

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 *Racial and Ethnic Disparities* Committee Meeting July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 10:00 am

### TRANSCRIPT

**Call to Order:** Chair, Commissioner Graham, called meeting to order at 10:00 am. Leslie Bittleston took roll and confirmed there was quorum.

**Roll Call:**

**(Voting Members)**

**Present:** Rebekah Graham, Brigid Duffy, Katherine Maher

**Absent:** Jennifer Fraser

**(Non-Voting Members)**

**Present:** Daniel Perue [ph], Sara Bruce [ph], Trinette Burton

**Absent:**

**Public Present:**

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

**Rebekah Graham:** I apologize I have [inaudible] at my office or whatever in the meeting. They drink [ph] water or find a squeaky toy, is this what happens. It's not me, I swear. So if anybody who is present for the February 18th, 2021 meeting, it was a while ago, I would like to -- take a moment to review the minutes and then if I can have a motion to approve those minutes.

**Brigid Duffy:** I was there in February of 2021. This is Brigid for the record and I reviewed these last night and I would make a motion to approve.

**Rebekah Graham:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Unidentified:** Second.

**Unidentified:** Second.

**Rebekah Graham:** Alright. All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**Rebekah Graham:** Alright, [inaudible]. Those minutes are approved. We're now -- next going to look at the DCFS update for racial and ethnic disparities work and so that's Leslie. She has two things for us to review at that level.

Whenever you're ready, Leslie, you're muted.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I was talking to myself, my bad. So, the first document I would like to go over with the group is the racial and ethnic disparities report assessment and action plan for Federal Fiscal Year '21. It is quite an extensive document, so if you want to pull that up and I will walk the committee through this document. Thank you, Madam Chair. And just a little background on this document, it is required federally, so I do submit this to OJJDP, the Office of Juvenile Justice, Delinquency and Prevention and on an annual basis. This data -- this report is prepared based on data that is obtained from the County Juvenile Probation Department and from the state facilities. So going through these documents starting on the introduction, it just basically says that this document is required per the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. And then moving on to the summary page, this is a brief snapshot of what was -- what will be highlighted in this document. The data currently has a population of youth 0 to 17 of 697,280; 9,755 youth were referred to the juvenile justice system which is 1.3 percent of the total population, 65 percent were males, 58.5 were minorities and then 29 percent were diverted from the system. And then we just have arrest, secure attention placements and then 174-youth placed with DCFS and 61-youth were certified as an adult and try in adult criminal court. Moving on to the next few pages is where I defined the contact point that I'm collecting data on. So, starting on page 5, what you will find in this document is referral, referral source, arrest and all of these items on the left are what I refer to as contact points. So, there is data within this document on all of those contact points. And then starting on page 7, this is a breakdown of population for the state, broken down by race for each counties. So as I stated earlier, 697,580-youth, this is how it -- these youth are broken down by each county by race and gender. So, this is a snapshot of what we have in the state as of December 7th, 2021 when I pulled this data. So we are -- thank you, moving on to the next page. So, this is just a different presentation of the same data that was on the previous page, just to kind of provide a clear picture of the breakdown of the race population in Nevada. And what's really interesting is Hispanic is now the dominant race in Nevada. Okay, moving on to the next page, this is a historical breakdown of race over the last few years. As you can see, white has kind of gone up a little bit. African American or black was higher and has decreased and Hispanic has increased as well as Asian. Another interesting thing on this chart over to the very right, there's a big spike where it says other mix. The way that we are capturing race data recently is allowing for in other which is really folks with two or more -- two or more of these areas. So, an other mix could be somebody who is white, African American and Hispanics, so they are identifying themselves as multiple or other mix which could be multiple populations or multiple races.

**Rebekah Graham:** And it looks like that impacted -- that's where the difference in those black and Asian. It looks like that largely shifted to the other people, we're able to identify more than one ethnicity.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. It was quite interesting -- yes, you're absolutely right because as you see the black and the Asian members spikes are pretty low and the spike over on other mix, so for -- it looks

like we got a lot of black and Asian mix youth in Nevada. The next -- the next chart is a snapshot of the crime data. If you remember what I was talking about the points in time, so this is a breakdown of referral, arrest, secure detention and all of those points in time, again, broken down by county. The very bottom line, the total, those are the overall numbers, so referrals 9,755; 4,320 arrest; 2,534 placements in secure county detention and so on. Table number 6 is that same data broken down just by gender. Nevada generally sees at least 60 to 70 percent male within the system. And then moving on to the next one, this is just additional breakdowns of referral data. So as you can see, we are more than 60 percent males for referrals and then the breakdown of race for referrals. And what is really interesting here is if you remember the predominant race being Hispanic but if you look at the referrals, it's -- the predominant referrals is white. So, we're seeing some disparity with white -- with white folks, white youth at referral because we're seeing more white than anybody else but we also are still seeing disparity of black referrals compared to the population. So, moving on to the next page, so this again is really -- so table number 9, these line graphs are really the graphs that really showed those disparity number. So, the blue is the race population in Nevada as we discussed earlier, the yellow is the referrals. So, there is some disparity at the white and the African American races but as you can see, very low for Hispanic compared to the population there. And we're going to see that throughout this report, the disparity of white and African American and the lower Hispanic. Table number 10 is where the referral is coming from just over 80 percent are from local law enforcement, almost 11 percent from school police and so on. Moving on to the next page, these are the diversions of -- as we can see again, these charts really will follow the referrals. So if there's disparity at the white and the African American, we're going to -- meaning higher numbers we're going to see higher numbers of white and African American throughout all of these charts. So, the percentage of diversions was 43 percent, so -- and when you look at diversion numbers, we are looking at those that are diverted from the system based on referrals. Okay, moving on to table number 12, these are the diversion types, more than 90 percent are misdemeanor, less than 1 percent gross misdemeanor and 5.5 percent felony and then breakdown by gender. Again, you can see the same line chart, this is the diversion and it follows the same lines as we saw at referral. So, we are seeing disparity for white and African American and then the lower Hispanic. And then, now we're moving on to arrest on chart number or table number 15. And this is where we see some interesting numbers here. The three big numbers are fairly close to each other. So moving on to the next slide or the next page, again disparity of males over females. And then, here's the line chart again. We see this interesting line of white, African American and Hispanic, so really our disparity on this chart is with African Americans. We have lower population or lower arrest data for the population for white and for Hispanic. And moving on, poverty, this is the poverty for -- poverty level for just arrested youth. Unfortunately, not all counties are able to provide this data, so this is just kind of a snapshot of a portion of the arrested youth. And what see is almost 54 percent or at are -- are at or below poverty. And then again with the household composition, again not all counties are able to provide this. Again, this is a small snapshot of arrested youth and what we are seeing here is the majority, over 55 percent have at least one bio parent in the home. Chart -- table number 20, those are just the historical arrest. As you can see, we are on a decline for the last three years. Table 21, the top 10 most common charges in Nevada for just for the last five years. And what was really interesting for 2021 as there was a lot of arrest for crime with the use of a deadly weapon or the possession of a deadly weapon. That was our number one charge for FY or for '21, followed by assault and battery, violation of parole probation, domestic battery. And then, our first status offense runaway that is number 7, so that is still a very high charge in Nevada. Moving on to number -- page 19, these are the certifications. This is where we really see the greatest disparity in Nevada and that is amongst the

certifications, three-white youth, 32-African American youth and 23-Hispanic youth and all males. The all males is not anything different than we see in the last previous years nor is the breakdown of race at certification but again it really shows that disparity for the youth of color. Moving on to page 20, this is that same line chart that I presented at several contact points. This really shows that disparity of the African American at certification. We're about halfway through the report, are there any questions? Nope? Okay. Moving on to page 21, this is secure detention placement in the counties. As you can see, again, our white, African American and Hispanic are fairly close, mostly male again. So, there is a lot of disparity in the system with the gender at all of these contact points. Moving on to table 27, here is, again, that same line chart that shows the disparity of secure detention placement for African American youth, so there's that. And then, the next one, moving down to table 28, these are the petitions. Here is where we see something pretty interesting. Again, we see disparity of white youth at this particular contact point. So, the data this year and I guess what I'm trying to say overall is this -- the 2021 data was pretty interesting where it showed some really big disparity in African American contact point but it also showed some disparity with the white youth as well. So, that is what we see for petition. Moving on to table 29, again the disparity of male and female. Table 30, here is the same line graph for the petitions and again we see that disparity of white youth versus the other youth. So, it's mostly white youth that were petitioned. There is disparity again at the African American but not what -- not to the level of what we saw with certifications and detention placements, so interesting data. Moving on to table 31, these are status offense petitions. As we can see, this is -- there were some disparity here with the African American youth again for just status offense petitions and then mostly male. Moving on to delinquency and adjudication, here's a breakdown of adjudications by race. Interesting data again, white, Hispanic and African American. So, these lines pretty much mirror the petition line, so more white youth are petitioned, some more white youth are adjudicated along that line. Again, the gender disparity on table 34. Moving on to table 35, this is the same line graph again for adjudications. It almost mirrors the petitions. And then for table 36, these are re-adjudications and what that means is we're looking at youth that were adjudicated last year versus youth that were adjudicated this year. Not all counties were able to provide this data, so this -- like the poverty and the household composition is a small snapshot of adjudication. So, it follows the same line as the white, Hispanic and African American. Table 37 is the gender breakdown and then 38 is that re-adjudication line following and again closely mirroring the other adjudication line, the general adjudications. Moving on to 39 -- to table 39. This is --

**Rebekah Graham:** Sorry, I was writing.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Sorry. Okay, this is probation and what we mean by probation, these are formal probation placements. This does not include any informal probation or anything that's part of diversion. These are formal probation placement and there is some disparity here for the African American male -- and males. And moving down to the next page, I decided to on this chart just to give us a different look than the line charts that I presented, so just to see what the -- I saw here. This is really the same data as those line charts, just presented as a histogram rather than line charts. So, it still shows the disparity across the system, especially for African American youth. Moving on to the next contact point, county camp placement, so this would be placement in Spring Mountain, Aurora Pine and China Spring. Again, the disparity we see with the African American and Hispanic follows the same lines that we see with the secure detention placement. So, a slightly smaller population of white youth placed in county camp with a high number of African American youth. Even though Hispanic youth are

at 32 percent, it is still under the population, so there is really no disparity there. Really, the only disparity is that African American contacts point. This is a breakdown of the three-county camp placements with Spring Mountain in Las Vegas. Aurora Pine is in Douglas County and it is only for females and then China Spring is in Douglas County and only for males. Moving on to secure confinement and what's confusing here is the secure confinement is a federal term. What it means is placement in a juvenile correctional facility. So, these are placements at DCFS for Nevada Youth Training Center, Caliente or Summit View. Again, this is the disparity of the African American male and males. Moving on to the next page, here's that line graph, again, that shows the disparity of African American placed at a youth correctional facility. Page 32 is really an outline of the conclusion of what was found in this report that I kind of talked about throughout is that there is an overrepresentation of African American youth at almost every contact point. Males are overrepresentative based on the population and there is some overrepresentation of white youth at diversion, petition and adjudication and underrepresentation of Hispanic youth at almost every contact point. So, really that's our four takeaways from all of this data that was presented. Moving on to page 33, the action plan. These are questions that OJJDP requires states to answer. So, what we are saying here is that what our numbers tell us is that overall we are referring less youth to the system. So with the referrals of less youth, we're seeing less youth at all contact points. Moving on to the next page, so what would success for racial and ethnic disparity reduction looked like in your jurisdiction. And basically, a reduction in disparity of African American youth, so what I point in this section was the enactment of Senate Bill 108 which requires all juvenile justice practitioners to receive training and cultural competency, disparate treatment and implicit bias. What we hope is that we will see some improvement because we're putting some more targeted placement, targeted training, excuse me, for all juvenile justice practitioners including law enforcement. So, that's what I put there. Moving on to the next page. Number 3, what do you want to reduce? So, basically, there's really not a lot to say here because the state does not have authority over county. So, basically what we say is that we want to implement training requirements across all the whole system, so we can better address the youth that do come in to our system. So, that's basically the remaining part of the report that talks about training for practitioners. That is really the racial and ethnic assessment report and I can take any questions.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid. I have a question or maybe just somebody could possibly help me speculate on the why. So if we have -- so on page 22 at table 28, the petition by race, so this is state-wide. We petitioned a disproportionately high number of white children but then once you get to probation like what happens to those kids?

**Rebekah Graham:** Didn't get put on probation.

**Brigid Duffy:** Yes, what -- that's what I don't -- where did they go, like we petitioned like almost twice as many like then as the Hispanic community and you know a large amount I want to say, maybe like three or four times -- three times as many perhaps as the black children. But then all of a sudden, it switches and everything for probation is disproportionately African American, so.

**Leslie Bittleston:** I think -- this is Leslie for the record. I think part of the problem is I rely 100 percent on county data but I believe part of the problem is counties are still struggling to provide accurate data with Tyler Supervision. So -- and maybe I do need to indicate that in here that we may have some interesting numbers because -- but I think that's part of the problem. And we are working on -- we as a

state, all of us, that used Tyler Supervision are working on better reporting mechanisms but I believe that is where we are seeing the problems with what you just pointed out, the petitions to the probation placements.

**Rebekah Graham:** This is Rebekah Graham for the record. Hispanic, -- I mean, sorry, African American youth are 2 percent of the population. They're 12 percent of the petition, they're 18 percent of the reeducations, 30 percent of detentions and 35 percent on secure confinement, like, you know, and that would be -- I know the training potentially will help and it hasn't helped yet but it seems that, you know, and we're looking at implicit bias. We're looking at those things. I mean, the African American community has a lot of historical trauma with the justice system, with law enforcement. And you know it would -- because, you know, would go from 2 percent to 35 percent seems that our system isn't working very well in understanding how African American youth may respond differently to law enforcement or judicial authority, absent [ph] their behaviors being that different, you know. Other populations, they don't have the same historical trauma, more yes sir and yes ma'am, you know, and it's not necessarily the child's behavior is worse. It's their attitude that might be perceived as worse because of their, again, the population's historic troubles with the system and that the system is -- there's a systemic bias that we see in DCFS, that we see in Juvenile Justice, you know. So, those reactions and responses from the community, it's now a -- kind of a vicious cycle, I don't know, but you know hopefully this training will address but that's why it's so important, I don't know. And I definitely like to hear from other attendees on what they took away from the data. Like Sara [ph] or Ms. Burton, is there anybody else who would like to, you know, kind of say what they saw from the data?

Okay. Alright, well, I think the action of the training is still really critical. This shows it more than anything why it continues to be so important. Does anybody else have any kind of highlights or strategies that you think would additionally improve these outcomes?

**Katherine Maher:** Katherine Maher for the record. I mean I don't want to repeat what you said, Ms. Graham, but I just think that not only that you got the families and having the education to understand like the resources within the family and within the smaller community and how those can be access rather than further penetrating the youth into the system. That's where the education I think in the training for all the stakeholders will also be important to maybe not have this YLS score and have a better understanding of the family dynamic overall.

**Rebekah Graham:** Because, you know, and I like YLS assessments but they're only as good as the data that get inputted into them. And so, you know, the assessor, whoever is doing the assessments still has some amount of bias in where they rate or score at problematic areas.

**Brigid Duffy:** And -- this is Brigid for the record. Rebekah, that's a really interesting point. I was thinking as I was listening to the -- Kathryn talked about the YLS and then you say that like as good as a person putting it in. Leslie, do we have data on risk level assessed by the YLS in racial, ethnic background, because that would be really interesting. Because as I think about how I -- how I can see a disproportionate amount of white children being petitioned in the court and adjudicated, what's the YLS score coming back where they don't penetrate deep into the system but our African American population of children are penetrating deep into the system at adjudication. So, that would be

interesting to see if maybe we can track that like Rebekah said, you know, it's -- well, it's very subjective, even though it's not supposed to be.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Brigid Duffy:** It's like [ph] the person doing the assessment based upon interviews with the family and whether the family is cooperative, whether or not they have, you know, support, extracurricular activities, like that would be a really interesting data point to see if that's why where it drops off for the white population and increases for the black population.

**Katherine Maher:** Katherine Maher for the record. I'd also add and that's the tool that is consistent throughout and which show why the disparity continues through the whole process.

**Brigid Duffy:** So -- this is Brigid again. Is the YLS doing what we expect them to do which was to impact the disproportionate minority contact but instead it's actually continuing to perpetuate it. I won't say increase it but perpetuate it.

**Leslie Bittleston:** This is Leslie for the record. I think that's really, really interesting. The state does not have I don't think enough of that data. I think what we can do -- so let me -- let me describe what the state does have. The state does have the YLS score for all of the committed youth to DCFS. So, we do have those YLS scores. We do not have YLS scores for all of the youth that are petitioned. So, what we can do is we can look at the YLS score of those committed to DCFS based on the race, ethnicity. What we are also tracking in -- with the YLS is we are also looking at their score at commitment to DCFS and then their score when they leave, like their final YLS but that is just on that tiny small population of youth that are committed to DCFS. So, we'd be looking only at a couple hundred kids, unless we want to talk about gathering some additional data from the county. So right now, DCFS only has YLS scores for those committed youth.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid again for the record. So -- but we know what that's going to show us because we know that a disproportionately high number of black children are going to the correctional placements because we see that from what you have.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Right.

**Brigid Duffy:** So, we know that's not -- so maybe -- I would recommend that we do send a letter from this committee asking for the counties to provide us information on their YLS scores based upon the race or ethnic background of a child.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** And Daniel [ph] was raising his hand by the way [inaudible].

**Daniel Perue [ph]:** Thank you. This is Daniel [ph] for the record. Something else I wanted to add to that too. A lot of the YLS that we do have, because I do run those reports as well and compare them with the change in that score, up to about 2018, 2019 is really where it starts. And so, it will be a couple

of years of comparison really of what we would be looking at but it would give us a trajectory to go forward.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes and this is Rebekah Graham for the record. I keep forgetting to do that. But looking at the YLS on how heavily it weighs static risk factors versus dynamic can definitely negatively impact, I don't know, groups that are more heavily arrested or seeing disparity at arrest and now the YLS, if it's weighting more too heavily in the historical police contact, it automatically increases those risk factors or the results. So every -- it amplifies the disparity instead of truly assessing risks just because if the police are already overly interacting with black kids and they have more citations or more tickets or more arrest, because disparities are already over there. When they get to the rest of the system, now the YLS is what this kid has been arrested three times and so now they a high risk when the behavior themselves maybe aren't that different from the rest of the population. The white kid just didn't get arrested with his potato [inaudible]. So you know, that's -- and then there are some studies around that where how heavily static factors weigh in versus dynamic factors, and how those static factors more negatively impact youth of color. And so, I think that's something that this committee, if we can get more YLS data, might be worth taking a look at and making recommendations around that, I don't know.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Madam Chair, I did not put a -- well let me double check my agenda. I don't think I put this for possible action.

**Rebekah Graham:** No, just that we were talking about but --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** I think when we, you know, as an action we would like to see the YLS data --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** --by race as much as that data is available, so we can take a look at if that's where disparity is coming from because it upcycles, it doubles at various points at the [ph] studies, doubling, you know, it goes from 2 to 12, to 30, to 35, like that's really big like split. And so where is that coming from is worth looking at.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Madam Chair, would -- do we want to add that to the next meeting, agenda to put that for possible action and the -- and specifically define the data that we want to request from the counties.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes please.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** And moving down our agenda, Ms. Bittleston, would you like to cover the SB 398 draft?



**Leslie Bittleston:** Yes. Leslie Bittleston for the record. SB 398, just to update the group is Senate Bill 398 is a requirement for the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission to present a report to the legislative -- to the legislature regarding the actions and updates or -- what am I trying to say? The words not even in my head, the progress, thank you, the progress made on the JJOC's strategic plan. So, DCFS has been working with the Strategic Planning Committee and the committee approved the plan yesterday. Is there one that is a draft that is in the Google drive of the SB 398? Okay. Alright, perfect. So, just to provide some information, what the group approved was this document through page -- if you go down to page 15 please. First, I'm going to inform this committee what the group approved and then I'm going to talk specifically the racial and ethnic disparity piece of this. So, what the group approved is this pull document down to this letter E on page 15 and -- so the remaining part of this report will be deleted. And the reason that will be deleted is this was more DCFS proposing some bill draft language for some help around compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The group decided, the Strategic Planning Committee decided that it was enough just to indicate that the state is out of compliance in these areas and end it there. So, the document, this was the one that was presented yesterday but this will not be the final draft that goes through the legislature. So, I don't know Brigid, you were on the committee, did I state that correctly?

**Brigid Duffy:** Yes. Yes, you did.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. Okay, going back to that same document, Madam Chair, on page 14. Thank you, right there. So, this document does include a bill draft recommendation for the disparities in the juvenile justice system based on the work this committee did a couple of years ago with the survey. So if -- I will remind the group that a survey was conducted of local law enforcement and the results of that survey identified some training -- some areas where local law enforcement and dispatchers need some training. So, this part on 14 going on to 15 is included in the report. So, that's what I wanted to bring to the attention of this committee that the work of this committee is included in SB 398. And I can take questions [inaudible].

**Rebekah Graham:** Thank you, Ms. Bittleston.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** Does anyone have any questions? Hearing none, we have Mr. LaBarbera and some additional data elements, if you want to go ahead? Did you need me to bring up any documents? You have to unmute yourself.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Hello, thank you. This is Daniel for the record and you said my last name perfect. Thank you for that, that's awesome. I usually get LaBirbra or some variation of, so rock and roll. Thank you very much. I will go ahead and pull this thing up here and we'll go through it. This is the racial and ethnic disparities information as it pertains to SB 107 for room confinement. Now -- let me pull up this document here, just bear with me for a moment while I pull it on the desktop.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Just before Dan get started, I want to preface his report with the fact that this is new data that we are working on to look at some additional disparities. So, this is brand new this time, so

we are really trying to work through this and work on a way to present this data the best way we can. So, bear with us with the new data.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes.

**Leslie Bittleston:** And Dan has done a wonderful job putting it together. He's, you know, fairly new with us but he's really -- he's dove in and got some data together. So, take it away, Dan.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Alright, thank you. This is Daniel for the record. So as we were talking before we got into this, we're wanting some more information for YLS's to make it more complete, more overhead view. This is kind of in the same boat. I want more information to add to this but this is where we're going so far. So as we know, we're all here, this is the Racial And Ethnic Disparities Committee. This information presented focuses really strictly on just room confinements and those racial breakdowns as it pertains to it. I -- going into this, don't have a lot of the information that I want to square it with, such as or for example, X facility has X population and out of that population there is X or Y, X for African American, X for that, blah, blah, blah. I don't have that, so I'm going strictly off of just what is being put, racially speaking, into room confinement. So first of all, start with the state facilities, NYTC, CYC and SVYC and I have them written down here, Nevada Youth Training Center, Caliente Youth Center and Summit View. This first little figure here just shows the racial totals, again for SB 107 room confinement, for these three-state facilities and what racial groups are being put in to room confinement. Again, it's kind of only one side of the coin because I can't -- I don't have the information to compare it as of right now to the population strictly speaking to that particular facility and/or county camp but this is what we have in SB 107 room confinements four state facilities. As we go down, I try to expand on this a little bit by breaking it down into each particular facility for the state. So, this is our NYTC facility all the way from July of last year to current of May. As you can see here, I have also added in other mix category because we're starting to see -- as I'm going through these numbers and these reports, I'm starting to see a little bit of an increase in that particular category. And if we need to break that down more to further, you know, extrapolate that, to figure out what exactly what that means, we can do that. CYC, as we go down as well, same timeframes here. It shows, you know, a lot of African American youth being put into room confinement but again it doesn't necessarily mean too much unless I have that comparison of racial population for that particular facility. So as we go down again, the last state facility here is SVYC or Summit View, same timeframes. Just a -- just a glance, again, and I'm sounding like a dead horse here but I don't have that other piece of the coin to compare it with. But just at first glance, it looks pretty consistent I would say with a couple of outliers here and there, maybe March and April being one. But for the most part, looking at it as a whole, as it is, it looks consistent and that's the end of the state facilities as it is now. You want me to go into the county centers, I want to make a couple of notes on this. Douglas County, Leighton Hall, and Teurman Hall have had no juveniles during the timeframe of 07/21 to May of 2022, so -- obviously, I don't have any information for that. Teurman Hall and I wanted to explain this too which is could complicate this even more. If everybody gets on the same page in terms of reporting the same exact standard information, we can get a very standardized view. It will look the same each time. So -- and let me explain what I mean. Teurman Hall, if I said that correctly, does not supply data in terms of racial, gender, or age demographic. So even if I got information from them, I don't have information as it pertains to RED or I can't look into that for RED. Douglas County does not supply data in terms of that same information. However, Leighton Hall does, except they just didn't have any juveniles. So, this can get kind of sticky as

we go through it, at least I think so, if we're wanting at the end an accurate overview of what we're dealing with. However with that said, I got four of the county facilities out of seven or excuse me, the counties out of the seven, Murphy-Bernardini, Jan Evans, Northeastern, and Clark County. Same timeframe, July 21 to May of 2022. You can see just the different racial populations. Now this is, again, all going to depend on the different influx of population. People who have more population will have more juveniles, obviously. People, you know, the thing that will make this very, very interesting is let's say, you know, the Jan Evans, I would really like to know of their entire population breakdown, their racial breakdowns because they do have a lot of the population there. And this would further -- this would help makes sense of this graph and I know I sound like a dead horse but that's just what I am today I guess. As we go down, I further expand on Murphy-Bernardini, same timeframe. We're looking at the different races that are being put into room confinement. October was interesting and again another note on this is, this particular graph and the reason why I don't this is because not every county does it. Because, I come from a -- quick background, sidestep, I come from the military, everything has to be standard for me. Like I have to -- everything got to be in particular way for me to do it to the best of my ability. Now if it's not standard in such a way, for instance with this, I don't know if it's the same individual of the same race being put in. I don't know -- I'm doing a lot of shooting in the dark here but I would really like to refine this to give you all a better representation of what I'm trying to show you. I just hope you get where I'm trying to go with this. Let's look at Jan Evans real quick, again facility is a lot more of -- more population, so it's going to go all over the place. And kind of what, you know, Leslie was bringing out in her presentation is she was saying, you know, Hispanic being the predominant race now in Nevada. This might explain why we're seeing some of these numbers like this, like why in November there's 36 compared to 16 instances of Y youth. That might explain, that's fine and there's no disparity there because we understand the population, you know, kind of dictates this too without really diving in. I know we can go deeper but hopefully you get my drift here. Northeastern, same deal, a little bit less of a population but again I'm just trying to show the different racial breakdowns as it pertains to the room confinement. Clark County, another highly trafficked area. The racial breakdowns as we see here, kind of around this area it looks find besides this outlier here. Again, we only have one side of the coin.

**Brigid Duffy:** So, I'm sorry, so --

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes, yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** -- that graph shows me -- this is Brigid for the record, that not one child that was -- that identified as Hispanic was put into room confinement for nearly a year?

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes. I think so. What did you -- can you say again, I'm sorry?

**Brigid Duffy:** So, there's not one identified Hispanic from July of 2021 to May of 2022 that was put into room confinement in the Clark County Juvenile Detention Center?

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes, there -- so when I get the report, so here how it goes, they'll say like -- they'll say, for instance, here's one individual and they'll give me the race of the individual and that will be on one day. And then a couple of days go by, maybe it's the same individual and that date, so if -- and maybe I'm not understanding the question correctly or the statement but in my county --

**Brigid Duffy:** So -- this is Brigid again. Let me -- let me see if I can try this one more time. So, look at that graph and not -- there's not one Hispanic room confinement. None of those bars are gray.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Oh my God, there isn't, yes -- yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay, so what I'm --

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes. That's good -- that's a good -- that's great, yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** There was another graph above that had the same issue with Clark County, so -- but this is just as far as population I think it was.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** If you go up to Clark.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes, let's see.

**Brigid Duffy:** But here's where I think -- yes, so it look and see -- so here's what Clark County does I believe because if I pull up -- let me pull up a kid right now, just without you all seeing him. This is going to go our highest level security facility. I believe that -- they just marked white for every Hispanic kid. I don't --

**Dan LaBarbera:** And that -- yes, that's --

**Brigid Duffy:** So, I'm just like --

**Dan LaBarbera:** [Inaudible] step up.

**Brigid Duffy:** -- this is not going to sound very scientific because it's, you know, I'm just going by last names.

**Dan LaBarbera:** No, I like to shoot straight.

**Brigid Duffy:** But for -- yes, so this child with a last name that is predominantly Hispanic and his photograph looks as if he is Hispanic, his race is identified as white.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes.

**Brigid Duffy:** Here's another one, all [inaudible].

**Dan LaBarbera:** Yes, they don't -- yes, they don't send me pictures either.

**Brigid Duffy:** Yes. Yes, yes, well, I mean not to say he's not maybe mix, maybe he identified as mix but -

**Dan LaBarbera:** True.

**Brigid Duffy:** -- that's a big -- there's no way, I'm sorry. I think it's the way they keep their data because there's just no way.

**Dan LaBarbera:** I think -- and this is Daniel for the record. I think it maybe then begs the question, do we -- as a whole then if we want this data, if this is something we want to look at, then do we want to standardize the way we do the reporting then? Do we want to make sure that we annotate, whoa, Hispanic not identifying as white or that because yes, obviously that's going to screw --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Here it comes.

**Rebekah Graham:** My apologies. Go ahead and continue now that we're recording.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay, this is Brigid again. I was just -- I think the recording stopped when I was making a comment that just going by last names that are more predominantly Hispanic such as Hernandez, Ramirez, they are all identifying as white on my screen, in my database --

**Dan LaBarbera:** Backing the [inaudible].

**Leslie Bittleston:** Here she goes again. She apologized.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Game on.

**Katherine Maher:** I am so sorry. I had been having WiFi issues all day. I'm like ready to pull my hair up, sorry.

**Rebekah Graham:** No problem.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Been there.

**Brigid Duffy:** Okay, so I'm not sure -- this is Brigid again just so the record is clear. I was just making a comment that all of our data from Clark might be skewed and since we are the largest county and impact what all of the data looks like when you collect state-wide data, we need to make sure even in the report that Leslie showed that we're collecting the proper white versus Hispanic data because that might be where the disproportionate white contact comes from when we're saying that there's more.

**Rebekah Graham:** Yes, this is Rebekah Graham for the record. I would agree. We are seeing Hispanic underrepresented, white overrepresented. We're also seeing our largest county not -- not use Hispanic as a category essentially.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Great. And again as Dan said, you know, we take the data at face value. If somebody is identified as white, we're going to put him as white and you know, so I think -- so I have added that for our next meeting as well as agenda item to clarify how we want data from the counties.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid again. I think I need to talk to Clark because I know from sitting in meetings on diversionary programs that we divert -- like when I sit in -- just I'm going to use our Harbor, so when I sit in those Harbor meetings and they give us the data that is collected from that program, they break it down by white, non-Hispanic and white Hispanic. And we are -- we are a very large percentage of diversion on the Hispanic population through the harbor. So, when I see that we are disproportionately high in the white category for diversion, I'm thinking they didn't break it down from a Tyler Supervision pool but the Harbor keeps data separately in a different Tyler, so I -- yes.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Brigid Duffy:** So before any of this -- any of this data goes public, I think we need to make sure because that's a -- that's a pretty -- I don't want to say controversial but it's a pretty big statement to say that we are disproportionately high in the Caucasian population. I think people are going to be like where is that coming from when it might not even be there because of the way Clark might have tilted that data, not intentionally, that's just how they keep it.

**Rebekah Graham:** Thank you very much, Ms. Duffy for the insight. If you hadn't been in the meeting, we might not have known exactly why Clark is doing that. Although, the data, zero, might give us a little clue.

**Brigid Duffy:** Dan's graph kind of made me go hmm, if anybody remembers that song from the 90's, that makes you go hmm, remember that? No? Am I aging myself?

**Rebekah Graham:** No, no, we're there, right with you. We have the most interesting meeting minutes. I'm just telling you. So that being said, Daniel, do you want to go over the room confinement by county detention or do you want to hold off on that until you had another chance to look at the data?

**Dan LaBarbera:** For the -- we went over it a little bit but yeah, we can -- we can table it for now until maybe we can do it next meeting. I'll have something else whipped up for you folks.

**Rebekah Graham:** Thank you, perfect.

**Dan LaBarbera:** Absolutely.

**Rebekah Graham:** Moving on to possible action. It seems like we have a couple of items that we definitely want to look at our agenda. For next time -- oh we want to look at the YLS and Ms. Bittleston and Mr. LaBarbera, I did send you both a study that just came out last year on the YLS in static versus dynamic risk factors that I would like to include in the material that goes out for the next meeting. And then, follow-up as well with definitions, racial categories that are -- we need to discuss that at our next meeting as well to make sure the counties are telling us the same thing for the same folks. Is there any other agenda items that anyone feels like we need to make sure are on our next meeting?

Alright, hearing none, we will send out a Doodle poll for our next meeting, unless -- is that what we're planning to do, Ms. Bittleston?

**Leslie Bittleston:** We can sign out a Doodle poll or we can -- we throw out some dates here and see if they work for the folks. And if you want to send out dates, I will ask Madam Chair how quickly do you want to meet? Do you want to go a month to month?

**Rebekah Graham:** Because we have so many action items that impact --

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay.

**Rebekah Graham:** -- our report impact what the data even says, I would like to go a month and so if Tuesday morning seem to work well for the group, we can look at August 9th or August 16th for potential meeting dates.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid, the 16th works for me. I had something from 10 to 11 already scheduled on the 9th.

**Katherine Maher:** This is Katherine, that works for me as well.

**Rebekah Graham:** Alright, then let -- let's plan on August 16th at 10:00 a.m. for our next meeting.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Okay. So, August 16th at 10:00 a.m.

**Rebekah Graham:** Alright and -- alright, there is room for additional public comment, if anyone has any additional comments.

Hearing none, I will accept a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**Brigid Duffy:** This is Brigid. I will move to adjourn this very informative meeting. It was great.

**Rebekah Graham:** No, everybody's different insights really what make this worked, you know, for sure. So, that being said, I think Ms. Maher is seconding.

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

**Rebekah Graham:** Alright. The meeting is adjourned at 11:06 a.m. and we will talk again soon. Thank you all for your robust dialogue.

**Katherine Maher:** Thanks everyone.

**Leslie Bittleston:** Thank you.

[end of meeting]

