

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.*



Cindy Pitlock, DNP  
Administrator

---

### Meeting of the Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) Committee Meeting November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 11:00 am

#### TRANSCRIPT

**Call to Order:** Chair, Commissioner Graham, called meeting to order at 11:00 am. Leslie Bittleston took roll and confirmed there was quorum.

#### **Roll Call:**

##### **(Voting Members)**

**Present:** Chair Rebekah Graham. Jennifer Fraser, Katherine Maher, Brigid Duffy, Sara Bruce; Zaide Martinez

**Non-Voting:** Sara Bruce; Zaide Martinez

**Absent:** Jacquelin Nadar, Daniel Pierrott

**DCFS Staff Present:** Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Williamson

#### **Minutes:**

**Leslie Bittleston:** Good morning everybody, we're just waiting for our chair. I don't see her on yet so hang tight. Kayla, did you get anything from Rebekah? I haven't got anything from her. No, you haven't, okay. We do have a quorum so. We will give Madam Chair another couple of minutes. If she doesn't show, we will -- I'll run the meeting I guess. Well, that's 6 after, if Chair does show up, we will let her take over but we do have a quorum so I will go ahead and run the meeting in her absence. So good morning everybody. I'm going to call the meeting to order at 11:06. I'm going to do roll call. Rebekah Graham? Jennifer Fraser?

**Jennifer Fraser:** Present.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Katherine Maher?

**Katherine Maher:** Present.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Daniel Pierrott? Jacquelin Nadar? Brigid Duffy?

**Brigid Duffy:** Here.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Sara Bruce.

**Sara Bruce:** Present.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yay. And I also see Zaide Martinez?

**Zaide Martinez:** Present.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you and then for staff, we have myself and Kayla Williamson. So, good morning everybody. Okay. So, we've taken roll call. Next item on the agenda is public comment. Is there any public comment at this time? Hearing none, we will move on to item number 4 for possible action. This is the review and approval of the meeting minutes from September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2022 which is attachment for. I am a non-voting member so I cannot do anything on that. I can just ask if you folks have reviewed the minutes and if there are any questions or changes.

**Brigid Duffy:** I have reviewed them and I will make a motion to approve. This is Brigid for the record.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you, is there a second?

**Katherine Maher:** This is Katherine Maher, I'll second that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you and for voting members, all in favor of approval of the meeting minutes?

**Group:** Aye.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you and any oppose? Nobody is opposed so motion carries. Meeting minutes are approved. Moving on to agenda item number 5 which is the bulk of our meeting today for discussion. Data regarding the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI), this will be presented by me so at our last meeting, we discussed looking at the data in relation to racial and ethnic disparities. The data that we agreed to look at was the commitment data for the YLS/CMI for the folks that are committed to DCFS from the various counties. It is a small subset of the overall State data but it's the only data that DCFS readily has access to at this point without collect -- requesting data from the counties. So, this was put together on attachment number 5 and should be available for everybody on the Google Drive. Does everybody have that attachment available? Perfect. I do have to apologize to the committee. I didn't finish this attachment until over the weekends. It was a lot of work and I did want to do more work around it but it -- it's just we don't have reports that pool things. It's really taking the data and manipulating that in doing hand counts for each little part that we want to do. So, with that being said, I'm going to go over attachment number 5 and for those of you who don't know, the YLS/CMI or the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory is a risks and needs assessment. It is validated tool and really measures youth's risk to reoffend. It does not measure any other risks so just why does the youth risk to reoffend. The YLS has domains. Domain number 1 is a static domain and that is the youths prior offenses. The remaining seven domains are areas -- need areas, I guess you can say, and they are dynamic which means they are changeable. They could go up and down based on services or situations or interventions or all kinds of things. As I was preparing this data, I did do a lot of reading about static domains and dynamic domains and what I did find out in all of the reading and research that I did that if those static factors which means prior offenses are weighed too heavily, they can skew a youth risk to reoffend. But when I looked at the YLS and moving on to page 2 of the report, I did put together the way that this tool is for. So, there're two ways to score in the tool. There's an overall score which is just an overall number and that's scored based on females and males. So, when you look at page number 2, the

left side females shows your low, medium, high and very high. And then the right male[ph] shows you low, moderate -- I said medium, I meant moderate -- low, moderate, high, very high. And then for males low, moderate, high and very high and there's a little bit of difference in the scoring between males and females but the overall score is from 0 to 42 for any youth with, you know, the low numbers being low up to very high. Then, once you get into past that overall risk score, you can get a risk score within each domain and that is not separated by gender, by male or female. That is just -- it just shows a score and -- and that is it. So, going down to the second chart on page number 2, the first one prior offenses which is a static -- which means it never gets better. It can only get worse. So, zero is low, 1 to 2 is moderate and 3 to 5 is high. So, the prior offense category or domain only accounts for a total of 5 points in the overall 42 points. So, I did want to bring that up to the group because I don't believe that the YLS is analyzing or using the prior offenses or weighing it too heavily, maybe that's the way I should say it. It's just 5 out of 42 points. So, the next seven domains are listed underneath. They're called family and parenting, education & employment, peer relation, substance abuse, leisure & recreation, personality behavior and attitudes and orientations. And as you can see the break down, you know, a lot of zeroes for low and then 1 to 2 or 1 to 4 or in the case of family parenting, it's 3 to 4 as moderate and then over to the high. So, that kind of scores or looks at scores for the YLS in two ways, the overall domain and then each category. So, going on to page 3, so I spliced and diced the YLS data for the last three years. I did not have a full year for 2019 or 2023 so that is why I used the years 2020, 2021 and 2022. Those were full years of data. So, chart number 1 shows the overall total risk score for all of the youth committed in those years, 25.43 in 2020, 24.30 in 2021 and 22.72 in 2022. So, that's kind of the overall scores and I'm going to stop there and see if there're any questions so far because this is a lot of data and a lot of information and I'm going to continue to go through it but I just was wondering if anybody had any questions. Nope? Perfect. Okay. Moving on to chart number 2, I took the same data and sliced it a little bit more for chart number two than I did for chart number 1. This is looking at the same kids, the same data but breaking it down by actual domains. So, by those eight domains in each year. And if you have a colored copy like I do, you can see the kind of bluish color on the very left, that's your static domain and so 2.23 is the overall score for all of the kids in 2022, 2.56 for all the kids in 2024[ph] and 2.88 for all of the kids in 2020. So, you can see these all over the place and if you look up and compare to chart two, where those are falling in the low, moderate or high range, what you're seeing is that's not really the highest need area. The highest need areas are falling within the gray which is education and employment, the yellow which is peer relations, the dark blue which is personality & behavior and so on. But again, this is just very high-level data and as I said I sliced and diced even further. So going on to chart number 3, same data again broken down by overall risk level in the domain. So, you can see the lows, the moderates and the highs. So, it's just -- oh, here's Rebekah. Hi Rebekah.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes, my apologies. Sometimes running a facility is running a facility and I got stuck with one of our kiddos for a little bit. So, yes, they're fine but I just needed to stay with them and I apologize.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, we did -- I just called the meeting to order, did the roll call and the minutes were approved and I'm going over chart -- attachment number 5 and we are on page number 5 and just to give a brief update, I did do a lot of reading about static factors when I was preparing this data and one of the things that I did find out is some risk and needs assessment do weight the prior offenses pretty heavily and when that happens, it can skew the data but in the particular YLS, I personally don't believe that it is being weighed too high because it is only 5 points out of the total 42 of the YLS. However, that's just that -- that was just kind of my initial thought around the information I was reading. So, in saying that we're going through the data and what I did is I really sliced and diced this data in multiple ways to see what we're finding, where we finding disparities and through there. So, I'm starting at the very high level going

down further. So, we addressed chart number 1 which is the overall risk score for all of the youth committed to DCHS in 2020, 2021, and 2022. And then chart number 2 was the overall score for all of the youth committed by those eight domains and then chart number 3 is slicing chart number 2 even further and saying, okay, out of the overall scores of those eight domains, where are they falling in the spectrum? Are they low, are they moderate, are they high? So, that is -- it's what chart number 3 shows. And as you can see something interesting is already popping out in chart number 3 as compared to chart number 1. As you can see, chart number 1, there was an overall higher risk score 25.43 and it drops all the way to 22.72 from 2020 to 2022 and then when you look at chart number 3, you see a lot of highs and then it just kind of drops. So, we're seeing kind of the same -- same thing. Chart number 4 is where we get into some race and ethnicity information. So, again, taking that same data and slicing and dicing it by the race and to kind to see what the overall scores are by race and so what we can see for this, is our highest areas are Native American youths. However, the sample size for Native American youth was quite small. I believe it was around 4 or 5 kids that was in that sample size where as the sample size for white and African-American and Hispanic was much higher. Native American, Asian and Native Hawaiian all very small sample sizes. But that's what we are seeing on the race and what is kind of interesting is it's kind of white and African-American except for the year of 2020 where African-American was slightly higher than white, white was significantly higher in the year 2021 and a little bit higher in 2022. So, that's -- that was kind of interesting. Moving on to chart number 5, this is where I start going through the data year by year. So, chart number 5 starts with the year of 2020. So, now, instead of looking at all three years, I'm now just breaking down the year of 2020. So, looking at 2020 data only, we had 134 highs, 31 very highs, 37 moderates and 5 lows. And then taking that data broken down by gender, for males 22 very high, 114 high, 32 moderate and 5 low. And then females 7 very high, 20 high. What I find interesting is as we go through this data is you're going to see quite a lot of moderates and lows and I'm going to talk about that as we get towards the end of the data. Chart number 8, this shows large disparities. This is the commitments in the year of 2020, 49 white compared to 81 African-American which is a very large disparity and then the four Native Americans which accounted for very high risk scores. Chart number 9 commitment by county, Clark County 141, Washoe 45 and then 1 Zs and 2 Zs through the rural counties. Chart number 10, same data as the previous few charts, now we're in year 2021. So, looking at that, the breakdown -- again, these are overall risk scores of all the kids whether they fall very high, high, moderate and then charts 11 and 12 are the breakdown by gender. The first chart on 10 is females and then going down to males -- my apologies that is on the chart on the top of 11 and that should be January to December so that is a typo, my apologies for that. But that is all of the kids -- all of the boys I should say. Moving on to chart 13 for calendar year 2022, again, the disparity in the African-American youth and Hispanic and white and then rest are kind of 1 Zs and 2 Zs. I am not sure why some of these charts are like backwards and forwards. If I had more time to put this together it would have made it a lot prettier but we didn't and this was what I could do with the time that we had. There was a lot of work Rebekah on putting that together to really slicing and dicing this data.

**Rebekah Graham:** No, you did a great job, yes.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So, anyway, I'm kind of looking at these charts as I'm going through it and I'm like, "Oh my gosh, they're all over the place." Anyway, chart number 14, Clark County, you know, the majority of youth from Clark County. Chart 15, this is going to 2022 data so 63 high, 14 very high, 45 moderate and 4 low and then again by the males and females. In this one specifically on the bottom of 13 is one of the charts that I personally find most disturbing and the reason is because what we have is 45 highs and 37 moderates and the reason that I find this chart the most disturbing has nothing to do with racial and ethnic disparities but it has to do with the fact that we are missing some services in our counties and then our state. We are youth correctional services which means we should be seeing the majority of high and very

high kids but we are seeing a large number of moderates and I think this is symptomatic of the fact that we don't have an appropriate level of care in our state or counties between a detention facility and a correctional facility especially for those youths with mental health disorders.

**Rebekah Graham:** On that note Ms. Bittleston, did you see the recent DOJ findings for children with severe behavioral health disabilities?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, I did and I didn't get a chance to dig into it a lot. I did a very high-level overview and it's the same thing. It's that, you know, we're sending kids out of state. It's all of that. It's -- I really think it's all symptomatic of the fact that Nevada doesn't have the appropriate level of services for the kids and we can see it right here in our data. So -- but this was the one chart that really stuck out at me as very problematic. But again, not having to do with racial and ethnic disparities.

**Rebekah Graham:** Not on this committee's agenda.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Not on this committee but -- anyways, so moving on to page 14, this is the commitments for females. This chart I think is much more appropriate. You know, the age is very high as the 18 highest, the 2 Zs and the 1 Zs -- seeing a moderate -- a couple of moderates and lows every now and then really is not something that's going to raise alarms for me because some of these kids could be sent to us based on the nature of their crime. They may be lower risk but have a high-level crime and so seeing the 1 Zs and 2 Zs is not problematic unlike what we saw with the previous chart with almost these moderates as there were highs. So that's that. So, anyway, that was my soap box, I'm moving on. Chart number 18 again this is the breakdown of race in calendar year 2022. So, as you can see disparate number of African-American youth compared to white and Hispanic. And then chart number 19 again is the county of origin and then chart number 20 is where we actually get into domain number 1. I actually dug into that. So, to kind of talk about what we're seeing in that static domain based on what we discussed in our last meeting, the report that Rebekah presented to us. So, what I did here on chart number 20 is I look for all years 2020, 2021 and 2022, I looked at domain number 1 for white youths and then all minority youths. So, any youth that is not white fell into the all minorities. And what we're seeing is in 2020, there is some disparity between the all minorities and the white from 3.34 to 2.88 then moving to 2021 and 2022, the white youths are higher -- have a higher domain score than all of the minorities which I thought was interesting. And then moving on to chart number 21, this is a breakdown even further of chart 20 and then breaking out all of the race categories. So, white, African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, mix and all of that. And again, we see those high numbers at Native American, the kids that we got, the four or five kids that fall under Native American that came to DCFS all had very high YLS scores as you can see here. But in looking at the African-American or Hispanic compared to white, we're seeing roughly the same thing. In 2020, there's a little bit of disparity but 2021 and 2022 are not really showing disparities in that score. So I couldn't, I didn't have time to dig in even further than just really look at the high level data but I did want to provide a little bit of analysis to the group so basically, you know, a risks and needs assessment is only as good as the staff who administer it. We all work really hard at DCFS making sure that our staff receive booster training, you know, and that we are trying -- maintaining the fidelity of the tool as I'm sure all of the counties are doing as well. I'm not saying anybody is doing anything wrong or gap but just we need to know that it is a tool that is administered by probation staff in some cases and clinicians in some cases. Criminal history is one of eight domains and only accounts for 5 out of the 42 total points. Domain number 1 can never get better, it can only get worse. In services are -- and interventions are really targeted for domains 2 through 8. We don't have any services or interventions to target prior criminal history but we do try to target those services domains 2 through 8. And then at the last bullet, if criminal history is weighed too heavy, disparities may be seen and I -- and other tools out

there, they do weigh criminal history much heavier than the YLS does. And then the conclusion of this data, there is an over representation of African-American youth in all years. The overall risk scores dropped from 25.42 to 22.72 in two years which is just over a 10-percent drop. And then again, I believe this is an overall symptom of not having the appropriate facilities or services in the counties or the right level of care so seeing the overall score drop from 25.43 to 22.72 in two years, I believe, again that's another symptom of surveying the kids that are more moderate that may be should be treated in their communities. I did want to do a little more analysis and provide some analysis on each of the 8 domains to see where they rank in comparison to the racial and ethnic disparities but I just really ran out of time and I'm willing to do that -- do some additional work and provide that to the group if that's what you'd like to see but that is where -- what we've gotten so far for you and we can take any questions or we can discuss anything that you may have seen.

**Katherine Maher:** Katherine Maher for the record, I have a few questions. So, first of all, I wanted to make sure that we are classifying white, if that including Hispanic youth or not including youth and I ask that based on similar other meetings?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. So, it is -- it separates white so the way that we capture the data here in DCFS is we say white Hispanic or white non-Hispanic. So, any youth that fell in the white Hispanic were captured under the Hispanic area and any youth that said white non-Hispanic were captured just under the white area. I'm not sure how counties do that. I don't know if they just do Hispanic or if they do white Hispanic or white non-Hispanic but we do the white Hispanic/white non-Hispanic here in DCFS.

**Katherine Maher:** Okay, thank you. And then, my second question, this is the YLS that DCFS is doing upon a youth's commitment not necessarily the YLS score that the judge is looking at from the county to issue his or her (inaudible). Is that accurate?

**Leslie Bittleston:** No, the data that I presented to you is the YLS that comes to us from the county upon commitment.

**Katherine Maher:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, we do have some more data around the reassessments that we do with (inaudible) but again, that's not anything I was able to get into here but just to clarify that these are all county YLSs that come to us with their commitment paperwork.

**Katherine Maher:** Got it. And then, looking at chart 4 for example on page 6 where the data was showing a lower YLS score for African-American and Hispanic youths as opposed to white youths, am I interpreting that to mean that the threshold YLS score is lower for them to be committed? Is that accurate in those numbers?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I just lost my attachment. Give me a second.

**Rebekah Graham:** So, this is Rebekah Graham for the record. I think what you're asking is looking to see if there are more African-American youths who are moderate committed to the state that high that the moderate and high breakdown is what you're looking at (inaudible)?

**Katherine Maher:** Yes. So, I mean that -- so, looking at chart 4 on page 6, I just want to make sure I'm reading it correctly. What I am seeing is that, you know, we have these charts that say there are more

youths being (inaudible) and then we said that the average YLS score for African-American youth and Hispanic youth is high. I don't want (inaudible) too much but is that indicating that they are more likely be lower YLS, you know, moderate scores.

**Leslie Bittleston:** (inaudible) yes. It's just --

**Rebekah Graham:** We don't really know because even with the end of this, if you have three outliers with really high scores, they can skew the whole population. I mean, that's were -- thing -- so we have the commitments by race, then commitments -- and we've done it before. You've shown us the commitments by YLS score and so taking that same data and doing commitments by YLS score by race, I think that would answer Ms. Maher's question.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, so basically when you look at chart number 4, it's taking the same data that's in chart number 1 which is what we do is we take -- in chart number 1, we took every kid that was committed and we just took an average score or the average YLS score for all of those kids committed. So, the average YLS score for the kids committed to DCFs was 25.43. It didn't -- this is not broken down by gender or race. It's just every kid. So taking that same data and slicing it by race and then -- which is how chart number 4 was created. So looking at just the African-American youth, males and females, their average risk score was 25.98 in 2020 which was slightly higher than white which was 25.42 but then going to 2021, the African-American score was lower -- overall average was lower than white youth. So, it's not really looking at each kid one by one, it's just taking the race and then those -- and moving those kids together and saying, "Okay, what is the average score of this population of youth?" Did that help or did that not answer your question?

**Katherine Maher:** I mean I don't know if it answers my question. I think it's just a question of whether it's -- as Ms. Graham pointed out whether it's a true correlation or if there's just some sort of outliers that are lowering that score.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, I don't know. I mean I can do a lot more digging around this work. I do know and can say for very certain -- very certain that Native American, Asian and Hawaiian, there -- the number of kids that are in those area -- in those populations are so small that as you can see, you know, those are pretty high scores for Native American. One of the Asian youth had a zero and I don't know why there was a zero but -- that was weird. It was like -- anyway, but overall, do African-American youths have higher risk scores than white and I think that's what you're asking me and so -- no?

**Rebekah Graham:** No, so -- so what you're asking (inaudible). What she's asking is -- so, the data is showing that the YLS isn't necessarily coming out high for African-American youth but there's still more African-American youths sent (inaudible) committed to the state than other races and so, what Ms. Maher is asking is does that mean then that African-American youths who are committed to the state have lower risk scores than other -- other racial groups that are committed to the state?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, I think I see what you're saying. Yes, and that I can probably -- yes, that's probably a completely different chart that I didn't even think of. Yes -- so yes, disproportionately there is more African-American youths sent to the state than any other population in comparison to our population.

**Rebekah Graham:** Right, despite having the same or lower YLS scores than other racial groups.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, so --

**Rebekah Graham:** That's what Ms. Maher was trying to bring to the surface.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Another thing --

**Katherine Maher:** And I think --

**Leslie Bittleston:** I was going to say another thing I can do Katherine is I can look at offense as well, you know, because sometimes people, they will -- or the white kids and the African-American kids being sent for the same type of offenses. So, I can also dig into that as well if we wanted really do a deep dive into that. Sorry, I cut you off, my apologies. You're on mute.

**Katherine Maher:** I apologize as well. Oh, I think I just had it appeared. Can you hear me?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. Okay. Katherine Maher -- I was just going to add because I think it's also showing if I interpret --

**Rebekah Graham:** I think she does keep freezing though.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Katherine, if you can hear us, you're frozen -- oh now, you're gone.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes. Ms. Martinez has her hand raised. Is that because you want to say something? Is that for public comment or?

**Zaide Martinez:** Yes. Alright, I can wait until the end for public comment.

**Rebekah Graham:** I think -- does she have to wait for public comment? Ms. Bittleston, I believe she does. No?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I mean that's up to you. That's up to you.

**Rebekah Graham:** Oh, go for it then. Go for it.

**Zaide Martinez:** Yes, I just -- Katherine brought big points and that's what I was also thinking about and in regard to DOJ report, I also received as well and there is -- if we have high level of care -- I mean high populations of minority youth in care, there is a correlation of how we're admitting the if they're not meeting the required YLS score to be committed. So, I was just -- and I might be missing some stuff because I missed a few conversations, what is the needed score, YLS score, to be committed to high levels of care and what are the requirements for each level of care.

**Rebekah Graham:** Well, that's a good question. There isn't like a baseline that has to be the score. The YLS is intended to inform like judges, probation officers in what the needs are when they're making their recommendations, like probation officers make recommendations, judges, you know, make the order and the YLS is meant as a general guideline and so what Ms. Bittleston is saying around the commitments to the state is that she would -- if we're doing this correctly, we should see high and very high kids at the state not moderate risk. You know, moderate risk, we should be able to treat in the community. There's not a hard and fast like rule but you would expect higher levels of service to have kids who are higher risk in them. So, it's -- and it's -- it's allowable to be overwritten and that's why Ms. Bittleston was talking about



the types of crimes. You know if someone commits a very violent crime, it's quite possible the judge -- well that might be the only they've been arrested for, it's such a -- such a danger to the community that the judge is committing that person to the state instead of trying them on lower levels of services.

**Zaide Martinez:** Yes, that's -- that's interesting. That's kind of shocking that we don't have like a requirement for a level of score here. There might be a lot of reasons why but obviously research shows, you know, a few -- and may, a child or kiddo until wrong level of care could be more detrimental than not and then -- but our state is based on the DOJ report, you know, we don't have the right level of care here which is sad that we ultimately choose incorrect level of care.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right and I agree and I think that that's what we saw -- you know, that's what stuck out to me. I mean besides the disparities but yes, we just don't -- we just don't have the right level of care and -- and that one chart that I did point out was really a good indicator of that. Anyway, so --

**Zaide Martinez:** It's just a good -- it's also just to keep it on backward although it's not what we're tasked to do. There is a big correlation based on the population of kids and care.

**Rebekah Graham:** And Katherine, you're back and you cut out so we did not hear your question.

**Katherine Maher:** Sorry about that. We're having internet troubles here in Washoe County. I was just going to add that I think the disparity was also there in the static factor actually that we're looking at with this report indicating that the Hispanic and African-American youth may be getting committed with a less -- with less criminal history. So, that's all I was adding which again could go towards the severity of the offense. So, I think that would be useful information for us to have.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I can absolutely add to this report and I can -- I can look at offense data absolutely and also look at some -- some really percentage comparisons on, you know, this white youths are being sent, you know, for the same crimes but their scores are higher. I can do -- I can do a little more slicing and dicing and look at that offense data. And I may not have the NRS code for everyone but I should at least at a minimum half whether it's a felony or a misdemeanor or a gross misdemeanor.

**Katherine Maher:** Thank you. Katherine Maher -- I also wanted to say thank you. This report is really interesting and I know it took a lot of work so before we ask you to do more, I just want to say thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** You're welcome. So, that is all I have Madam Chair unless there are more questions from members?

**Rebekah Graham:** And hearing none. We'll move on to the next step, discussion. So, you know, as we look at -- we took a side road or a rabbit trail over to the YLS to that and it seems like Ms. Bittleston has an excellent work in gathering the data for us and showing us that for the most part, the YLS does seem to be appropriately addressing the concerns. We'll keep contended to keep an eye on the studies and the data because it does still come out even with 5 points, that can be the tipping point from 19 as a moderate to 24 straight into a high. So, it's -- it's something I think we still want to keep an eye on as the research continues to around the wireless. So then, that being said, as she prepares our RED report, is there anything else that you would like to tackle before we start to work on the report itself? Anything else -- any new data requests, any other issues or concerns that this group would like to see -- discuss?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I think the one thing that I heard is looking at the same data a little more around offense and something like that which I can absolutely do and then as we get to the end of the calendar year, I will have 2023 data to look at. So I can -- I can look at the offense information and then look at 2023 after the end of the year and I do want to let the group know that the county provides the racial and ethnic disparity data to me sometime between December 1<sup>st</sup> and January 31<sup>st</sup>. So, there's a big range I would prefer it by the 15<sup>th</sup> of December because it takes a lot of work to put it together but it also takes a lot of work for the counties to gather that data and get it to me. Realistically, I may not have anything to share with this committee until February or -- I'm hoping February but it may be March if I get late data and I'm talking the racial and ethnic disparity report.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes -- no, that makes a lot of sense. So, we have kind of one last little piece of data we wanted to look at. It seems like you won't -- you'll be largely focused on data. Do we want to have another meeting at the beginning of December to look at that or we could simply wait until, you know, mid-January, you know, you'll have the data in, we can look at the last piece of data we requested and give you any final feedback for that report that you'll finalize in February.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, I think that's -- I think that's fair because by January I can have the offense data in the 2023 data put together. So, probably more towards the end of January because it takes us, you know, usually by the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month, we have all of our previous month then. So, yes -- that's fine. I would absolutely support that and prepare that next layer of data for you all and then we can go maybe March, to look at the RED report.

**Rebekah Graham:** Sounds good. So that essentially covered number 7, you know, next meeting date and time, so we'll going to do a little post sent out for late January. If anything comes up between now and then that you'd like to request, please let Ms. Bittleston or myself know. If there are any public comment or discussion for item number 8? Hearing -- I think Ms. Duffy just rejoined us. I think the internet didn't like her either.

**Leslie Bittleston:** She actually is on her way to a meeting.

**Rebekah Graham:** Oh, she switched device this. Alright, well, Ms. Duffy, we're looking at the end of January for our data request and for just kind of the final discussion before Ms. Bittleston finalizes the report. If there is -- unless you see a need to meet sooner.

**Brigid Duffy:** No, end of January. Can you hear me okay?

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes, we can. Thank you.

**Brigid Duffy:** I haven't -- I haven't pulled out on my parking spot yet. So, end of January works for me. I'm not driving and looking at my phone.

**Rebekah Graham:** No worries. Any other public comment or discussion? Alright, then we will adjourn this meeting at 11:54.

**Group:** Thank you.

[end of meeting]