already planned on the Innovation Center doing we're not there yet. So now we're playing catch up, but we did fund them recently.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So the work is picking up again as a result of the release of funds.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yes, it is.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So presumably by the time we update this plan, we'll have more information about -- gaining traction in a specific action.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: And -- and, sorry, this is Commissioner Salla. I do think that this is going to be an ongoing item, though, only because we will continue to grow it as the funding becomes available. I'm not sure that we're ever going to be completed -- completed totally on this one.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right. And moving on to page number six, the top two items is again, related to the resource center. So there are several areas that are related to the resource center that as Commissioner Salla just said, will probably be ongoing.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So what I'd like to do is, is briefly talk about the yellow highlights, just so that I get an understanding of where we are and it has been so long and this -- since the last meeting over a year. And so I think we've talked about the evidence base Resource Center and if there's a plan in place now that funding has been released to move forward, that the work will continue in the strategic or in the SAG committee, and we'll continue to monitor that. For initiative 2.5 versus county engagement, it indicates we're on -- this is page six now -- ongoing communication, establishing regular communications for updates and reminders to counties and service providers. Leslie, can you give an update on that?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: For policy implementation.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Individual...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, the when the -- Leslie Bittleston for the record, so when the strategic planning group met last year, nobody on that committee seemed to understand what was being requested there. So it's highlighted because we don't know if it was done or not because we don't know what it meant or what the intent was.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So, is that clarification that needs to be sought at the full commission meeting?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, or through this group to flesh it out a little bit more. To make sure that we are addressing it.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Commissioner Flores, I can add something through the SAG on that, if it would be helpful.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Yes, please.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Commissioner Sala. So one of the requests that we had received through the counties were training surrounding the strategic plan and, and other requirements of AB472. Recently, we just --we received that. So during our psych committee meeting last week, what we decided is that we were going to allow time for the Strategic Planning Committee to update their strategic plan as needed and then we could roll out, if jurisdictions needed additional training through the psych committee, we could roll out that additional training. I do think that this part is a little different now because we have been talking about it so much through [inaudible] also, to get us all on the same page, which I think helps the jurisdictions. But once the strategic plan is updated, then the training will occur through the site.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: This is Commissioner Florez. Can you go into what specific training was requested? So it was all of the training required to make sure that we're all in compliance with the new requirements.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: The training that -- Commissioner Salla for the record -- the training that was requested was the elements of the strategic plan that county level Juvenile Services departments, were going to be responsible for. It was that specific. And as we all know, with the new legislation, too, there's so much more, that is being required so that we could just combine those and do it all at once. So it's really what the juvenile justice agencies are responsible for.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And so -- Commissioner Florez for the record, so this documentation like a list let's say of all of the requirements and the training associated and the compliance efforts associated, that's not all being compiled in one place yet. Is that true?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I, -- Commissioner Salla -- at least in my opinion, it's through the different committees like the data subcommittee to me has their requirements, SAG has their requirements, Strategic Plan has their requirements. So at that point, we could -- we would -- the SAG would collect all

of that and then take like a template or a training to the full commission for approval to roll out with the jurisdictions.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Combining everything.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: That would be helpful. Okay. Is there any further discussion on [inaudible] county engagement? Okay. If I go through this to the next page, page seven, initiative 3.1, Tyler Supervision. A lot of this is highlighted. Leslie, can you give an overview?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. So there was a lot of robust conversation around Tyler Supervision in the few meetings we had last year about what we thought it was going to be and what it is, and in relation also to data sharing. So I think we all hope and expect that reports that the counties are being asked to provide can just be created and somebody in my office myself or Ms. Landis [ph] can just push a button and run a report on DMC [ph] or status offenses or room confinement or a slew of other things. However, we're not quite there yet. And it's going to take some additional funding to get us there. And so we talked a lot about the funding not being adequate upfront to build some of the pieces that we need, which is why some of these items are not yet completed. Does that help or do you need more information?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: No, thank you. No, that's helpful. I appreciate that. And recognizing when I read this report, it is clear through audit and the case still remains that Washoe has not yet signed on with Tyler.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And that's something that we're working through right now.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right, and then moving to the second one on page seven is really part of the same discussion around enhancing data sharing, you know, to make sure that, you know, the state can run those reports. So these are -- we do have a data sharing agreement in place, which is why it says completed, but it doesn't mean it's where we need it to be again. So that's why it's highlighted on State County's funding.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So, Commissioner Flores for the record. Leslie? So right now the -- because that bridge has not been constructed where the state can then just pull those mandatory reports. Are you receiving -- are you receiving all of the required information just from or is it Access [ph], Excel? How are you getting all of the data now?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: A variety. I'm getting some of it just in a Word document. I'm getting some of it by Excel. I'm also getting some reports out of Tyler Supervision. So, it's really kind of just a bunch of different ways. I do know that counties are still having a hard time getting what they need for DMC. I had a conversation with Elko County. They did a QA on some of their data and it's not pulling accurately for DMC. So I think counties are still in a bind with providing the data as requested. Due to I think they're having to pull it by different mechanisms as well, which is why I'm getting it in different forums and formats.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay, thank you. Does anybody else have any comments regarding Tyler Supervision, the QA, or the performance reporting?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh, Madam Chair, an update on the QA, which is initiative 3.2. At the time we did this, this was incomplete, but we have trained seven new assessors. So I think we are up to 11 qualified assessors in the state. So we might turn this white because I think we have enough to do the state facilities and the youth camps. Unless there's discussion of rolling this out to detention facilities, then we...

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So thank you for that clarification. In that section where it talks about detention centers and counties, is that -- and then eventually community providers, what's the status of that?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: None. There has been no conversation about expanding the use of the CPC tool to detention facilities or community providers.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Is -- forgive my memory. Is that a requirement under the statute?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Not currently. The only requirements under its NRS62B.620. The only requirements are the three state facilities and the two youth camps. So this is probably something that needs to be vetted and if it wants to, or if there's -- if the JJOC wants to expand it to detention facilities, it probably needs to be updated in the NRS.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Understood. Okay. So -- and that also includes the regional camps, is that correct?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: They are required.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: They are required currently.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Leslie, for my benefit, I'm sure it's -- maybe you could direct me somewhere where I can see the tool.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So the tool is proprietary and the tool is owned by the University of Cincinnati and they do not show the tool. The specific tool they give like an outline of what the tool measures. So, for folks that are not trained, it's kind of like the YLS. We don't want to give the tool to somebody who's not trained to use it because it's very confusing. So what I can provide you is kind of an overview of what the tool is and what it does. I can't really give you the tool itself. It's not really a tool. It's just a mechanism of review and a scoring guide is what it is.

UNKNOWN: You could show some of the old ones that have been completed and then their responses, and that would be a better idea to see what the audit suggest, and then what the community or the counties or the council responses are.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah, I can do that. I can provide that to you, Commissioner Florez.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you. So my understanding, I'm just gonna deviate -- leave this a little bit. My understanding, Leslie, is that this group has the ability to bring forward a bill draft.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: But then that bill draft, there could be multiple components? Correct. It doesn't have to be -- it can be something that after review of this process and updating our plan, we can incorporate things like you suggested, potentially to move forward the juvenile justice reform effort

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That's correct. And that bill could be as large as the JJOC wants it to be. It can include stuff as recommended by the SAG or the -- or any of the other groups. It could be as large as the JJOC wants.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay, thank you for reminding me of that and clarifying. Okay. Initiative 3.3 performance reporting -- procedures for reporting by counties. This is when were you indicated the data sharing agreements were all signed, but this has not moved further than that. Is this one that also requires more funding?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I don't know if it requires more funding or if it requires more conversation around exactly how we want to share data. So, this one was very confusing to myself and to the members when we discussed it last year, is we don't know if it requires additional data sharing agreements or something else. Because a lot of us are just not sure how data is shared and what that means behind the scenes. So that might be a discussion for some technical people that are not us.

EGAN WALKER: I can help perhaps a little bit, Madam Chair, if that would be useful.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Yes, please.

EGAN WALKER: So when we built the strategic plan, it was contemplated that Tyler would be stood up across the state long ago. Tyler made promises to the JJOC -- let me back up even farther. So, at the time of the JJOC stand up meetings before the legislature was passed, you all may recall that Jack Martin and Frank Cervantes and myself, and Judge [inaudible] all voted in favor of going to a common case management system across the state. And that case management system was Tyler. And it was believed at that time that Tyler would be stood up years ago. That we wouldn't have had the teething problems that apparently we've had. And so all of this data sharing was contemplated to occur within Tyler. In fact, it was contemplated to occur even into the State Department of Corrections in the adult criminal system. That's how expansive it was. And so I don't -- maybe that background give some context to some of these measures.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And, Madam Chair, if I may add a little bit more, I think that the data sharing process has become a little bit convoluted due to the fact that we still have some concern about sharing data across county lines and state lines, and I don't know what that looks like. I don't know if it's something that we need to just let go of. But, you know, when we discussed data sharing agreements when we were going through that process, many of the counties were like, okay, I can say, okay, you can pull these reports, but we don't want the state to have access to all of our data. So I think that there's some conversations around what does a statewide database mean? Is it everybody enter stuff into the same database or is it separate databases where there's just bits and pieces of permissions? I think it's a bigger conversation than just what it looks like, you know, I think there's multiple layers is what I'm trying to present.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Mike?

MIKE WHELIHAN: Mike Whelihan for the record. So, I was one of the ones that testified on AB472 with the judges and everyone that was involved, Jack and everybody. So, the idea of the system, at least when we were communicating with the founders of the bill, was that each person -- the entire state, we use the same systems, as Judge Walker said, and then it wasn't to allow the state to go in and go through everyone's system. Data is one thing as far as like reports, like the Tyler tech, it's supposed to be able to create a report, like if we're talking, you know, if we wanted a -- I'll just make up a report like the average age, race and a charge. So at that point, the Tyler tech, which was actually caseload pro at the time, would have built a report. And then the state would have a data sharing agreement with each county, and then you could just pull that report from each county and it would have the same information, but you would get the name of the kids and all the personal information, home addresses and all that stuff like that. Like poverty level, you would get the actual number of cases by age, race, you know, income, so forth, and so on, and not the individuals names, families addresses on all of this. So it's more data not getting into the system, but Tyler supposed to create these reports. So we can all have the same information going in to our systems.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you for that clarification. This is Commissioner Flores. So I understand, as I'm piecing together information about Tyler and what has occurred in the past that there are -- there are quite a few things within the strategic plan that are coming upon that system working and being viable, which makes it difficult. And so perhaps we can have discussion about as it is that we update this plan. How much of that do we keep in knowing that -- I think Leslie, I can't remember where it was where we talked about what the potential timeline would be for the full rollout of Tyler building these bridges, and it's, it's not in the immediate future is my understanding.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No, and I think the biggest problem with my conversations with Tyler Supervision is the reason that these reports are not going as smoothly as we hoped they would be, is that each county does things a little different. They call things a little different. So when you -- when Tyler builds a report, let's say something like age, gender, poverty, something like that, it requires Tyler Supervision to go into each county to configure that report specifically for the state. It's not like a one and done where Tyler's supervision creates one report, and then I could just run it through every county. And that's what we have run into. So it's not going to be a one and done. It's going to be Tyler Supervision going into every county and configuring a report for all 17 counties that I can run. So -- and they are running and -- and then there's the aspect that Tyler Supervision is slow. So yes, we are not looking at anything soon.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I'm trying to say that diplomatically, but I don't think it's coming out that way.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Commissioner Salla, it looks like you've unmuted.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah, I think -- Commissioner Salla for the record. I think there's a couple things, one, with the -- with the data agreements, at least for my jurisdiction, and our legal counsel had concerns that it was too broad, right. And we brought that back and said, hey, we have to make it more specific as Mr. Whelihan was talking about. Not having access to our cold data system because we have medical stuff and their mental health stuff in there, all that stuff. So that's number one. Number two, I think the big picture with Tyler's supervision is that until we get funding to support the creation of the reports that we need, and that was part of the discussion as a state and that the state was going to

provide that funding. If all the jurisdictions are trying to piecemeal like I have -- I have different work requests into create some reports for me at thousands of dollars [inaudible]. And if each jurisdiction has to do that, we're never going to get to the time where there's going to be a platform of a report in Tyler Supervision to pull the information the state needs. So I think the larger conversation is, where do we get the funding as the state -- as a state, not jurisdictions, to support the request that we need for effective and accurate data reports?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Does anybody have an easy button on that? No?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: State recovery funds.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: I think it's too late to request for state recovery funds.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Commissioner Salla for the record. Well, it's coming in two different pieces so maybe the first [inaudible].

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. My recommendation is to request, you know, funding from general funds because -- but, again, that's a large request of the state budget. And I'm not high enough on the food chain to say one way or the other about that.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So I believe -- this is Commissioner Florez for the record. I believe. I've heard another meetings where Administrator Ross Armstrong, he had made note of the state recovery funds, but I don't recall the second apportionment. So, Leslie, is that something that or maybe perhaps you now that we can have a conversation with Ross in that venue. And we can -- I can -- we can -- we have our president of NAJJA on this call here so, maybe that's as -- we can see clarification from Mr. Armstrong on that. Is there any further conversation about performance reporting 2.3? So moving on to, I believe, oh, let's see. So within that same area, one of the last yellow highlighted areas, says policy -- determine policy to review and report to Governor and legislature required outcome measures by January 31 and July 1. And Leslie, I did have questions about the reporting schedule. So, that January 31 date is that the DMC report?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, but it is -- when we talk about the governors report, it's actually the governor's reports that is due by this office to the governor's office by January 31st. I have not been able to meet that requirement due to not getting the DMC data. With enough time to -- and just to let everybody know, I get DMC data by county, which means I have to compile that into statewide for about 32 different points in time and that takes me a lot of time. It can take me up -- it could take me 80 hours to do that just alone. And then taking all of that data and putting it into the governor's report, with enough time for the JJOC to approve it. So, I have -- I guess the biggest problem is that January 31st is an unrealistic timeframe and I don't know why it's -- and that came out of AB472. Previously, I believe it was like March or April of when the governor's report was due and that's very doable, but January 31st is not -- and I haven't met it any year -- any -- in any year. Usually, I'm provided that report in March, with apology letters as to why I cannot get it done by January 31st. So, I'm thinking that that might be something that maybe this group would like to include in their overarching bill to change some of these

due dates to be a little more realistic because we have to give counties time to provide the data and then the state needs time to compile that data.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So, Commissioner Florez for the record. Thank you for that clarification, Leslie, I do know from Washoe when the date changed, it did create a burden and concern actually that our information wouldn't be as accurate because the information required is on a calendar year. Correct? Not?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It's on a -- yes, it's on a -- but it's the -- the calendar year is a federal fiscal year. So it's September through -- excuse me -- October through September.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: But even saying that providing that by December 1st is very, very hard for counties. And even at that it's -- I can't even get the report done by January.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you for that. It looks like initiative 3.4 cross-agency collaboration has all of the elements complete. And there was a note completed two quality assurance reviews in 2020 and have three scheduled for completion by the end of the year. That year was 2020. Can you give us an update on that?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I'm sorry, Madam Chair, which one are you talking about -- oh, 3.4.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: 3.4

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay, let's see -- determine points of contact for various children.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: My specific question is the reviews that occurred in 2020.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I believe we were talking about the reviews being the CPC reviews. So, we are conducting quality assurance reviews per NRS62B.620 annually on five facilities, the regional camps and the state facilities. I just completed China Spring last week. NYTC is coming up. Spring Mountain is completed. So we are on schedule to do annual reviews for all of -- for those five facilities.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Commissioner Florez for the record. And the results of those are shared off of JJOC, is that...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That's correct. The last review will be conducted in January. That would be Caliente Youth Center. So, it'll be March when the results will be shared with the JJOC.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you.

JO LEE WICKES: And this is Commissioner Wickes for the record. Liz, I think at the last JJOC meeting, you volunteered to be on my subcommittee and those reports flow through the quality assurance subcommittee and then to the JJOC.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: That's correct.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So with the -- so just for clarification at the JJOC, I provide an overview of all of the completed reviews, but at the quality and grants committee. The committee does review each completed report and facility improvement plans, so they get to dig in to all of the information.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you. Okay, then on page 10, goal four, which is 4.1 Family Engagement Plan, all of those appear completed.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, and this is -- this was a confusion for the subcommittee. So the state has a family engagement plan, and it is my understanding that each county has a family engagement plan. It's not a statewide family engagement plan, but it was part of AB472 that jurisdictions create family engagement plans and my understanding is those are all completed. It was not clear on who was supposed to do it.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: And the legal requirement -- but so the individual policies, it's not like there had been a review of family engagement plans through the quality assurance committee or it doesn't funnel that way, right?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That's correct. There is no committee that reviewed family engagement plans from the counties.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. And Commissioner Florez for the record. And the family engagement handbook. Is that -- is that something that's for public consumption?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So the state created a family engagement handbook and I believe it is on our website. But this is another one where I'm not sure if counties created their own.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. We should probably be able to answer that question. This is something that we can take back to NAJJA as well, just for clarification. Commissioner Salla, were you going to add something to that?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Commissioner Salla for the record. Humboldt County has one also and I know jurisdictions have asked to see it because they were working on there. So, we can definitely check in at NAJJA.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you. Initiative 4.2 case plans re-entry plans. Can you give an update on this one?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. So at the time we completed this a year ago, we were still plan -- still pending the case plan in Tyler Supervision. The case plan is now completed. So, that -- so the fourth -- fifth one down is now completed. The case plan handbook, DCFS is working on one. It's still in process. I don't know about jurisdictions if they're doing that. This might be a good one to go through the SAG committee because there's been a lot of conversation around case planning in the SAG committee. I just threw that to Pauli. I'm sorry.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Say it again. Leslie.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I was talking about on page 10, the last one under 4.2, the case plan handbook. I know the state is in process. So I'm wondering if that could be something the side could take on maybe develop a statewide case planning handbook. Just a...

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Commissioner Salla. Yes, that can run through the SAG. The other thing is the YLS quality assurance committee is working with [inaudible] still and actually our next couple meetings are on case plan and policy development, so.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, Madam Chair, it's just that -- it's just the case plan handbook has just not been completed. It's just -- it probably needs to stay on until we can get it completed.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you. All right, moving on to -- let's see. This is the risk. Let's see page 12, initiative 1.1 Risk Assessment Tool. This looks largely completed.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: This is the YLS. So, the YLS is up and running. Some of it was talking about the state was going to pay for the YLS upfront and then the counties we're gonna take over. Let's see -- case planning, and reporting. And there's still some work for the Evidence Based Resource Center that needs to be ongoing. But for the most part, this is completed other than the Evidence Based Resource Center.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So, Commissioner Florez for the record. Commissioner Salla, in the SAG committee, I know you're discussing evidence based while the Innovation Center is -- is this falling under that as well, the developing the definitions of the matrix to evaluate processes? Does that all fall under this? Was this also one that was stunted by the funding issue?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Commissioner Salla. The definitions have already been identified with the matrix. They're there on the website because we can use evidence informed and or evidence-based. So, but we are working with the Innovation Center to help identify evaluation processes of evidence-based programming or evidence informed programming. So, the answer to your question is yes, that's being addressed through the SAG. Now that they have funding and are up and running again that is a standing agenda item for us.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you. So, this Commissioner Florez. Just for my understanding, is there -- is there a place Ms. Bittleston that I can look to, to see where some of these elements within the strategic plan are being addressed within JJOC and its subcommittees?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I don't think I understand the question.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: So, for example, I didn't because I've not been a part of the SAG committee. I didn't realize that a lot of these things fall under them, or what, you know, Ms. Wickes just indicated that some of the work that's happening in that committee. Is there maybe -- if it's, you know, it's not deemed inappropriate, maybe perhaps separately you can educate me on that.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, Madam Chair. I think when this document was created, we didn't know where those things would live. So over the period of time that this has been in place, things have been assigned.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, yes, I think that -- I do not have this document in a Word document so I've had to kind of retype it. So, you know, so yes, I can kind of put another box or column to say SAG committee or grants committee or quality assurance committee or whatever it is.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you. And so, I'm trying to go through these here, but in the interest of time. Going on to initiative 2.5, county engagement. This is the roadshow that's been completed. Is there anything else under this area that needs to be explored?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Not to my knowledge in relation to AB472. I don't know if everybody attended the roadshow but we did do a roadshow.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Does anybody have any comments on that? Okay. So initiative 3.1 is Tyler Supervision. I feel like we've talked a great deal about this and the performance reporting, I apologize, please indulge me.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh, 3.1, that is now complete. The case plan is now within Tyler Supervision. At the time we did this, it wasn't complete, but it is complete now.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. This is the case plan. Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And then the next one, which is 3.3. That's ongoing discussion about these beta recordings, and as Commissioner Salla brought up earlier, kind of an overarching funding plan to get this in place.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And then the case plan handbook again.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So, a lot of work has been done on this. I mean, I know that there's been some time since AB472 went into place, but there's a lot of completed on here. So, kudos to -- and thank you, Leslie, for putting this all in one place for easy review. I know in a previous conversation I've had with Ross Armstrong who attempted to orient me and catch me up to where this committee stood and what needed to be done, he did remind of SB398 and that plan, and indicated that we would need to go through this plan to determine how it is that we can update it. So, one of the suggestions is to -- that Leslie had brought forward previously, was to remove what's been completed just for purposes of moving forward and whittling down what it is that what the areas are that we need to work on. It looks to me like as part of this process, committees are charged with going through some of the elements and providing more information to report back so that we can update this plan. And so I think we accomplished some of that with -- in speaking with Ms. Wickes and with -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Wickes and Commissioner Salla. We're also going to have to answer for the items that have not progressed in a timely manner, what some of the challenges have been, whether it's been resource driven, pandemic driven, whatever the case may be, we'll have to document those within the strategic plan. And then, as another element bring forward recommendations for updating the strategic plan, not only with whatever is statutorily required through SB398, but also continuing the work and the questions that have been brought forward as a result of working through this plan. So at this point, I'd like to hear from the group that there are some recommendations about how to move forward with fine tuning this instrument for purposes of getting this report, getting the strategic plan updated, as well as a report to -- that meet statutory guidelines. If anybody has any ideas.

EGAN WALKER: Madam Chair, if I may?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Yes, please.

EGAN WALKER: Egan Walker for the record. I volunteer to be assigned the task to contact Tyler Supervision to understand from Tyler's perspective what the issues are in terms of rollout across the state, more particularly what it is that Tyler believes they need in terms of money to complete even, for example, signing an agreement with Washoe County. Part and parcel of that is understanding on a county by county basis, what the challenges are. So if that is something you think would be useful, I'd happily undertake that because somewhere along the line -- along the way, we got lost. I did not know and it's my ignorance and no one else's fault. I did not know, for example, that Washoe County has still not signed a contract with Tyler. And this is four years in. And so I must say, I think a better understanding is needed from both sides of what the challenges are

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you Judge Walker -- Commissioner Walker. This is Liz Florez for the record. So, just to share some additional information in that regard from a Washoe [ph] standpoint, after having spoken to all of the chiefs across the state regarding their experience with Tyler, I'm putting together a plan for how it is Washoe elects or not elects to move forward with Tyler Supervision. But one thing that was underscored, and Leslie brought it up is that one of the challenges that Tyler has is that each county does things so uniquely that it does make it a challenge on their end to create a platform. That being said, another point that was brought up and this was uniform, I would say almost unanimous from all chiefs, is that there had not been a training of sort that brought together all of the jurisdictions in order to build from the beginning, something that all could agree upon so that this could have been prevented. Now, I understand that's not -- that fault doesn't lie squarely on any one entity's shoulders. That's just sort of the nature of how this all rolled out. And so I -- and in my conversations with Tyler, I've -- that's what I've heard from them as well. That being said, what is the repair for that? So it perhaps would be helpful, Commissioner Walker, if you would like to have that conversation, I think in -- before that conversation takes place, I would likely have a conversation with you personally, doctor, -- I'm sorry -- Dr. Walker, are we there yet? Am I premature in saying that? Commissioner Walker. So, thank you for that. I will reach out to you and provide you more information that I have. I do think that would be important because that's -- so much of the strategic plan is weaved with that very -- that very goal. And so it does make it difficult to get to the completed section on so many of these of these goals.

EGAN WALKER: What I'm hearing is that some jurisdictions are flat, not going to use it. That may be an overstatement and an overgeneralization, but that's -- I'm just being candid, that's what I'm hearing. And I have heard in the past that some quietly and maybe not so quietly, think it was a mistake to tie the state to one system. Fair enough. But I guess again, what I'm volunteering to do is to try and wrap my mind around sort of the full range of the challenges, and from both sides. From Tyler's side and from the state side because the issues I'm hearing are prohibitive is the word I'm going to use. It just doesn't sound like it's going to work.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you for that.

JO LEE WICKES: This is Commissioner Wickes. I am not officially on the data subgroup, but I go to a fair number of their meetings. And a lot of those discussions center around trying to get the data, identify what we need, but also trying to remain cognizant of what can the counties do. And a lot of those discussions circle back to the Tyler Supervision, because if the data can't be pulled out of that system, or

can't be easily pulled, then you know, there's real life discussions about the fact that maybe we can't gather certain data points, which are reasonable for us to have as the JJOC and to be communicated to the public if -- but we know that most of the counties aren't running around with a bunch of full time data people to do it. And if you can't pull it out of the system, it's going to require people to do hand counts if possible. And it certainly is a big issue and it creates ongoing problems, probably in every aspect of what we're doing because we're not going to be able to have data that we have confidence in that's accurate and be able to report it out even to our own comfort level, let alone present to the public a report card of juvenile justice in Nevada because we can't get the data. So, obviously a big issue.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you, Commissioner Wickes. And to Commissioner Sallas' point, is that it's -- the money is the barrier. A lot of that is a barrier and so getting -- having that conversation with Tyler is a good place to start to understand. As you said, the full range of challenges associated with it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And Madam Chair, can I say another thing? I think another thing talking about Tyler Supervision is I think there was an assumption on Tyler Supervisions part that everybody would have a data person. Like Commissioner Wickes just said, somebody that understands data can pull stuff out of a database. And Tyler Supervision is a database, it would require somebody that knows how to data mine, create crystal reports and all of those things. If there was people in counties that could do that, we'd probably have a better opportunity to get some of this data. The state side, we do not have one of those people either. So, we need the reports for dummies, meaning we need somebody to create the report so we can push a button, or we need to have some serious data people, people, I mean, I don't know what you call these people, these people that can -- that know databases and can run data. And maybe that's a different way to ask for reports is to ask for positions that no one understand how to do this because my understanding is when I talked to Tyler Supervision about data reports, they're like, you have access to the database, just pull the reports. Well, we don't have anybody that knows how to do that. And that's a specific skill set. And it's not my skill set and, or anybody on my teams. So I'm wondering if that's another way to present this if we could get some positions that have access to the backend data that can build these crystal reports and just pull the data out of the system because we do have that for Unity. We just don't have it for Tyler Supervision. Just the thought.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you, Leslie. And I know that's been the case in Washoe, too. We've had difficulty with the retirement of our point person. So, going forward with, let's see, I want to make sure I'm not skipping through the agenda here. So, I don't think we've gotten as far through this agenda as I had hoped. So I appreciate the orientation that folks have given me and thank you, Leslie, for your patience as well. So on the agenda item six, identify incomplete items for removal. I didn't hear there were some clarifications that were put on the record. Identify new items to be added, which we know SB398 provides a guideline. What we didn't discuss is that potentially there were suggestions for new items. The revision of NRS, agenda Items seven may be added. So, we haven't gotten to item number seven. So, as far as this strategic plan, what -- I'm not sure what the rules are, so I apologize. Indulge me. What I would like to do is work with Leslie on perhaps condensing this document down to the items that we need to focus on just for -- I know that helps my brain work better. And so perhaps we can whittle this down a bit to make it a workable document. Regarding the revision of NRS, agenda item seven maybe added for discussion. This I believe, Leslie, was regarding the Maryland article that you sent.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: There are two things I believe. So item number seven, based on the conversations -- and we can put this on the next meeting, but just to -- these are things that came up in discussion in both the racial and ethnic disparity and in the strategic plan. So just items that came up for discussion

that maybe need some clarification or NRS changes. I think this is the bigger topic for AB398 or SB398, is what do we include in our bill?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay, so they're...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And the same thing with the Maryland document. The Maryland document is some legislation that Maryland is currently putting in front of their house in relation to the new changes that occurred in 2018 with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. So these are bigger discussion items that we probably can put on the next agenda.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Or follow or upcoming agendas.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you for that. So this is Commissioner Florez. I believe based on the time that's elapsed, we would likely have to push these on to a different agenda item. And I would just ask that we all review these items so that we can have very clear discussion on them and we can get to a point of making recommendations as to whether or not these are all items should be included in the proposed revised strategic plan.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Does anybody have any issue with that? Okay. Okay. So item number eight for possible action, new business. At this point, we'll open it up for discussion. Does anybody have new business items? No? Okay. So, in my limited experience as a chairperson of a subcommittee, assigning tasks to committee members as needed.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That's your discretion, Madam Chair.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: I know that I've assigned myself a task where I'd like to work with Leslie and whomever else would like to join. Again, to fine tune this document for purposes of providing focus, and it'll be a good opportunity for me to further educate myself about what has happened. And I think everybody for the -- for some of the history that helped create this document. I believe Commissioner Salla has signed off, but another task that I will -- what I would like to do is have a better understanding of what all the subcommittees are that are working toward -- directly towards contributing to this strategic plan. So, I will be reaching out in my position as chair to the chairs of all of the other committees so that I get -- this can sort of coalesce for me about where responsibility lies or where information is best garnered from these committees to -- because I believe that that will help us narrow down the focus of this strategic plan. Commissioner Wickes, has there been an invitation that I missed to the QA?

JO LEE WICKES: No. I actually just sent an e-mail about getting a list of who are the members because it was a small group. It's been expanded. But I haven't seen one of our committee members at a meeting in many, many meetings, so I'm not even sure if that person will still actively participate. And so an invitation will be going out. We'll probably do a doodle poll or I'm going to ask Leslie and [inaudible] to do a doodle poll so that we can get when scheduled. Things have been pretty quiet after the new people got trained, but we should have some records to review.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. Unfortunate we lost Eve Hanan. She chose not to re-apply. So, she was one of our big members on the grants and QA. So we lost her. We still have Jeremy Sutters and Paula Smith and Liz Florez has offered to be a part of it. So that's where we are.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So -- and to confirm, Commissioner Walker has volunteered to reach out to Tyler. So that will be an assigned task of or a volunteer for task and I'll make -- I'll reach out to Judge Walker with some extra information that might be helpful.

EGAN WALKER: But -- thank you. I'll need from both you and Leslie the point of contact information.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Will do. So Leslie, hopefully you can assist with that. I know who my technical assistant is, but he's not a major decision maker, so.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, I will follow up with you and Judge Walker on that one.

EGAN WALKER: Thank you.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. So If I may ask the brilliant people on the call who's been on this committee for longer than I, is there something that we need to explore further other than what I talked about? I will be working with Leslie. I'm going to reach out to the other subcommittee chairs in an effort to move forward some work on this document. That was an excellent suggestion to make a recommendation to the JJOC that we receive dedicated professional support on this document so that we can ensure that it's a living, breathing document that is guiding the work that we're all attempting to do in this state. Does anybody have anything else or recommendations for this chair who is brand new, trying to figure it out? No? Okay. Let's see. So, confirming the next meeting date and time. Leslie, can you assist with that, please?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. So we can do -- sorry, my calendar is being a little ridiculous. Open. Okay. Do you want to meet before the next JJOC knowing that we've got holidays coming up and the next JJOC is the 10th of December or would you rather meet after the first of the New Year?

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: My preference is before because I feel like the clock is running out on us to get all of these things accomplished, especially if we would like the JJOC to approve us moving forward with contracting with the strategic partners. So, that's my vote, but I recognize that that will be a challenge. So, perhaps others can weigh in, but we could make an effort of doing another doodle poll to see what works for the majority.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Does anybody not agree with that?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So it sounds like we can do a doodle poll, just you know, I'm concerned about people taking time off. Unfortunately, I'm in a use or lose. So, I will be having to take four weeks off by the end of the year. So, I know my schedules nasty until the end of the year. So, just because I don't want to lose time so, I recommend we do a doodle poll for maybe the last week of November or the first week in December.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Well, let's try that Leslie and...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: ...we'll see what...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: If we can do it.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: If we can do it. And if not, then it'll have to be in January, as you initially suggested.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right. And just to say that I -- if we cannot meet, you know, at least we know we're going to ask the JJOC for funds. And then that'll give me and my staff and new time to get some better documents like the completed document and then the what's -- what are we still working on document? If we push it out till January, if that's what we have to do.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Thank you.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Okay. Item number nine, public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment or further discussion? Okay, I don't see any therefore we'll move on to adjournment and it is 12:29, a minute under. So with that, thank you, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you Madam Chair for the first meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED: Take care.

ELIZABETH FLOREZ: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED: Bye-bye.