

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 State Advisory Group Planning Committee Meeting September 22nd, 2022 at 2:00 pm

TRANSCRIPT

Chair Pauline Pauline Salla-Smith called meeting to order at 2:00 am.

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

(VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Pauline Salla-Smith (Chair), Rebekah Graham, Jennifer Fraser, Jack Martin, Paula Smith, Joey Orduna-Hastings

Absent: Jessica Velazquez, Jeremy Setters, Jaquelyn Nadar

(NON VOTING MEMBERS)

Present by Phone: Joe Siez, Andrew Wachter, Melissa Sickmund

Absent:

Public Present:

DCFS Staff Present: Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Williamson

Meeting Minutes:

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Alright. Let's move to agenda item number 3, Public Comment and Discussion. Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for a later meeting. Do we have any public comment or discussion?

Seeing none and I think that Melissa Sickmund was going to join too. She had e-mailed me, so maybe we'll -- we'll wait to see because I think she did have some public comments but we can get her at the end of the meeting [inaudible].

Agenda item number 4, Approval of our February 7th, 2022 meeting minutes. This is attachment 4A and June 6, 2020 minutes -- meeting minutes, this is attachment 4B. But -- for everyone had a chance to review it and if so, I will entertain a motion.

JENNIFER FRASER: Commissioner Fraser for the record. I move to approve the minutes for both meetings.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Commissioner Fraser. Is there a second? I see Commissioner Martin is giving us the second. Thank you. Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Any opposed? Any abstention? Minutes are approved as submitted. Move to agenda item number 5, Evidence Based Resource Center Next Steps. Andrew, I'm going to turn this over to you.

ANDREW WACHTER: Hello everyone. Thank you. I got a few updates, mostly some trainings and some items that have gone up on our NCJJI website, but we did conduct two trainings recently. One was gender justice, understanding and supporting girls and young women in the youth legal system. That was a 90-minute webinar with Francine Sherman. That's recorded and now up on the NCJJI website. We also had a three-day training on using SMART goals to motivate and engaging in case planning. That training was recorded and is also up on the website. That's a -- there's three separate videos because it was a two and a half to three hours per day for three days. So, those are up there as well. We also supported some registration fees for a few different training opportunities in the last, you know, three to four months. First was a Mental Health and Juvenile Justice training curriculum. It was a training of trainer curriculum, so those individuals that attended would become master trainers on that curriculum. Those were about five-staff from DCFS that went to that but also created a plan for how they would use that -- that training in the future in terms of who else they might be able to train. So, Pauline, that's the training that you and I chatted about that you're also a certified trainer on, so. The -- we also covered some registration fees for online motivational interviewing course for about 23 registrants. That training course is online. You have up to a year to complete the curriculum, once you registered. So it's not time-bounded in any way, so you can take it at your own pace which is convenient. We supported some registration fees for two-probation officer staff to attend the APPA Conference in Chicago which was just in end of August. August 28 I believe, and some new newsletters that have gone up on the website. Cross-system collaboration and SMART goals, that was a written companion to the three-day training that I referenced earlier and one on girls in Juvenile Justice and responding to the deeds of girls [ph]. That is a newsletter that is up there. I will reference that we've done so far this year three workshops. Pauline, you just attended one today. That was our third one. We did one in May on mental health. Today's -- just a couple of hours ago, we did our third one which was on probation conditions and light up [ph] supervision. We'll continue doing those -- that's kind of a standing item that are -- it's in our budgeted work. So, we'll continue to do those. My colleague, Martha Blomquist, and I sort of planned a year of course of what those quarterly events will look like but we're certainly open to feedback. And so that's where we're at now and we're starting our new -- so Fiscal Year budget. So, we will have our new proposal that we've -- that wrote several years ago but we're going back to that to whatever events we have planned, deliverables we have planned in that. We'll start those this years as well, so. Happy to answer any questions, if anybody has it.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Pauline, you're on mute, if you're talking.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Oh my gosh, I was talking. I had like such great things to say too. So, thank you, Andrew from -- for presenting that. I just asked if there was any questions from the committee

members, comments for Andrew? And then -- seeing none, I think, Melissa, are you online now? Are you on the phone?

MELISSA SICKMUND: Yes, I am.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. Well, you did miss it. We'll have public comment at the end too, if you can hang out with us until there.

MELISSA SICKMUND: Sure, sure. I'm going to jump in my car but I will -- I will stay on the line.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay, thank you.

MELISSA SICKMUND: Thank you. Bye, bye.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay, so let's move on to agenda item number 6, DCFS Updates. Leslie, we got a lot to go over, so let's start with the Formula Grant Fiscal Year '21.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. So, the Formula Grant Fiscal Year '21 was supposed to be awarded on October 1st of 2021 last year. However, the award of that grant was put on hold for all states, not just for Nevada but for all states to revise their compliance manual on basically describing how the state is going to or states are going to ensure the four-core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. That was a long process. So, Nevada's Compliance Manual was approved on 08/01, so August 1st, 2022, Nevada's Compliance Manual was approved. And the fund for these grant were awarded to Nevada on the 8th of August. And they are -- so that grant is now active. As part of this, Nevada received about \$200,000 more than it had been receiving for the last several years. Nevada was receiving about 400 -- roughly \$400,000 a year. This FY '21 grant was \$610,000. So, it was quite boost from what we had been working with for the last several years. In anticipation of having additional grant funds, what I did do is I did send out a request for proposal for two sub-grants, some additional funds out, roughly 150,000 over and above the sub-grants that we are already funding on a year-to-year basis. And for reference, those sub-grants are located on attachment 6. That is part of our packet today, so these are the grantees that we are continuing to fund year-to-year. So, that \$150,000 request for application was over and above the funding of these -- these six sub-grants. The bad news is, is the state did not receive any applications for that additional money. So, I will try to come up with some solutions to bring to this body at a future meeting on how to sub-grant those additional -- some additional grant [inaudible]. That is all for bullet number 1. Madam Chair, do you want me to stop there for questions?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes. Let's -- let's stop. And does anyone have any questions on that part? So, that's crazy Leslie because I was just going to ask you when -- when that was due and -- so clearly that go away from me too. And I'm wondering if maybe a conversation at NAJA [ph] with all the chiefs and directors would be beneficial because -- that's just may have gotten away from -- I guess -- it definitely go away from me because I had a -- I had a request in mine, so today would be --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And my thought, Madam Chair, was, you know, I'm wondering if some additional outreach is needed, so I agree that the NAJA [ph] is a good idea. I'm wondering if there are

some gun shy folks out there that may not, you know, know if the funds will be there or not based on what the state has been going through over the last few months or few years I should say with, you know, the VOCA grants and then this compliance manual. So, there -- so I agree with you, Madam Chair that maybe some outreach and some discussions at NAJA [ph] and then maybe another request for application after that.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Great, alright. Anything -- does anybody on the committee have any questions on this Fiscal Year '21 fund? Alright, let's move to our annual compliance report.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Great. The annual compliance report, this has been a bone of contention with me for last few years because OJJDP has changed the due dates pretty much annually. Last year this report was due on February 28. This year it was due on August 3rd, right around the same time that the FY '22 Formula Grant application is due. So, it's difficult to try to work around OJJDP's timeframe when we are trying to gather information needed for this report. So -- but the good news is the report is done and submitted and already accepted by OJJDP. So, what I'm going to provide today is just an outline of what was in that report, so we submitted that report on the 22nd of July. We did have 89% reporting compliance from secure facilities. And for those of you who don't live in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention world, a secure facility is both a juvenile and an adult facility that is hardware secure. Hardware secure means fences, bells, cuffing benches, anything like that, that makes the facility a hardware secure facility. So, we required those facilities to report annually through a survey, the number of youth that they had in their -- in their facility in a -- in an annual timeframe. So, we had 89% reporting from those secured facilities. We had zero sight and sound separation violations which is really good news. Our DSO which is, Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders, wait was 0.32 per 100,000 reported which is well within OJJDP guideline. So, we meet the requirement there. And jail removal is 2.96, so -- 2.96% out of 100,000. We did have nine placements of juveniles in adult jails. So, that's what our report is and like I said I was told via e-mail that the report was accepted and was good but I have not yet received the formal OJJDP letter that says we are in compliance with everything. The one area that I did want to address and maybe we can address on the go-forward, as you can see we have 89% reporting compliance from secure facilities. We would like to see 100%. That is really the best practice recommendation from OJJDP. So, this is an area in need of improvement that the programs office is going to work on going forward to do a little more outreach with those secure facilities on what exactly we need and why we need those. The reason this is so difficult from year to year is because you have changing folks in these facilities. You know, court administrators change, sheriffs change, all kinds of things change, so it's a constant outreach with those new folks. So, the good news is Dan LaBarbera, who is not on the call today, he is very gung ho when he has really taken this on. So, I'm hoping to see an increase in that reporting compliance at next year's report. So, that was a lot of information. I'll stop there for questions.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. Committee members?

So, I just -- I will say that for the reporting, that -- that takes like annual, biannual visit, in-person to those facilities and just, you know, I'm talking to them about how important it is. Because -- yes, I mean it -- if that's one of those areas where we should be reaching 100% just because OJJDP can find us out of compliance on our monetary universe and how the state monitors compliance. So, I think that you're right, you got to get out, and I met with Dan on Monday too. He was in Winnemucca

coming through and we talked about that, this development relationship and go in there in-person and getting that number up.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, totally agree. And so that's -- that's our programs' office goal for next year is to increase that reporting compliance number. Any other questions from members?

I don't see any.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Go ahead.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Just to finish this topic, I do want to say the bullet number 4, we will table for a future meeting, so there will be no update on bullet number 4. But bullet number 3, the FY '22 Formula Grant application was submitted on July 25th. So, that grant as -- so the Formula Grant is awarded annually, so this would be this year's award on October 1st. So, it has been submitted. It has not yet been approved by OJJDP, so we are waiting for that approval. So, that is all for my update.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Questions, concerns, comments?

[Inaudible] today. Alright and the Strategic Planning Committee update is the one you're tabling?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, Madam Chair. We -- after this agenda was written and sent out, we have some more information and we like to kind of go back to square one and address this on a go-forward. So, I would like to table this for now and put it on a future agenda for the next meeting to kind of discuss back from the beginning.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay, thank you. Then item number 7, Legislative Updates. Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So, the programs office has been really busy over the last several months. It seemed like a lot of things came into focus at the same time that was -- some of the workaround the implementation of legislation. And then the grants and the compliance report seemed to all come at the same time. So -- so that's why we're getting a lot of updates at this meeting but for this one, I wanted to give everybody an updated -- on the legislative implementation. So SB 356, if you all remember SB 356 was a study -- requested a study on the housing of youthful offenders. So, the state did prepare a report and I'm going to pull that. Right, it is --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: It's 7A.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: 7A, thank you. So, the state put together a work probe with a couple of internal DCF staff and Department of Corrections staff to kind of really look at the background of -- of how the Department of Corrections is working with housing those youthful offenders that are already convicted as adults and placed at Lovelock Correctional facility. So, that was kind of a subset of one of the things that we were already working on before this bill came out. So, SB 356, the report that was submitted to the legislature was prepared by DCF staff and it talked really about two parts of youthful offenders or two components of youthful offenders. One component is those individuals under the age of 18 who have been convicted as adults and are currently housed at Lovelock. The second part of the report is looking at

kind of what the national push is, is to really look at those individuals age 18 to age 24 is not really juveniles but also not really adults. They kind of fall in this -- this gray area to where do they really belong in the juvenile detention facility? Do they really belong in a correctional -- adult correctional facility? So, the two parts of this report, so the first part again addresses those youth at Lovelock but then it goes in and it talks about those youth that are in that between area. And basically what we came up with is that our recommendations and I'm just glossing this over. I'm not going to read everything to you. I'm just going to give you a summary, is really the fact that we don't have any place for girls. That's what this report indicated and I don't think that's news to anybody but there's nowhere for girls, whether they are convicted as adults under the age of 18 or between that 18 and 24-year-old age. And really the only place that we can house males is at Summit View and the interesting thing about Summit View is that the building or the facility itself is currently has the capacity to hold 96-youth. It is only legislatively funded through 48, so this report kind of looks at the possibility of expanding and using those additional unfunded beds. It also looks at building a new facility or a new building on the Summit View grounds. The Summit View property does have some room to grow. So, we proposed either expanding up to the 96 or building something new. However, the piece that this is missing, this report is missing is the cost analysis. The state did not have any method to do cost analysis of any of these initiatives, whether it be moving from 48 to 96 or building a new building or series of buildings. So, the state is in the process of doing an RFP to hire a vendor to do just that, the cost analysis of the initiatives outlined in this report, looking at an increase at Summit View to 96, looking at a possibility of building additional buildings on Summit View property or actually looking at other construction or other places outlined in this report. So, basically, that's kind of an overview of what was submitted to the legislature on SB 356, so.

MALE: Madam Chair, with your permission.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Of course.

JACK MARTIN: So, I would like to point out to the state and I know this is painfully obvious to some of us who don't -- can't put caps on our beds. When we say that, you know, my beds are funded at 120, but I regularly run over when I'm holding kids from the state and I'm holding parole violators, when I'm holding kids that are mentally ill. So to put arbitrary caps on numbers because the state can't afford and/or higher and/or include trophy excuse after that, is becoming increasingly frustrating for those of us that actually have to do this business daily and that when we choose to conveniently. So I would argue with that logic, first and foremost. And then the second part I would argue with is that if we can't fill 48 beds at Summit View, then we probably need to rethink about reinvesting in the counties to be able to manage these better and to decrease to create incentives for the counties to decrease the reliance on state beds and really put this money to good use versus building and building and building more. I mean, we've got three facilities right now all at less than half capacity. I mean, I can -- do I have -- I'm not a mathematician, I play one on TV, but I would -- I would think that sometimes if we were to maybe shut one of those institutions and maybe allocate those funds somewhere else, we might be able to repurpose an entire facility at zero cost, you know, and just transfer the title for lack of a better term. So, I appreciate your thoughts, Leslie. Those are -- I appreciate the hard work on that, but I think there might be some logic errors that -- where county concerns weren't taken into consideration, but thank you, though.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: May I respond, Madam Chair?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Certainly.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you. I think those are really great suggestions, Jack. And I'm wondering if you can send me an e-mail about that because when we start working with the vendor, it doesn't mean that I can't present these as additional ideas because looking at a cost analysis should really be looking at the total cost analysis, what's going to benefit the state most. So, I would be happy to take those ideas to the vendor for consideration. Thank you, Madam Chair.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Go ahead. Commissioner Martin, did you have something else?

JACK MARTIN: Yeah, just as a follow up, I mean, any of us I'm sure, Madam Chair, would probably be the first to volunteer being, you know, the director of all things holy and righteous from Winnemucca. She would probably be more than happy to speak with your vendor while they're -- while they're developing their stuff, right. So -- and I would be more than happy to do that, too. But I will happily construct an e-mail probably Monday and get that out to you ASAP.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: And, I mean, I agree with Jack. I think that there's some other things that need to be considered there. And we just don't want to do what's best for the state. We want to do what's best for our kids. And sometimes, you know, that's not the most favorable for the state budget, but really, we want to do what's best for our kids and our family. All right, any other members? Any questions? Thoughts? Concerns on this one? All good? All right. Okay, (inaudible) Leslie.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you. Moving on to attachment 7B. This is the report that the state submitted on SB 385. SB 385, just to remind all folks, was looking at the investments of prevention activities in the state. So, a lot of this data or actually all of this data was provided to the state through various methods. Some of the data is annual data on the community corrections partnership block grants. Some of the data is annual crime data. What crime data is the arrests, the referrals, all of that comes from the counties. And thirdly, a special request went out to the counties for this report to look at if counties are expending additional funds over and above the community corrections partnership block grant on prevention activities. So, all counties did respond and that data was put together into this report. This report also included a large research component that I received help from with the program evaluation unit of DCFS. The program evaluation unit of DCFS is made up of all clinical staff, individuals that know clinical work and all of that, which is not my area of expertise. So I reached out to my DCFS partners for some help on looking at those, what the national research is around prevention activities to help with this report. Moving on through this report, we have identified that there are three categories of prevention services provided in Nevada. One is programs and services provided at the probation level and there is a list of all of those programs and services starting on page six of this report. It does not mean every county does every program. These are just programs that are provided throughout the state, you know, maybe one county provides just one, one county may provide seven of them. So -- but these are just the programs that have -- that are provided. Going on category number two includes services like...

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Leslie, can I -- before I forget, can I say something now before...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Sure. Sure.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So there's a couple things. The referrals and diversion data.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Referrals and diversion.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: On table two.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Got it.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: That looks really off to me. I mean, we went from 65% diversion to 29 during -- and part of that was COVID. I mean, I can't -- I know that we just had some discussion earlier today with a different group and there's a lot of jurisdictions that 70% of their referrals are being diverted and is that data accurate?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: You know, that is -- and I did get that same question as this was going through the review process. I just reported the numbers as they were reported to me. However, that doesn't mean that you know, there isn't possibly an opportunity to dig into this a little more. I, unfortunately, did not have time to really dig into this before this was due, but I think there -- and maybe this is a future agenda item, Madam Chair, is I think there's some confusion still around how to report and what to report on the annual DMC reports. One of the things that we found in Las Vegas, and I did speak to the Las Vegas data folks directly about this, which was a few months ago, was I believe they are capturing the race data. You know, they were over reporting white youth. And I think in talking with last -- Clark County about that is they were reporting, you know, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, all of those are white youth. But what was missing and what was reported to me were just those white youth that were of Hispanic origin. So, I think that there may be some opportunity here to try to figure out how to better get out what we need in the correct data. So, that's my thoughts. Also, if you would like me to dig into this specific data more, I can do that, but I just reported what was reported to me.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah. So, there's a couple of things. One, when I see that percentage, that worries me because somebody would look at that and be like, they're going backwards on reform and I can't think of a jurisdiction in Nevada that isn't moving forward leaps and bounds with reform. And, I mean, we're looking at -- we're looking in a year period, we went from 65% to 29, divert. I mean, that -- I would really like someone to dig in on that. I'm a little concerned that you said you didn't have time to really dig into it before this was due. And I mean, like that warrants some double checking, I think, because that to me tells us that we're going backwards and not forwards. And I just can't imagine that, I mean, that's like a 55% decrease in diverted cases.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. And we saw...

REBEKAH GRAHAM: It's worth double checking, but -- this is Rebeckah Graham for the record. It's worth double checking. It's also worth considering the effect that pandemic and school closures had on some of our -- the rates at which things were hitting the system. You know, when everybody got back in school, I think we all noticed that kids were having trouble. And so the behaviors could have been more severe as a result of us just not observing them for a year when they were out of school, on and off for COVID. I mean, so when we look at the data, if that's really what's holding, it could still be other factors in the -- and the juvenile justice system is going backwards, I guess, is a nice point.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah, that's -- I mean, that's a valid -- that's a valid point. I just look at the total number of referrals decreased too. So, if we're just looking at strictly the rate, the percentage rate that we are hoping, I mean, our goal is really to divert 70% of our population, right, from the offense. That's the overall -- that's like the national standard or 70%. I mean, we're at 29.19.

REBEKAH GRAHAM: Yeah, I think the acuity of kids spiked in, what, you know, I think we're all noticing the kids we are dealing with are more mental health, more acute, just like Jack was saying earlier, like, so you, it's more difficult to divert them when they're already high risk when we didn't see them when they were low or medium risk.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yeah. And that's a really good point. And I also want to point out that this data is also mirrors the child welfare data. I'm not saying the actual percentages, but I'm just saying that on the child welfare side, we've seen lower referrals and higher acuity, as well. So, I think that's a good point. It doesn't mean I can't look into the data more, but I did want to say that we are seeing that on the struggle for (inaudible) as well.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yeah, maybe -- maybe I look at it differently, but our kids who were adversely affected at a higher rate because of the pandemic, our goal is still not to escalate them in the system, is to divert them from the system into the right services. So, if mental health is their primary issue, there's still the ability for probation and juvenile justice agencies to divert them from the formal court process that give them the help they need. So, I mean, I look at it a little. I understand the effects of the pandemic. I mean, we had a little bump, it seems to, but not at that rate. So, that's all I got to say about that. And then my other question was, can we -- have this already been submitted?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. So just -- I guess, if we ever do a revision, maybe just identify that in category one, that's not an all-inclusive list because that's like, yeah, that's -- there's just other, a lot of other evidence based programs, but I didn't see where it says, which are listed below.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: And these came from when all of the counties provided the information when we started doing the YLS. This is -- so this data may be a little bit outdated, but this is what this came from, as all counties provided the services they were using when we were starting with the YLS.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I remember doing that it's from like our service matrix, but it's not an all-inclusive list of ours. I mean, there's, I think that is 16 programs we do on site. There's two of them listed on here. And the same, maybe identify that it's not all-inclusive. You did it in category two, just not included, but not limited to...

LESLIE BITTLESTON: When did I did that? Sometimes, yeah, I don't know. I probably thought it and didn't do it. Anyway, you know, when you write these reports, and you just look at it so much it just all blurs together. Anyway. Any other questions, Pauline, before I go forward?

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: If you hadn't get that before I forgot.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Great. And category two includes other community based services like, you know, counseling physicians, community programs. And I did put not limited to, boys or girls club or on wood, Spring Mountain, China Spring, Western Nevada Regional Youth Center and the group home and specialized foster care. Group three is relief specific to Clark County. It includes the Juvenile Assessment Center. And really looking at the Juvenile Assessment Center and the successes around this is really one area that I'd like to talk to, you know, additional counties about because Clark County has done an excellent job with their assessment centers by growing it from one, I believe it's five now, is that right? Five? You know, we've really seen a decrease in status offenders pretty much from a whole bunch to none

in Clark County. So, that's just so -- category number three is the Juvenile Assessment Center. Table number three really goes over. It's a very high level. It's the 50,000 foot view. It doesn't tell the whole story, but it just kind of says these are the number of youth served and the amount per county. And all I did was divide the number of youth served by the funds. Again, I rely on counties for this. S -- and it's really kind of interesting to see the difference, but I know this data better than just this report. So for example, Clark County spends the majority of their funds on group homes and in more inpatient type settings, while some of the other counties do more community services like, you know, maybe one of the things in category number one. So, I know why this is different, but like I said, this is a very 30,000 foot view of looking at the community corrections partnership block grant of FY 21. Table number four, is some of that extra data that was provided to me by counties on additional funds, county funds, federal funds, other funds that they use in their counties over and above the community corrections partnership block grants. And as everybody would expect, it varies by county. So, that's the information I received there. And then we provided some state commitment data. And then we talked a lot about starting on page 10, the national trends. This is the area for the next several pages, is the information that was provided to me from those clinicians in the program evaluation unit of DCFS, really just looking at what other states are doing and really what is best practice around prevention services. They cited a couple of states and some of the information you'll read in here is absolutely fascinating. But again, knowing how Nevada is set up against other states, you know, we may not even have the infrastructure to do it. But we just provided this as information on what are some of those best practices out there. And then, on page 16, there is an outline of what those best practices are broken down in different areas. The first one being inter-agency collaboration, family engagement, things that we are already doing in our juvenile justice system. I think the biggest area that I came away with this that you can read at the bottom or is that best practice really relies a lot on clinical staff. It relies on trained clinical staff. And that is an area that we struggle with in Nevada. Now, we're not the only state. So, if you want to ensure that a program is done to fidelity, it's really looking at the type of person or individual providing that service or that program, and are they doing it the same every time? Are the folks trained the same way. So that's really kind of what you read throughout this report. And that's really looking at best practice. So, really the -- what we said -- excuse me -- going to the summary, what we have said is we've already -- we as a state have already done many of the things that we've identified as best practice. We've already implemented the use of a validated risk and needs assessment. We've already implemented a mental health screening tool. We already have requirements for what evidence based best practices are. And we also outline and provide information in our policies on adolescent brain development. Basically, it just says that we could put more money into prevention services and that's really -- we're doing a lot of things right. We're just not putting a lot of money into prevention services.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Any questions? So, go ahead and keep going, Leslie. Is that it, are we done?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Moving on to attachment 7C. This is the -- this report is concerning Senate Bill 398. It was a report concerning the progress made by the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission in compliance with the -- and compliance with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. This report was worked on by DCFS staff and the Strategic Planning Committee of the JJOC. So prior to the submission of the -- of this report, it was approved by the Strategic Planning Committee because this is really outlining the successes and challenges of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. The way that this report was written is we looked at the strategic plan and -- that was created -- and we said, we went through each element and said, complete, complete, complete, not complete, complete, complete, complete, not complete. And really, as we went through, a lot of things were completed. And some of the areas that were not completed or were only partially completed, were all as a result of lack of funding. For example, if you look at the evidence based resource center, which is on page seven, bottom of page

seven, you'll see if there's a status there that says partially complete. Again, talking about funding, it doesn't mean that things haven't been done. It just means that the things haven't been done to the level that was outlined in the strategic planning and why it wasn't done. So -- and then moving on to page eight. At the bottom of page eight, there's a status of incomplete and again, this was due to funding. And so, it just went through all of the -- all of the pieces or elements of the strategic plan. And then moving way down to page 14, this is one of the components of the plan was looking at disparities in the juvenile justice system. This information was provided by the racial and ethnic disparity work group or committee off the JJOC. They spent the last year and a half doing some work on identifying where the problems? Where are some of the most racial and ethnic disparities are? And of course, we have found out that it is out of rest. So, the racial and ethnic disparity workgroup conducted a survey of local police departments and all of that and really looked at those results and determined that there's some training that they would -- that the committee would like to recommend for specifically for law enforcement. And they broke it down by dispatchers, law enforcement and just a standardized training curriculum. One of the things that was interesting for this workgroup is there's a lot of requirements around training for law enforcement. But there was is no mechanism to determine if individual officers were actually trained. There was nobody following up to ensure that those NRS trainings were done. So, that is the last piece where it says standardized training curriculum. Agencies may develop and there's a verification process. So, we do have Rebekah on the line. She was the chair of the red committee. Rebekah, did I do that justice or would you like to add anything else?

REBEKAH GRAHAM: No, that's accurate. We dug deep into the data and identified the pieces. And we found that there is an NRS requirement for a lot of the training, but nobody's checking if they're doing it. And in our interviews and surveys with law enforcement, they're not doing it. And so, yes, no, that's accurate.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: This is Pauline. I have a question.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Sure.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So, nobody, because like when we get cooked -- when we get audited by both, they pull all of our training records that I think all law enforcement agencies go through that, like post audit. Like that's not occurring?

REBEKAH GRAHAM: We couldn't find anything in any of the inter-agencies to talk to us. We talked to, you know, Las Vegas Metro. We talked to Reno P.D. We talked to several police agencies and they didn't have any awareness. Maybe they're not the right people that we were speaking to about the training, but even the officers themselves who we spoke to were like, no, we don't get that training. Like -- and so sometimes, if we're -- if we're -- if we're delivering a training and our staff don't know we delivered it to them, maybe it wasn't -- I don't know. We can only go by what we gathered.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: There'll be deemed data compliance with their peace officer, like, I mean, they've pulled all of our records and had to meet the statute of a certain, you know, cultural competency, implicit bias, like all these things, and if we didn't have it. That wouldn't be good. So that's the problem.

REBEKAH GRAHAM: No, the police agencies we spoke to said that cultural competency training is more well received. So they integrate them into other trainings. Oh, yeah. Because you know it's really well. That's for real. It's in the minutes somewhere.

PAULA SMITH: I know too -- this is Commissioner Smith -- that with COVID and all that we had to do a lot of online. It's called police one training. And we had to do a lot of different classes and stuff. And I think there was only one like cultural class, but several mental health classes and stuff like that and de-escalation. But a lot of it -- the only time we ever been (inaudible) was at the range to go shoot and we have so many officers at a time learn some. Thank you.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you, Commissioner.

JACK MARTIN As a thought, Madam Chair, with your permission.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: That was a quick change, Commissioner Martin. That was a quick change.

JACK MARTIN: Well, thank you. So, like Superman or super fat, it's more difficult than it looks. Just as a suggestion, one of the things I continue to see pretty regularly every legislative session is lots of our think tank, a lot of our lawyers, PD's, district attorneys, judges, all require more and more training for probation officers. But yet I'm seeing less and less training for them. I've got district attorneys acting like complete asses in court because they don't -- they wouldn't know a kid from an elephant. So, I mean, as we continue to move forward with some of our training recommendations, maybe possibly we require, you know, if NRS is going to require us to know adolescent development, shouldn't everybody in the courtroom know adolescent development from the PD to the D.A. to the judge? I mean, a lot of the things that we're doing are almost like mystery things to these judges. But yet, you know, their legal training, they get to act like social workers. In our -- in our social work and law enforcement training, we don't get to act like judges. So, you know, while we're making recommendations for training, let's ask all these highfalutin Boyd graduates if they'll get their ass in training?

REBEKAH GRAHAM: Yes. But, here -- the thing is, Jack, this is Rebekah Graham. The thing is that we are retraining recommendations not for probation officers because that's not where the disparity was. The disparities at arrest and the disparities at sentencing. So, it's not -- it's not you all. It's not the probation officers and social workers where the disparate data is showing up. The largest onset of disparate data was at arrest, which is why we targeted dispatchers and police first. So, yeah, no, we're not coming for you.

JACK MARTIN: Please do. Hey, I have no problem. I just don't want to be -- I just don't want to be the only one in the firing line. You know what I mean?

UNIDENTIFIED: You're not at all. Because we're -- we're following the data and the data isn't pointing to you.

JACK MARTIN: Well, here -- here in Clark it is actually, we -- we violate more disproportionately than -- than others. That's why we started our cultural diversity subcommittees and we're analyzing case by case and doing apple to apple comparison. So, we, I mean, we're -- we're actively seeking resolution to a lot of those things because we know there's disparity at all nine of those decision points. You know, I would just like to see if all of us are operating from the same sheet of music. I think it's just always easier to play in a symphony, right.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes. And -- and one of the things that we notice, and this might come down to probation and just training just as a peak ahead, we're starting to peel apart and look at the data for the YLS, because the research has shown that black youth are disproportionately, affected by static factors and -- and they get false positive for 44 percent of the time because of the static factors. So that -- that's what we're looking at -- at the -- on the RED committee as well.

UNIDENTIFIED: What's the false positive -- what's the false positive mean of that? What do you mean?

UNIDENTIFIED: False positive means that you're saying this child is high risk and they're not really,

UNIDENTIFIED: And you're talking in domain one. That's our only --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. Domain.

UNIDENTIFIED: Domain one, the static. Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes, I think some of that -- this is Commissioner Salla. I think some of that is because, which we were addressing in our YLS master trainer group that -- that sometimes, like there some areas where we're counting violations of probation as a failure to comply and as another area in there. We've done a lot of work on that. And -- and the static domain is one domain out of seven. So, I think that the -- with the master trainers, because that was one of the areas that -- that we found, that there was some discrepancy in how it was being trained. So, I think that -- that we might be seeing some different scoring in -- in that domain because we worked with NISAP [ph] who was our technical assistant through -- through our master trainer group, because that was one of the areas that was defined that we identified. So, we're hoping that we worked through some of that too.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, I have a comment, Commissioner Fraser, I know that the last legislative session there was SB108 that advocated and passed for training for the attorneys and in the Juvenile Justice System. The original bill was for judges to be included in that, which I think is key. However, the judges oppose that as a separation of powers issue. So, legislatively, I don't think we'll be able to mandate judges get training. I think we need to figure out other ways. I don't know if NCF, NCJFCJ can help with that, but absolutely. Especially in Clark County, we have, you know, new -- newer judges and it's a specialty court and they're not getting specialty training. So.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: Good point.

UNIDENTIFIED: Maybe AOC can help us with that too, with the judge.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Any other comments? We just have one last part to go through on SB398 and this one is compliance with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. So, based on some of our NRS's in, in kind of the way we've done business over the years, and then this reauthorization in 2018 really tightened a lot of federal recommendations around juveniles that are being charged as adults, not those juveniles that are convicted. So not the ones in lovelock, but the ones that are being charged as -- as adults that are under the age of majority. In the past, they have been really allowed to have those individuals in adult jails and even our own Nevada Revised Statute allows for individuals charged as adults to be in adult jails. So, we've just got some conflicts between this 2018 reauthorization and some of our -- our state laws and, and that's what is outlined on page 15 and 16. Just a very, very high level these are some of the areas that the state is not really in compliance with the federal requirements. And I would also like

to request of Madam Chair, on the go forward if this group can really dig into some of these areas and figure out how to address them on the go forward. So, I will be requesting that as a new agenda item on the go forward to kind of pick something and look at how to address it out of pages 15 and 16.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Commissioner, Commissioner Salla. I think that until the state gets their, I guess better understanding of the 2018 reauthorization language, that it's a moot point for us to discuss that here because, I mean, we -- we know that the sight and sound stuff that has been coming up with jurisdiction, has jurisdictions have created some difficulties and some frustration with that. But our -- I'm still not convinced that the language and the reauthorization doesn't allow us to still follow NRS 62E-710 with the proper court hearings and -- and all of that. So, I mean, I -- I think we -- it -- it's on our radar but I think that, that the states got to do some meeting on their own with their DAG [ph] and -- and become clearer. I, I've asked for some information from OJJDP too, so when we bring it to this committee it's not -- it's not any blurrier than it needs to be. Because right now it's blurry.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Very blurry. So, okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: And we will, this committee will definitely have those discussions. I just want some foundation work done first.

UNIDENTIFIED: Great. Perfect.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: So that is it for those three, three reports. I did want to cover a couple of the regulations that the state has been working on. The NAC 62B regulation from SB108 is still pending drafting from LCB. So we do not have that language back to present at a public hearing. On NAC 62, that this is an old one. The NAC 62 update, which we did in work through in 2019 and 2020, 2021 from AB 472, all the revised data elements, finally got that draft back of the revisions that were requested at the public hearing on, I believe it was October something of 2021. Got those back in August, just last month. However, we are at the two-year mark. So, apparently, there's this whole process to where you have to start a regulation and finish a regulation within a two-year mark. And so we are now over that mark. So the state will be going to committee next Tuesday to request an extension of this two-year mark. If that is not granted, we will have to start over from the beginning with this, with this NAC. And if for those of you who have been here NAC 62H currently is completely outdated. It was written in 1996. So all of that information must be replaced with -- with the updated information. So, I just wanted to update the group on that. So if you've looked for NAC 62H for all of those updates, it's not there, because we've kind of run into a little bit of a roadblock. So that's where we are with that.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So, to clarify, Leslie, we're just waiting from the legislative commission to determine if we can move forward or we have to start over again.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Correct. That hearing is on Tuesday, 1.30 p.m. and I can't remember the committee right now, but I do know it's this coming Tuesday at 1.30. So, I will be presenting to that committee a timeline of how we started, and just wait for their recommendations. So, either they're going to tell us, okay, you get an extension, or no, you have to start over.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So, Leslie, can you also send out a -- I would think that we can log on.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Sure. Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Okay. Can -- can we get a link for those who want to log on to that? I'm in training that day, but maybe I can step out to listen.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Link to that council. It is in person in both Carson City and Las Vegas for those of you that would like to attend. But I will send that to Kayla and have her send out to this group.

UNIDENTIFIED: Got it.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Alright. Anything on agenda item seven for Leslie? Now we'll move to agenda item eight. I don't -- Dan, is Dan with us?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No. He told me today, just a little while ago that he had to -- to run to a doctor's appointment. So, I will try to flag through this. He -- he did all of the work on this and -- and has been doing the work on this. So I can try to run through it. If there's questions, I'll have to take them back to Dan. But attachment number eight, this is the county room confinement totals. It is a 12-month period from July, 2021 to June, 2026. And if it, you have color, it is color coded. For example, the light blue is Clark County. The orange is Jan Evans [ph]. And of course, we would imagine that Clark County and Jan -- and Jan Evans would be at the top because they have the most folks in their facility. And then, the gray one is northeastern. And then the smaller ones at the bottom down there. But those are just the total number of room confinements for those facilities in that month. And then moving on to kind of looking at the hours, the total hours for those room confinements. So, for example, if you're going to look at Clark County for September 21, if there's a little spike there, it's about 55 folks. And if you go down to the same spike, you see a little over 400. So those 55 folks total spent a little over 400 hours in room confinement. That's how you read this report. It is, like I said, this is a 50,000-foot report that doesn't really drill down into details. It just gives a very high level overview. And then moving on to the state facilities on page number -- he doesn't have pages on here. State facilities, I believe it's the third page. This again is the, NYT CYC and Summit View with the top being the total, and then the three facilities blue for NYT C, orange for -- CYC and gray for Summit View. And then the same thing on the next page. This again is taking the total room confinements by facility for the month and then the total time those individuals spent in confinement for that. So that is this. And I also want to mention from Dan. Dan is always open to suggestions if -- if this type of chart doesn't work for folks, he is open to suggestions on other ways to present the data. This was just the mechanism that he came up with that really shows everybody on the same page. So, if anybody has any suggestions about a better -- different way to present this data, please feel free to reach out to Dan. He is willing to adjust as needed. Any questions on --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So, Leslie?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Rebecca had a -- she's just put on our chat if we had quorum because we lost Jack too, and I was typing back that I don't think we do, but I --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No, we don't.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: But I don't think we're taking.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. We were -- we were five out of nine and then he left, so.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Shoot. So maybe I should stop.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Hold on, hold on. I don't think we're doing anything for voting, right? It's all information.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. Then we should be fine.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. These are just information.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes. I think -- yes, I think as long -- we just can't make a motion. We can't take any action --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: No.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- but we can sure listen.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Listen to me chat. Yay. Attachment 8.A is kind of a different way to look at the data. Again, it's all of the facilities on one chart. But it's kind of a -- a different way to present the data. So, if you look at just July of 2021, room confinement, total room confinements, you know, by facility, for example, the first one with a number one is Murphy Bernadini, then Jan Evans, the Northeastern and Leighton Hall, zero, Clark County, two. And then, the total hours. So we just looked at the -- the previous charts, it is the same data presented a little bit differently. And then he calculated something a little different on the right of this chart, which is just the average hour spent in confinement per the number of confinements. This is just again for one month. So, and then here's the month of August, which is the -- the second thing. So he kind of went through and did this for each month for, if you would like to look at it. It's -- it's, this is really the type of data that you can slice and dice so many different ways. So he, like I said, this is just the way that he feels is the best way to present the data. So, that's that. And then attachment 8.B is the same thing that I just showed you for the counties, but for the state facilities, broken down by month, total room confinements, total hours in confinement, and then the average spent per confinement. This type of data doesn't tell us why folks are in confinement. It also doesn't tell us if there's, you know, maybe one kid that was confined eight times. It doesn't tell us that. Like I said, this is a very high-level look at room confinement. Going to attachment 8.C. This is use of force data. This is -- this is the first chart is the state facilities looking at October 21 through June of 22, broken down by the three types of use of force. Physical, restraint, a mechanical restraint or a chemical restraint. I would draw your eye to the bottom, the chemical restraint. We would love to see zeros, which means we never deployed OC spray but we do have a few that has been deployed for OC spray. I really like his second chart, which is the total use -- of use of force by type. It gives you the total. Again, this does not break down mechanical, physical, or -- or chemical. It just gives you all of them. Or, excuse me, it does break them down. So physical, mechanical, and chemical, which kind of shows you where most of our restraints are. Sorry, I was thinking about something different. But so, so we do have 380 restraints. What is interesting about this chart, you're going to say, well, those don't add up to 389. It's more than 389. Well, the reason it is more than 389 is because most -- most uses of force start with a physical restraint. Some of them escalate them to a mechanical restraint and some further escalate to a chemical restraint. It's fairly unusual you will have just a mechanical restraint from the beginning, or an O -- or a chemical restraint from the beginning. So again, this doesn't tell you a whole lot, it just kind of that very high level look at the uses of force.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: And Leslie, just real quick, this is why -- this is one of those areas where when we were all working on our use of force --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- then identifying the unduplicated youth is really important. Because, you know, it looks like there's 389 use of forces and then, you know,

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- those other ones that could have escalated. But I think if we're not tracking, somebody can look at that and be like, wow, 380 kids, you know, got physically restrained when in reality it -- it could be 150 youth that got restrained multiple times.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: So, I think because we had spoke a lot about that in our work group when we were coming up and it with [inaudible], too. So.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I noticed that we're not, we don't have unduplicated youth on there.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: You are absolutely right and I will absolutely follow up with Dan on that. But I -- I don't need to go through all of this report. Again, it goes through month by month for the state facilities and then it goes down into all of the -- we also get data from both youth camps, so we get it from China Spring and Spring Mountain. So, I just want to say that we are getting great cooperation from the counties, all of the county detention facilities and the youth camps. But you're right, Pauline, and I do need to follow up with Dan to get that unduplicated number because we did talk about that a lot. But anyway --

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: But it's on the, it's on the China Spring and Spring Mountain one.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. And I think it's probably because he just really runs out of room and he's trying to put all this data on one thing. But yes, you're right. I will have a conversation with him about that. Okay, so I guess we probably can't do any questions because we don't have a forum. So we're just listening.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: I think -- I think you can do questions, we can't take action.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay. Are there any questions? And -- and again, if you'd like to see something different or a different way this is presented, Dan is open to whatever would be the most youth useful. I will talk to him about the unduplicated, but if there's a different way folks would like to see any of this data presented, he's willing to listen.

PAULA SMITH: Yes, I had a question. This is Commissioner Smith for the record. Could one kid in one incident have all three, like the physical --

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

PAULA SMITH: -- chemical and [inaudible].

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes. Yes. And that's why I wanted to explain that the -- that that chart that's really pretty doesn't tell you the whole story. It just, because yes, one kid could be physically restrained then chemically or, mechanically restrained and then chemically restrained. It -- so, and also one incident -- one incident can involve six or seven kids. So, you know, I mean, if you've got a fight situation, you know, maybe they're on the basketball court and you've got five or six kids starting to brawl, you know, that's a -- that's -- you're probably going to restrain more than one kid in some manner. So, yes, it could -- one kid could have all three. And that's why Pauline's point of unduplicated is important because it kind of shows a little bit more about how that can progress from the lowest level to the highest level.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Thank you. Hey, I'm thinking that -- that I'm going to -- I'm going to table the rest of it just because I don't want us to get into trouble with trying to take some action and stuff. So, I mean, we've made, if every -- if that's okay with all the other members. I mean, we're ending, you know, 11 minutes early and less. And we can -- we can just move this over to our next agenda.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Perfect.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: But just to keep us all safe [inaudible] and in the line, we'll just -- we'll table that because we don't have forum right now. So, I'm just going to say, hey, I appreciate all of you guys for attending today. We'll set up another meeting and try to get agenda. I'm going to move everything, the county training request. We know what needs to be on our agenda for the next one. And -- and we'll probably send out a Doodle poll for our next meeting to make sure we can have quorum. And unless any other members have anything else, I'm going to adjourn.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Wait, you forgot public comment.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Well, we don't have a quorum, so.

MELISSA SICKMUND: I'm still here.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Gosh.

MELISSA SICKMUND: That's what I was going to say.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Melissa. Okay.

MELISSA SICKMUND: Yes. Yes. And, and just to, I mean, this is just for information. If you want to, you know, end now, I can send an email to Leslie and to you Pauline, and you can share, you know, share stuff. One thing I wanted to, Leslie, are you going to the state relations conference in San Diego in December that OJJDP is hosting?

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes, I am.

UNIDENTIFIED: Excellent. Because I think some of the things that you guys were questioning about compliance data and stuff should be addressed there. Chaz will be there and Hunter.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: And Kim, God -- Kim Godfrey who we've been working with on -- on some stuff. So, I'll leave it to you whether there's just some other kind of TA opportunities and stuff that I think you might be interested in.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: So, I can e-mail that to you. I can tell you now.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Yes. Yes. Will you e-mail that? Because I'm -- I'm just want -- I -- I just want to make sure we're in compliance here and if you e-mail it --

UNIDENTIFIED: Sure.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: -- to Leslie or me, we can send it out to everybody else and -- and we're all interested in it. I just want to make sure that we're -- we're doing right here.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Yes. So --

UNIDENTIFIED: Perfect. I'll do that.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Sorry, I should have -- I should let you off the hook earlier. Sorry about that.

UNIDENTIFIED: That's alright, I was just driving home and I enjoy listening to -- to all the information, so.

LESLIE BITTLESTON: Thank you. Alright. I'm going to join the meeting at 3.21. We don't have quorum, so I don't even need a motion. We're done.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Bye.

PAULINE SALLA-SMITH: Have a good afternoon everybody. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED: Bye.

[end of meeting]