

Steve Sisolak
Governor



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

Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission Strategic Planning Committee Meeting February 1st at 9:00 am

Meeting Minutes -

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

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

(VOTING MEMBERS)

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

Absent: Egan Walker, McKenna Finnerty

(Non-Voting Members)

Present: Mike Whelihan

(Staff Members)

Present: Leslie Bittleston, Jennifer Simeo, Kayla Landes, Kayla Dunn

(Public)

Present: Kayla Nariani – Nevada PEP

Meeting Minutes:

Elizabeth Florez: That's okay, thank you. All right then, well good morning, everybody. Happy, I thought today was going to be 02/02/22 but it's 02/01/22, so tomorrow will be an interesting day on the calendar with all the twos. It is 9:03. Good morning, everybody and I'm going to call the Strategic Planning Subcommittee Meeting to order. And with that, we can move on to roll call. Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. My apologies. I have the list up and lost it, so please give me a second. Okay, Liz Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Jennifer Fraser?

Jennifer Fraser: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Egan Walker? Okay, Brigid Duffy?

Brigid Duffy: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: McKenna Finnerty? And non-voting members, I see Mr. Whelihan, I see staff members Jennifer Simeo, Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Landes, Kayla Dunn and I also Kayla, Kayla, could you please spell your last name and let me know where you're from?

Kayla Nariani: Yeah, so my last name is N-A-R-I-A-N-I and I'm from Reno, Nevada.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, are you, what agency?

Kayla Nariani: I'm in Nevada PEP.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh Nevada PEP, okay, thank you. Is there anybody that I missed? Okay, Madam Chair, we do have a quorum.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent, thank you. So, right now we'll move on to agenda item number 3, public comment and discussion. If anybody wishes to make public comment, I will ask that you identify yourself and your organization. So with that, is there any public comment?

No? Okay, moving on to agenda, agenda item number 4. This says review and approval of the 12/9/2021 meeting minutes but I believe it's up October 25th, 2021, meeting minutes. Ms. Bittleston, can you weigh on that? I don't, I think the 12/9 meeting, we didn't have quorum.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, so it should be the, Kayla Dunn, what did we post for meeting minutes?

Kayla Dunn: I believe we posted 10/25.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, my apologies for the typo, so the 10/25 meeting minutes would be the last ones.

Kayla Dunn: Should we push it off until the next meeting and then we can make sure we have the correct date on there or does it matter?

Elizabeth Florez: From a legal standpoint, I'm not sure of the correct answer.

Kayla Dunn: We should probably do it just to be safe, if I'm correct.

Brigid Duffy: If it's just the date, this is Brigid, for the record, if it's just the date then somebody can move to amend it.

Kayla Dunn: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: And then we can approve the amended minutes.

Kayla Dunn: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: If it's just only the date that's wrong or if there's something anybody else wants to comment on in the minutes, then, you know, you know, somebody's name was spelled wrong or, so.

Elizabeth Florez: Well, let's do this, I, when I looked on the website, the minutes are dated October 25th and the, on this, on agenda item number 4 it says review and approve, approval of the 12/9/2021 minutes, I'm going to move to amend that the agenda reflect that it's not 12/9/2021 but October 25th, 2021 and that will be my motion and I will ask for a second.

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

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Is there any discussion around that motion? All in favor, please say aye or raise your hand.

Committee: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. I see all the voting participants raise their hand or said aye, so the motion will carry. And that being said, are there any comments on the actual minutes from October 25th, 2021 or discussion points, corrections? I do not see any; therefore, I'll ask for a motion to approve the October 25th, 2021 minutes.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid, I'll move to approve the October 21, 21 minutes.

Jennifer Fraser: This is Jennifer, I'll second it.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent. All those in favor say aye, raise your hand. Aye, motion carries. Thank you. Okay, moving on to item number 5 strategic plan update. In discussion of this, we'll look to attachment 5 as well as attachment 6. Attachment 5 indicates, is an update on what we've, what has been accomplished, what has been completed on the strategic plan, the areas that are partially complete and those that are incomplete. So, thank you to, to Leslie, Ms. Bittleston, for having compiled this in a snapshot and then attachment number 6 is, reflects what has not yet been done in the strategic plan and she's broken that up under each of the goals within the strategic plan. So, does anybody have any comments on those documents or wish to discuss those documents? I believe the next agenda item will, we're going to talk about next steps potentially including these plans. Okay, so moving on to agenda item number 6, we had talked at our last meeting in October where Judge Walker had recommended that the state, that the state contribute to hiring the same vendor or, or a different vendor to assist this committee with creating the next plan update which would be for FY, I think, '24 through '28? And so, my understanding was that we would have to take that to the larger JJOC meeting for a potential vote but Ms. Bittleston, can you, can you remind us of the process on that, please.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, Leslie Bittleston for the record. So, since the strategy plan was due pretty rapidly, the prior one, the one that was completed for 2081 through 2023, the state used one-time startup cost that were allocated with AB 472. There was \$1.5 million in startup cost allocated for AB 472. So, the state hired a vendor, the vendor's name was on strategy and the state paid roughly \$52,000 for this product and what the vendor did was they held a series of meetings. I am not quite sure how many meetings. I think two, either two, three or four meetings. They compiled all of that information and then they produced the product that we have today is our FY '18 and F, through FY '23 document. At the 10/25 strategic planning committee meeting, it was brought up that possibly the state could, could do this again. So, I went back and did the research for this. I discovered the cost of it, how we paid for it and the vendor that we used. With that being said, I do want to say that the state does not have funds to cover the \$52,000 because once the \$1.5 million in startup cost with AB 472 were exhausted, no other funds or

sustainable funds were provided to the state. So if the strategic planning committee would like to take this to the JJO, so the full JJOC, just please note that I don't know where the funding will come from right now. Does that help, Madam Chair?

Elizabeth Florez: It provides clarification, this Liz Florez. I, I guess I would like to have a discussion then with this group because the strategic planning is a, is a very complex and labor-intensive project and I'm not, well I know and I can surmise that for the rest of the committee members that would be a very heavy lift for those of us who have our regular employment and, and this is, this would be above and beyond what we're probably capable of. So I, my, I believe that we need to take this forward to the JJOC to have larger conversation about how it is the JJOC and the state intend to support the update of the strategic plan but I would welcome comments from my fellow committee members on that.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah, there is, this is Brigid for the record, there is no way we can do this without, without a coordinator. There, I was a part of it when they first did it, like we were over at the Highway Patrol Office down on like Decatur and Sunset area and it was like all day thing of them like going through everything and it was several meetings and, and then they put everything together. I don't see how with all of the, all of the different subcommittees that DCFS group has and Leslie and Kayla and really like there's any way we can do this without an independent vendor. Maybe we can but it won't look, it would just be throwing together.

Unidentified Female: Agree.

Elizabeth Florez: Thanks to you both. So, at this point when we put together our report when I'll work with Ms. Bittleston on putting together our, this committee's report to the larger JJOC, I will indicate that's the group's consensus around this, this topic. And I do not believe the next JJOC meeting has yet been scheduled. Is that correct, Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that's correct.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: And also FYI, I did click this as possible action. I don't know if you need possible action or to vote to move this to the larger JJOC but it is there, if you do want to vote to move it to the larger JJOC.

Brigid Duffy: I have a question, this is Brigid for the record. Because our current strategic plan takes us through FY '23, can the recommendation be that we go back during the legislative session and recommend the allocation of the money for 50,000 of contract?

Leslie Bittleston: That's a, that's really a great idea. You know, I know that there's a lot of ask out there right now and also the JJOC has a bill tied to it, so this might be a good place to put a piece. I know that Madam Chair and I have had several conversations about a lot of things that possibly need to go into this JJOC bill and this is just probably another good place.

Brigid Duffy: Well, how are the county, this is Brigid again for the record, how are the counties doing? Because when we, with 472, if I had the bill number right.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes, that's right.

Brigid Duffy: So, when we came out with that like there was that one-time pot of money that people of the counties were using for their screening tools and, and then that dried up. So, are the counties individually funding all of that now or...

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that's correct, Leslie Bittleston for the record. That is correct and the state is also funding their own. So, what, what AB 472 initially funded was the selection of the MACI, mental health screening tool and the startup cost training and all of that for the YLS and the case plan. So when that pot of money dried up, that 1.5 million startup cost, each agency, county and state had to pick up those ongoing cost because it is a monthly, excuse me, an annual cost for both the MACI and the YLS. And just FYI, the state pays 18,000 annually just for the YLS just for the state. I don't know what Clark County pays and I don't, and Washoe. I don't know what, what you guys pay. We also hold the contract for the 15 smaller counties, so overall we paid \$40,000 a year to the YLS vendor. Eighteen of that is DCFS and 22,000 of that is the 15 counties and they reimbursed the state, you know, equally for that \$22,000. So yes, they have had to bear the burden of that ongoing cost but like I said there was no sustainability plan or anything within AB 472, just those startup costs and then it was dumped on the agencies to sustain it.

Elizabeth Florez: So if I may...

Brigid Duffy: Go ahead Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: So F, I get, because this is a, this is a, not a federal fiscal year or is it a traditional fiscal year, so FY '23 would go through July 1 of 2023, correct?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes and I was not, in part of the planning, so I don't know if they use the federal fiscal year or a state fiscal year. So, the federal fiscal year would be October 1 through September 30th.

Elizabeth Florez: And it doesn't say FY, sorry, I'm not the accountant, so right now [ph], we stay confused. So, do we know then, so Brigid then, so FY '23 in your, what is your, where do you, what's the deadline?

Brigid Duffy: In my mind it starts January or July 1 of 2023.

Elizabeth Florez: Right, so then it would go through, into '24 then, that's right.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: That's correct, okay, so that does give us time. And if I could just also remind that SB 398 passed this last legislative session that says that on or before August 2022, the JJOC shall submit to the legislative committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice a report and the it lists multiple updates and recommendations that the JJOC is supposed to bring forward by that August 1 date. What it talks about are recommendations for legislation relating to improvements on the next five-year strategic plan. So that, that does, that seems to over, I think that would go well with the recommendation that Ms. Duffy gave about bringing forth recommendations that would give us time during the next legislative session. It also asks for an update on disparities in juvenile justice system as well as compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act which I know Ms. Bittleston has already, that's one of the attachments that we're going to discuss in a moment. So, I think we can incorporate a lot of these recommendations using that language as well.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid for the record. I have a question for DCFS staff. Do you know if there's a plan to do a presentation during interim to the judiciary committee?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. No, I am not aware of a plan right now.

Elizabeth Florez: So, this is Liz for the record, so Ms. Bittleston, when we looked at SB 398 and the requirement for the JJOC to submit this report, what is your, what knowledge do you have of this and what role do you, let me take that back, do you know if we will have a meeting with the JJOC prior to this date that gives the JJOC enough time to submit in a timely, to meet this deadline?

Leslie Bittleston: Leslie Bittleston for the record. My understanding is that we're to go back to business as usual. I know DCFS staff at, has met with the Governor's office to talk about the JJOC, so I think we are to go back or to continue business as usual. So, my plan is to reach out to the chairs to get a date on the books for the full JJOC going forward. So the, the long answer is yes, that we should have a meeting prior to August 1st, so the JJOC can submit their report.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Okay. So, regarding agenda item number 6 for possible action, we could, what is this group's thought on putting forward more formally a motion to, let me see if I can craft it, that would, that would indicate that our recommendation is that, is that we would request funds for, from the state of Nevada to select a vendor who would move forward the next strategic plan for FY '23 through FY '28. That was a really messy motion. I move...

Brigid Duffy: I understood it though, this is Brigid. I understood what you meant. I mean we're going to go to the full JJOC and recommend that the full JJOC vote on, during the next legislative session requesting the additional funding for a vendor. I understood it, so I will second it.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay, sorry for the, the scribe, best to capture that. Thank you. Okay, so is there any discussion regarding this motion? Okay, all those in favor say aye or raise hands.

Committee: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay, the motion carries based on the votes. Thank you. So, moving on to agenda item number 7 for discussion, legislative questions. This item is assigned to Ms. Bittleston in the, Ms. Bittleston would you please go over the attachment that speaks to OJJDP requirements?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record and just to give a little background, so the state has been participating in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act since the late 80s, early 90, some time around there. As part of that, participation in the act that the state receives Title II Formula Grant funds. The Title II Formula Grant is awarded on an annual basis. Historically, it was, it was between 5 and 600,000 and then it decrease to around 400,000 for several years and my understanding is for this award that was started October 1st that we are back up to \$600,000. So, that grant comes from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention which is under the Department of Justice, the federal agency. So, our latest grant was supposed to be awarded on October 1st of last year. We did not receive the award on October 1st last year, rather the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention or OJJDP reached out to states on November 3rd and said that the awards for this year were not going to be provided until states complete a revised compliance manual. So, compliance manual means compliance with the requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. And as

you heard me say in a few of the JJOC meetings in the past, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 2018. There was a lot of changes made in 2018, so OJJDP is now tightening the, the grip around state to comply with the changes that were made in 2018. So with that being said, OJJDP sent out a draft template for a compliance manual. I received that template on December 15th and have been doing some work on that template since then. I am, I am not finish with it but attachment number, excuse me, which attachment number is it? Attachment number 7A is that draft is where I am today with it. So if you would like to pull up attachment 7A, I will go through kind of the areas, this is a, the whole draft is not really the, under the guise of the strategic planning committee. There's just certain pieces that the state does not comply with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. So, those are the areas that I want to point out to this committee for discussion and maybe inclusion in that larger bill.

Brigid Duffy: Good point. I'm sorry Leslie, I'm trying, I have, I don't see an A as an apple. I go from attachment 6 to 7B, 7C, 7D, 7E and then revised manual draft.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay, it's, excuse me, I apologize, it is called the revised manual draft.

Brigid Duffy: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: My apologies, committee, but that is what I'm looking at. So like I said, most of this draft is, does not fall under this committee. I just want to outline a couple of things. The first thing I would like to outline is on page number 9, 9 of 27. So, this is related to, if you're there, I have a little question that says, how to address this training with the course, question mark. What this pertains to is the use of a valid court order. So if a juvenile court determines that they're going to lock up a status, a status offender under a valid court order, these things must happen. And my first question is, I think we need some training with the courts because, and also just to add a little context to this, the use of valid court orders in Nevada is not very high. And last year we only had two and both of those came out of Douglas County. So, valid court orders are typically when they're used or used in rural jurisdictions for those status offenders that are just frequent flyers status offenders. But my next question is, for this committee to determine, is do we want to put in statute that we do not want to use valid court orders for status offenders. That is the recommendation nationally that states go to eliminating the use of valid court orders across the board. So, that's kind of the two-pieces around the valid court order, do we want to continue to use it and train the court or do we want to put in statute that we are not allowed to use a valid court order, that's up for discussion.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez for the record. So, my understanding is that are, are the Title II funds in jeopardy relative to this item?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. If we do not get a, approved compliance manual, our Title II funds are in jeopardy and we may not get them at all. So, I'm not saying we have to have it fixed by today or tomorrow or when I'm finished with this whole thing but we have to have a plan.

Elizabeth Florez: Is, this is Liz Florez for the record and you indicated at the beginning that some of these items don't fall under the purview of this specific committee but perhaps others. So, is this, has this been part of the SAG discussion?

Leslie Bittleston: Not yet because the SAG Committee hasn't met either. So, the SAG does have a meeting date for next week and yes I will be bringing it up to them as well. But anything that I'm

proposing legislatively, I'm bringing to this committee and that's kind of why I brought up the valid court order. Do we want to eliminate the use that would maybe be a legislative question, I don't know. I'll pose it to the SAG as well.

Brigid Duffy: So, I have a question, this is Brigid. I, maybe because we don't use them in, in Clark but I don't understand what a valid court, what's the definition of valid court order like what, can you give an example of how this is even use, so I can, I know, so maybe that's like elementary 101 but I'm, I don't understand it.

Leslie Bittleston: Probably because you're in Las Vegas and they don't use it, mostly rural jurisdictions use a valid court order. A valid court order is used for status offenders, so when a status offender is picked up and locked up in juvenile detention and they go see a judge, a judge could say, hey status offender you should not be running away and if you run away kind of thing. So, then the youth is released, then they're picked up again on another status offense. A valid court order allows a judge to lock up a kid for another status offense. In the past, there was no amount of time how long a judge could lock up a kid for multiple status offenses. This item that I am outlining to you today is new in the 2018 reauthorization that says you can only lock up a kid for seven days and all of these things have to happen. So, that's what a valid court order, it is really targeted to those repeat status offenders and we really don't need to be locking up status offenders, you know, maybe for it, anyway but that's kind of what it's for. Does that help?

Brigid Duffy: Yes, I understand it better.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: If I may ask for a clarifying question, Ms. Bittleston, you, I think you said Douglas County had a couple of violations of valid court order...

Leslie Bittleston: Last year.

Elizabeth Florez: Last year.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: So, and I, and I believe I heard you said in the past that under the prior rule there was a certain percentage of violations that were allowed before a penalty was imposed, is that correct?

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct.

Elizabeth Florez: So, would this, this then would, so that would no longer be in existence, this, this small margin of violation?

Leslie Bittleston: So, the small, I believe we still would, would count the, the violations and it's still in percentage. That percentage changes on an annual basis, sometimes it's higher, sometimes it's lower. So, I can't tell you right now what the percentage for the next compliance here is going to be, so it changes every year. The thing that adds to the burden to my office is if a valid court order is used that puts the onus on us to further investigation to make sure that they have followed the requirements that I outlined with making sure it didn't last longer than seven days, kind of why they did it. I would like to say or

respectively say we don't have the staff to do that. I mean that is a, even if it's 2 or 20, I hope it's not 20. I think that would put us over the ratio but it, it, it really requires us to do some additional work when we just do not have staff to do it. And I just don't want to sit here and say we're going to do a good job when we don't have staff to do it.

Elizabeth Florez: So if I may, this is Liz Florez again for the record. I certainly recognized that one part of the conversation is, is, is state's capacity to do the work, that's one piece of it but the other part of the conversation is why, why are valid court orders used at all? And I do, I do always want to be sensitive to the fact that, that we are so diverse in the state and people have and various jurisdictions have access or less access to resources in their communities. And so in Clark County, you know, they have the benefit of, of The Harbors and children are completely diverted and they, and law enforcement are provided opportunities to take children elsewhere and that's, that's the optimal scenario. I do know in Washoe County there had been times where in very extreme circumstances our detention center has been used for very short burst of time and I don't believe we've been in violation. I'm not certain but I, I guess my clarifier and I'd be very interested to hear the discussion in SAG regarding this as well because I think they talked about, I think one of their points, one of their discussion points or agenda items is around status offenders, if I'm not mistaken because it is one of those core requirements for the SAG committee. So, one last clarifying question, Leslie. I apologize if I'm slow in the uptake here. The, the question is if we put this in statute, correct?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, that is the question...

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: ... and I will also pose it to SAG as well. I just wanted you all to be aware because you are the holders, I believe, of the bill.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. You know, I, I'm just saying that the national push for the last five years has been to eliminate the use of valid court orders no matter what the circumstances but you're right, some, like Clark County probably has less than five status offenders I mean in a year because they have Child Haven, they have The Harbor, you know, the rural jurisdiction struggle, you know. So much so that I'm actually looking at the, looking at homeless shelters and, and things like that in rural areas. That's another bigger project for down the road to give some of the rurals some other resources, you know, especially for these out of state runaways which is another conversation. So, yes, so I just kind of want to put that on the radar. I, I will leave it to SAG and maybe this committee could follow the SAG recommendation. Are there any other questions about valid court order, if not I will move on. So, moving on to page number 10, so this is the big one, Nevada State Law allows for juveniles to be held in adult jails. And if you go down to page 12 of 27, you will see a blue highlight, it is NRS 62B.335.8. It says jurisdiction over adult charged with certain delinquent act, delinquent acts committed as a child in part. A person held in custody pursuant to this section must be held in the state prison, a county or city jail or detention facility for adults and is entitled to bail as established on criminal proceedings. This is extremely important because the reauthorization in 2018 stated that no juveniles for any reason are to be held in adult jails. Now once convicted, if once they're convicted of adult criminal offense, that is different but while they're pending charges as an adult, so that's the biggest issue facing this committee is that we currently allow for juveniles in adult prisons and that is a big problem.

Brigid Duffy: So that's, this is Brigid, that's the gap statute.

Elizabeth Florez: Right.

Brigid Duffy: That's, that's, that only applies if the person is...

Elizabeth Florez: Actually an adult.

Brigid Duffy: Actually 21.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh but I think, but we're still housing kids in adult jails, there's a whole pod in Clark County with like...

Elizabeth Florez: Right.

Leslie Bittleston: ...with kids.

Elizabeth Florez: But not [inaudible] had that statute.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, okay, so I have the wrong statute.

Brigid Duffy: That statute applies, so we're not putting adults, 21-year-olds, into juvenile detention.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh okay, so I, so I apologize. I have the wrong statute, so if you could help me which statute says that we put kids in adult jails.

Brigid Duffy: 62B, so.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Brigid Duffy: I don't know if it ever, if it uses the word adult jails but let me, hold on, I'm going to look it up unless Jennifer goes off the top of her head.

Jennifer Fraser: No, I can't think of a statute that says that they are. I know there's a statute that's specifically allows the juvenile to go in front of the court to be asked to be placed in juvenile detention but I don't, so I can find that.

Brigid Duffy: Yeah.

Leslie Bittleston: So, basically and I apologize and I'm not a lawyer, so that's probably why I have the wrong statute, so my apologies for that. But, really what the, the reauthorization of 2018 says is that juveniles is, and while they're juveniles are to be held in juvenile facilities, even if they are pending adult charges. That is the piece that we are noncompliant with.

Mike Whelihan: So, can you show us the language where it says that? This is Mike Whelihan for the record.

Leslie Bittleston: In the, in the, in the reauthorization?

Mike Whelihan: Yeah, I'd like to see the language where, you know, I like for other people to read what you're reading, so we can all be on the same page that, that's what it means.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. So, I did put some other attachments in, you know, the, so I have like the adult, adult inmate decision tree that was created by OJJDP that is attachment...

Kayla Landes: Mike, this is Kayla Landes. I'll send out an, I'll send out the e-mail with the revision.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, send [inaudible].

Kayla Landes: So, you can review, I'll send it to everybody, so that you can review it.

Leslie Bittleston: And also can you identify the section that they need to read.

Kayla Landes: Yes.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. So, I, I just provided just a few materials but Kayla is going to send out the, yes. That revision is, what is it, a few hundred pages long, so it's a lot of reading.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record again. So, even on page 12 on the bottom left corner, you have exceptions that are listed this, it says six-hour exception rural travel, conditions exceptions and conditions of safety exceptions and then it says removals of adult and just locked up. In addition, the court may determine after hearing and then writing on this, in the interest of justice to permit a juvenile to be detained in a jail or locked for adults or have psych sound context. So, it makes it sound like there's a hearing and it's okay.

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct but we do not do that in the state and also...

Mike Whelihan: We do, do that in the state, so they are hearings, kids are certified through the hearing process.

Leslie Bittleston: Every 30 days.

Mike Whelihan: Not, it doesn't say 30 days here.

Elizabeth Florez: It's on the next page, Mike. This is...

Mike Whelihan: Oh, it's on the next page?

Elizabeth Florez: Mike, if I may, when I read through this report and [inaudible] correct if I'm wrong is that, is that, there's nothing prohibiting children to start for, in an auto [ph] certification cases at the adult jail and then petition to come back to juvenile. My understanding is that in this scenario, they would have to start on the juvenile and there would have to be a petition for them to be moved to the adult. So, it would be a reverse of the current process. Is that the simplest way to put this Leslie?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes and also if we do put them in the adult jail, if you go on to page number 13 which I've highlighted, the court must hold a hearing at least every 30 days or 45, that would be urban areas, 45 for rural, to review all of these things which means every 30 to 30 days for urban and 45 for rural, the court would have to issue another court order addressing all seven of these things. So again, that's a big change for our court and number two, that puts the onus back on my office again to do all of these work, you know, I would have, I or a staff member would have to review every single one of these court orders to make sure it addresses 1 through 7, so there's two pieces here. We're not doing what the reauthorization says and we just don't have the staff to do this extra work. So, there's two pieces here.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record again. So it, it seems to me it's not illegal to hold a kid in a jail now, some of the processes are in place on the adult side of it and you don't have the staff to collect the data but it doesn't make it illegal.

Leslie Bittleston: No and I apologize. I didn't mean that it, it was supposed, I didn't mean to say it was illegal. I'm just saying that we are in violation with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act with the way that we do things now today.

Elizabeth Florez: Liz Florez for the record. Leslie, do you, when you sit on the national groups, do you have any understanding of what other states are doing relative to this requirement?

Leslie Bittleston: States do a variety of things. Some states just keep kids in juvenile detention, some states have built different facilities, you know, like a, like a Summit View website but those would be for the -- like a facility like that would have a separate area for the, the kids pending adult charges. So yeah, that's, that's kind of what they do. A lot of states have also raised the age, the minimum age from 18 to 22, 25, the state of Washington is 25, other states are up to 25. What that means is the, the juvenile facilities would have to hold these kids up to age, whatever the maximum age is but some facility, there are some states just hold kids in juvenile detentions, others have built facilities to match this population. And also I need to say another piece of this, girls, you know, girls are a problem because we don't have any place for girls in adult jail, so we are keeping them in juvenile detention or placing them out of state. So, those are the issues. I'm not, I don't have all the answers, I'm just presenting the problem.

Mike Whelihan: Well, Mike Whelihan for the record. So, I mean that the costs that would create for at least the bigger counties, Washoe, on ourselves, would be millions of dollars to retain all these kids in a facility, on a juvenile jail pending their outcomes because they'd be, they could be sitting out for two years, you know, before they're, they're finally, the disposition is made and then you got to wait for the jail bid to open and then the fact that they're, we don't know the true number of kids that would bring it to our facilities because they get, they get bailed out, they get, or they get things that they don't get in the juvenile side. So, every single kid with that charge would be here and, and unlike the adult system where they can be bailed out and go home. So, it's a lot of more than \$600,000, it, I mean it would be tough. It's, it, you know, that causes millions to retain those kids. We don't have the facilities.

Leslie Bittleston: Right.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez for the record. While Washoe, certainly our volume is distinct from Clark County, I echo a lot of the concerns and we've often been in the position of we don't receive formula grant funds directly in Washoe County. However, we attempt to compliance for purposes of, you know, we, we, we grasping at here too, a lot of, a lot of the elements and core strategy associated with the OJJDP requirements. However, the costs and that would be one where the costs would be something really difficult for us to absorb in some of those circumstances. Thankfully, we don't, again, don't have the volume that Clark County does. I, I'm curious, I know that there, in the past multiple sessions, there had been bills around this very thing and I believe there's actually a study that the state, there was a bill that passed at the state, they're supposed to be studying this right now, is that, are you involve in that Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: So, here's another complicated thing. Ross Armstrong when he was the administrator was going to do the study himself. Mr. Armstrong has since moved on and I have expressed to state leadership that I need a contract or somebody to do this work because, again, we have four-staff and one staff is full-time PREA, PBS and all of that and then two, one staff full time data, one staff full-time administrative assistant. I just, I have expressed that I just don't have the staff to do this work. So where is it now? Its' with DCFS leadership to figure out who's going to do the study.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record and this is the second session that bill has went through. So, this isn't the first time and I, I thought they were supposed to hire out this time, didn't they have some funding too and they're supposed to hire out to get contractor to do it and they're supposed to reach out to us to, I don't believe it's been started yet because no one has reached out to us yet.

Leslie Bittleston: Right, probably because there's no staff to, to get it started.

Elizabeth Florez: So, this is Liz Florez for the record. So, what you're, what is being, what's being discussed right now is, is like the hot potato that goes back and forth every session and the fact that the state doesn't have the resources available to do the study which is supposed to inform, you know, putting together a bill that would be, that would reflect all of the typical dialogue and debate that goes back and forth to ensure that the bill is crafted to, to, you know, after going through that vetting process. I feel like we're stuck. I, I'm not sure where to go with that, other than to perhaps put forward a recommendations again for, that this, that this be funded properly in order to do a study.

Leslie Bittleston: Right. Another and just, Madam Chair, just to also throw another caveat in there. OJJDP over the last five years has become more, what's a good word to use...

Mike Whelihan: Regulated?

Leslie Bittleston: Regulated, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Whelihan, regulated which has put a lot of more pressure on me and my office to maintain compliance with OJJDP rather than program managers reviewing our material, they now have legal minds reviewing material and their regulations are becoming much more complicated. And I'm not a lawyer and most of my counterparts in other states are not lawyers, we have this conversation on a national call just last week about how legally minded OJJDP has come and how doing this work has become harder for those of us because we are not lawyers. The reason I'm saying all of these is because there could be a conversation around opting out of this funding. If the state opts out of this funding, we do have a full-time staff person associated with this grant, so that would have to be funded with state general funds. And then other things like Clark County for example gets 130,000 a year out of the grant to help with their SARP and met programs. So, things like that would go away. I, I guess that's another piece, Madam Chair, that maybe up for discussion. I mean when you're thinking about the cost, you just said, somebody just said it's more than 600,000. So if we opt out of accepting the formula grant fund, then we are not held to these requirements.

Elizabeth Florez: Liz Florez for the record. Ms. Bittleston, in, in your, again because of Washoe County, we have not afforded ourselves a formula grant for many, many, many years. In, in the history that you know, has that ever occurred where we've opted out?

Leslie Bittleston: No, that has never occurred and one of the biggest reasons is and I don't have the history. I've only been in this position six and a half years but for some reason my position was always tied to the formula grant, so to pay, my position comes directly out of the formula grant. And Madam Chair and I have this discussion offline, that if the formula grant goes away and the state doesn't fund my position, I go away. So, there's that piece but there's also counties that received money like Clark County, Humboldt County, Pershing, excuse me, the 11th judicial receives money. We also fund our evidence-based resource center, our vendor in CJJ is one of our vendor. So, those things would all go away if we opted out but just for transparency, the state has discussed* opting out in the past due to these increased regulations. That's just been internally. I have not discussed it externally. And the reason I brought it up was due to the fact that somebody said -- I think it was Mr. Whelihan -- said it's going to cost a lot more than \$600,000. I'm not saying I have all the answers. I just want to present all of the information to this committee.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. So, is there a way to get a breakdown of where this formula and money goes to so we know before any decision is even discussed, like not being in compliance? So, we need to know where the money is going. And one my -- my suggestion too if it's getting that complicated and we opt to opt in maybe if you need another person to help you because if -- if we can't -- we can't collect on all these data either. So, there has to be someone to do it. And if you're talking on the adult side, maybe someone needs to have access to the adult system because none of the juvenile systems have that access. And so, when you ask us for stuff, we don't have it. We know you don't have it. So, we're not going to be in compliance with this anyways because we got to get -- or you have to, as a state, get a contract with NDOC and some of the local jails to get all that data --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Mike Whelihan: ... you know? And that's going to be time consuming if we get that. So, I feel your pain. And I would suggest asking for another staff to assist if we keep this grant because it went -- it increased \$200,000 from what you told us. So, the money is there when in effect any other current programs or anything is being funded. So, why not, you know, use another \$75,000 to fund another full-time position?

Unidentified Female: Yes.

Leslie Bittleston: Well, the grant just -- the grant does have some parameters around it. 66.6% of the grant does have to be sub granted out. And the reason that OJJDP does that is they do not want states funding positions out of the grant. That's just their deal. So, we would have to see if we even had enough funds to hire another position, you know. So -- I mean, my office needs more positions than just one because there's so many things that fall under my officer for -- for different reasons. But -- I mean that's a possibility. I can look at that. But just know that there are parameters around the grant and we may not be able to fund our position out of it.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. So, could you use \$222,000 based on what the math you just game me with the increase. I don't know [inaudible] staffing.

Leslie Bittleston: Well, if you look at -- well, if you look at -- I would have to subgrant more money out. So, if you look at \$600,000 --

Mike Whelihan: Well, you said 63% if it has to be sub granted out on that. So, that would leave the remainder that doesn't have to be sub granted out to be \$222,000. So ---

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, so, yeah. In my --

Mike Whelihan: Unless you make a lot of money.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. So, I have to look. I have to look and see what we can do. So, again, like I just said, OJJDP has come very heavily regulated, and they may trash an idea. I don't know. So, it's -- it's an ask, can we fund the position to take this work?

Mike Whelihan: I'd like to see you get help because --

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah.

Mike Whelihan: ... it's ridiculous. I'm going to be honest, Leslie. I know you work hard and we get frustrated with you, but you rely on us for things that we can't even do ourselves, you know, and then you're -- you need it and then, you know, then we're -- we're in a circle of who's going to get it and no one can.

Leslie Bittleston: Mm-hm.

Mike Whelihan: Then we're out of compliance, we all look bad, it's -- it makes it tough.

Leslie Bittleston: Mm-hm.

Elizabeth Florez: So, this is Liz Florez for the record. When I look through the agenda, item number -- subitem number three, Executive Order versus state statute. Is that -- is that related to --

Leslie Bittleston: That, Madam Chair, if I can answer that question. So, as I said earlier, the state has participated in OJJ -- excuse me -- the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act since the '80s, '90s, some time. The state has never codified any of the language of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act into state statute. So, all of the work that my office has done historically has been done via Governor's Executive Order. Where that has become problematic is part of our requirements are to go into the adult jails, the adult lockups, and a lockup to OJJDP is a court house with holding cells. That is considered a lockup. We struggle with some of these adult facilities. They don't want us there. They don't know why we're there. They don't think they need to comply because they don't see juveniles. But it is part of our job. So, this is a question that is the Executive Order enough or do we really need to put some -- some language in state statute to allow for the monitoring that is required to maintain compliance with OJJDP.

Elizabeth Florez: So, this is Liz Florez. I -- I want to make sure I'm understanding. So, this -- this conversation has to happen in conjunction with the other because we were just talking about whether or not the OJJDP funding is worth it.

Leslie Bittleston: Mm-hm. Right.

Elizabeth Florez: If in fact it requires us to expend far more than what we're getting and then this is related to actually putting into our statute, which would then bind us to all of it, even if we weren't receive -- if in the future we weren't going to be receiving these funds and opted out. So, I don't see -- so, is this -- this is just such a large discussion and I know -- I know, Leslie, you've indicated that there was -- that this is going to be a very [meaty weighty] manner and I feel like it's really difficult because we don't have the information from the study that is supposed to have been taking place, not once but now twice, and we come back to the same situation where due to lack of resource we're unable to answer some of these questions. So, I'm -- I'd like to just open this up for conversation. I -- I don't even know if we're able to take action on this when I'm looking at the agenda for possible action.

Leslie Bittleston: No. I -- I knew that this was a large conversation. So, I just put it for conversation. Depending on what the committee would like to do for the next meeting, I could be a little more targeted on the agenda.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. Now that we're talking adult jails and prisons and all that stuff and making mandates coming from this committee for them, I -- I don't know how much we will be able to get passed if they're not part of this conversation. Brigid is more of an expert in legislation than I am. So, maybe Brigid?

Brigid Duffy: I -- this is Brigid for the record. I don't -- I -- really get \$600,000, like I know. That's -- that's what I keep coming back to, like this is a lot and I -- I really like what Liz had asked earlier is, what do other states doing? Are there -- are there large like similarly situated jurisdictions like we are with the rurals and the urbans that -- that opt into this for \$600,000 because now you are talking about like -- I mean it's -- it's -- going into the adult system, none of us have that ability. I mean maybe I do, but -- and Mike is right. We're gonna need some changes to statutes. But I just would like -- be interested to see, is

this something that like really small jurisdictions we're getting? Does it have to be statewide? Is it -- like I don't -- because this is a lot of work for little money.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And to answer -- to answer your questions, OJJDP has lost some states. There are states that are starting to opt out, especially the smaller jurisdictions. Wyoming is an example. Another state, I think it's -- is it Minnesota or -- maybe not Minnesota -- Michigan -- I don't know. But yes, states are starting to opt out of the funding. Some of the larger states get a lot more money than we do. California, for example, gets like close to \$2 million, but that's based on population. So -- but some states, to be perfectly honest, are very far ahead of Nevada and what they've done with their juvenile system. So, for them, it's not even a problem. They've already been doing this. So, I don't know how to answer that other than some states are opting out. Some states are ahead of us. And some states already meet the requirements.

Elizabeth Florez: So, to Ms. Duffy -- this is Liz Florez for the record. To Ms. Duffy's point, I think it would be helpful to this group if I may direct you, Leslie, to provide for us what some of those things are in writing because I think going forward, especially at the level of the JJOC, there -- that question will come up and I'd like to provide something in writing potentially to answer that question as well as if I could direct you following up on a previous discussion point where Mr. Whelihan had asked for more specific to OJJ --

Leslie Bittleston: [Inaudible].

Elizabeth Florez: ... the regulations. I know you had -- I know on the record you had already directed Kayla to do that, but I didn't know if officially I had to do that on record. Because I think we're going to need all those information points to at least begin to understand the breadth of this lift. It's -- it's -- it's massive. And just in having observed last legislative session surrounding certification, there is always a massive debate around this very subject. And if we were to embrace and move forward with the OJJDP regulations, it will -- the cost will be -- I can't even imagine the price tag across the state for coming into compliance with this. And just seeing how slowly some of those things move, if on the other end it's to save 600 -- or to get \$600,000, I just don't know -- I just don't know how far we're gonna get with that. I appreciate you bringing this forward. We are -- we need to be informed about what the OJJDP is requiring. And I know you've been warning us at NAJJA for a little while about this, Leslie, and the -- the bell has rung on it. So, thank you for bringing those items forward. Is there anything else you wanted to report on agenda item number 7?

Leslie Bittleston: No, Madam Chair. That was it.

Elizabeth Florez: Is there any further discussion on item seven from anybody?

Brigid Duffy: So, this is Brigid. Leslie asked if at the next meeting she -- we wanted her to kind of narrow down some things. I -- I -- what I hear -- what I heard her say -- I believe I heard her say is that some of these are just process changes to getting to compliance, such as the hearings every 30 days. So, I'm not saying we can't have juveniles in adult facilities, but there had to be these 30-day hearings and seven factors that need to be looked at and, you know, educating the -- both adult and juvenile -- from what I'm reading -- that they can only be held there for 180 days unless the court does something else. So, really, just kinda of breaking down what is just a process change versus what is like just, I guess, a statutory change because right now our statute -- and thank you, Jen, she put it into our chat -- allows

children to petition to stay in -- in the juvenile detention facility and the courts here have done so. But -- so it's not a complete -- we -- they can go back and forth.

Elizabeth Florez: Mm-hm.

Brigid Duffy: But you know, just I think Leslie just kinda of saying like in these areas, this is just a process change. We have to educate and it's gonna take staff to do that and this is, you know, it would -- we need another staff to do it, so then we decide whether or not it's worth \$600,000.

Leslie Bittleston: And just to respond to that, part of -- I'm not an attorney. So, part of it I may not understand if it is a statute change or a process change. You know, I -- thank you, Jennifer Fraser, for the information on the actual statute. But I think the court pieces, my understanding, are process, right? But the statute would be changing the statute to say we're not allowing kids in adult jails or whatever, I don't know what it needs to say, but -- so there's really two changes, right, the statute change and a process change?

Brigid Duffy: So, I have a question. This is Brigid again. Where's the attorney general's office, like are they not helping break this down for -- they represent you, alright?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And -- and I need to -- and I've asked her some questions. But you know, there's -- I don't -- I don't know how to say this nicely. There's always a back and forth like this, state and feds. The state doesn't want to make a federal determination and the feds don't want to make a state determination. So, I'm stuck in the middle trying to figure out what the heck to do.

Brigid Duffy: I -- I would -- this is Brigid again for the record. I think it would be important because we have the deputy attorney generals who represent DCFS being able to assist you all in determining --

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: ... legal issues around this. Not to say that, you know, I couldn't, Jen couldn't, like we could, but I mean ultimately this is the state oversight of all of this. And so, I -- it's hard for me to tell you how I think you should do your job under the statute when you're represented by the Attorney General's Office.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. Okay. I took all those notes. Thank you.

Jennifer Fraser: Hi. This is Jennifer Fraser for the record. And just to echo off of what Ms. Duffy has said, is I -- there's a lot of discussion about what the cost would be and is it worth it, but I -- I would like more of a breakdown of, like you said, like the staffing issue cost. Mr. Whelihan said like the breakdown of the grants and what we're looking out there and also the breakdown of like cost of the detention facilities or adult facilities. I don't know if we're gonna be able to get that. I know that was the whole point of the study, I think to give us more information about that, but there's a lot of nuisances here and it isn't just a binary decision of they must all be either in detention or adult facilities. There are ways where, you know, the court hearing would still allow certain offenders to be in there. Just because a child was certified doesn't mean that he wouldn't then be entitled to an OR release or bail release where that child should be considered in. So, we would have to look at numbers of like how many kids were certified or drop file and then look at that and understand that model that would be locked up during the [sentencing] of their case. Also there are the exceptions like -- I would imagine like the murder cases that some would take longer, but a lot of the robbery [inaudible] negotiate within, you know, and they're

sentenced within four to six months. So, the two years are the outliers and I don't wanna be making decisions on the outlier. So, I just -- I think we would all need more information about that.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz Florez for the record. I -- Ms. Fraser, I think what you're describing is what was supposed to happen during that study.

Jennifer Fraser: Yeah, I know.

Elizabeth Florez: It was a collection of all of that. And so -- and that's what -- what Ms. Bittleston is saying that she doesn't have the capacity to do. And I am curious I -- Mr. Whelihan, [inaudible] there were -- there was an allocation associated with that, and I thought so too. So, it'll be interesting to know -- to follow up on that and figure out what happened with that.

Leslie Bittleston: Madam Chair, this is --

Jennifer Fraser: Yeah. Maybe this -- oh, I'm sorry. Just -- our discussion today could highlight why that study is so important and the specific that need to make these present decisions.

Leslie Bittleston: And Madam Chair, would you please remind me of the study -- of the bill draft related to the bill for that study? I will escalate it.

Elizabeth Florez: If you give me a moment, I will look. It's SP3 something.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Great.

Elizabeth Florez: That narrows it down, 356 and 65, I'm not sure. I will -- I will look.

Leslie Bittleston: It's okay. Yeah. If you could -- if you find it and send me just a quick email, I will escalate it up to DCFS chain to find out what is going on.

Elizabeth Florez: I believe -- this is Liz Florez for the record. I believe it's SB357.

Leslie Bittleston: 357.

Elizabeth Florez: SB357 is a system to target expenses related to the housing of youthful offenders. And then SB356 provides further study of certain issues relating to the housing of youthful offenders. And then SB398 actually requires the JJOC to track and report expenses on housing juveniles.

Leslie Bittleston: We can only do that for juvenile facilities. I don't have any access to any adult data.

Elizabeth Florez: Mm-hm.

Leslie Bittleston: So, the other piece that I don't have access to is the number of direct files. I only have certifications that I get from the counties. I still don't know how to get direct file data.

Elizabeth Florez: And this is Liz. For Washoe County, direct file, we don't have a standardized system. But because we're small enough, at the end of every year or the beginning of a new year, I contact our

local jail and they send me that information, but that's not -- I mean I can't imagine for Clark County if that's easy to do, but -- and it's not a perfect system. So, you're right. That's another barrier.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. I just -- anything related to the moving kids past the juvenile system is -- is beyond my reach for data.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. So, thank you for that robust discussion. Because -- because there's no possible action taken for that, however, Ms. Bittleston, we've -- the committee members and I have asked for you to do --

Leslie Bittleston: [Inaudible] information.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes. So, we'll proceed in that way and -- and have further conversation. Hopefully, at that time, you will -- during that time, you will be able to communicate with the AG -- Brigid brings up excellent point --

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: ... to further guide this work. Okay. Moving on to agenda item number eight, new business. At this point, we can open it up for discussion if there's any new business. Okay. I do not have any further assignments because I believe that the holder of most of the information is the state as we move forward. So, I will not be assigning any tasks. And the next agenda item is to confirm our next meeting date and time. I think because we missed a couple of meetings I've forgotten how often we meet. Is it every other month or monthly?

Leslie Bittleston: Madam Chair, it -- when we were meeting -- when we were doing active work, we were meeting monthly.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. So, Ms. Bittleston, does one month give you enough time to compile this information? There's quite a bit that we've given you.

Leslie Bittleston: Madam Chair, I believe I can get a lot of it done. I should have an answer from DCFS leadership on where we are with SB356 and SB357. I can have a grant breakdown. I can -- and then hopefully some information from the [DAG]. So, I think I can provide some -- some information.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan. Why don't we do six weeks since it's a short month?

Leslie Bittleston: Perfect.

Unidentified Female: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. So, Ms. Landes or Ms. Bittleston, do you have a calendar that you may be able to propose a date so we can work our schedules?

Kayla Landes: I am looking at it right now. Six weeks from now would be April 12.

Elizabeth Florez: Wow.

Brigid Duffy: April?

Kayla Landes: Oh, I'm so sorry. We're in February. [Inaudible]. I'm sorry. I'm -- yeah. I'm crazy. March 8 or March 15.

Elizabeth Florez: One, two, three, four, five, six, okay. So --

Brigid Duffy: I could only -- this is Brigid. I could only do the 15th in the afternoon because we have a [CSET] coalition in the morning or I could do the 22nd any time because I'm wide open the following Tuesday.

Elizabeth Florez: Ms. Fraser, what does your 15th look like in the afternoon?

Jennifer Fraser: I -- I could do that. I'm at court, but I can get that covered.

Elizabeth Florez: And Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: I am good from 2 o'clock on -- on the 15th in the afternoon.

Elizabeth Florez: So -- and Mr. Whelihan, you've been very helpful. I know you're not a voting member, but at 2 o'clock on the 15th, are you available?

Mike Whelihan: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. So, why don't we schedule for March 15, which is a Tuesday, at 2:00 pm.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. For 90 minutes?

Elizabeth Florez: Ninety minutes, please.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. So, the next agenda item is public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment? Seeing none, we will move on to item number 10, which is adjournment. I thank everybody for your time today and look forward to our next meeting. There he is.

Leslie Bittleston: Not often referred to as helpful.

Mike Whelihan: Nice. It is --

Leslie Bittleston: Hold on to that, Mike. Hold on to that.

Mike Whelihan: Did you say there it is?

Leslie Bittleston: It's a good day. It's a good day.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you everybody. Bye-bye.

Leslie Bittleston: Bye.

Mike Whelihan: Bye.

[end of meeting]