

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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

Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
January 30, 2023 at 2:00 pm

Transcript

Called to order at 2:03 pm.

Roll Call:

(Voting Members)

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

Absent: Egan Walker

(Non-Voting Members)

Present: Mike Whelihan

(Staff Members)

Present: Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Williamson, Sharon Anderson, Catherine Roose and Linda Anderson

Elizabeth Florez: Hello Brigid. Okay. So it is 2:03. Welcome to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission Strategic Planning Committee meeting. And with that, we'll call the meeting to order. And Ms. Bittleston, if you could please call roll.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Ms. Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Egan Walker? Brigid Duffy?

Brigid Duffy: Here.

Leslie Bittleston: Jennifer Fraser?

Jennifer Fraser: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Those are the voting members, Madam Chair. We do have a quorum. Also in attendance, I see Mike Whelihan, Sharon Anderson, Catherine Roose, Leslie Bittleston, Kayla Williamson, and Linda Anderson. Is there anybody else that I did not get? Alright, thank you. Take it away, Madam Chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you very much. Moving on to agenda item number 3. Public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment? Okay. Seeing none. We'll move on to item number 4 for possible action, review, and approval of minutes. There are 2 minutes to review. Attachment 4a is the meeting from June 13th and attachment 4b is the meeting from July 11th, both of 2022. Prior to hearing any motions on this, I do want to note that on the July 11th meeting, my name is spelled correctly at the beginning, but throughout the document it is spelled incorrectly with an S versus a Z in Florez. So with that note, I can make a motion to approve the June 13, 2022 meetings and the July 11, 2022 meeting provided Elizabeth Florez's name is corrected. May I get a second to that motion?

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

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. All those in favor, say aye.

Group: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Any opposed?

Female Speaker: No.

Elizabeth Florez: The motion carries. Thank you. Okay. Item number 5 for review. I'll turn it over to you, Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Alright. Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to go over some of the legislative reports that DCFS was required to do from the 2021 legislative session. The first one I would like to go over is SB356, which is attachment 5a. SB356 was a study bill to study housing of youthful offenders. So the state was required to look at two different portions or two different pods of youthful offenders. One was those youthful offenders that are under the age of 18 that are convicted as an adult and currently housed at Lovelock Correctional Facility. The second part of youthful offenders were those offenders 18 to 24, housed in either adult jails or adult correctional facilities. So the state did a report of that and basically the report said that we have some ideas that we presented forward and some of those ideas for the first population, the youthful offenders population that are currently at Lovelock, some of the ideas we presented were moving them to Summit View Youth Facility and also looking at maybe new construction or other areas like that. And we also, for the youthful population of 18 to 24, we recommended maybe repurposing a current facility such as Warm Springs Prison, which closed in December of last year. It has a capacity of roughly 500. Please don't quote me but somewhere around there. Repurposing a facility like that or a new construction facility. So basically the report outlines the reasons why we recommend separating these individuals from adult offenders based on national literature and best practice and all of

that. What that report did not entail is a cost analysis of what it would cost to move those individuals to, let's say, Summit View or to another facility. So the state ended up, after that report was submitted, we did write at the end of that report that we needed to obtain a cost analysis for all of the ideas that we outlined. So we obtained a vendor. The vendor's name is Pinnacle Consulting and Advisors. This vendor began their work in December of last year, and they're looking at two things. One, they are looking at the possibility and the cost of moving the individuals from Lovelock, the individuals under 18 who are convicted as adults to Summit View, and what is needed and the costs around that. That will be the first part of the report. The second part of the report will be looking at the cost associated with moving those 18 to 24-year-olds into another facility, a repurposed facility or new construction, what that would look like. They anticipate - the vendor anticipates having part one of that report by the end of February. That would be moving those under 18 from Lovelock. And they anticipate having part 2 of that report, which is the 18 to 24-year-olds, by mid-June. The full report is due to the Legislative Counsel Bureau by June 30th of this year. The one area that is of concern is our lack of placements for girls. Currently, if we have girls that are convicted as an adult under the age of 18, we send them out of state. And then when they turn 18, we bring them back and we can place them at Florence McClure Prison down in Las Vegas. So the vendor will be looking at a cost analysis of all of those things I mentioned and a possibility of what to do with the girls. So that's an overview of 356, so I will stop there and take any questions.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Ms. Bittleston. Just for the record, I do see we have some other folks on the line. Leslie, if you can make note of that.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. I see Lilla Baron? Lillith? Can you let me know where you're from, please?

Female Speaker: Hi there. I'm at the ACLU of Nevada.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, great. Thank you so much. Welcome.

Female Speaker: Thank you. Sorry I was a little late.

Leslie Bittleston: And then Ms. Tamika Chantay Where are you from, ma'am?

Female Speaker: Yes, it's Tamika Chantay, and I am also from the ACLU in Nevada. I'm in the southern part in Las Vegas.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. So ACLU south, and Ms. Baron, are you from the north?

Female Speaker: Yeah. We're just one organization, though.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Thank you very much and welcome.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Thank you for that. Appreciate the visitors. In relation to SB356, Ms. Bittleston, it does say in your first bullet point on the agenda, the study is due June 30, 2023 and which you also stated. Originally, the study was due July 1, 2022, so can you explain how that extension

transpired? I'm certain it was because we couldn't find a vendor, but if you could just elaborate on the change of date.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. That is correct. We could not find a vendor to do the financial, fiscal piece. So DCFS was able to do the programmatic kind of overview. And then when we followed up with the fiscal note that was attached to this bill to hire a vendor, the fiscal note was available until June of 2023. So that gave us some leeway to re - I don't know what the word is - repost for another vendor and put out a new RFP So we did put out a new RFP in July of last year and did get a vendor. So that is why we pushed that out to June 30th of 2023. So it's really the second piece of that report, the fiscal note, I guess you can say.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. And just for clarification, on Senate Bill 356, when looking at the original language, it says that the Department of Corrections and DCFS in consultation with the JJOC. So by keeping it on this agenda, I believe we're in compliance with the statute for continued discussion.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And this is not the first time this group has seen this report. It's just a follow-up going forward.

Elizabeth Florez: Great. Thank you. Are there any questions or comments related to SB356? Okay. Moving on to [interposing]

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. I have one. Did you guys take it to account the difference between - for the 18 to 24-year-olds, if this is the recommendation from the state - so like juveniles aren't afforded bail and ORs and things of that nature, is that going to take into account when you're talking about the fiscal cost or are we going to have separate? New law should be established if we're going to have this agency - I don't know if it's going to go over to juvenile justice or - I made the recommendation when they were looking at [inaudible 00:14:29] last time they make it intermediate agency that's not juvenile justice nor adult because my concern with this is if you take these children and put them in our agencies that monies that we're using to divert kids from juvenile justice will go to the higher needs, which would be the ones that will be facing these types of charges. So that was my only concern with the report because I didn't see any of that.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you for the question, Mike. One of the things that I was going to mention at the next NAJJA meeting is the vendor is willing to meet with a few of you from the counties to discuss some of the historical knowledge and some of the things that maybe we haven't thought of. So I do leave that open for some of you from the counties that would like to meet with the vendor to kind of bring these concerns to them because knowing from the state - and I don't have a lot of the history that some of you all have - I do not think that I did mention that, so that is probably something the vendor needs to hear.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. So Nevada always seems to take their lead from California. And we know CYA which is similar to what is being suggested here, failed. So I would like to voluntarily be one of those people that talks because I don't want to do what California did and if there's other best practices, if we're going to do something like this, California's not the answer.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you. Thank you. I will write your name as a volunteer down, Mike, but thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that, Mike and Leslie. And I do anticipate there will be more volunteers when we discuss it at NAJA It's a really important conversation. Before we move forward to the next item, I know that Commissioner Fraser has to leave early, so I'm going to ask if there's - I may take chair prerogative and move some agenda items around. But Ms. Fraser, is there something you would like to discuss prior to having to leave early today?

Jennifer Fraser: No. Thank you. I apologize. I just have to hop onto another meeting at 2:30. But I wanted you guys to have notice in case - before leaving.

Elizabeth Florez: I appreciate that. Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions about SB356? Okay. We'll move on to SB385. Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. SB385 is attachment number 5b. This is just an overview of prevention activities in the state. This was also a study bill that we originally hoped to find a vendor to do this study for us, but we were unable to find a vendor, so this study was completed inhouse by a variety of units. The program's office being one of them, the other one being the program and evaluation unit, and then the third one being the - oh gosh, the Nevada PEDS Unit, and I don't know what that stands for. They do some of the crisis prevention on the front end. Basically, what this report entails is it provides an overview of the funds that the county spent upfront on prevention services and what those services are. It also talks about some things that other states are doing for prevention activities, specifically, Georgia, Ohio, and maybe that was it. Georgia and Ohio. And then it goes on - I'm on page 16 now - it talks about the best practice principles for prevention activities. What does a program need to be a good prevention activity? So that starts on page 16. Then we talk about fidelity programs and services. And then the summary. And basically, let me just summarize what this report overall says. That the state made a lot of progress when it selected and implemented the use of a validated risk and needs assessment pre-adjudication. The second thing is the implementation of a mental health screening. The third was the creation of the evidence-based practices that we included in our JJLC [ph 00:19:38] state plan. And then the acknowledgement of adolescent brain development and all of the training and policies that have been developed over the last few years around that. So all of those things have moved the state forward and their work around prevention activities. Really, the biggest gaps are the lack of mental health clinicians, and that is not unique to Nevada. That is problematic countrywide. But when you talk about model fidelity, a lot of the best practice models talk about clinical oversight and promote clinical oversight. And that is really the biggest area of concern and of what we found in this report. So that's really the 100,000-foot view of SB385, but I could take questions.

Elizabeth Florez: Prior to questions, I think we have another - I think somebody joined us.

Leslie Bittleston: Hanna Fom I don't see the whole name.

Elizabeth Florez: Looks like -

Hanna Fomme: Hanna Fomme

Leslie Bittleston: And where are you from, ma'am?

Hanna Fomme: I'm with Belz and Case. And I'm taking notes, honestly.

Leslie Bittleston: And just from my understanding, what is Belz and Case? Is that a [interposing]

Hanna Fomme: It's a lobbying firm.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, a lobbying firm. Okay. Thank you very much.

Hanna Fomme: Yes. Probably more familiar with Jeanette or Lea Case.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh yes. Yes, yes. I'm familiar [interposing]

Hanna Fomme: I'm their new intern.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh. Well, thank you and welcome.

Hanna Fomme: Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay, thank you and welcome. Are there any discussion points around SB385, which is the prevention study? I do have a question. And I see that this was agendized a few times but in a couple of those meetings, we didn't have quorum, and so I think this is the first opportunity we have as a group, if I'm not mistaken, to really digest and discuss it. On table 2, page 5, there's an accounting of the percentage of diversions compared to referrals. And diversion is always something that there's a lot of debate around how you define it. And I see above that it says that the charts are using the federal fiscal crime data. Can you give - and it says in 2021, the percentage of diversions compared to referrals was under 30 percent, which I know in Washoe County, that's nowhere near true and when I've spoken to other juvenile justice chiefs, I just can't believe that to be true. So can we have some dialogue about how this number was derived?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And I agree with you on the confusion or - I don't know what the right word is, but the way that we define diversions, I think that the biggest problem at my level is really trying to define what a diversion is in each jurisdiction. Every jurisdiction defines diversion as something different. With that being said, when I get the annual DMC data, there is a question on there of the total number of referrals and then there's a question on total number of diversions. When you look at just those two points without any other information, without including citations issued or misdemeanors or any of that, when you just look at those two points, that's where we get that 30 percent. Where I think it's problematic is that we need to include - and I apologize, I did not do this for this report, but what we need to include are those other citations and those misdemeanors in that total, which would increase that

percentage. So that's what that number is from. It is just the point in time of referrals and the point in time of diversions with nothing else added in there.

Elizabeth Florez: Oh, this was for - so it excludes misdemeanors?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. And that is my fault and I take full responsibility for that and will be cleaning that up in the next Governor's report or Juvenile Justice report, which will be done, I hope, within about a month or so.

Elizabeth Florez: So this is - Liz again. So this report was already submitted to the Legislative Committee last year?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Leslie Bittleston: But I did want to explain where that number came from. It is just looking at two numbers and that difference.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Are there any questions or comments related to that?

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan from Clark County. So when I'm looking at table 2 on page 5, it shows the total referrals 18,609, and then all the way down to 9,755. I don't see the state having 18,609 felony referrals. So that's where I'm kind of questioning the numbers. It almost seems to me like the Harbor numbers were taken out because around 10,000 on an average year for us. So when I'm looking at the numbers, so if it's only felonies - I mean, that's a lot of felonies in the state of Nevada, especially in 2020 when you had Covid. I just don't see there being that many, in comparison to now that with the [inaudible 00:26:06] open in 21, and then there's less than when there wasn't Covid. So I'd like to know what charges were included. I don't know if that's a possibility, like what charges were included in those referrals to diversions.

Leslie Bittleston: On chart 5 is - let me look at chart 5. I want to make sure we're talking apples to apples.

Elizabeth Florez: I think he said page 5, table 2.

Leslie Bittleston: Oh, page 5. Excuse me. Page 5. Yeah. So the crime data is a federal term, and basically what that means is these points in time, like in table number 1 when you see referrals, arrests, secured attention, these are really the biggies that the Feds request states report on. So the total number

of referrals - that's the total number of referrals that the counties reported in 2021. And then the total number of arrests. I can't explain why that number is 9,755. It's just the total of what all the counties provided to me. And I don't clarify what a referral is. I say anything that comes to your probation department is a referral, so count it. So I can't answer why that is that.

Mike Whelihan: My guess would be - Mike Whelihan again, sorry. My guess would be that the Harbor not included in this data.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay.

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid for the record. Mike, I think because in 2021, there was that process that started that took citations out of our referral system and diverted them directly to the Harper, so that's probably a huge chunk of cases missing that were [interposing]

Mike Whelihan: Yeah. Mike Whelihan. That's probably like 11,000 to 12,000. I don't have the number in front of me, but it's got to be anywhere from 10,000 to 12,000.

Elizabeth Florez: So this is Liz Florez for the record. Having just amended our DMC report that we turn in to the state annually, we really had a lot of questions about the definitions, and one of the things I wanted to do was consult with fellow chiefs on how in their jurisdictions, they were interpreting and filling out that report to the state because I have a feeling that there's probably variances in opinion and of definition. So what I wanted to bring up at our next chief's meeting was an agenda item to discuss separately, perhaps create another little subcommittee, so that all of the jurisdictions can talk about, with Leslie potentially if she's available, to explain so that we can all have understanding and ensure that we're reporting the same way. Because what concerns me is that if this data which is incorrect, particularly around - this is a study on prevention activities, and the diversion number is really important because that's an indication of our prevention efforts, and this is incorrect. And if legislators are making policy decisions based upon this report, that's really concerning, so I appreciate Leslie that there will be a correction in the next report. And so I think part of that work, what we can do to help you with that is to have a meeting with all the people who report data to you and with you. That's my suggestion if you're okay with that and if your leadership is okay with that, just so that we can clarify this and support you going forward with the reporting of the information.

Leslie Bittleston: Yeah. I would support that and I agree. And like I said, it's just - I am reliant on what's reported to me, so I think that's a really great idea to meet with the chief to make sure that we are reporting referrals accurately and diversions accurately so these reports are correct.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. I think when we do this, I don't think this should be a NAJA meeting. I think this should actually have - like for us, we have a data team that does this, so it should probably include them because they're the ones that are actually providing the data to Leslie. So I think it would be better for us - at least at Clark County, to have the people actually reporting it. And like

I said, with this one in particular, Brigid's correct in the fact that they are diverted from criminal juvenile justice so they wouldn't be included in the juvenile justice number.

Elizabeth Florez: Right. This is Liz for the record. Yeah. My intention was at that meeting to seek - yeah, I would have somebody else representing Washoe County as well. But it would be to start the conversation and get buy in from everybody in order to move that forward. So I appreciate Leslie's efforts in this, and I think we all need to support that so that it's accurate reporting. Are there any comments or questions or anything further related to SB385, the prevention study?

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan. Just one more thing, Leslie. Mental health. I know it's mentioned in here, but I don't see a lot of substance around mental health, and we know that for us, it's probably one of the biggest issues facing our children right now. There's not a lot of services for kids with mental health.

Leslie Bittleston: And you are correct. And fortunately, there's a big push in this upcoming legislative session around mental health. And Catherine can support me on that one as well. So over and above what's in this report, the needs of our juveniles are well understood, and I believe we're going to be seeing some more stuff around mental health in this session. Catherine, I don't know if you want to say anything. I haven't personally seen any bills. Maybe you haven't yet either. So -

Catherine Roose: This is Catherine Roose for the record. No bills yet but I want to mention that in the meeting this morning was related to the budget there were several RPA funded programs that were on Governor's recommended budget. So on those RPA funds, some said [inaudible 00:32:53] is looking at continuing all those programs. Mobile crisis, some early childhood programs. I can't think of all of them on the top of my head, but it seems there's a willingness to put money towards those programs, to continue [inaudible 00:33:08]

Elizabeth Florez: Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you for that. Okay, moving on to the next bullet point under agenda item number 5. SB398.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. SB398 is attachment 5c in the packet, and 398 was a report concerning the progress of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission in compliance with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. As most of you know or maybe not know - I'll give a little history lesson. The JJOC, the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission was created as part of AB472 that was passed and signed into law in 2017. Starting with this whole AB472, the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission was required to complete and approve a 5-year strategic plan, which really outlines what all of the goals were of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. This particular bill, Senate Bill 398, is asking for an update on the progress of that strategic plan that was put into place in 2018. So as we move through this report, starting on page 3, those are the requirement for the creation of the strategic plan. On page 4, the key accomplishment of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission and DCFS and the counties as well - because a lot of the things that were accomplished by the JJOC and DCFS also affected all of the counties. So page 4, moving on to page 5 where all the accomplishments of the JJOC. Starting on page 6, this really outlines specific goals. This is the start of the outline of the specific goals in the strategic plan, and it talks about whether that goal was completed or not completed, and if it was not completed, why was it not

completed. So we go through a lot of several pages and we get to our first partially complete on page 7. And that is in relation to the evidence-based criteria. It basically says youth and families will be referred to evidence-based practices. Successful outcomes will be determined by a decrease in recidivism. Basically, this is partially completed because at that time of the strategic plan, we also, as part of the strategic plan, contracted with a vendor to house and create a data warehouse of programs and services that meet the requirements of evidence-based practices in Nevada. That vendor was provided startup money in 2018 and no ongoing funding. So that is why this one piece is partially complete. The funding for this is lacking. So I just wanted to point out why something could be partially complete. Moving on to page 8, we do have an incomplete item, and this is for the same reason that I just mentioned. It was the evidence-based resource center and not a lot of funding around that. Moving on to page number 10, CaseloadPRO, which is now called Enterprise Supervision, the reason this is partially complete is really - to kind of go back and provide some history, CaseloadPRO, now called Enterprise Supervision - the goal of the state was to have one system that the state could kind of pull reports from and kind of, I wouldn't call it a data warehouse but one system where the onus to pull reports is more on the state rather than counties. That never materialized due to lack of funding. What Enterprise Supervision would need to do that would be building bridges and some other things that are very costly. So that is why that is incomplete. Moving on to performance reporting on page 12. That is also partially complete. And the reason that is partially complete is it required the state, DCFS specifically, to track data into the adult system. How many direct files were there? How many individuals who move from the juvenile system into the adult system were arrested? How many convictions? DCFS currently does not have access to the adult system and no bridges have been built for DCFS to have access to juveniles once they move into the adult system. So that is the reason that is partially complete. Moving on to page number 14, general recommendations. Really, we talk about the evidence-based resource center being underfunded. And we also recommend looking at phase 2 of Enterprise Supervision, and that's the part where building those bridges and making it more accessible for the state to pull those reports out and put more of the onus on the state. Disparities in the juvenile justice system on page 14. This is information that came out of the racial and ethnic disparity subcommittee. They completed a survey of law enforcement and dispatchers and discovered that there were some lack of training amongst the dispatchers and law enforcement around adolescent brain development and peer development and some of those training requirements that those of us in the juvenile justice world get all the time. So that committee wanted to recommend some training for law enforcement and dispatchers around the more juvenile-focused trainings. And then moving on to page 15. This is talking about compliance with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, and basically we just talk about the reauthorization of 2018 and looking at really those direct files. Currently, direct files bypass the juvenile system, which makes it hard for me to collect data and for the program's office to collect data, and it also doesn't allow the juvenile system to weigh in in any way. So that's really kind of the piece that we as a state need to look at on the go forward to be compliant with the 2018 reauthorization. So sorry, that was a long-winded report, but that's really - I wanted to provide a really comprehensive summary of what we did and what is not yet complete and our recommendations.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that report, Leslie. And this group worked - the majority of our meetings last year were related to this report and agreeing upon the final language and it was a lot of

editing back and forth, and so I appreciate the work that went into this. And so, Ms. Bittleston, this had been turned into the Interim Committee in August of 2022, correct?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions or comments related to SB398 and the report?

Brigid Duffy: This is Brigid for the record. I just want to say thank you, Leslie. This is - like Chair Florez said, this is like the report we did a lot of work on, and the final review matched everything we had talked about at the prior meetings, so thank you for your work on that.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan. The only question I had was since this was a JJOC report is should it go in front of the entire board before it gets sent.

Elizabeth Florez: It has been sent, Mike. It was due last August [interposing]

Mike Whelihan: No. I know I thought it was sent but [interposing]

Elizabeth Florez: [Interposing] record.

Mike Whelihan: No one's reviewed it. Like the JJOC hasn't had a full meeting and [interposing]

Elizabeth Florez: Right.

Mike Whelihan: So the executive team - or I don't know, whatever you guys, I'm not on it, so - has not reviewed this report, so that was my only question, so does the JJOC executive team, the voting members, need to see this report before it's finalized and approved? Do they vote on it, I guess, would be the question.

Leslie Bittleston: So the answer to that is without the JJOC full commission meeting in over a year, this committee was the committee that we worked with to represent the JJOC.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Liz for the record. I remember having this conversation, and that's why on the title of the report, it doesn't say that this report was prepared by this committee. It was prepared through this committee because we were concerned for that very reason because it didn't have time or there was no opportunity to get it before the JJOC full body. So - I know that there was a lot yet to be known or shared related to the status of the JJOC, and I think there will be some clarification forthcoming this legislative session, at which point I would hope to get direction on the status of this and probably some other things that haven't reached full vetting through the JJOC. Okay. Anything else? Okay, moving on then to item number 6 for discussion, the 2023 legislative session. Ms. Bittleston?

Leslie Bittleston: Alright, yes. This is a standing item for us to use for any upcoming bills that we would like to look at. One, a bill that I believe we would like to look at as a group is the BDR [ph 00:44:52] or bill around what is going on with the JJOC. I asked this morning if it had come in to DCFS yet, and as of this morning, it had not. So, but this is just an open item for any bill from any of the committee members that they want to discuss, but I do plan on putting that JJOC bill once we get it.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. Does anybody have anything to add related to item number 6? Okay, moving on to item number 7 for discussion. Bill draft review, items for the 2025 legislative consideration. Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. One of the things that I learned very, very recently within the last couple of months is there's a process to - and I don't know if it's a formal process, anything in writing, but maybe a word of mouth process. I don't know what process, but to kind of look at some of these NRS items that may be a little weird or may hinder our jobs. So basically what I'm proposing to work on as a committee over the next several months is looking at some of these NRS language for possible update revision, things like that, to present as a BDR for the 2025 legislative session. So for those of us that don't know, changing NRS requires a BDR and it must go through the legislative body for voting and for approval. So I did prepare an attachment. The attachment, like I said, it is a draft. It is attachment 7a, and it is just a work in progress. I started going through all of the NRS's that affect the Juvenile Justice Programs Office and Oversight and all of those things, and I just started drafting those and I put this on attachment 7a. And I'm not saying we can go through it one by one today. I'm just presenting that we as a group work through some of these items over the next several months to come up with maybe a BDR that we can submit on behalf of this group to the legislature. So this is my first work in progress. And then also under this item, there was also some discussion about the definition of dual custody and the different terminology or the different understanding of the word custody amongst the juvenile justice side and the child welfare side. So all of this is kind of under this heading of things to work on over the next year or so for the legislative session of 2025.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you, Leslie, for doing that. I know that was a lot of work and these are items that either in this arena or another's, we've been hearing a lot of conversation about. And it's evident that you're trying to - you're really trying to streamline, fix, get clarification on a lot of things that continue to pose challenges to us [inaudible 00:48:56] justice. Are there any questions or comments related to this report? Okay.

Mike Whelihan: Mike Whelihan for the record. So I'm all for this. I think this should be like a committee of people to look at it, including maybe a district attorney named Brigid Duffy. Help us with our legal aspects on this bill. Just a thought.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. I propose this as a standing item for the next, like I said, several months, maybe even next year or so. I don't know if this is the right committee or if we want to establish a subcommittee off of this group. I don't know the best way forward, so I'm open to suggestions.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that, Leslie. Some of this to me feels like it belongs - especially the ones that are related to the juvenile justice, that OJJDP, it seems like that might fit better in the SAG committee, but we certainly can talk about that. Also, some of this is related to the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission, and I think after we learn what happens this session with that, that may inform some of the conversation related to that. I think after this session, we'll be a lot - I think we can dive into this a lot more thoughtfully and, to Mike's point and to yours, it may be that the work needs to happen in a different area, but this is a great start. I appreciate it very much. Okay. If there's nothing further in item 7, we'll move on to item number 8. Confirm the next meeting date and time. At this point, we don't have one of our voting members here who we would need, so I would propose to do another doodle poll.

Leslie Bittleston: Alright, Kayla? Doodle poll.

Kayla Williamson: Got it.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Thank you for that. Okay, on to item number 9. Is there any public comment or discussion? Seeing none. We will adjourn this meeting at 2:50. Thank you, everybody.

Leslie Bittleston: Thank you.

Mike Whelihan: Thank you, everyone.