



---

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission**  
**Full Commission**  
**Committee Meeting**  
**December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at 1:00 pm**

**Meeting Minutes – DRAFT**

**Call to Order: JJOC Co-Chair Joey Orduna-Hastings called the meeting to order at 1:02 PM.**

**Roll Call:**

**Voting Members Via Phone:** Joey Oduna-Hastings (Co-Chair), Eve Hanan, Ross Armstrong, Pauline Salla-Smith, Frank Cervantes, Gianna Verness, Brigid Duffy, Rebekah Graham, Katherine Maher, Jack Martin, Jo Lee Wickes

**Absent:** Nancy Saitta, , Kevin McMahill, Paula Smith, McKenna Finnerty, Alejandro Gonzalez, Alexis Waddell-Upton, Scott Schick, Judge Egan Walker (Co-Chair)

**Non-Voting Members Present:** Ali Banister, Heather Plager, Christine Eckles, Mike Whelihan, Toshia Shaw, Zaide Diaz-Sanchez, Captain Kenneth Young

**DCFS Staff:** Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Dunn, Jennifer Simeo, Kayla Landes, Kathryn Roose

**Public:** Kimberly Palma-Ortega, Dave Laity, Wendy Garrison, Lexi Beck, Alexis Tucey, Susie Miller, Patrick Mendez, Salwa Philips, Elizabeth Flores, Linda Anderson, Jennifer Spencer

**\*Leslie Bittleston took roll and quorum was confirmed.\***

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** All right. Go Team JJOC. All right, let's get this started. Happy Friday, everybody. I do have some opening comments. As a reminder, this meeting is being recorded. Please place yourselves on mute when you're not speaking so that we can ensure a good record and not a lot of background noise. And then for public comment, we will limit public comment to three minutes per person. We will do that at the beginning of the meeting and after, at the end of the meeting. So with that, we'll go to item number 3. Is there any public comment?

**Kimberly Palma-Ortega:** Madam Chair, this is Kimberly Palma-Ortega. My public comment would be I know on your guys' agenda item number 8, further down, it was talking about possible current JJOC membership. I know that you guys have youth as an option be on here. I was wondering if you guys would ever consider or if we can work with legislation to allow a parent's representation to be on that. I currently sit on the Nevada Commission for Children and a lot of the same participants for here is both mirrored on that other Commission as well. With that, I know in our meeting today for the Nevada Children's Commission, we were really addressing some education concerns that we've noticed with COVID-19 as well as just with our youth in general and with that, I know that you guys have a lot of conversation, you guys have your subcommittees, but if we can make an adjustment to the educational concerns that you guys are all facing in regards to probation or parole, and if we couldn't put something with you guys, if we can maybe mirror or collaborate with the Nevada Commission for Kids and try to build that bridge between youth going from probation into parole and coming back on facilities and how that education will roll out. I know one of our new members for the Nevada Commission is Superintendent Jara from CCSD, and then they also have the superintendent for Washoe County. So we're making some movement there. Again, I'm

just really excited that you guys were able to make quorum today, and I appreciate everybody on this Commission and all of your efforts.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you very much for your comments and they are noted for the record. Is there anyone else that would like to make public comment? Okay. Hearing none, I will proceed to item number 4, approval of the October 16, 2020 meeting minutes. Is there a motion?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Commissioner Salla. I'll move to approve.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Is there a second?

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid. I'll second.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Is there any discussion? Okay. We have a first and a second. All in favor, please say aye. Aye.

\*Ayes around\*

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay. With that meeting minutes are approved. Thank you. Moving along to item number 5, the COVID-19 testing update, Ms. Bittleston?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, thank you. In your packet of materials on the Google Drive, there is a document titled COVID testing information, and that is the document that I will go over. The testing numbers are gathered from the seven juvenile detention facilities, the three state facilities, and the two youth camps, China Spring and Spring Mountain Youth Camp. This is a running number that was started in May and is through November 30th of this year. The total youth tests given are 698. There are 25 positive youth tests for a positivity rate of 3.58. There have been a total number of 721 staff tests given, and out of those staff tests, there's been 73 positives for a positivity rate of 10.12 percent. The chart underneath that is the running total of all of the positives. Our first positives were in July. However, in the month of November, our facilities were hit fairly hard: there were four staff out in Humboldt; one in Carson City; two in Churchill; two in Clark -- excuse me, one staff and one youth in Clark; 21 staff at Caliente Youth Center, six youth at Caliente Youth Center; one staff at NYTC; one staff at Summit View; two youth at Washoe, and seven staff at Washoe. So those are just November positives. I will have an update at the end of the month for the committees -- excuse me, next month for the committees with December data. I have already heard that there are some additional positives this month as well. So that is where we stand as of November 30th. Are there any questions?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** This is Commissioner Salla. I think -- I think it's important for us to remember that -- I mean, you know, like, I had four staff out with positive COVID, but I had an additional six staff out so I was up to 52 percent of my staff out because they have to quarantine, they're waiting for test results, they're -- we can't have them at work. So our positive -- the positive cases is just a piece of the issues with our staffing because they do -- and especially for us, it takes seven to ten days back to get a test from our hospital screening clinic. So they're still quarantining the whole time and maybe they'll get it on the tenth day that they were negative, and then our health department, our health Board, recommends they still quarantine for that exposure.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Commissioner Salla. Are there any other questions or comments? I'm trying to look through to see if there are any hands raised? So please do feel free, Commissioners, if you have a comment or a question. Okay. I'm seeing none. Thank you, Ms. Bittleston, for the update. Moving

on to item number 6, we have several here so I'm going to call on the DCFS staff that's assigned. So with that, Ms. Landes, if you could please go first on SB107?

**Kayla Landes:** Thank you. This is Kayla Landes for the record. I have -- on your Google Docs, you'll see the normal graphs for -- for county detentions and for state facilities, and this data is only through October. The agenda says through November. I didn't get everybody's numbers in to provide you guys with November numbers in time, so this will just go through October and there's nothing that stands out that's too concerning. For the room confinement, it's pretty much been consistent. So if you have any questions on the state or the county --

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Are there any questions of Ms. Landes?

**Jo Lee Wickes:** This is Jo lee Wickes for the record. Is it -- would it be too difficult for the facilities and the probation departments that run the facilities to also provide information, for instance, like, average daily population, because the numbers tell their own story but in relationship to the average daily population or something to put it in a more broad context, I think it might be a little bit more meaningful. Don't know what kind of burden that places on the departments, however and that's --

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is -- yeah, this is Leslie Bittleston for the record. We can absolutely add that. That is not something we are asking our juvenile detention facilities to provide now, but we can add it to the room confinement report that we get monthly and just have them provide an average daily rate for the month on that report. I don't know if that would be a terrible burden. We do have a couple of individuals on the phone, like Commissioner Salla or Commissioner Martin or Commissioner Cervantes, that may be able to provide any information if that would be a huge burden to the facilities, just to add that question.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** This is Commissioner Salla. Is -- if it's on our template, we can add it. Tyler Supervision does a average daily population for us anyway so at the end of the month, we could just calculate that and add it for Humboldt.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Okay. Any other questions or comments of this SB107 report? Okay, seeing none -- and please tell me if I'm missing something, so please speak up. Ms. Landes, we'll move on to the second report, the use-of-force data.

**Kayla Landes:** Okay. I have two reports on this one. The first one is the graphs and on this one, I did actually include, because I do receive population counts, monthly population counts and daily from the institutions. So the use-of-force graphs do include the average population for each facility on those reports. And again, this is only through October because I did not have the numbers for November. So if you have any questions on that, and this will show you the physical, mechanical, and then OC. And then the next document I have, if there's no questions on that, I -- they're labeled county use of force and state use of force and I've collected for the counties, if they -- the type of mechanical restraints they use, if they use physical restraints, chemical restraints, and their types of trainings that they take yearly. So that's to provide you guys with that information. And I also -- so there's one for the county for all detention centers and then there's one for all three institutions for the state with the same questions.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And this is Leslie Bittleston to add to that. DCFS was asked to provide the use-of-force continuum for each detention facility and state facility at this meeting. So Ms. Landes gathered that data to provide to this -- this advisory Board to discuss next steps or if -- or other things. So this was per request of the JJOC.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you. Are there any questions of Ms. Landes on either one of those reports from the Commissioners? Okay. I'm seeing none. Moving along then to the PBS report. Ms. Simeo?

**Jennifer Simeo:** Good afternoon, Jennifer Simeo for the record. I'll refer everyone to the document entitled JJOC PBS data for October 2020, and this first data graph represents -- well, the data overall represents the October 2020 PBS collection period and the first graph is a snapshot of how all three DCFS facilities fell within the PBS field average and compared to the facilities' previous data collection period. This graph uses the 33 PBS critical outcome measures, and all of our three facilities performed better than the field average, but not as good as their previous data collection period in April 2020. Moving onto the next page, this shows each facility, how they did compare to the PBS field average for all outcome measures and just a reminder, the field average is comprised of other PBS participating juvenile correctional facilities around the country and there are a total of 101 outcome measures. Caliente Youth Center was 68 percent, same or better than the PBS field average; Nevada Youth Training Center was 70 percent, same or better than the PBS field average; Summit View Youth Center was 58 percent, same or better than the PBS field average. And you can see on there there's a blue star, and that represents the top performer within the field average and that facility performed at 90 percent. And then the next set of graphs are a handful of critical outcome measures based on the order and the safety categories. So you see order 03 pertains to physical restraints. CYC and Summit View were above the field average, NYTC was below. And just a reminder, on these graphs, the red bar represents the PBS field average and the white bar represents the average of all three DCFS facilities. That's the jurisdiction average. Moving on to order 04, mechanical restraint, CYC and Summit View were above the field average, NYTC was below. Order 06 has to do with chemical restraints, and there were no use of OC spray in any facility in October so all of the facilities were well below the field average. Order 08 is room confinements. This is the overall use of room confinements and based on usage and the youth population, CYC and NYTC were above the field average, Summit View was below. Order 09 is the average duration of room confinement in hours, and all facilities were below the field average with CYC and NYTC averaging a little over three hours and Summit View was under an hour. Order 10 is the percent of room confinement terminated within four hours, and this is a good one to be above the field average on, which all facilities were. CYC was at 75 percent, NYTC at 90 percent, and Summit View was 100 percent for terminating room confinement in less than four hours. Order 11 is the percent of room confinement terminated in eight hours or less. CYC was at 83 percent, NYTC 93 percent, and Summit View was 100 percent, all about the field. Sixty-02 is injuries to youth and youth injuries can result in restraint application or youth fights, for example both CYC and NYTC were under the field, Summit View was above. Sixty-03 is injuries to staff. There were none at CYC and NYTC, there were two recorded at Summit View. Injuries to youth, 60-04, CYC and Summit View were under the field, NYTC was slightly above with Summit View having none. Sixty-06 is suicide behavior with injury by youth. Only Summit View reported these behaviors with seven occurrences. Sixty-07 is suicidal behavior without injury by youth. All facilities reported zero occurrence. Sixty-09 is the average daily ratio of direct care staff. All three facilities are below the field average regarding staff ratios. Sixty-10 is youth injured during the application of physical or mechanical restraints. All facilities were above the field average. CYC reported three incidents, Summit View two. Sixty-11, is assaults and fights on youth. CYC and NYTC were below the field, Summit View was above. CYC had three, NYTC four, and Summit View six. Sixty-12 is assault on staff. CYC and NYTC were below the field, Summit View was above. CYC had two incidents, NYTC none, and Summit View three. Sixty-13 is percent of interviewed youth who report that they feared for their safety within the last six months and as a reminder, staff, youth, and families are all surveyed during the collection period. CYC and Summit View were above the field, NYTC below. That was -- with CYC, eight youth reported this or 25 percent surveyed, at NYTC this was one youth, and at Summit View this was five youth or 17 percent surveyed. Sixty-14, percent of staff who report that they feared for safety -- for their safety within the last six months, and all facilities were under the field. At CYC, three staff, or 13 percent responded affirmatively to this; at NYTC, two staff, or 6 percent; and at Summit View three staff, or 15 percent. And then our last graph, 60-

15, percent of interviewed youth who reported that they were forced to engage in sexual activity within the last six months, we did have one youth report at CYC and one youth at Summit View. There are a set of questions that the youth can answer if they, you know, report the affirmative on this one. The youth at CYC reported that it was reported to the facility and it was resolved by the facility, and the youth at Summit View didn't answer any of the corresponding questions so it's unclear if they reported it or what the outcome of it was, and these surveys are anonymous. And in closing, DCFS is now working on revising our facility improvement plans based on the October data and we'll be working on those plans until the next data collection period in April 2021. So thank you for your time.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Ms. Simeo, for that very thorough presentation. Are there any questions of this PBS data and of Ms. Simeo? Okay. I'm seeing none. Then we'll proceed to the final report in agenda item 6, the federal fiscal year status offender summary. Ms. Bittleston?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, thank you, Leslie Bittleston for the record. In your packet of materials, there is a document called status offense summary. I have never presented this data before. This is an annual report, it is a federally required report, so I decided to put this in here just to kind of let everybody know that we do collect data on status offenses. This data is provided to DCFS monthly from each of the county detention facilities. So overall, this report identifies that we held in the state 196 -- we booked and put in secure detention 196 total status offenders. There is a breakdown of male, female, white, minority, and the average age is a little over 15 years of age. The offense breakdown, 36 are minor in consumption, that would be alcohol. In Nevada, minor in consumption is a delinquent offense. However, federally, it is considered a status offense so that's why it's lumped as part of a status offense on this this report. The biggest thing that we look for with status offenders are any status offenders that are kept in secure detention 24 hours or longer. So any status offender that's kept in a detention facility for 24 hours or longer is considered a violation of one of the core requirements of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. This year, out of the 196 status offenders that we booked and placed in secure detention, we only had six violations, which is really good, and two violations of a valid court order. This report provides a whole bunch of information, breakdown information, on the types of status offenses that were kept over 24 hours, breakdown of gender and race, and also at the very -- on the very last page, page 4, it does outline those violations, the six violations of the 24-hour rule and the two uses of valid court orders that were used in the state. So that is the status offender report and as I said, this is a federally required report that I provide to the feds every year as part of an overall compliance report in February of each year. So that's status offenders, if there's any questions.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you. Are there any questions and Ms. Bittleston?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** This is Commissioner Salla. I have a question. So on the -- the list of violations with Jan Evans that has the date and time-out not provided or unknown, does that mean the youth is currently there?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Leslie Bittleston for the record. On the report that was received from Jan Evans for that particular month and that youth, it stated the youth was still in custody, and the reason the youth was still in custody was due to pending evaluations and assessments. However, we did not follow up to get additional -- additional time out, it was already over the 24-hour mark, so we counted it as a violation.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I -- just as a follow-up, Commissioner Salla. So we have 24 hours pre-court, 24 hours post-court, excluding weekends and holidays, right?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** So it's -- to me it's a little misleading to put -- to put not provided or unknown that you can put as of 11/30 currently detained or whatever that -- that report went to because at least in my experience, when the feds see that, then they'll that we're -- like, we're not following up on that information to see why it isn't. So I think if you just put, you know, as of 11/30 still detained, it's more accurate than not known or not provided.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Will do. Thank you, Commissioner Salla.

**Jo Lee Wickes:** This is Jo Lee Wickes for the record. It also looks like there's a typo in that it says the youth was detained on November 17th of 2019 as opposed to 2020, and I'm confident that we don't have anybody who's been there for more than a year.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So being that this is a -- excuse me, Leslie Bittleston for the record. Being that this is a federal report, we go on federal fiscal year, which is October 1st of 2019 through September 30th of 2020 would be this report. So this particular instance happened in November of 2019, which is part of our federal fiscal year.

**Jo Lee Wickes:** Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** You're welcome.

**Ross Armstrong:** This is Commissioner Armstrong. Leslie, do we get feedback in, like, how we -- how we rank in this in terms of other states? I mean, are we -- you know, is this violation, like, a really bad number and we need to get on top of it or is this, you know, we're doing pretty good? What's the -- I know that there are some states, I mean, like Arkansas is one cause there's -- that senator was holding up a bunch of legislation, but, like, you know, there's a lot of jurisdictions I think that lean on the valid court order loophole and so I was just -- can you give us some context in how it looks compared to other states?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, Leslie Bittleston for the record. These numbers are very good. Six -- six instances of -- or six violations in a 12-month period is very good, and two uses of a valid court order are also good. Of course we would all like to eliminate the use of valid court orders, and I spoke about this yesterday in our state advisory group committee meeting about this, and I am going to reach out to the county that used the two valid court orders just to kind of talk about why we're using them and, you know, to see what we can do to maybe eliminate those in the future. However, with that being said, the way that the feds rate states is they do it per number of instances per 100,000 population of youth. So we are given, like, a percentage and under a certain percentage is good and over that certain percentage is bad. The state of Nevada, in just the last five years, has always been under the required percentage for status offenders in juvenile detention, so it's -- these numbers are good. I hope that helps.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Yes. Thank you for those questions and the clarifications, Ms. Bittleston. Are there any other questions of this report? Okay. Seeing none, moving on to item number 7. This is our committee updates and we're going to take one committee update out of order to accommodate a fellow Commissioner's commitment later on this afternoon. So with that, Commissioner Wickes, would you please proceed with the grants and quality assurance committee update?

**Jo Lee Wickes:** I will good afternoon, everybody. It's nice to see some smiling faces. The Grants and Quality Assurance Committee in this last period has really been focusing on the correctional program checklist that as you know, or may remember, for this year has been a challenging point because the process for the

assessment requires the assessors to be onsite at the facilities and obviously with COVID restrictions, there were numerous assessments that had to be rescheduled and just some challenges around doing that the way that it's supposed to be done. I do want to thank Sarah Valasquez, who's one of our certified assessors in the process, because she did provide an overview to our committee and I have summarized that with some important edits by someone who is either wiser and/or takes better notes than I do so I appreciate the assist that I had asked for, but that will give you just a summary of what the process is about and how it operates. I think most important to note is that all of the facilities that are currently required to be assessed were assessed in 2020, except Caliente. Caliente is now scheduled for its evaluation in January of next year. The other item that I think is important to recognize is that the state of Nevada has a low number of people who have gone through the training and been certified by the University of Cincinnati in this process and in writing the reports. Some of that is caused by the fact that there weren't many people trained in the beginning and then some people retired, and for other reasons, the number of assessors dipped lower. That puts a lot of burden and pressure on the assessors that are still certified in the state of Nevada. Good news, however, is that Mr. Martin and his group had set aside some money before for some training and they have earmarked those funds still to train four staff members to become assessors and Ms. Bittleston found a grant which will also pay for four state employees to be trained by the University of Cincinnati. The training actually requires quite a bit of classroom work, and then it requires the trainees to attend an actual assessment of a facility, do those logistics, and probably impacted by COVID again, the training for the additional assessors in the state of Nevada is now scheduled to occur in September of 2021. I'm hoping that that's a firm date and will hold firm because earlier training did have to be postponed. It - - I'm hopeful I think that COVID will be well under control by then, and that there won't be travel restrictions, and that the training can go forward. So that's really what we focused on during this time period. There's more detail in the committee reports, and if you have questions, I will attempt to answer them and if I can't hopefully, Ms. Bittleston can.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Are there any questions? I am not seeing any, Commissioner Wickes. I think you are good to go.

**Jo Lee Wickes:** Thank you.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you for a very thorough report. And now we'll start at the beginning. Commissioner Duffy on data performance committee, please?

**Leslie Bittleston:** You're on mute, Brigid.

**Brigid Duffy:** Oops. Sorry. This is like the back-to-back meeting I've had. Okay. So thank you. My first thing was thank you if you can't read lips. This is Brigid Duffy for the record at the last meeting I left off with the revised DMC document and you should have that in your packet. When you pull it up, you will see that they -- it is -- there's two DMC documents. This would be titled the DMC template for FFY (SIC) '21 draft. The changes that are being made are in blue so you can see that it's hard to see that there, well, at least for my eyes that they're blue, but there are changes. This is the recommended changes. There's no vote needed on this, this is just our changes and explaining to the different county judicial districts what we need as far as explaining the data to collect. We have not had a meeting since our last October full meeting so that's why you don't have a written report, but I will tell you that going forward, the things that the data subcommittee are going to be working on is going to be revising our scorecard, so presently we are collecting certain information that is statutorily required, but we also, as a Commission, voted on some performance measures that are pretty big wish list items that Tyler Supervision cannot currently capture for us. So as our subgroup is moving forward, we're going to be talking about what very specific performance measures we want to collect now that we can collect. Also we'll be continuing to work on the

satisfaction survey for our customers that come through the juvenile justice system, and then a big thing we need to discuss is how we are -- hold on, let me look at my notes, how do we want to request the state get the data. So right now, what I've been educated on is we collected by judicial districts and so for example, one judicial district will have three counties in it and other judicial districts are one county. So do we want to split it by county or do we want to keep it by judicial district? And if we decide to split it into county by county, that's going to cost money for Tyler Supervision to do that. But there is an issue with the fact that we collect by judicial districts and that that just could encompass several counties in our state. So that is a conversation we're going to be having going forward, and our next meeting is January 13th at 1:00 if anybody wants to be involved in any of those conversations besides my current subcommittee members. I would also update you on 62-H but that's a whole big agenda item so I'm just going to pass that off to I believe Leslie has that one later on in the agenda. So if there's not any questions I just ask you to take a look at the DMC, FY '21's new template and we can always bring back with questions in the next meeting.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And this is Leslie Bittleston. Can I add one thing to Ms. Duffy's report? Elko County Chief Plager kindly provided her first DMC poll from Tyler Supervision, and that is also included in your packet of materials. I believe it is called -- let's see, T SUP DMC data poll extract. So that is how the first wave of data is coming from Tyler Supervision. So I just wanted to -- and I spoke to Ms. Duffy about this as well just to let you know what we're getting currently, and that will help us with our data committee going forward. We are going to continue to work to make the data pull better, but this is where we are to date.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Commissioner Duffy and Ms. Bittleston. Are there any questions regarding this report from anyone? Okay. Seeing none, thank you. Moving along to the SAG advisory group, Commissioner Salla-Smith, please?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Thank you. Our first item that we'll actually need to take action on is the juvenile justice delinquency prevention through your plan. We moved it from the SAG Committee to the full Commission. Yesterday during our SAG Committee, there was discussion regarding adding a caveat about how COVID 19 and the governor's directives and protocols has affected several areas within our three-year plan, and one of those is being the ability to do onsite monitors or audits, however you want to call it, at the juvenile detention centers because a lot of the centers have -- we've limited visitors, we're not allowing people to come into the facilities if we can help it. So we discussed that, but the three-year plan that I believe is included in -- is it included in our document? It is not. Am I missing it, or is it not in there?

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** I'm looking as well. Ms. Bittleston, can you please confirm?

**Kayla Dunn:** That is me, and I swear I triple checked everything. I apologize if it did not get on there. That is my responsibility.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. Well, the three-year plan is wonderful and we are asking -- the SAG Committee is the committee that really has to review that to move it to -- federally the SAG Committee approves it. We always move it to the full Commission just because that's how we want to operate. Seeing that it's not part of our documents, I believe that it's going to have to move through the SAG Committee that was moved --

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Correct.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- and approved so --

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Correct.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- but we'll make sure that everyone gets a copy of that to review, and we will add that cop caveat about COVID-19 affecting several areas cause it does -- it is -- look, it can affect some of our compliance issues, but it's really out of our control and we'll include that in our three-year plan. So I guess I don't need a motion or anything like that. We're good?

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** No, we're -- we are unable to take a vote.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. And we're also working through the new federal data requirements in 2021 and we're working with the Data Committee also just to make sure that we're not overlapping our efforts or we're not missing some of those new data elements, and in the SAG Committee, Kayla Landes has done a wonderful job of doing a summary of all the new data requirements and if they're currently being collected and reported and if so, where that is, and how can we not have to report data several times to different entities. So that's a work in progress, although I think it's really close to just having all of the information and I'm seeing if it's part of our documents and I don't think it is, but when it's complete, it will be and I think it will help all of the jurisdictions know what's expected of us, and then also that we're only reporting one place the data that's needed, and if we're already reporting it to a different agency, how do we get that streamlined. Our formula grant update, the update is that, and we've had a lot of discussion about this in the SAG Committee because really the formula grant is what drives us and directs us with our federal compliance. The 2019 up to current formula grant is still frozen. The funds are still frozen. We did receive partial 2018 funds. I think that at this point, because we have several federal fiscal years frozen, that if we could have some legislative -- legislators help on getting those funds released, especially at this time where the state budgets decrease the number of beds at our state facilities and our formula grant funding is really for front-end services but we can't access that funding for several years now because it's frozen and we have less state beds, it's kind of a perfect storm brewing, and so I just ask this Commission to help us develop a way, a plan to get some answers on how we can get these funds unfrozen. And I can keep going through it, and we can come back to that, but I just want us not to forget that they're still frozen.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** The compliance update, I think Leslie discussed our status offenders, which is one of our four core requirements. That's actually really good data for our state. The feds call that De Minimus exception and so it makes me excited to see that -- that really that's -- that's a low number of DSO violation. So the other four core requirements of course are disparate -- are racial and ethnic disparity component, sight and sound, and then our jail removal. I think it's going to become a little harder for us to maintain compliance if our -- if we don't have our formula funds to help the front-end services so I'm going to keep going back to that. And other than that, the SAG Committee is going to start tracking legislation. We do discuss that in our committee to make sure that we're all keeping on top of that, and the SAG -- the information we track in the SAG Committee we share with NAJJA too so that we're all working from -- from the same information. So that's our report from the SAG Committee. If there's any questions, I welcome them.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Okay, Commissioner Salla-Smith, I do not see any questions, but your point is well made about we need help to get our state funds unfrozen, so I hope Ross and the team at DCFS is hopefully coordinating with the governor's office and our legislative body to assist us with that, and our delegation I would hope in DC as well. So thank you. So the next committee we have up is Commissioner Graham, the Racial and Ethnic Disparity Group, please.

**Rebekah Graham:** Hi. So Leslie Bittleston -- this is Rebekah Graham, for the record, by the way. Leslie Bittleston kindly prepared the aggregate data so that we could kind of see how law enforcement responded to our survey. So just kind of a recap, we had a series of committee meetings to try to identify where the racial and ethnic disparity occurred. We reviewed the state data, and it really clearly occurred at arrest, and in talking to law-enforcement partners, in particular Clark County school resource officers were very involved and helpful. Eric Spratley from the Nevada Chiefs' Association, Chiefs' and Sheriffs' Association, was very helpful and it became clear in the course of our conversations, that where the -- there was a significant gap and although the NRS requires racial and ethnic disparity training, it did not seem like it was consistently occurring or that there was any checks and balance. You know, POST isn't checking it to see if they're meeting that NRS requirement. So we sent out a survey and again, Eric Spratley was very helpful in getting that out to his membership and unfortunately, despite our repeated requests to Clark and Washoe to be involved in our committee, they did not even respond to the survey. So our largest police agencies did not even respond to the survey. Those that did respond to the survey, there are eight -- eight police chiefs from rural counties that responded in the data does show -- continue to show that need for training that we -- it seemed like was present in our conversations. Having three agencies report they're unprepared to deal with juveniles that, they're unprepared to deal with a member of a racial, ethnic minority, and they are unprepared to deal with mental-health calls. So that really does speak to a pretty significant need in our state and it kind of continues throughout. I won't read the entire report to the Commission, it is available in our drive, but it's clear that there's a gap in the training for our law-enforcement partners who bring youth into our systems of care, a gap in their ability to respond to mental-health calls, a gap in their ability to respond to racial and ethnic minorities, and there's definitely not trauma-informed training. What is very positive is our law-enforcement partners indicated they would be interested in training on trauma-informed policing. They would be interested in more training so our feeling at this point, and I am very interested in hearing from the rest of the Commission members, is for Ms. Bittleston to include this in her governor's report. I think that is sort of essentially the extent of the JJOC's scope of authority or power is we cannot make new rules, we cannot enforce these rules, but we can definitely bring it hopefully to attention of people who can make those changes. Is there any comments or further direction from the other members of the JJOC?

**Eve Hanan:** Hi, this is Eve Hanan for the record. I'm actually just looking for the report. Is it in -- was it in the Commission materials, and what's the title of it?

**Rebekah Graham:** It is. It says red committee state plan actual survey aggregated responses.

**Eve Hanan:** Great. Thank you.

**Rebekah Graham:** Ms. -- oh, Joey, you're muted.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you. Sorry, I only do that 25 times a day, I think.

**Rebekah Graham:** Right.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Commissioner Graham. I do have a question, Ms. Bittleston. Because the governor's report was not, you know, available for voting today and I hear Commissioner Graham asking that this be added to the report, could that be done, one, and could it be attached as an appendix?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Leslie Bittleston for the record. The governor's report is due at the end of January, so I haven't written it yet for this next year. Yes, it can be included. It can be included as a recommendation for the governor's office to look at, so to speak.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** So, Commissioner Graham, would that be satisfactory for you and the committee?

**Rebekah Graham:** Yeah. And I'm interested to hear if other Commission members have other ideas. I -- essentially, I think that is the extent of our ability is to make recommendations to the governor.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Correct.

**Rebekah Graham:** We cannot do anything else.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Right. By way of adding this to the report, is there any objections from anyone on the Commission of adding the information that Commissioner Graham shared in a summary format to the governor's report?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** No objection by me.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Commissioner Salla?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** No objection.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Commissioner Martin?

**Jack Martin:** As a side note, if Ms. Graham needs help reaching law-enforcement contacts here in southern Nevada, to the extent where I can help there, please feel free to call on us and I will do what I can to help put you in contact with the people that make those decisions.

**Rebekah Graham:** Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Martin. Commissioner Duffy also reached out and Brigid Duffy I believe also has pretty good connects, but maybe we should have perhaps tried you and I apologize that we didn't think of that.

**Jack Martin:** No, no, no, --

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Well, I'm wondering it -- did -- I know I missed the last meeting, but we had Chuck Callaway from Metro attend the one meeting over the summer and he was very helpful and very open. He's the Metro lobbyist officer as well, but did he get a copy of the request for the survey?

**Rebekah Graham:** We sent it out via the Chiefs' and Sheriffs' Association so it maybe didn't trickle down from the top.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** And so if Ms. Bittleston indicates that we have time before the governor's report, then I can -- I can try them directly. So if there are Commissioners who have recommendations for reaching out to Reno or Washoe or Clark or Vegas, because as the largest law-enforcement organizations in our state, for them to not be included in this report does not make a lot of sense. I know I've personally called Washoe and Reno and emailed Washoe and read out and did not get responses. I got people who on the front end were interested and, like, oh, that sounds great, let me pass that along to my supervisor, and then crickets. So if anybody does have a direct contact that they recommend, if you'd please forward it to me or Ms. Bittleston, we will ensure they get a copy of the survey.

**Jack Martin:** Just -- just as an observation, Madam Chair, the undersheriff for Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department attended our last meeting and is a Commissioner on this so we do have his direct email. If you wanted to get it through Ms. Bittleston, I'm sure she has it.

**Rebekah Graham:** Thank you very much.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Mr. McMahill -- yeah. Okay. I will send it directly to him. Thanks, Commissioner Martin.

**Jack Martin:** He's the number two. He's the undersheriff so he actually runs the entire department.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Thank you.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Great. Thank you, all, and if you do have contacts, please coordinate with Ms. Bittleston and Commissioner Graham. So thank you. Our final committee update is the strategic planning committee. We do not have an update for that, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge Commissioner Cervantes' announcement that he is retiring, so congratulations to him. We will miss him and we thank him for his service, and I think it's January, correct Commissioner Cervantes?

**Frank Cervantes:** That's correct. January 8th is my last day of service.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Congratulations. So we do have you on another topic later in the agenda, but please, if everyone would reach out to him offline and send congratulations, that would be great. So moving on to item number 8, this is for discussion and possible action. I will ask Ms. Bittleston to also offer comment. We periodically review the JJOC membership. We know we have vacancies and we are reaching out to the governor's office. Many of the vacancies we have right now need to be appointed by our legislative body and so Ms. Bittleston is working with us to outreach to the legislature, to -- in hopes that we can get some of the appointments moving prior to the formal legislative session starting. Ms. Bittleston, do you want to add any comment or Mr. Armstrong?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Leslie Bittleston for the record. Just to let everybody know that we do have two positions open that have to be nominated by the state assembly or senate. We have three youth member positions open and then we will have Mr. Cervantes' position open, but that's really not an open position, it will be filled by his successor when that person has been named, and I will reach out to that person after they've been named to have them apply. So it is specifically for that position, the director of Washoe County Juvenile Services.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Ms. Bittleston. Commissioner Armstrong, do you have any update or comment?

**Ross Armstrong:** No. This is Commissioner Armstrong. Just that it does seem to be, you know, a little bit tricky to get the nominations from the legislature. They might've been, I don't know, waiting for the election to occur, but it's the same thing with the advisory committee too. This Commission is -- the majority of those are, you know, appointments from the legislature. So, you know, we'll continue to work. I think -- it seems that the process -- once we get an application into the governor's office, that process from getting the application, the completed application, into getting an appointment has smoothed out quite a bit. Those legislative appointments still remain a trickier part.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you for the update and thank you to those of you that I know are on this call today that have made application to be appointed. I really thank you for your interest in and commitment to this work, and hopefully we'll get those appointments moving soon. Are there any questions about that bullet point before I move on? Seeing none, okay, so this one, we were asking -- we're really going to rely on Commissioner Cervantes for his comment first, but as with any process that we do through strategic planning, there's often times we have to come back and revisit and retool our strategy and our approaches and we've done that a couple of times since the JJOC has been Commissioned to come together. And one of the questions we have today and, Commissioner Cervantes, I know I'm putting you on the spot, but the strategic planning committee, the question that we have going into 2021 is should that be a standing committee that meets regularly, or should it be as an as-needed basis since our strategic plan has become much more operational? Do you have thoughts on that?

**Frank Cervantes:** For the record, Frank Cervantes, Commissioner? Yes, I do, Chairperson Orduna. I think that the second option might be more viable for the strategic planning committee because there was so much work pertinent to the initial conception of it and, you know, it's really kind of a foundational piece of work and so as things need to change or as things change, I think that's the time that you update the strategic plan, or if something's identified, that is really something that should be added to that at that time. That's the way I would kind of go forward with that project myself. I would leave the ultimate decision to the new chair of the subcommittee, but I think that's probably a more logical way to proceed.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Commissioner Cervantes, and your point is well taken because we will be asking for someone to volunteer to chair the strategic planning committee and we want to make sure that this person knows when he or she volunteers that they have license to modify the approach that's been taken. So thank you for that. Are there any other comments from Commissioners as to this? I'm trying to see if there are other strategic planning committee members on the call today, if they had any comments about maybe as an as-needed basis for right now for a strategic planning committee. Not seeing -- anybody want to comment? Okay. I'm not seeing any, so we will be asking for a volunteer for strategic planning committee chair, and then we will work with that Commissioner to determine the future structure of the committee and scheduling purposes. So thank you, Commissioner Cervantes, for your input.

**Frank Cervantes:** You're welcome.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** So with that, we are moving right along to item number 9. This is an overview by Ms. Bittleston of legislative items.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Leslie Bittleston for the record. Earlier this year, around February, March timeframe, I submitted revisions to Nevada Administrative Code. Are those the first ones? I don't have my agenda up. Yes. Thank you. Sorry. To Nevada administrative code 62B and 62H. 62B has the draft of NAC. 62B has been completed by the Legislative Council Bureau and provided to DCFS, and that draft is in your packet of materials. Let's see. Okay. Maybe it's not. For some reason it looks like not all of our materials are there.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Are you looking for the 62B draft?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. Is it there?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** It's there. Mm-hmm.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. It's called --

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** NAC 62B draft PDF.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yeah, NAC 62B.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Yeah.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** You have to --

**Leslie Bittleston:** For some reason, I'm --

**Rebekah Graham:** It's alphabetical. It's right under JJOC subcommittees.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Thank you. So NAC 62B draft. So that is the draft that was recommended by the Legislative Council Bureau. Now that we are in a legislative session, the next step of enacting a NAC is to go to a public hearing, so I believe that we will have to put off the public hearing for 62B until after the legislative session is over, but we do have that draft and that moves me to NAC 62H. That draft is still going through the review process through LCB. That draft was much more detailed and lengthy. That draft talks about all of the requirements that the counties have to provide data for racial and ethnic disparities and status offenses and general data for juvenile justice system analysis. So I'm hoping that that draft will be ready within the next couple of weeks. So that's where we are on the NACs and with NAC 62B, we will not be able to hold a public hearing until after the legislative session is over so our plan is to have a public hearing for both 62H and 62B at the same time. So are there any questions on those NAC revisions, or do you have any questions on the NAC draft that was provided to DCFS?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I -- oh, sorry. This is Commissioner Salla. Because this is just the draft, right --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- and I know we have to have a public hearing, but we can't do that for a while, just when I was reading it, the section 1 uses evidence-based practices, but the Oversight Commission used evidence-informed and evidence-based, so I'm -- I think that we should mirror the same language because it's going to get us into the same spot we were before and the Commission approved evidence-informed also.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Commissioner Salla, could you please send that to me and an email and I will submit that to LCB, just so I don't forget? Thank you. Are there any other questions on the NACs before I move on to the next item, which is the pending BDR? Okay. In your packet of materials, there is a document titled -- I believe it's called pending BDR. So let me give you a little background on what this is. The governor's report, which we talked briefly about just a couple minutes ago, the governor's report is due every year at the end of January. That report is quite extensive and includes a whole bunch of data around the juvenile justice system overall over the past year. It includes information on racial and ethnic disparities, status offenses, and all of the data that we are -- really provides you piece by piece throughout the different meetings. All of this is put into an annual governor's reports and posted on DCFS' website. The SAG Committee is responsible for helping or approving the governor's report, just like it is with the three-year plan, which we discussed earlier. However, in January and February of this year, the SAG Committee did not meet for various reasons. Thank you, Ms. Graham. It is called the BDR Working Document. So we did not meet in January and February. So the governor's report went through the DCFS review process and was posted to the DCFS website. That governor's report included some recommendations kind of at the

staff level so kind of at a -- looking at it from the DCFS level, some recommendations on some things that may improve the system as a whole. So what happened was a sponsor, and I don't know who it is, maybe Ross knows who it is, but somebody took those recommendations and put it into a BDR for this legislative session and I just wanted to go over what that -- what is in there and just also to let you know that we discussed this same document in the SAG Committee yesterday, and the consensus out of the SAG Committee yesterday was they request more information. So they were not willing to support or not support any of the things on the BDR working document. So if everybody has that working document up, I will go through what is in there. Number 1 -- and before I go on, does everybody have the document open? Okay. All right. Number 1 is addressing corrective-room restriction. In NRS 62B-215, there is a whole section talking about how to use room confinement. This language that is currently there was created out of SB107 and I believe that was from the 2014 or '15 -- or '13 -- excuse me, '13 legislative session. It was really put into NRS to cover all of the uses that the state facilities and the juvenile county detention facilities use for room confinement. However, since that time, there has been a lot of national research and push nationally to kind of move away from using room confinement as behavioral modification or corrective modifications to behavior and more for, you know, the safety of staff and youth and the safety of the facility. So this was put in there kind of to look at this, to see if this language is still appropriate, or if this language needs to be modified to where we would like to go in the future with using room confinement not for behavior modification, but for the safety and security of youth, staff, and all of that. So that was number 1, and I will stop there if there are any questions on number 1.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** This is Commissioner Salla. I think in addition, because we discussed this yesterday in our SAG Committee also. I -- I think that -- I mean, how you just explained it, Leslie, and what it says and how it's written there, there's, like, some differences in there because one of the things that was compromised with SB107 was that the state was going to really increase the trainings for the jurisdictions of evidence-based programs that work -- that work with our youth, so that we could decrease --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- the amount of room restriction or room confinement or corrective action, whatever you want to call it, and so the way that that language was worded during that session allowed for facilities to get trained, decrease the use of room confinement, but didn't take away the ability -- I mean, what you might consider behavior modification or room confinement, but it really might be for the facility that it's a security and safety risk for that moment and that's what's needed. So, I mean, I think the corrective room restriction is something that at least for, in my opinion, is going to have to have a lot of discussion with NAJJA and the facilities because when we did SB107, there was a lot of groundwork that went into that to meet the needs of the bill draft sponsor, the facilities, and do what's best for our kids, but not to push facilities into a corner when it comes to safety and security.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. Any other comments on number 1? And also, I should say that this has just a very, very general bullet of what's there. There's a lot more that we can talk about with each one of them.

**Jack Martin:** Madam Chair, with your permission, this is Jack Martin. I agree with Commissioner Salla completely that this needs to go back to manage it and I would even go one step further and say probably reconvene silver state, you know, the detention leaders and have them really go through this. And the second piece is is we don't even know who's carried this -- who's carrying this piece of legislation yet so before we run out too far in front of ourselves, we probably want to wait to see what assembly person or senator assigns themselves to it. Then if it's too ridiculous, we just can stick the rocket on them and see what happens, you know, cause, you know, our southern lobbyist down here, Commissioner Duffy, is pretty good at getting things straightened out for us I know in Clark.

**Frank Cervantes:** This is Commissioner Cervantes. Definitely agree with both Jack and Pauline. There was a lot of thoughtfulness and discussions around this deal when it was originally drafted, and so some of the things that are discussed on here were really kind of gleaned out in the initial bill in the language and so I agree, although I won't be here, that this is absolutely something that should be vetted through NAJJA.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Thank you. Okay, moving on to number 2, definition of state money. This was defined in the revised NAC 62B. It states -- so -- so I don't think -- my point is is I don't think this is needed anymore and can be deleted from any BDR since we did define it in the most recent revision of NAC. The third one, submission of certain reports. Previously, or prior to AB472, there was an NRS requirement, NRS 62H-230, that puts requirements on the counties to provide racial and ethnic disparate data and a report every year. However, with the enactment of AB472, that's obsoleted that NRS 62H-230. So to mitigate that issue, we are putting -- DCFS recommends putting the due dates for those reports in the NAC 62B revision. We do not have that draft language from LCB yet, but this has been proposed just to mitigate what was obsoleted in NRS 62H already, so it's not a big change, it's just moving it from NRS to NAC. Number 4, this -- there is a lot behind number 4 and these couple of sentences don't really do this justice, but the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission is outlined currently in NRS 62B-600. There is also a requirement to have a state advisory group for the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and the formula grant program. Unfortunately, the state advisory group and the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission, as written in NRS, conflict in several areas so it has been a long discussion in the SAG Committee and also at DCFS internal staff with the co-chairs on how to maintain compliance with the JJOC as it's written in 62B and the state advisory group as required under the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. So there is -- there is a lot behind number 4 there, and if you look at them side by side, there's a lot of differences, but that's what number 4 is, and there was quite a lot of discussion in the SAG yesterday about this. Commissioner Salla, do you want to relay that discussion to the group?

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Sure. Commissioner Salla for the record. I think we just discussed that -- okay, you want me to address the membership or the last one?

**Leslie Bittleston:** The membership.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Okay. That's what I was doing. I thought maybe -- yeah. We just discussed that when we had our previous Juvenile Justice Commission with the federal guidelines, we had the ability to have more people on that Commission as defined by the feds and we had some of the same issues with getting some of the requirements, but there's a couple of things: sometimes we don't know that other people sitting -- like, people that are on the Commission with us can actually count in different areas of the requirement, so if you have different license or additional licenses, or you have some other training, or you're an expertise in different areas, like, all of that can help count and help us meet the requirements of the disciplines that need to be represented on here. So that was one thing. The other thing we discussed is -- that we threw out is that at least with our Nevada Juvenile Justice Commission, our state legislators didn't count as full-time government employees because we have a part-time legislature. So we could have them on our Commission and it wouldn't count for towards the number of how many governmental employees we can have on there. The other thing that -- the other thing that we can think of -- I mean, we're going to have to just get some other representation that's required on the Commission, but I do think that -- but before -- if we don't have additional spots to get more people to decrease the level of percentage of government employees on our Commission, which is on our Oversight Commission, which is what we did with the Juvenile Justice Commission, we just had the ability to add more members of private agencies or community-based treatment centers or private citizens that then decrease the overall percentage of our government employees, then we might just want to think about, or at least let Leslie know if you have other

areas of expertise at least to maintain compliance while we work through this. Please let her know so that it can count towards those different disciplines too.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Commissioner Salla. I would also add that this goes back to what Commissioner Martin was saying. This list is helpful, but I think there needs to be much more discussion and exploration with who might be supporting this, what is the intention, what's their understanding, because these are so vague, it's really hard to understand what direction someone else might be thinking about. So I would, again, just point out that this is still too vague to really pursue without knowing who the potential sponsor is right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And I don't see Mr. Armstrong on here anymore so -- oh, there he is. He's up there.

**Jo Lee Wickes:** This is Commissioner Wickes for the record. Could we get a list of the different disciplines that are supposed to be represented on the SAG so that --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Jo Lee Wickes:** -- we have an idea of what, "additional expertise" actually looks like?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, Commissioner Wickes, I can put those side by side. It's not really a matter of discipline, it's really kind of how our state operates that is -- that is more problematic. Many states, many other states, have private providers that operate juvenile detention facilities and juvenile correctional facilities, and we are fully state or county operational with all of those things, which means that really our SAG should be probably more state and county people because those are the people doing the job. However, the way that the federal government looks at it is they look at it as you have too many federal or government employees on your SAG. I mean, they don't break it down to the level of saying why do we do this. I've asked for waivers, I've asked for special consideration, I have advocated, I've spoken directly to the administrator of OJJDP and said, you know, this is how our state is made up, this is how our state needs to operate, and I know it's out of the norm, but that's part of the problem. So it's just -- it's not really disciplines, but there are some interesting disciplines, but yes, I can put 62B-600 on one side and then what the SAG requires on the other side, just to kind of show you that. And that leads me really to the last one quickly. The last one is really the quality assurance reviews that the state and the county camps were required to start in AB 472. It was mentioned in AB 472 and in the strategic plan to look at expanding those quality assurance reviews to the counties. However, with our discussion yesterday in the SAG, it looks like we need to do a little more research on the things that the counties are already receiving and if any of that work would be duplicative of -- the QA review would be duplicative of any of the reviews that the counties are already receiving. So that's kind of an overview of what was in there, but it sounds like, again, I don't know who the sponsor is and Ross is -- I see his name, but I don't see his face, so I can't answer that. So maybe our best course of action is to provide more information and then go from there.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** Chairman Hastings? I'm sorry.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Go ahead, Commissioner Salla.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I just -- I have to step out. It's -- I'm getting my COVID vaccine right now --

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Oh.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** -- so I need to step away and go get that. I'm sorry. I thought we might be done by 2:45 but.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you. Good luck. Go get your vaccine. All right. Are there any questions or comments for Ms. Bittleston and the BDR document and her point of wanting to do more -- a little bit more leg work on this and report back?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Okay.

**Pauline Salla-Smith:** I'm sorry. Before I leave, I do support that. Thank you.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Okay. Thank you. Okay. It looks like I'm getting -- I'm seeing some nodding heads, so we'll -- we will do that. We will ask that Ms. Bittleston and the team do a little bit more research and get a little bit more detail before we take any action. Okay. So the last item, Ms. Bittleston, is related to juvenile justice related BDRs and the review of such?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, excuse me. Yes. I apologize. I got sidetracked with all those other things. So the state will be reviewing BDRs as they turn into actual language. What -- I reviewed the list of BDRs about a week and a half ago, and many were not even turned into any language yet so the state will work on that along with the State Advisory Group Committee, so we will monitor any related BDRs that turn into bills that relate to juvenile justice. So just wanted to let you know that the state and the side we'll be working on that together.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you. Are there any questions of Ms. Bittleston as to that approach? Okay. Okay. Seeing none, I hope. Okay. And the SAG, just so you all know, as the committee reviews legislation, you can attend. So if there's anything of pertinent issues, we will make a point for the SAG to agendize it if needed and make this body know of the conversation so that we can loop everyone in as well. Okay. So then moving along to item number 10, at this point I am not aware of any need to assigning tasks or new committee members right now. If you do have agenda items for our next meeting, which I'll get into in a moment, please do send them to Ms. Bittleston so that they can be reviewed by myself and Judge Egan Walker to be added to the agenda. Related to confirming next meeting dates, if we were to run on this same schedule that we've been doing for a couple months now, we would be looking at middle of March of 2021 for the next meeting and that -- those dates could be the 12th, the 19th, or the 26th. Now, obviously we'll be in the midst of legislative session and probably still working remotely. Last session, we had the ability to do a meeting at the legislature, and obviously we won't be able to do that this year, but what I'd like do, if possible, if we could schedule the meeting at least in March knowing that we may have to change it, I'd at least like a starting place so that we can get something on the calendar for early 2021. So if we were to use today's exact schedule, we would be on the 19th of March at 1:00. Is there any significant opposition with what we know today to holding this meeting on March 19th, 2021?

**Jo Lee Wickes:** No.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** No? And, Frank, you're always welcome to come back and join us and observe, give public comment. Okay. So why don't we do that, folks? I don't see any hands raised and if I'm missing anything, I apologize. Let's schedule our next meeting for March 19, 2021 at 1:00 in the afternoon and as the date gets closer and the agenda gets developed, we will revisit the date if absolutely necessary. Okay? Does that sound good to everybody?

**Gianna Verness:** Commissioner, Gianna Verness for the record. I just wanted to let you know that that is in the middle of spring break for Washoe County. Some of us are very optimistic that we may get the opportunity to travel finally, but there there's two weeks that start that Monday of that week. So I don't know if that's a consideration.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** So, Commissioner Verness, thank you for bringing that up cause we do hope everybody gets to get out and be with their families. So when you say two weeks, is that the week of the 19th and the week of the 26th --

**Gianna Verness:** Correct.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** -- or is it the week of the 12th and the week of the 19th?

**Gianna Verness:** Nope, the latter -- or, I mean, the former, 19th and 26th. I apologize for the confusion.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Okay. Since we're all trying to look at our crystal balls here, would everybody be in favor of moving -- of having the meeting on March 12th at 1:00 so as to convey optimism, that spring break will actually occur this year? Okay. March 12th, thumbs up. All right. Great. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. All right. So our next meeting will be March 12th, 2021 at 1:00 PM. Look at that. Go Team JJOC. Okay. Wonderful. All right. Now that brings me to public comment. Again, public comment is welcome and limited to three minutes. Do we have anyone that would like to provide public comment?

**Jack Martin:** Happy holidays.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Commissioner Martin. Anybody want to provide public comment before we get to holiday celebrations? Okay. I'm hearing no public comments. Yes, Commissioner Martin, thank you. Happy holidays, everybody. Thank you for all of your work. And we are going to get through 2020 and hopefully cheers to a great 2021. Any last comments from any of the Commissioners before we adjourn?

**Jo Lee Wickes:** This is Commissioner Wickes. And I would just like to say that I'm sad to see Frank go. I'm looking forward to I'm sure someone who will be replacing him, who will help guide us and help us along our path. I will miss Frank very much in his capacity as director, but also as a Commission member and hopefully he's not playing so much golf that he can't come back and visit occasionally.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Very well said. Can we give Commissioner Cervantes a virtual round of applause, everybody? Maybe send some virtual hugs. Wonderful.

**Frank Cervantes:** Thank you.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Frank, is there anything you'd like to say?

**Frank Cervantes:** Just that, you know what, I mean, you're pretty lucky when you get to do something that you love, do it for this long, that has a really valuable mission and to work with so many amazing people with just -- when I look at this cascade of all the people I've met, just off the JJOC, through NAJJA, all of the collaterals, it's been pretty rewarding, feel really, really lucky. I mean, this is a really unique group of people that dive into juvenile justice and so I feel really fortunate. So, so glad to work with everybody. I can see some of you on the screen. I see your names. Wish you all happy holidays and thanks again.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you, Frank. So with that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

**Rebekah Graham:** Can we make motions without quorum?

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** I'm sorry?

**Rebekah Graham:** If we're allowed to make motions without quorum, then I'll make a motion to adjourn.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Do we not have quorum anymore?

**Rebekah Graham:** No. Pauline Salla --

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Oh, Kate -- Ms. Maher joined us so we do now. This is a different quorum.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Yeah. Otherwise we'd have to stay in the meeting.

**Rebekah Graham:** Right?

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** So, Commissioner Graham, is that a motion to adjourn?

**Rebekah Graham:** That is a motion to adjourn.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Jo Lee Wickes:** Commissioner Wickes, I'll second.

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Fantastic. All in favor, say aye. Aye.

\*eyes around\*

**Joey Oduna-Hastings:** Wonderful, everybody. We are adjourned. Have a safe and happy holiday. Thank you again. Good work, everybody.

[end of meeting]