

Steve Sisolak  
Governor

Richard Whitley, MS  
Director



## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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



Cindy Pitlock, DNP  
Administrator

### Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING** *June 13th at 9:00 am*

#### Transcript

**Called to order at 9:00 am.**

#### **Roll Call:**

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

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

Absent: Egan Walker, McKenna Finnerty

##### **(Non-Voting Members)**

Present: Mike Whelihan

Absent:

##### **(Staff Members)**

Present: Leslie Bittleston, Daniel LaBarbera, Kayla Williamson

##### **(Public)**

Lea Case

**Leslie Bittleston:** We have a -- yeah, we have a quorum, Madam Chair.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Thank you. With that, we'll move on to item number three, public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment? Seeing none, we'll move forward to item number four, the minutes from our last meeting, May 25, 2022. I understand they are not yet available. Is that correct, Ms. Bittleston? Okay. So, we will defer that until the next agenda. Moving on to item number five, review, discussion and possible action of the SB 398 Report. I will turn this over to you, Ms. Bittleston.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Has anybody know how to share your screen? Oh, share screen, never mind. Okay. Does everybody see the Strategic Plan Report?

**Elizabeth Florez:** Yes, I do.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect. So, at our last meeting, I provided an overview of how this report was written. And just to go through that again I -- and based on the last conversation, there were some changes made to the report and those changes are noted or outlined in red. So, Madam Chair, do you want to discuss the changes or do you just want me to go through from the top down?

**Elizabeth Florez:** If you could please what we through from -- do we go through from top down last time? I can't recall if we went through thoroughly?

**Leslie Bittleston:** No, Madam Chair. We -- I just provided an outline of how I wrote the report. So, no.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** We can start at the top.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Why don't -- why don't we do that and I -- and I do recall that I had asked -- I charged all of us committee members to review this and be prepared to provide feedback today. So, I think, yeah, from top to bottom will be good. Thank you, Ms. Bittleston.

**Leslie Bittleston:** The executive summary, the report was prepared by the division in conjunction with the JJOC in response to the Senate Bill 398 enacted June 5, 2021. The introduction, this piece was taken right from SB 398. It is the language that says this is what this bill needs to provide. Moving on to requirements of the strategic plan, this is word for word from NRS 62B.615. And if anybody has anything, just please stop me as I'm going because I'll just keep going until -- unless I hear somebody say, hey. The accomplishments of the JJOC and DCFS, these are items that I included based on the things that we have done, we in conjunction with the JJOC and DCFS, since the strategic plan was enacted. So, the JJOC was formed. The JJOC developed bylaws. There was a webpage dedicated to the JJOC. We have obtained a vendor to do evidence-based resource center, selected and implemented a risk and needs assessment, selected and -- this should be implemented -- and approved mental -- approved mental health screening tools, created and approved a comprehensive definition for recidivism, selected a quality assurance tool, drafted policies. This is DCFS. DCFS drafted these policies. Revised the following policies, these are DCFS only and that is a question to you, Madam Chair. DCFS does not have authority to oversee policies in the jurisdictions. So, I just included the policies for DCFS.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Thank you. I see, in general, recommendations that comes later on. It talks about in various areas how a lot of the requirements did not extend beyond some of the state facilities. So, perhaps when we get to that section, we can further communicate [ph] of this.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect. We launched a web-based case management system, which is now -- it's on its third name. For those of you who are not familiar, it went from Caseload Pro [ph] to Tyler [ph] Supervision. Now, it is Enterprise Supervision. So, with exception of Washoe County, drafted regulations for 62B and 62H, defined [ph] evidence-based practices that would be that evidence-based definition matrix and created and approved the performance scorecards. Did I forget anything or do you think I -- other things need to be added?

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid for the record. So, unlike key accomplishments part, I appreciated the little conversation you just had because it's not clear to me that that's -- those drafted new policies are only related to DCFS facilities.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** You might want to make sure that's -- so -- because everywhere else you have like DCFS established this.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** So, there, it doesn't -- it doesn't really -- I would have thought it -- what was for state wide.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Does that fix it? I did put DCFS drafted new policies included in the DCFS revised policies to include new mandates.

**Brigid Duffy:** I don't know. Liz and the rest of you --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** -- like do you think it has to say drafted new policies --

**Elizabeth Florez:** That are --

**Brigid Duffy:** -- like from them? Like -- because I can't -- I don't know. I just feel like I could still take it because the staff does -- state is a lot like that it could be, you know, state wide policy. So --

**Mike Whelihan:** This is Mike Whelihan for the record. I agree with Brigid. It makes it seem like it's for the entire state when really it's only for state-run facilities.

**Brigid Duffy:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** So, you could just say that unless this is actually relevant to field parole [ph] as well, but --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Brigid Duffy:** So, just say drafted new policies for state facilities and parole [ph].

**Leslie Bittleston:** [Inaudible].

**Brigid Duffy:** [Inaudible] just say what it is.

**Leslie Bittleston:** State facilities and --

**Brigid Duffy:** Use parole [ph]?

**Leslie Bittleston:** And use parole [ph]. And then that would be the same thing here, [inaudible].

**Brigid Duffy:** And then just put including -- you have it the word including up there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, including.

**Brigid Duffy:** I have my other -- I'm looking at both. I have my --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Revised policies for -- including --

**Brigid Duffy:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** -- okay. My fingers work faster than -- or my brain works faster -- I don't know. Something happens. Okay. Here we go. Does that make sense? Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** So, Leslie. This is Mike Whelihan for the record. So, I guess, do you want to talk anything about the COVID oversight that you guys provided during two -- that two-year period?

**Leslie Bittleston:** That was --

**Mike Whelihan:** Because we reported it to JJOC

**Leslie Bittleston:** But that wasn't part of the strategic plan.

**Mike Whelihan:** It's an emergency plan that was reported to the JJOC. I mean we spent a lot of time --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** -- during our meetings discussing, you know. I don't know. Just my thoughts.

**Elizabeth Florez:** I haven't thought of that, Mike. And this is the Strategic Planning Committee. I don't know how much the Strategic Planning Committee had conversations around the COVID emergency plan where we -- that -- a lot of that was before my time. Was the Strategic Planning Committee involved very much in that plan directly, as far as approval of or anything like that? Did it come through this committee?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I don't believe so. I know we talked about it, but there was no formal plan that came through this committee.

**Brigid Duffy:** But I think -- this is Brigid for the record. I think because we're in a heading of key accomplishments of the JJOC and DCFS and it has referenced to like my data group who had the recidivism thing, I don't think it would necessarily be something that had to come through this committee --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** -- to be listed as a key accomplishment of the JJOC and -- I don't know. I don't think -- see there's any harm in saying, you know, that that was something that was done. I think it's -- even though it wasn't -- nobody knew what the world was gonna look like, but there was definitely a lot of time and effort went into that to put it into this report. This is going to the governor, right?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. It's going to go to the legislative council or judiciary committee and probably to the governor too. So, I just added emergency planning for COVID-19. Is that okay or should I expand?

**Mike Whelihan:** The only reason I'm saying you should put it in there it's because it obviously impacted even meeting with people.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Mike Whelihan:** It impacted our numbers. It impacted the entire state and a lot of time and energy was focused on that instead of being able to be focused on a lot of the stuff that we were trying to do with the strategic -- strategic planning when everyone was scrambling not having staff, I mean, the impact of that emergency planning and for the state who took lead on it I think is -- you got to recognize that because it really impacted -- and we probably be farther along if it wasn't for COVID.

**Elizabeth Florez:** That's a good point, Mike.

**Mike Whelihan:** Mike Whelihan again for the record. So, I don't know if you want to put something there about training, Leslie, because I know that's a big topic that's been discussed through this group and with JJOC and with legislators in our last meeting. So, I think mentioning some training efforts would probably be important for the state.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Statewide training. If we did the statewide training for YLS and kids plan, statewide -- anybody come up with it had a bullet for that statewide training.

**Mike Whelihan:** So, I would -- I would put the -- was that AB472 required statewide trainings that were completed, you know, as part of the legislative requirement. And then I think the new one is it -- what? Is that AB230? I can't remember the other one off hand, but the last legislation. So -- but the -- up to AB472 requirements for -- what year was that, 2017, when we did AB472?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah, it was.

**Mike Whelihan:** So, I would -- I would put the year in there to be specific, legislative training required by AB472 in 2017 have been completed. You don't have to elaborate as much. And then I would say that you're working on [inaudible].

**Elizabeth Florez:** I think you're talking about SB 108. Is that the implicit bias handling [ph]?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Elizabeth Florez:** This is Liz Florez for the record. I believe that's SB 108.

**Mike Whelihan:** It is.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Completed -- okay -- training required by AB -- SB 108 enacted June 2021 in process [ph]. Okay. Alright. Got it. Anything else on this topic of key accomplishments of the JJOC and DCFS? Okay. Moving on to goal number one. Just to provide the group an outline of how I wrote this. I -- I took a lot of the information right from the strategic plan and then indicated whether it's complete, in process or incomplete. Goal number one, screening and assessments, this was the selection and implementation of the YLS. We all know that that is complete. No more to say there. Develop a policy -- this is number two. Develop a policy for reporting requirements from the use of the tool, establish a process and timing for counties. So, this is really talking about are we obtaining data from the use of the YLS. And this is partially complete. I have requested a data report and enterprise -- what is it now? Enterprise Solutions -- enterprise supervision to gather this data. So, we are in process, but it is not yet complete. Anything on page 5? Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** Mike Whelihan. Do you want to put that you're doing some manual reporting in the meantime, I supposed?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, because we --

**Mike Whelihan:** Yes. I would put that -- put that in there so it makes like you're actually doing some of it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** And this makes it look like you're not doing any of it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, partially complete, jurisdictions state and jurisdictions -- jurisdictions are manually tracking [inaudible] -- tracking --

**Mike Whelihan:** And reporting?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Tracking and reporting, thank you.

**Mike Whelihan:** I don't know if you'll put local jurisdictions?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. The next bullet on -- is that okay, everybody? I don't hear anything. Okay. Perfect. Alright. The next bullet on page 6, the vendor for the YLS, which is Multi-Health Systems, they do have capability to provide us comprehensive reports based on statewide. However, that is at a cost of between \$50,000 and \$80,000 annually. I just included this for the legislature to -- to determine if they want -- if what local jurisdictions in the state is doing -- is okay or if they want more comprehensive reports. So, it's just for their -- for their benefit. Moving on to case planning. Just to -- so case planning, the state and jurisdictions have implemented a statewide case planning tool. It has been embedded into the case management system. This is complete. Okay. Moving on to goal number two, proven programs, this is all around the evidence-based resource center. So, the state did obtain -- did complete an RFP back in 2017-2018, selected a vendor and resource -- evidence-based resource center as established. And there is a dedicated website. The state has earmarked roughly \$51, 757 [ph] a year out of federal -- the federal Title II formula grant for the sustainability of this. And then in 2021, the state and the vendor secured a one-time award of \$66,000 for additional work on the website. So, this is complete. Evidence-based criteria, this is partially complete due to the fact that the vendor was unable to work for a period of time because the formula grant runs were frozen. So, there's still more work that the evidence-based resource center has to do to meet the performance measures outlined in AB472. This red here is what I added based on the conversation from the last strategic planning meeting. Okay. Not hearing anything, moving on. Evidence-based inventory, this, again, is incomplete based on the frozen funding. Therefore, the vendor was unable to work for a period of roughly three years. So, this is also incomplete based on lack of funding.

**Mike Whelihan:** I'd like to make a comment. I think incomplete sounds bad, maybe in progress would sound a little bit more acceptable. If you're working on it, incomplete means -- sounds to me like you're not even doing it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** In progress.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** I want to do the whole thing. I'd go back later and --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** -- take out incomplete and put in progress.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect. Thank you. Evidence-based practices, number four, this is essentially around the evidence-based matrix that the JJOC created. So, that -- this is -- so, basically, it's an outline of what is a program -- a proven program or an effective program versus what is ineffective or harmful. So, that is complete.

**Mike Whelihan:** Mike Whelihan again. Complete makes it sound like you're done with it. So, maybe complete and ongoing because you're always looking at new program and new ways to -- to update, right? Complete means -- makes it sound to me like we completed a table that were done, must move on, everything set in place, but a lot of these are completed but yet you're still always looking for new best practices. I don't know how you report that, complete ongoing or -- I don't know, just my thought. I could be wrong.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Complete and -- Madam Chair, complete and ongoing?

**Elizabeth Florez:** That's probably the most accurate way to describe it, unless we wanted to -- complete and ongoing -- complete -- complete -- yeah, let's chew on that. I understand what Mike is trying to say, but let's continue to evaluate that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. [Inaudible] engagement, this, again, is part of the evidence-based research center. So, we have developed a website. Counties have provided names of the programs that they use in their jurisdictions. So, this is, again, complete and ongoing or whatever we want to call that. System collaboration -- okay. I'm trying -- system [inaudible] -- oh, sorry. Okay. Objectives, Caseload Pro now called Tyler [ph] Supervision, DCFS in 16 counties have successfully converted to Enterprise Supervision. And I put partially complete, unless there's a better way to say or did -- partially completed [inaudible]?

**Mike Whelihan:** Even in progress -- partially complete and in progress, I don't know. I'm just trying to think of different ways to say it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. We can chew on that.

**Mike Whelihan:** Jennifer puts up in the chat.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, she did. I can't see the chat because I'm sharing my screen.

**Jennifer Fraser:** This is Jennifer Fraser for the record. I just put maybe substantial progress and ongoing if you want to keep using progress. You know, just a thought.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oops. Okay. And so, I will highlight this. We can chew on how to word these. Okay. Moving on to quality assurance reviews. This one has always been really confusing for me because

AB472, the actual enactment of the bill required quality assurance reviews more globally than what went into NRS. So, this one is really around the selection of the tool. So, we did select a tool. We did train staff in the use of the tool. And we did start these reviews in the required facilities, which are the three-state facilities and the two youth cares. So, this, again, is complete and ongoing, however we want to say this. Performance reporting, I'm sure Brigid has a lot to say around this one, just kidding. Anyway, the data committee did a lot of work around this. And it was actually I thought some fun work. But anyway, so performance reporting, this one I put complete but requires additional work. So, I think we need to re-word that as complete and ongoing. Oops. So, any questions on page 10 before we go to page 11? Okay. Cross-agency collaboration, this is where we start getting into some really confusing pieces. So, the state did select and implemented statewide risk and -- risk and needs assessment, embedded a case plan in DCFS currently. However, the -- there was information and intent behind AB472 to do a lot of community outreach. However, who or what was supposed to do that was unclear. So, I -- so the note in there is the intent is unclear and who is supposed to conduct this community outreach.

**Mike Whelihan:** I guess to me what is the definition of community outreach would be the first question, what does that mean.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Should I put this in hear as another note, what is the definition of community outreach, because, again, that intent, whatever that meant, was not clear.

**Elizabeth Florez:** This is Liz Florez for the record. I'm looking at my notes from the last meeting and I know, Leslie, we had asked -- I don't -- it might not have been item, but it might be another -- we were asking if LCB might have been able to provide input on legislative intent for some language. Do you think that would be helpful in this case?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Probably.

**Mike Whelihan:** Yeah. I think -- Mike Whelihan for the record. That's why we need a definition [ph]. That's kind of a generic community outreach.

**Brigid Duffy:** Can you do this -- this is Brigid for the record. Can you do -- since this is going to the legislature, could you put in there, you know, request or like just have another subcategory that says request or needs of the JJOC and have it say that, you know, it's unclear who is supposed to be conducting the community outreach if the -- you know, if the legislature could assist us and --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Request the --

**Brigid Duffy:** -- so if you just have another subcategory in there.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** Mike Whelihan for the record. I would put a request to the LCB, legislative intent, and then those two would be the bullets underneath it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** How is that? Or --

**Mike Whelihan:** It looks good to me.



**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Liz Florez -- sorry, Mike. Liz Florez for the record. So, is -- can you maybe outreach in the actual language of the statute or is that our word to describe the cross-agency collaboration?

**Leslie Bittleston:** So, no, it is not in the statute, but it was in AB472, the actual enacted bill. And that's where there's some confusion because what -- some of the language that was in the enacted bill did not make it the statute, and this is where my confusion comes in, and this was one of them. It was in the bill, but it did not make it the statute.

**Brigid Duffy:** I'm gonna look that up real quick. So, that would mean that -- this is Brigid for the record. That would mean that the as enrolled bill changed at some point.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** They wouldn't just take stuff out unless it was voted out or not. So, we would make -- we wouldn't even referenced it if it didn't make into the -- into the statute. But let me see what happened. I'll look at -- look at it real quick.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. I got it highlighted.

**Brigid Duffy:** That's from the 472, which was what session, 2017?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Seventeen.

**Elizabeth Florez:** 2017.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Let's see.

**Mike Whelihan:** Brigid, this is 32 pages long.

**Leslie Bittleston:** [Inaudible] why is it was so confusion and I'm not an attorney. So, sometimes, you know, trying to figure that out was a little dicey.

**Mike Whelihan:** Brigid, I have a copy if you need it.

**Elizabeth Florez:** It was just -- this is Liz. It's the 79th session. So, this is Liz. Leslie, the -- what were some keywords in AB472 related to this? Was it collaboration or is that something that the JJOC -- a term - - a coin that came from JJOC?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Wait a minute. I think I'm saying the wrong thing. I'm very, very sorry. Not AB472. The strategic plan.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I'm sorry. I'm saying the wrong thing.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** In the strategic plan -- if somebody can pull up the strategic plan -- shoot -- I'm sorry. It's the strategic plan.

**Elizabeth Florez:** So, this is Liz. While we're looking for that, I have an update from -- it says, status update August 2020. It says cross-agency collaboration means to engage children services providers including child welfare, children's mental health, community providers, schools, Division of Public and Behavioral Health and Nevada Medicaid. So, that's how they describe cross-agency collaboration.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Great.

**Elizabeth Florez:** And as a goal, develop ML [ph] use for collaboration and cooperation with each agency. Is that ringing a bell, Leslie?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Kind of, yes.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. Let me stop sharing and see if I can pull up that strategic plan.

**Mike Whelihan:** Liz, can you forward me a copy of that?

**Elizabeth Florez:** Yeah. I have it printed because I'm old school. So, let me -- let me try to find a link.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, strategic plan. And kind of like our performance scorecard, I think the strategic plan kind of went maybe further than we could do, further than we could go like Brigid and I and the rest of the data committee, you know, we realized, God, we wanted all this great stuff, but it's not really feasible. Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid for the record. So, I just want to -- I've been like looking through the different sections of -- so nothing in the bill mentions anything about agency collaboration -- well, it does, but I mean the -- the language has left my head -- about going out community outreach and all that. It's not in the bill. So, what you're saying, Leslie, is now you realized it's -- that's coming from the strategic plan and not from legislation at all?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay,

**Elizabeth Florez:** So, this is Liz. So, then clarification might need to be sought from the larger body or the original -- I'm not sure if anybody here was an original member of the Strategic Planning Committee that has some recollection of the intent and -- of that.

**Brigid Duffy:** No. I crashed like one meeting once, but I -- well, they asked me to come to a meeting because of my data, but I wasn't on the original Strategic Planning and then ended up going to a couple of meetings after that. But I don't really recall.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. So, the -- I'm going to share my screen again.

**Brigid Duffy:** I'm sure we have all the minutes though. Somebody could just look through the minutes.

**Elizabeth Florez:** This is Liz for the record. Because I am not an expert in [inaudible] meeting was, I found the link to the -- to the document. Am I -- should I share it everybody? I'm here just to Leslie for her sharing?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I think you can share it because -- yeah.

**Mike Whelihan:** It's public information.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, it's public information. It's on the JJOC website anyway. Okay.

**Elizabeth Florez:** Oh, I'm slow. Leslie, I'm sending it to you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. I'm on --

**Elizabeth Florez:** [Inaudible].

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah. I'm on page 27 of the strategic planning document and let me see if I can share it. [Inaudible] show my screen. It's not working. [Inaudible]. Maybe that will help. Share screen. Okay. So, here I am. This is page 27 of the strategic plan document that says, cross agency collaboration. It says, engage children service providers, child welfare, and institute a system of care by improving service provision, communication, and collaboration with all stakeholders involved. So, maybe I used the wrong word when I said outreach, rather I guess I should be using engage because to me that is somebody has to do the work of talking to these agencies.

**Brigid Duffy:** I think that's the better way to put it, just use it --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** -- exactly from this language. This is Brigid for the record.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, the intent is unclear on who is supposed to engage.

**Mike Whelihan:** Collaborate.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Collaborate -- collaborate with -- what are they called?

**Mike Whelihan:** Children service providers.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Thank you. Children's -- children's service providers. Okay. Alright. Okay. Now, I need to stop sharing that and start sharing -- okay. Stop share and start share --

**Mike Whelihan:** Mike Whelihan for the record. So, I would say that's more on each jurisdiction because not every county has the same service providers. So, I don't know how you would do a statewide system of care if Aetna [ph], everyone, even has -- even close to the same list of providers. They're not going to be in the same -- there're going to be different names for every county.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Mike Whelihan:** So, I mean -- I think some of the things like state parole, state welfare, state Medicaid, working with the individual counties and with DCFS, which you guys already do because it's all state-run institution or agencies. So, I think that would be incumbent on each county to build their own system of care.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** As much as I hate to say that. It should be the state's responsibility. I'm kidding.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Do you want me to leave this at here or -- or re-word it in some way?

**Elizabeth Florez:** Can you --

**Mike Whelihan:** [Inaudible] -- go ahead.

**Elizabeth Florez:** -- scroll -- I'm sorry. You're still screen sharing. Can you -- there we go. Okay. Thank you.

**Mike Whelihan:** I would say it's completed and ongoing. I think it just -- it would be more driven as far as from the state level to meet with the counties to, you know, make sure they're -- they're working towards these goals, this system of care goals. I mean, for us, we're doing -- we're already doing all this. I know Clark County, I'm sure Washington, other counties do, but some of the smaller Jersey cities aren't going to be able to have the big systems of care because they're looking to have any services.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Right. And so this is Liz. I- I'm- it's just difficult to measure that. Right? And so I'm not sure. And that's why I think when I was looking back at a previous version of the strategic plan, it said things like developing an MOU, things of that nature, which are not always the appropriate vehicle for system collaboration. Not everything requires an MOU. So, would that satisfy, Leslie? Do you think if we- if we did as Mike said, and just- it's- it's really each- each communities working with their own service providers and there is crossover with the state. It brings up larger conversations about the barriers that we have with accessing deep in mental health, deep in corrections, funding- appropriate funding to access everything. That is, I mean, there are vehicles right now to do that through like mental health consortium through -- I'm trying to think of other meetings where we have these conversations with the state where counties have conversations with the state on all of these different areas of impact.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Mike Whelihan:** I think that our state overall is we got [inaudible] that does that, you know. There's the local group of group homes that meets with Medicaid quite regularly, right, trying to get the rates changed. I think there's -- like China Springs services. I don't know how many counties, but they service a lot of counties, the state is servicing every county, right? Clark County, we actually entered into a contract with Nye County so they can use some of our facilities, detention answering mountain. So, I think at a statewide level. I think you're -- really the only thing I think we do really need to work on his mental health as a statewide systemic need, which we already -- we all know that so. I had to say that's ongoing, right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So I don't need this at all, right? Okay. So, we're just at the complete and ongoing.

**Mike Whelihan:** Right. And providers come and they go, right? I mean, the --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Mike Whelihan:** -- Reno just lost a huge one. Washoe County, last year, you guys lost one of your biggest providers, right? So, they're going to come and go, so it's hard to --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Alright. Look, we figured something out, yay team! Okay, are we good with cross agency collaboration? It's complete and ongoing. Okay. Tailored services, objectives, family engagement plan, policy procedure, and this one may be another one we can talk through. I know that the state has developed their own policy procedure for case planning and family engagement. However, there's no way for the state to verify that the jurisdictions did theirs. So, I don't know if that was the intent for the state to verify that those are done or just we're going to call it complete that everybody did their own thing.

**Mike Whelihan:** Didn't you request, Leslie? This is Mike Whelihan again. Did you request our family engagement plans at one point? Didn't you -- as I know, we said, you are us before.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I didn't request your family engagement plans. What I did request were a list of your providers -- not providers, programs. The list of programs you're providing in your county jurisdiction.

**Elizabeth Flores:** This is Liz. So- so, I know that you've brought this up on a few different issues Leslie where it's unclear what authority the state has over the counties relative to a lot of the things that have come out of AB472. So, under general recommend -- and -- and so you're right. If we -- there's nothing here that compels you to collect and ensure that we've all done this and that's the question, is should that be a general recommendation going forward in the next strategic plan that the states be given that authority and that responsibility. Am I stating that correctly?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I believe so, yes. With that being said, do I need this here or do I delete it and we'll just address it in the recommendations?

**Elizabeth Flores:** That's my recommendation because in the recommendation, you -- I think you have bullet number five says review the intent of AB472 regarding the state's authority to verify jurisdictions have policies in place.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So --

**Elizabeth Flores:** Because I think it's broad. It applies to things beyond the family engagement piece.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Elizabeth Flores:** That's my recommendation.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Everybody okay with -- we're okay, perfect. The same thing here. Again, case plan and re-entry plan, it is complete and ongoing. And the state's oversight or ability to provide oversight, which we just discussed. Okay. Before we move on to general recommendations, do we want to address this language yet or do we want to do the complete an ongoing, or do we want to do that at the end.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid for the record. I was wondering if maybe, like, I don't want to maybe like a key so that they -- when they read it, like we could have complete and ongoing mean equals, you know, we -- it's completed. However, it's a task such that it's ever changing because of, you know, your new providers or new so that -- or complete and ongoing equals it's completed, however, it continues to need periodic review to ensure that, you know, we're still meeting the requirements.

**Mike Whelihan:** Maybe you put like a little asterisk on it.

**Brigid Duffy:** Right.

**Mike Whelihan:** Like at the very bottom of the page, and like one asterisk for complete, two for ongoing and they just define it at the bottom of the page.

**Brigid Duffy:** Right.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** Yes. Something that helps them under, like I don't know or really they'll probably just figure it out on their own.

**Mike Whelihan:** And just define it. And just define it at the end what it makes because you got partial in there too. Just do it like a key at the bottom.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Okay. So I need to define these. Alright. Okay, general recommendations, just to - and I will go through each one of these. Just to give you an idea of where this came from for discussion. So, the first one is consider funding annual comprehensive reports from the risk of needs vendor. And it's not for -- good thing I'm reading this -- for the risk and needs assessment. The vendor, which is multi-health systems, I don't know if that needs to go in there, has access to the raw data from juris -- from DCFS and all local jurisdictions as long -- and what I mean by that is that the YLS is embedded into the case management system and we do -- for those of us that are using the case management system, we can put-- we put all of our YLS in there. And once we send it to score, that data is kept in a general database, I believe, by the vendor. Except for, I believe, Washoe is not doing that because they are not on Tyler supervision. So maybe we don't need this right now because we don't have everybody doing it.

**Elizabeth Flores:** This is Liz. There would probably still be value though in that. If that's -- if that's a measurement -- if that was an original goal to collect all of that information, I wouldn't necessarily let Washoe hold that up.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Elizabeth Flores:** That's just my recommendation. I'll -- I can ask fellow committee members what their opinion is on that. Because I think you could -- there's still value and seeing if it accomplishes its goal, which is to, you know, provide the reports on the efficacy of states programs and services.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. And the vendor can do such a better job than I can. The state does not have a dedicated statistician for juvenile justice data like we do for child welfare data. So, the vendor could do such a better job than I can. And so that's kind of why I put this recommendation in here because I think

we could get some valuable data from the vendor on an annual basis. But of course, we do have to pay for it, so.

**Elizabeth Flores:** This is Liz. Just for clarification purposes, right now, can each -- can each jurisdiction pull that -- pull that information for themselves? So like for the state, are you able to pull that at least for the state?

**Leslie Bittleston:** We can pull very minimal data around -- YLS for example, we can pull the completed YLS's supervision level and overall score. But what we cannot do is we cannot put all of that together and break it down by age or race or gender or anything like that. So, we can't -- we can do a very basic report, but we cannot do the level of detail that the vendor could. The vendor could provide data around very specific things like for females, there's all of this stuff. For males, all of this stuff. So, we just can't do that.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Okay, thank you.

**Mike Whelihan:** Well, I think some of the problems with collecting this data now, too, is with that new misdemeanor bill that went into effect. You're going to -- the majority of the recidivism rates can't even be tracked because you're supposed to purge it. So, how do you even track it? You'd be violating state law.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right. Maybe that's another recommendation is- is what is our -- how are we to proceed with collecting recidivism with the intent of that particular bill? I don't know how to work that.

**Elizabeth Flores:** This is Liz. I had actually, when we were going to get there, I was going to -- I was going to add that recommendation as to seek clarification. Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Perfect. Recommendation number two, the evidence-based resource center is underfunded. The only funding provided on an ongoing basis is \$51,750 from the Title II formula grant. I don't know how to word that any other way, but \$51,000 a year is not a lot of money for what was expected of the resource center based on what was in the strategic plan. So, that just is a funding thing. Did you get -- juvenile justice system currently lacks the functionality to track youth from referral to case closure if the youth crosses county state lines. Further, there's no way to track a youth into the adult system. Recidivism tracking requires juvenile justice data specific -- juvenile specific data, meaning personal identification- identifying information such as name, date of birth and contact dates with the systems, adult system information and the authority to share juvenile specific data across county state and system, which would be juvenile versus adult. Hopefully, that makes sense. If not, because we are not able to do this, we can't track the data the way that I think we should be for recidivism. And what I was really trying to get to here if somebody has a better way to state it, is I think it's a lot to ask of jurisdictions to provide the level of detail that we need for a youth when we have all of these confidentiality requirements around juvenile information.

**Mike Whelihan:** That's where AB 251 hinders that.

**Elizabeth Flores:** I was -- this is Liz Flores. I was going and to recommend a bullet that hopefully somebody can help me wordsmith. Mike, you've been pretty -- you've been on a roll today. But what I was going to add was that AB 251 further restricts recidivism -- recidivism studies based on its requirements for record sealing.

**Mike Whelihan:** Well, I would say record destruction.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Record destruction.

**Mike Whelihan:** Yeah.

**Brigid Duffy:** It's and/or so, it's record sealing and/or destruction because there is the expungement and then there's the sealing.

**Elizabeth Flores:** True.

**Brigid Duffy:** So you could just say record expungement and sealing.

**Leslie Bittleston:** For record, oops, expungement. How do you spell expungement?

**Brigid Duffy:** P-U-N-G-M-E-N-T? There might be an E. There's an E, but I think before the M.

**Elizabeth Flores:** There is.

**Leslie Bittleston:** There we go.

**Brigid Duffy:** There you go.

**Jennifer Fraser:** This is Jennifer Fraser for the record. These sealing statutes like the record sealing statutes do have an exception for the recidivism studies. So, it's more of the expungement because we're sealing -- the court always keeps records. So they're not technically -- they're not destroyed. But with expungement, it does require the destruction. So, the statutory already sets it up for that records that are sealed. I think the question remains, though, for the expungement.

**Mike Whelihan:** I hate to add this, but I think there's somewhere in the NRS, I don't know exactly where, but it talks about the sharing of personal information with the state through this system is not allowed. You're supposed to have a number. So, I think that is a problem in itself as well.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, back to this first bullet, AB 251. Do we want to just leave record expungement and sealing or do we want to delete and sealing based on what Jennifer just said.

**Mike Whelihan:** I would say take the sealing out.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** As what Jennifer said.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Then there was what you just said Mike on the further.

**Mike Whelihan:** Yes. Current law prohibits the sharing of personal information from the data, what it was called now Springer or [inaudible] Johnny's caseload system.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, the sharing of personal --



**Mike Whelihan:** Information. Suppose to use the number, the case number.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Oh, that's right.

**Mike Whelihan:** Right. It can be shared, not the -- all the personal information, so.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yeah.

**Elizabeth Flores:** This is Liz. Mike, is that in 62 E.? Do you know where that is?

**Mike Whelihan:** I can't remember off the top of my- my head. I got to read down somewhere, but finding it will be another story, but it's- it's in there. I know it is. I just don't know the number offhand. It might be an AB 472 when it was written.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Is -- are these last two bullets okay? Actually, are all five bullets okay or re-word or delete?

**Elizabeth Flores:** I think it's okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Mike Whelihan:** Well, I would ask what, if I was reading this, what does adult system information mean? If I was someone that didn't know what we were talking about, what does that mean?

**Leslie Bittleston:** I'm talking adult arrests or convictions. Arrest and/or convictions. And then, moving on to number three, I kind of touched on this again, that we don't have access. We, DCFS, does not have access to adult information as -- we don't even have access to direct file data. We don't get information on adult convictions. We don't get information on placement in adult jails for those, you know, direct files. So, we just don't get any of that.

**Mike Whelihan:** I don't know if you want to mention in state or out of state access. Because it's a national -- even if you had it for Clark -- for NDOC, still wouldn't have accurate recidivism data because people are pretty transient as the community goes.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. And then the last one is review the recommended phase two if enterprise to provision determine how to proceed. Phase two was really talking about the bigger -- what am I trying to say? The bigger vision of linking the systems together so we could kind of share, really so the data can obtain some -- the data -- the state could obtain some of those reports, without requiring the jurisdictions to have staff to do those reports. So that we need bridges and all these data systems to talk and so, that was what phase two was, but there's no funding for that. So, is that worded okay, just review it and determine how you want to proceed? Because I don't think we need to have out there in the public domain that DCFS can pull data from jurisdictions when we can't.

**Mike Whelihan:** Looks good to me.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Disparities in the juvenile justice system, this is based on the work from the racial and ethnic disparity committee. So, this is just their work that I copy and pasted and put in here.

The last one is the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, and it talks about -- so, for those of you who are not intimately involved in the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, it has gone through several revisions since it was enacted in 1974. And each revision has been stricter on the requirements of how to deal with juveniles in the criminal justice system. The latest revision in 2018 really promotes the placement of juveniles even if they are pending adult charges in juvenile facilities rather than adult jails. So, these three bullets have to do with how the state is doing that currently. So, basically, what this is, is the act, the 2018, reauthorization said -- I hear people talking -- prohibits the placement of individuals under the state's age of majority, 18 in Nevada in adult jails, pre-sentencing. And what that means is it's really those youth that are direct filed. If a placement in an adult jail is done, the JJRA Act requires that the court does what's called an interest of justice hearing every 30 days in urban areas and every 45 days in rural areas. And there's a whole bunch of stuff around all of that. So in order to address this -- and then I spoke with Liz about this, we have met one on one a few times. One of the recommendations is really consider removing the direct file option in Nevada, which would require all juveniles to start in juvenile court. It doesn't mean that the juvenile court can't move the kid to the adult system, but at least they would all start in juvenile court and we could gather data around that. So, that's really what all of this is.

**Brigid Duffy:** I'm not -- I just have to say, I think we have to be really careful about the term removing -- this is Brigid for the record -- direct file as an option because right now, there's only -- it's only murder and attempted murder, pretty much left except for the mass casualty on school property as the only direct file options, but I don't think -- I don't think everybody's in agreement that those two categories can leave yet until we have other options available for juveniles that especially with those that are competent.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** I think you can address it in statute by saying consider requiring all juveniles and now your mic is going to blow up, shout in my other little box down there, like all juveniles that are -- that are outside of the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, because that's what a direct file is, are housed in a juvenile facility pending sentencing. That's the -- that's the -- because right now, the statute allows those juveniles that are in -- that are outside jurisdiction to petition the court to stay in a juvenile facility. And in Clark, that happens routinely for those long term kiddos that are facing some homicide charges.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** Most of the other ones are going out on bail that are getting over there anyway. So, in Clark, so that's the -- that's the less -- it'll be a fiscal note issue. But it's the less controversial, I think, than removing an entire category of murder and attempt murder.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, can --

**Mike Whelihan:** Mike Whelihan for the record. I got a comment now. So, obviously, we're not in agreement with that because all it says in there is that they have to have a court hearing every 30 to 45 days. So, Brigid and her team decide to certify and the judge certifies them --

**Brigid Duffy:** Direct file.

**Mike Whelihan:** -- petition, or even the -- what about the indirect? This would cover them, too. So, my thing is that, you know, they can petition to come back down. That's not mentioned here in our state laws.

They can petition to come back down. And all it does is require the state adult system to hold a court hearing.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Mike Whelihan:** So, that doesn't mean that the kids have to stay here, it just means they have to do the court hearing. So, to me, that just needs to be reinforced and not pull all the kids down here because like you said, Brigid, a lot of these kids get on bail. So the true numbers we don't even know because we don't have access to it. So, there is no [inaudible] in juvenile justice. So, we could be sitting here with, you know, the average -- what do they average, about 30 kids in the adult system right now. And that's not including the ones in the county jail. The ones that are out on bail, which is probably double that. So we could be sitting back here with 60 to 90 kids for two years waiting to go to prison or even a sentencing where they can even get out because there's no bail here. I mean, to me, that's fiscal year responsible and a huge impact to the county. We already had a huge impact. I think it was -- we guess it -- we estimated about \$3 million is a guesstimate on the certification laws have changed this last time. So, that would be even there, so.

**Elizabeth Flores:** So, this is -- this is Liz. I'm looking at SB 398 and it does say that we have to report on compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. It doesn't say we have to suggest remedy. And I think that because, I mean, the discussion, even with this small group is so robust, right, and each of us recognize the system impact related to this, this is something that in past legislative sessions has sparked lots of debate. So, I don't know if it's appropriate that we, in this small group suggest remedy if in SB 398 it's not required to the specificity that we've done here. So, I'm just throwing that out there. I'm wondering if there's other language. Yes. Yes, according to the requirements of in compliance with JJRA, our state is not compliant. But also, Leslie, I- when I had spoken to Commissioner Salla, she had indicated that -- that there's two type, there's two parts of the compliance. One, yes, there's the 100 percent following the language as prescribed by JJRA, but then for purposes of funding that is not what's holding up the funding, that the update of the compliance manual to reflect what is happening in Nevada is what's holding up the funding. So, I just wanted to put that out there and, Leslie, perhaps you can clarify if when you -- if -- or make comments on what I just said.

**Leslie Bittleston:** So, yes -- yes. The update of the compliance manual is what is holding up the funding. However, the compliance manual is how the state will address all of these things. For example, here's, you know, this -- this is what the JJRA requires, prohibits placement of individuals. So, somewhere in my manual, I have to say how the state is addressing this. So, I have put in there into the manual that is still pending review. I've submitted our manual to OJJDP and I have not received any feedback yet. But I still have to put in the manual, how we will address all of these things. And it is subject to approval by OJJDP. So, if they don't approve what we are doing, then our funding can still be held up. So, I think one of the things I think you're right, maybe I don't need to put this level of specificity in here, but I think one of the things that would help me immensely, is if we could get better data reporting from the adult system. And, you know, maybe that would help us address some of these other issues rather than saying, okay, let's remove direct files. But I think if we're going to have kids and adult jails, we do need a judge to address that, you know, every so often to make sure that they're safe.

**Brigid Duffy:** So, this is Brigid. So, isn't the -- my thought would be the easiest recommendation is to make sure that we're training judges in the -- in the adult system, as well as stakeholders, from adult prosecutors to adult defenders, that they know that there are these requirements to have these hearings every 30 days. That's kind of an easy solution like the judges should be required to understand what the

JJRA is. As long as we are a state that still has children under 18 that go to the adult system, whether it's on a certification or direct file, then the judiciary should be trained on how to handle that so that the state isn't dinged on money.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. That was really good. How do I say that? So maybe I delete all of this crap. And -- here- this right here, this is what the judge has to do. That's directly out of the JJRA. So, if they're 17 and below, these are the things that the judge has to consider. So, I don't know if I want that level of specificity here or if it's okay just to say that judges and prosecutors need to be trained in the requirements of the JJRA.

**Mike Whelihan:** I agree with what Brigid had to say. They just need to be trained.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So I can just put here, judges and prosecutors --

**Mike Whelihan:** I would even have public defenders because they are the ones that are going to force us as being done.

**Jennifer Fraser:** Yeah, I could be a defense counsel.

**Brigid Duffy:** Should be mandated to be trained.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Should be mandated to be trained in the JJRA. And maybe that's all I need to say.

**Brigid Duffy:** But you need to oh, God, I'm still unmuted. You need to make sure it's, you know, that are in that -- specifying that it's for judges, prosecutors and defense counsel, who in the adult criminal system, like, because that's what this is. I mean, it's not Jen and -- Jen and I aren't over there, so.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Should be mandated. Okay. Judges, prosecutors in the adult criminal system should be mandated to be trained in the JJRA. And do I need to reference certification and direct file use or?

**Jennifer Fraser:** This is Jennifer Fraser for the record. I think you could put something mandated to be trained in the JJRA to understand like they're required -- the requirements to be in compliance for 17 and younger who are in the adult system or something like that.

**Mike Whelihan:** Is it for those that are housed the kids on bail wouldn't have to meet this requirement, right? It just be the ones housed in a --

**Jennifer Fraser:** For those 17 and younger housed in adult facilities.

**Mike Whelihan:** Yes.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Those in adult -- okay. So that's -- so -- and I don't need any of this, which is what the judge is supposed to address. That would just be part of the training. Okay. So, let's get rid of this. Okay. And maybe there's a better way to say this. I would like to beef up reporting requirements from those adult facilities. So, that's kind of what -- so, just to give everybody an update, we do this work -- DCFS does compliance work based on an executive order? The first executive order was drafted in 1988 and there has been several revisions since then. However, that executive order is not always enough to get

adult facilities to comply with data requirements. Many adult facilities are very hesitant to provide data because they believe it's adult data and they don't need to provide it to the juvenile system. So, I would like something like in statute or something to say that these adult facilities have to report if they have kids under 17 in their facility. And I don't know how to work that.

**Mike Whelihan:** But is this the avenue you want to take us through the JJOC?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Well.

**Mike Whelihan:** I think that's more legislative than.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay, so just delete it.

**Mike Whelihan:** We delete it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. And all these miscellaneous requirements are on legislation. So I guess that's delete as well. So I'm going to get rid of that because that's all legislation not related to the JJOC. Okay. So it looks like we are done.

**Elizabeth Flores:** So, this is Liz. We can get rid of the number one then, if that's our --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Elizabeth Flores:** -- what the recommendation is for compliance with JJRA.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And I think this is a really good idea because we were talking about in our last meeting doing bench cards for judges. So, maybe this is part of the bench card system, because I believe, oh, this is adult judges. The juvenile judges I think need to be trained in the use of valid court orders and status offenders. So, maybe that's a number two.

**Elizabeth Flores:** So, Leslie, I see that agenda item number six talks about valid quarters and bench card. Is that or is that a separate -- so is this --

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is [inaudible] discussions.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I think in saying that judges in the adult system and then I think judges in the juvenile system should be mandated to be trained in the use of a valid court order and the placement of status offenders. There we go. There we go.

**Mike Whelihan:** So would chance [ph] be the same thing as the status of enter [ph]?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Mike Whelihan:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Do you want me to just put chance [ph] -- there we go. I think judges and based on the data that I've been seeing recently, the last couple of years from the juvenile facilities, I think judges are having a hard time dealing with some of these status offenders because they're repeat status offenders or they need mental health evaluations. But I think judges need to know that they are -- we- we -- the state can be deemed in housing status offenders for too long of a period of time in a detention facility, so that's kind of what I'm talking about here.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid for the record? Do we have the, like, the data on how often that's happening that's causing issues? Just out of curiosity?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes, I do have that data. So --

**Brigid Duffy:** So, I'm not -- I mean, being in Clark, it's not. I mean, shoot, I can't even get a misdemeanor.

**Leslie Bittleston:** No. And I need to say this, this does not happen in Clark.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is really more of the rural jurisdictions maybe. But I didn't want to say rural judges. I'm just going to be more generic. Clark County is really unique in the fact that it has the- the harbor. You have very few status offenders, but you're the only county that has the harbor. So, the other counties are still taking status offenders to detention, so.

**Elizabeth Flores:** If I can, this is Liz. I remember you reported in the past that there's a certain threshold that we have to -- a percentage of violation that we have to stay under otherwise, it impacts statewide funding. And you had mentioned in before -- you had mentioned before that we're typically under that, that we don't reach the violation rate. And I think you even named a specific county where the majority of the violations were coming from. It wasn't Washoe.

**Leslie Bittleston:** It wasn't Washoe.

**Elizabeth Flores:** But, yeah, so. But what you had started with Leslie, as you indicated, that you're seeing a rise though in the percentage of violations related to that.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Okay.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Last year, we had one. This year, I've counted six. And one to six when we have a small population, you know. And when I say population, I'm talking 18 and under. So, six violations for roughly 700,000 youth is a lot of violations, so. And I don't know if that's going to put us over or over the threshold. I haven't done that data yet. But I just pulled the data and we have six violations currently. So I think it would be beneficial for judges to understand that there is a threshold for holding status offenders. And we are almost out of time, Madam Chair. We have five minutes to go. I think we've done a really great job on this.

**Elizabeth Flores:** This is Liz. Leslie, can you remind this group of your deadline to submit this to your internal committee?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. It is due August 1st to the legislative committee on the judiciary. It takes roughly two weeks to go through the internal review process. And what I mean by the internal review process is that anything that gets sent to the legislature or the governor does have to go through DCFS and the Department of Health and Human Services review process and that takes roughly about two weeks.

**Elizabeth Flores:** So, if we're -- if we are to reverse calendar, I'm looking at August 1 and I think we had talked about this last time, but I didn't write down the date. So, for your purposes, you really want to get this to your team, a final draft no later than July 18th, and that's really, I mean, that's two weeks from prior to August 1.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Elizabeth Flores:** So, what my recommendation is, is that with the edits that -- that -- we attempt to schedule another meeting to review whatever your edits are so that this group can have final review and approval prior to that time.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Perfect.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Does that sound reasonable to everybody?

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Elizabeth Flores:** And so, the next item is -- so that was item number five. For item number six, Leslie, do you think it will take more than two minutes to discuss? Perhaps you could -- we could start the topic and then if it's going to require more robust discussion, we can add it to the next agenda.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I recommend adding it to the next agenda.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Okay. So, we will move agenda item number six and different until the next agenda. So, that closes item six. Item seven for possible action. I don't have any new business, and so does anybody else have anything that they'd like to add at this time before we confirm the next meeting date and time? No? Okay. Ms. Bittleston or Ms. Williamson, should we throw out some -- well, does the group prefer to throw out some dates now to get something on the calendar or do you prefer Doodle poll? I think with -- I think prior Commissioner Walker indicated that there are certain dates that don't work for him. And I think that's why we did the Doodle poll last time and for the dates that he was available, we didn't have enough other members to reach a quorum, and that's why those dates weren't selected, so we can try another Doodle poll to try to get -- find a date available for him.

**Leslie Bittleston:** May I recommend Madam Chair if Monday's are good? Is Monday, July 11th okay for the group?

**Elizabeth Flores:** That does work for me. This is Liz.

**Leslie Bittleston:** We can do the same time at 9 a.m. But I see Brigid shaking her head.

**Brigid Duffy:** That works for me.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Why don't we do that Madam Chair. We can do July 11th at 9 a.m.

**Elizabeth Flores:** Okay, we are scheduled for July 11th, 9 a.m. Moving on, is there any public comment or discussion? I don't see any. So, we will adjourn this meeting at 10:29. Thanks, everybody.

**Mike Whelihan:** Thank you.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you.

[end of meeting]