

Steve Sisolak
Governor



Richard Whitley, MS
Director

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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



Ross Armstrong
Administrator

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
State Advisory Group Planning
Committee Meeting
May 27th, 2021 at 11:00 am**

Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

Chair Pauline Pauline Salla-Smith called meeting to order at 11:00 am.

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

(VOTING MEMBERS)

Present in Person: None

Present by Phone: Pauline Salla-Smith (Chair), Jennifer Fraser, Jessica Velazquez, Paula Smith, Jacquelynn Nadar

Absent: Joey Orduna-Hastings, Rebekah Graham, Jack Martin, Jeremy Setters

(NON VOTING MEMBERS)

Present in Person: None

Present by Phone: Eric Smith, Heather Plager, Christine Eckles

(PUBLIC)

Present in Person: Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Dunn

Present by Phone: Lexie Beck – Youth Move

Meeting Minutes:

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: So, I'm just going to do some housekeeping here real quick. We'll see if someone else joins us. Agenda item number eight for our new data request for the use of force data monthly template. Can we move that to the full oversight commission? Because I think we're going to have to have a lot of discussion on that.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I'm still waiting from a couple of the detention centers to give me some feedback, but I think I'd like to take it under the SAG to the full commission.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. And Madam Chair, Jessica Velasquez just joined. So, we do have quorum.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: We have a quorum?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, ma'am.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Perfect. All right. So, let's move to public comment. Is there any public comment? Seeing none, let's move to the approval of the April 29, 2021, minutes. Hopefully everybody had a chance to review them. And if so, I will entertain a motion.

JENNIFER FRASER: I'll move to approve the minutes.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Thank you. Is there a second?

PAULA SMITH: Approved for a second to pass them.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion or corrections? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Any opposed? All right. Minutes are approved as is. Let's move to agenda item number five, COVID-19 data update. This is just a standing item we have. It's attachment 5A here on the DCFS website. Leslie, do you want to address this?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Yes. And just as Madam Chair stated, this is a standing update at the request of the JJ AOC co-chairs that this data be reported. For this particular meeting, this data is up through March 31, 2021. And this is just testing data. We are not seeing many new COVID-19 positives among staff or youth. So, I'm just keeping a running tab of positive data from May of last year through March of this year. So, as of right now, or March 31st, there has been a total of 1,334 youth tests given, 63 positives for a 4.72% positivity rate. And as you can see, the positivity rate for last, last month -- wait a minute. I think I messed up. This is through April of 2021. My apologies. I mislabeled table one. March of 2021 was 4.91% and April, we are down to 4.72% for a 4% decrease. For staff, there has been a total number of 1,168 staff tests with 103 positives for an 8.82% positivity rate. And we are down just slightly from last month. So, my apologies for the misprint. This data is through April. And that is it, Madam Chair, for that agenda item.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Thank you. Any questions on that? Clearly staff are testing higher than our youth are. All right. Let's move to agenda item number six, formula grant and compliance update. Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: This is attachment --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: This is an update -- 6A.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, to let the group know that OJJDP, our federal partners, have released the FY21 formula grant solicitation and the compliance monitoring tool. They released those both on the same date, which is May 14th of this year. It is roughly three months late. Normally, this data and the formula grant solicitation is due by either the end of February or the end of March. So, this is a little bit late. So, but it has been released. With that being said, I am currently working on the grant and the compliance data submission. Excuse me. Our formula funds are still frozen. What that means is we've been dealing with frozen funds. We are going on our fourth year. So, with that being said, I propose to keep the same funding levels as the last two years, which is your attachment 6.A. So, part of the formula grant is

supposed to be sub-granted out to community partners. It could be non-profits, units of local government. So, this is the same funding that we have provided over the last couple of years. However, what you will see on this attachment is, if you are looking at it, in column E. This is the same level of funding that we have provided over the last two years to the same grantees. It is estimated that the state of Nevada will receive a higher grant amount from the federal government this year. We received \$411,000 in FY19. In FY20, we received roughly \$500,000. And in FY21, we are expected to receive \$600,000. With that being said, we do have to increase the amount of funds that we provide to our sub-grantees. So, this is one proposal. We can either keep the same amount, which you find in column E. Or we can up the amount by roughly 40% for each of the sub-grants, which you will find in column H. And that would be more in line with the \$600,000 allotment that the state would get. If we choose option A, which is keeping column E the same as it is, what that means is that the state will have to do a request for proposal for that overage, that additional funding, which would be roughly 103 to 3000. Since our grant funds are frozen currently, that is the reason why I'm proposing that we just up the current sub-grantees by 40%, because they have had the same funding over the last few years. So, and the only thing that I don't know with increasing each of the sub-grantees is I do know that the city of Las Vegas, Clark County Social Services, and NCJJ would greatly benefit from the funding. I am not sure about the 11th judicial or the 6th judicial. The 6th judicial is represented here today. So, she can speak for herself on that one. But that's kind of what I'm proposing, only because we are still in frozen funds. And I just think it would be a waste of time to do an RFP when we just can't guarantee the funds until a later date. So, that's kind of why I was proposing to up the amount. So, that is for discussion, Madam Chair.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Members? Thoughts, questions? Anything? Okay. Well, I have a question. A couple actually. A.) Can we do that? Can we do that? If it's additional funding?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: That I don't know. I believe we can keep it the same. I am not --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yes, we can. We can keep them flat funded.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. I am not sure if we can do that. I mean, I'd rather ask for forgiveness than permission, but, yeah.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: **Yeah.** That's with federal funds though, and I won't even ask for a vote on this, because I think your DAG needs to weigh in on it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Because flat funding's okay with the federal government. I'm not sure additional funding is okay. I mean, anytime we got additional funding, we had an RFP that amount out. And yeah, it's frozen. If it's a three-year grant, maybe you hold that additional funding for a year and see if it gets unfrozen and then RFP it out, cause that is a lot of work to do for frozen funds.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: M-hmm.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: But yeah, I don't -- I'm not sure that's legal for us to do with additional funding.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: And then, my other question is, on page -- okay. So, I don't know if this just looks weird on mine. But where it says, like, where you have the \$600,000, increase each award by 40%?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: And the formula 2021-06, that's me, right?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Formula dash --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: On the bottom?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh, the formula grant number. So, formula 01 is city of Las Vegas.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Right.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: 02 was Clark County, 03 is Clark County, 6th judicial is 04, and CJJ is 05, and 11th judicial is 06.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. So, I'm 04.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I used to be 06. Okay. Cause I was like, yeah, that number doesn't match even what I'm currently getting.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: So, I was confused.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It's 04.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Yeah. I think that -- yeah. I mean, I wouldn't feel comfortable asking the members for a vote, just because I'm not sure it's legal.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. But I think for the sake of where we are today, we will, at a minimum, keep the base funding. What I may have to do, like you said, is I may have to do an RFP for those additional funds. But I think it's just a lot of work to just, for frozen funds, when I don't know when it's going to be freed.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah. I think -- and I agree. I mean, I wouldn't do an RFP for those additional funds for Humboldt, just because that is a lot of work and we haven't seen any funding for years. So, I do think -- it's a three-year period though for the grant cycle. So, you have the ability to hold it the first year, RFP it out the second year, and then they can finish it out the third year.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: If it's unfrozen. Then people, you know, then other agencies are -- I mean, I can live on what I get currently and provide our programming here. So, I think there's some flexibility how you can hold that for at least a year to see if it gets unfrozen.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. And with that being said, so, just to let the members know that the flat funding will continue, and then we will look at an RFP later for those additional funds.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: And the formula grant going back up to \$600,000, that was the minimum for years and years and years was \$600,000.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Then, it got cut when the first crash happened. And --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: So, I think they're just -- they put it up to the minimum funding now.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And we're still fighting to get the Juvenile Accountability Block grant back. That went away, I believe, 2014.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: No. That went away --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: 13?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: -- that went away 2000 and --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh. Anyway, we're still fighting --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: The JAB. Yeah.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah, we're trying to get --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: JAB's been gone for a long time.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: -- that back.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: JAB's been gone.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, anyway. So, that's where we are on those. So, I will provide an update at the next SAG of where we are. But just to let you know that those have been released. I'm working on them, and we're moving forward, but our grant funds are still frozen.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Any questions members? And then, Leslie, you'll -- and maybe check with your DAG.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Yes, I will. And I'll also doublecheck with our program manager with OJJDP about that as well --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: -- because they may have some information that I don't know.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Thank you.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yup.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: All right. Let's move to agenda item seven, resource center project. This is attachment 7A.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. A few months back, or a few meetings or maybe one or two meetings back, I discussed some funding that came available through the national -- actually through the research --

through the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court judges. So, a subsidiary of NCJFCJ had some excess funding of roughly \$66,000. And what that funding is for, is to help provide services to states to build up their capacity in a variety of ways. So, we, DCFS, currently contract with the National Center for Juvenile Justice, NCJJ, which is another subsidiary of NCJFCJ. They are our juvenile justice evidence -- or excuse me -- juvenile justice resource center vendor. So, we have been contracted with them for the last roughly four years. And so, they provide resources for us on our website. So, Andrew, our contact at NCJJ, reached out to me and said, "Hey, there's this excess funding available, roughly \$66,000. We can, you know, apply for that and see if Nevada gets awarded those funds." And then NCJJ would provide some additional assistance to us. So, I applied for it. I worked with NCJJ's staff to talk about some of the weak areas in Nevada across the board. So, if you look at attachment 7A, on the second page under proposed technical assistance introduction, you will see a number one, a number two, and a number three. So, those are the areas that NCJJ will work with the state, because we did get awarded those \$66,000, which will go directly to NCJJ. So, they will provide virtual training to probation departments or court professionals on case planning strategies including using SMART goals. They will provide research on existing quality assurance tools to help us determine if programs that probation departments are using our evidence-based or evidence-informed or promising to meet our requirements. And then lastly, they will provide materials regarding case management, SMART goals, and other things on the website to include six newsletters and four training videos, which will be on the website. So, I just wanted to update you and let you know that we did receive that \$66,000 funding. And for that, our resource center vendor will be doing these three items. I will be meeting with them soon to get this started, and we'll provide updates as needed. So, this is just an update that that's happening very soon.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Members? Any questions? Hi, Joey.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Hi, Joey. I don't think she can hear us yet.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Can't hear us. Is she texting us? Did she put something in the chat?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It says connecting.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: She texted me. Hold on.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Let me see what it says. Sound's not working. I can't hear you, and you can't hear me. Aw, that makes me sad, Joey. I was going to say, maybe reconnect.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Or she should --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: The chat on Zoom is disabled.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: She says the chat on Zoom is disabled. Oh, it is disabled.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: How's that?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Kayla -- the host --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Kayla?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: The host can probably do that.

KAYLA DUNN: I am looking. Sorry.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: You're good.

KAYLA DUNN: Is it fixed now?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Let me see. No, mine says chat disabled.

KAYLA DUNN: Hm. All right.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I'm going -- she's going to log off and then log -- oh, now the chat is working.

KAYLA DUNN: I'm sorry. I don't know why it was like that. It usually is always enabled.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah. Now it's working. She's going to log on and then log back off. Members? Any comments or, or anyone on this meeting, any thoughts, comments, questions? You good? Leslie, so the existing quality assurance tools, if we're using evidence-based programming, aren't they attached to that curriculum already?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I think one of the things that we talked about when I met with them to apply for this funding, was how do we, DCFS, or how would I determine if something that you are using in your department is evidence-based? I mean, what is that criteria? That's what I'm asking them to do. And I think what they mean by research existing is to see what existing tools are out there in the domain.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: M-hmm.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, that's kind of what that means.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. I guess we can get some clarification as we go there, because if we're using evidence-based curriculum, there's usually quality assurance piece to ensure we're, you know, staying true to the fidelity of it. That's attached to those. Now, if people are using other programming that they want, that may not be classified as evidence-based, and they want to see if it's effective, that's a several-year-long process. So, I'm just trying to figure out what they're doing.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: Pauline, this is Christine Eckles. Isn't there also a bill where DCFS will be doing an interim study about evidence-based programming in the facilities?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yes.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: How does this work with that?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I think it's 385. I would think that NCJJ is going to work with DCFS on that interim study. I could be wrong, but Leslie --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And I think it's -- I think it's a little bit different, Christine. I think it's -- I'm looking -- so, when the -- let me back up. AB472 has kind of two different pieces of quality assurance. It's kind of how we're doing in the facilities, but the second piece, kind of that I'm talking about with the resource center, is how to look at those kids on supervision, on community supervision. So, I think we're looking at two different things, but that doesn't mean that we can't look at that bill with our vendor and see how best to do that. So, I hope that helps. I know that was as clear as mud.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: Yeah, that's helpful. Thank you.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yep.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Any other questions? Okay. And the other thing is, Leslie, is the, like, the SMART goals and the case management, is it going to be tied to our YLS? Like, are they going to follow the same concepts and training that we're all using for our YLS?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, I have not yet met with them. We just got approved this about a week ago. So, when I do meet with them, I will be providing them our YLS and our case plan so they know kind of our templates. I think the biggest piece is really to help us -- and I don't know about your probation departments, but I can tell you on the DCFS side that our PO's are struggling with wording objectives. They're struggling with wording the activities. They just don't have a solid foundation to how to do that. So, that's part of the reason why we said we need some help in this area. But yes, I will be providing that information to them.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay, good. Yeah. Just so we're really staying on task of what we've been trained to do and the tools we're using. One of the things we started doing here, and I'm not quite sure I'm at the point of where I want to share it yet, but I'll probably get to that point, is that when the PO's are doing case plans and they have a really amazing SMART goal that just, like, nailed it and in what domain it was, then we're making, like, a spreadsheet of those and the activities that go along with it that's tied to our service matrix. Just so, like, new PO's or if we need, you know, someone can't think of a good SMART goal that they can still individualize it. But if it's in a certain domain and it's tied to our service matrix, that we just keep a running log of those. So, I mean, it's been effective for us and we just keep adding to it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. We're good on that one? I don't know where Joey went. All right. Let's move -- so, as I mentioned in the beginning, agenda item number eight -- and we can talk about it. We can do a brief talk about it here, but so, we took it to NAJA for the use of force template, like our monthly report on use of forces in our detention centers. We took it to NAJA. At that point, we had some good discussion at NAJA regarding it. There are some concerns, just about the intent of the data collection, as well as ensuring that we're defining what the oversight commission is specifically looking for. There seems to be -- you know, there's some differences between what was on the template about physical restraints and then some of the jurisdictions, depending on what behavior modification program they're utilizing, which is usually the physical restraints and the mechanical restraints piece of it. So, I do think that it needs to be a broader conversation than this commission, then this committee. And I am -- I really want NAJA's feedback on it and for those jurisdictions that operate a detention center. I think it's really important. And I don't know, Leslie, if the state facilities have already -- you guys use PBIS, so that's already been defined.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: M-hmm.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: But we just -- I just think we need more discussion before we vote on it here.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: With that being said -- excuse me. Madam Chair, I will put this on the agenda for the commission under you to present. So, I'll just put it under the SAG committee discussion, so. And we will add the attachment as well.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Thank you. And I'll have a summary to present just from feedback from the jurisdiction. So, you know, we can all share that. All right. Questions on that? Good? Agenda item

number nine is our legislative items. You guys have an update on the legislative bills. I think it was most recently updated on 5/17. I haven't updated it since then.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. And for the attachment, Madam Chair, I just took your latest email, which was more up to date, so it's -- and I just copied and pasted that. So that's the attachment I provided to the group today.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Let's see. What attachment is it?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It is attachment 9.A.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Really? I don't have 9.A.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: You don't?

UNIDENTIFIED: I don't see it either.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh, dear.

KAYLA DUNN: What's the name of it?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: It's attachment 9.A, Kayla, in the --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Legislative item.

KAYLA DUNN: Yeah, I'm sorry. It's not labeled, but it is in there. It's 2021 legislative bill. I'm sorry. It just doesn't --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Oh, I see it.

KAYLA DUNN: -- say 9.A.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I see it. Got it. Got it. Got it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Sorry.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Yeah, this is the most -- one of the things on the summary is that, if there's an amendment or if it's been enrolled and signed by the governor, then the link will take you to that on the legislative website. There're several bills that we've been tracking. If they're highlighted blue, that means that they didn't meet the deadlines and there's no further action on it. But I don't know if anybody has a particular bill or legislation that they would like to discuss. NAJA's been tracking these closely too. There's been testimony and written testimony submitted, either in support, opposition, or neutral. There are some that -- some of them seem a little duplicative, but we sometimes get that in legislative sessions. So, I don't know if there's any specific ones we want to talk about. SB108 is really the youth legislative commissions bill that focuses on training for disparate treatment, which is important for our commission and all of us. So, that one is -- that one's a bit duplicative too, because, maybe not for our detention staff, but post requires training and implicit bias and juvenile standards have cultural competency. So, I don't think that there's anything new in that one that's going to really affect us or be an unfunded mandate. It does include court employees too in the juvenile system. So, might be unfunded mandates for some other agencies, but not us. What do you guys think? Is there any that you want to talk about? Christine, you follow legislation too. Is there one that you think would have good discussion here today?

CHRISTINE ECKLES: No, I've just been following closely SB21, which, you know, creates the background investigation. And they took out the part about the applicant and the weighing test. And then Ross told me that they would be correcting that in SB108. So, I've been -- I'm waiting to read that. I don't know if something's come up, but -- I don't know what he meant by that, but -- it does, you know, put some limitations with SB21, and the DUI is probably the biggest factor we will immediately, if that goes into effect, lose an employee. And that they can't work with kids while -- after they have had the offense. So, that will limit a lot of the smaller jurisdictions that don't have a lot of staff if that staff immediately can't work with any kids.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Right.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: But most of the offenses, I totally agree with. It's just that one for me.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah. Yeah, the DUI one does seem to be the sticking point for most of us.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: Right.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Not that it's okay to get a DUI.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: No. It's not.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah. There is the one that, AB158, is the one that made changes to our youth who get a minor in consumption or a minor in possession. And actually, we did a filming for PBS this morning for juvenile justice reform, and really it's, you know, the first and second offense cannot be considered a delinquent offense. We can do informal probation, but not make it a delinquent offense. So, my thoughts is that sometimes, for those of us who are the agency who provides the most direct services to kids, including groups and paying for counseling and paying for evaluations, I think that when we start making first or second blanket state -- like, first offense, second offense blanket statements like that, it really goes against our choice to use a validated need and risk assessment to determine what the needs of the kids are and what the risks of the youth are. So, I'm torn on that one. But I guess we'll see how that plays out. And, yeah, we'll see how that one goes. But that does take us back, I think, to prior to using a validated risk assessment to determine what can happen with youth. So, I feel like that one took us backwards a little bit. Larger jurisdictions probably don't have that same concern, but we do here. Because if the kids aren't with us, we can't pay for services. So, that eliminates -- that provides -- then that's a responsivity factor of being able to access counseling.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And one that I've been watching myself, I believe it's -- is it SB317? Is that the one? So, Senator Orangehall requested a report from DCFS and I'm not sure if that's the right bill.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: This is the one that provides back pay?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Oh, nope. That's not the right one then. I'm sorry. I don't remember the actual number of it, but what it is, is it -- Senator Orangehall requested a report from DCFS on the progress of the juvenile justice oversight commission, in regards to the current strategic plan to see if the JJOC needs a bill or help or something around that. So, there is a bill that we've been monitoring. I've been involved in a couple of hearings about it, and it seems to be going through, but like I said, I can't remember the number of it off the top of my head.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Is it SB365? Is it through the legislative committee on child welfare and juvenile justice?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. It's 365 then. Thank you. So, that's been the one on mine, just because it's another report provided by DCFS. But it does relate to this commission and the work of this commission.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Is that the one that focuses on blended sentencing pretty much?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: I think --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Like, the interim study for youthful offenders?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. And it also is about, you know, look -- and it also kind of ties into looking at the incompetency piece of juveniles and the housing of juveniles in Lovelock. And so, it's kind of a very multifaceted bill. And it kind of touches pieces of other bills too. So, yeah. So, there's that one that I've been watching. And what I don't understand, and maybe, and this is just a general comment, is there's a lot of bills, like you said, that overlap and that are repetitive with each other. So, that's been kind of hard to navigate, you know, looking at, "Okay, this touches this bill, this bill, and this bill." So.

JENNIFER FRASER: I've been following the AB230, and that's the direct file bill. So, we'll see what happens with that.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Thanks, Jennifer. Do you think that, that one's going to go through?

JENNIFER FRASER: I think --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: And written?

JENNIFER FRASER: I think so, but I -- you never know.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yeah.

JENNIFER FRASER: It's crazy, so I don't know.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: You don't even know at like 11:59 on the last day, because they just pass things right through.

JENNIFER FRASER: Yeah.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Or modify. That's how --

JENNIFER FRASER: But I know that'll affect our jurisdiction more than others, like, you know, so.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Any other questions, thoughts? And as I update it, I'll send it to Leslie. I usually try to do it on Fridays or Mondays. And this week has just not been conducive to that. All right. Kayla, just cause I'm going to have to bug out here pretty soon, on SB107, which is our next agenda item 10. Is there any data or information that you would like to point out to us or have us look at?

KAYLA LANDES: Nope, it was --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: It seems that we're just staying -- I mean, we're either decreasing or -- we're not increasing.

KAYLA LANDES: Exactly. I think the numbers decreased by 30 for detention. And then by, like, 10 or so for the state institution. So, yeah, it's staying pretty consistent.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Good. That's what we -- we want it to decrease, right? And at a minimum we don't want to see a large increase. But then again, we have to still be aware that COVID helped the decrease, and I'm not sure about everybody else, but we're definitely seeing an uptick in referrals and bookings. And for some serious charges too. So, our SB107 data might start looking a little different, and we'll have to drill down on that. All right. Thank you, Kayla.

KAYLA LANDES: Sure.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. Let's do our next meeting, we need to decide if we want to continue Zoom for our SAG committee. What are you guys' thoughts? Love Zoom, hate Zoom, sick of Zoom?

KAYLA DUNN: Chair?

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yes?

KAYLA DUNN: If I may, I did receive an email directly from our office that Lifesize is supposed to be used for all of our meetings. So, I don't know. That's just the directive I got. I just wanted to throw that out there.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Is Lifesize the one we started with the first time?

KAYLA DUNN: We -- yes.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And Lifesize is very similar to Zoom. It's just a different platform. The reason that they recommend Lifesize is because we can use Lifesize in our meeting rooms.

KAYLA DUNN: Right.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right.

KAYLA DUNN: Because we have a physical location going forward.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Right. So, our directive is we have to have one physical location, which we can do in our building, and continue with Zoom or Lifesize, if that is how the group likes to meet. Or we have the one physical location and go back to conference calls, which is what we did before. So, that is up to the group.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Thoughts members?

UNIDENTIFIED: I'm good with whatever.

PAULA SMITH: Commissioner Smith --

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Yes?

PAULA SMITH: Commissioner Smith, I prefer Zoom. I mean, been using it all this time, and it's easy access. So, that's my input.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay.

CHRISTINE ECKLES: I like Zoom for our committee meetings. I really would love to have an in-person oversight commission meeting just to get to see everybody in person, but that's just me. I mean, I guess if we have to use Lifesize, we can use Lifesize. I'm not going to put a dog in that fight.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Ms. Velasquez said, "Hello, my mic isn't working, but I wanted to say that I prefer Zoom, but in person is great." So, just to let everybody know that for the full JJOC commissions, we will be going back to in-person in the Carson and Las Vegas locations. That is the direction of the chairs, the co-chairs of the JJOC. However, the committees are different. And I wanted to leave it up to each committee with what they wanted to do. We will make whatever your choice is, work. So, if Zoom/Lifesize is good, we will have a meeting location -- a room booked in our Carson City office with Lifesize going forward.

KAYLA DUNN: So, just for, as an example for the next data performance meeting next week, I have a physical location. The teleconference line will also be on the agenda. And the video link. So, I feel like everyone will kind of get to choose anyway, if that makes sense.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Okay. All right. So, you know, Zoom, Life -- let's do Lifesize, have the conference, whatever people want to do. Our next meeting will be -- I think that we better meet June -- oh, Lord. What did I just do? Hold on a second. I just had it. June 17th. Our oversight commission is June 11. And if we get some direction for our use of force, and if they want to keep the date as July 1st as our starting reporting period, I'd like to have June 17th in case we need to come back to this committee to finalize that template and definitions and things like that. Does that work for everybody? June 17th? June 17th at 11?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yep.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: All right. Works for me too. Let's do it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Let's do it.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: Any public comment? Seeing none. We're going to adjourn this meeting at 11:46 AM. Have a great rest of the week. Have a nice, long weekend. Everybody stay safe. Come to Winnemucca. We have a big motorcycle rally going on this weekend. It's supposed to get all crazy here. So, I'm going out to the farm.

UNIDENTIFIED: Stay home. Yeah, stay home.

PAULINE SMITH-SALLA: I'm going to go far, far out. Play with my lambs. All right, everybody. Have a great week.

MULTIPLE: Bye-bye. Thank you.

[end of meeting]