

Joe Lombardo
Governor

Rique Robb
Interim Director



DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

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



Marla McDade
Williams, MPA
Administrator

PUBLIC NOTICE

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEVADA JUVENILE JUSTICE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (JJOC)

DATE: Monday, December 15, 2025

TIME: 9:30 AM – Adjournment

LOCATION: This will be a virtual only meeting as authorized by pursuant to NRS 241.023
Join on your computer, mobile app or room device.

Members Present

Chair Karlson
Pauline Salla
Elizabeth Florez
Derricka Daniel

Members Absent

Brigid Duffy

Staff Members

Adrian Taylor

TRANSCRIPT

Agenda Item 1. Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call

(Roll Call. We have Quorum)

Chair Carlson: I don't see any guests, but I will ask if there are any guests present that they identify themselves, introduce themselves. Are there any guests? Seeing none.

We will move on to Item Number 3, which is initial public comment. Action may not be taken on any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for a later meeting. To provide public comment, telephonically dial 1-775-321-6111. When prompted to provide the conference ID, enter 581-642-784, number sign.

In providing public comment during the meeting, unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and spell their last name. Is there any public comment? Seeing none.

We'll move on to Item Number 4 for possible action, review and approval of the minutes. I believe everyone received a copy of the minutes from the October 9th meeting. Are there any corrections that anyone would like to make at this time before I ask for a motion to approve? Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from October 9th?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I move to approve the meeting minutes from October 9th.

Chair Carlson: Thank you, Commissioner Florez. Can I have a second?

Pauline Salla: Commissioner Salla, I'll second it.

Chair Carlson: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. It has been a motion has been made and seconded to approve the minutes from the October 9th meeting. All those in favor say aye.

[ayes around]

Chair Carlson: Anyone opposed? Anyone wish to abstain? Okay.

Moving on to Item Number 5. For information, discussion, and possible action. Review the bylaws and proposed recommendations to the members of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission. The Executive Committee will review the Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission bylaws and develop proposed recommendations for revisions to the full JJOC to ensure consistency with novelty by statute, open meeting laws, and the Juvenile Justice Prevention Act and current commission operations, i.e., for example, work groups.

The Executive Committee will identify specific JJOC bylaw sections that will be recommended for revision, clarification, or restructuring to the full JJOC. And the Executive Committee will determine tasks and

assignments to be completed before the next executive meeting.

I placed this on the agenda, let me give you a little bit of history. Back in October, Commissioner Anderson made some recommendations that were format issues, nothing regarding the actual words of the document, but some format issues. Once that was done, it came to my attention through various meetings and so forth that I want to make sure that we're hitting all of the requirements under the federal law, under state law, under procedures that we are using that that are under Robert's Rules.

I'd like to have them codified in the bylaws because I have come to understand that if not implicitly stated within the bylaws, there can be questions and confusion. And I want to try to have less of that and more solid ground when we are moving forward with trying to do what we need to do, if any of that makes any sense.

So, this is an attempt to clarify some things I know specifically as we go through this, there are some things that the Executive Committee, that it's not specifically spelled out within the bylaws but I believe that's important for us to do or at least recommend the full Commission, that we'd be able to do. There might be other things in the other committees that that you might want to add to bring forward to the full Commission.

So, what I would what I would recommend doing, I did prepare a bylaw comparison table along with my best friend Ricardo. That's chat GPTA for those who don't know. We can start with this. We can start with—if you want to start a different direction, that's fine. But how would you like to proceed? Anyone?

Pauline Salla: Can we see what Ricardo created?

Chair Karlson: It's on there. The bylaw table is an attachment.

Pauline Salla: Oh.

Chair Karlson: Oh, you want to see it on there? Yes. Could you bring it up, Adrian? Could you bring up my attachment, the bylaw comparison table? Thank you, Commissioner Salla.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. [crosstalk]

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez, for the record, while Ms. Taylor is bringing that up. Commissioner Karlson, this is really great. Especially the columns about the recommended revisions. Was there another draft where Ricardo was given the directive to make the actual revisions within the original bylaws document?

Chair Karlson: There was a request and that became extremely confusing and I don't believe that Ricardo had enough information to do that. So, then I put in additional information and between Ricardo and myself, this is what we came up with.

Elizabeth Florez: This has got the human factor in it. Got it. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Chair Karlson: And I do appreciate both you and Commissioner Salla introduced me to Ricardo. He's been a great help. Okay. So, it is up there. So, if it works, everyone, I will, I will go through this and then we can go from there.

So, under Article 2 which is Mission and Authority the one thing that it was kind of blinding to me that we do not have because it wasn't law then was to include the authority and powers under AB 384. I think that that is significant that that's going to be a very major requirement of the JJOC that we need to codify that in the bylaws.

Pauline Salla: Agree.

Chair Carlson: Under Article 4, under Appointment and Vacancies, this is something that may be more that we have done, but it's not codified within the bylaws. It's certainly allowed within Robert's Rules, but there is no reference to non-voting members on situations such as task force or work groups. And I know with AB 384, that may be a direction that the Commission may wish to go is to create a task force that includes non-members.

So, I think with that, I think it would be important to just specifically state in the bylaws that we can have non-voting members on those type of situations where they're in advisory capacity or they're brought forth their expertise. Does that make sense?

Elizabeth Florez: Yes.

Chair Carlson: Okay. Also, under Section 4, orientation of new members, this is something that I discovered as we brought forth six new members in the last few months. There really is no formal process for orienting our new members. And I think it would be important to include something that specifically talks about how recommendations are made in the first place to the Governor and from there, what materials are provided to the new commissioners, what kind of orientation perhaps you know we want maybe to assign a mentor.

I don't know those are things we can discuss but I think that's something else that we should include in the bylaws. Also, where am I? Orientation. Where am I at? Oh, this is under conflict of interest.

When there's a situation, because this has come up, I'm just going to be very clear on this. Commissioner Anderson, as we know, is our acting juvenile justice specialist. And she and I have had conversations that if there's ever a situation where there is a vote that needs to be captured, that conflicts with her role as a commissioner versus a juvenile justice specialist or overlays, that there needs to be steps for recusal in those types of situations. That just kind of brought to my attention. There may be things in the future.

I just think it's a good idea to have that within the bylaws, that we have some kind of recusal steps and that it's documented. Whether that be by letter or just in the minutes, whatever may be needed. Because there is no formal process right now.

Pauline Salla: And I think that's a great idea, DeVere, because as we get back to reviewing the grants, commissioners will need to recuse themselves if their jurisdiction is receiving funding, which we had that in our previous commission, you know, there will need to be a process that they recuse themselves and not participate in the vote for that grant funding. So, I think it's a good idea to include conflict of interest and recusing and abstention.

Chair Carlson: Okay. Under Article 5 and that's meeting and the open meeting laws. Our current agenda development section does not specifically go into what is required under—what is required within an agenda.

And I would recommend that we expand that section to include specifically what is necessary under not only open meeting law, but under the policy of the Division of Child and Family Services. Such things as the authority to bring forth whatever the item is, the expected outcomes that we expect to see, deadlines, what the posting rules are specifically.

We've learned a lot in the last month about posting rules, but I think once again if we put those in writing within the bylaws, we don't lose that. And it just makes it—and having that laid out just makes it much clearer and I'm trying to create a situation where we the approval for agendas is will go much smoother. Because we're all aware of what the requirements are. Any thoughts about that?

Pauline Salla: I have a couple. Adrian, can you just scroll down to the is there another page?

Chair Carlson: There is—yeah.

Pauline Salla: Thank you. That's what—I guess, my—if we're going to codify that information, I guess my question is, is that identified, is the process systemically identified like that or is it person specific? So, I guess what I'm trying to say is I sit on other state commissions that when we have open meeting, like when we're doing agendas, it doesn't seem to be so difficult and specific.

So, if it's what the system requires, I'm okay with codifying it. If it's like, individually, a preference of how articles or how agendas are created, that's a little different to me. Because when individuals change then does that mean our process is going to change? I'm just trying to figure that out. Because you know, I sit on other state committees and we create agendas and it's different.

Chair Carlson: And I've asked those questions and what I understand, Commissioner Salla, is that some of these are within policies within the Division of Child Family Services. Who are our administrative—we are assigned to them for administrative support. So, some of these are within their policy. Some of them are under the open meeting law, which clearly needs to be—that's within state law.

So, that's easy to go back and go per this specific function of NRS 241, we will do these things. I understand what you're saying and I'm just trying to, as the chair, I'm just trying to make this process run smoother and more efficient I guess. But I guess it's a mixed bag Commissioner Salla. I think it's policy within the DCFS and then it's also required under open meeting law.

Pauline Salla: So, then would our language mean to the language of the DCFS policy? Because I guess we would need to see that to incorporate that language in our bylaw.

Chair Carlson: That's a very good point. I will get with Commissioner Anderson and ask for that policy.

Pauline Salla: Yeah, because I think if we're going to include it, let's use the language.

Chair Carlson: So, we can specifically—some of it is—I have noted, because now I'm working directly with Commissioner Anderson on the agendas, what has really—and this is also seemingly coming from their gag, and I don't know if they're taking that information once again from DCFS's policy or they're taking it from open

meeting law, but they keep coming back through Commissioner Anderson saying, what is your authority to do this item? That seems to be—again, I don't know, and I haven't done a tremendous amount of digging in open meeting law, because it's really, you have to be an attorney to be able to read that. That might be something we can have, Commissioner [inaudible] could do for us. But I will do some more research on that, okay?

Pauline Salla: Okay.

Chair Carlson: And come up with a draft, perhaps, for our next meeting that we can all look at.

Pauline Salla: Thank you.

Chair Carlson: Any other comments on that? Also, under Article 5, Quorum and Voting. It's confusing how it's written now. I think we need to be more explicit. It's stated, especially in Robert's Rules. It just says majority and it doesn't clarify if that's majority of those present or majority versus the whole group.

And as we know, it's the present of the members of the group. If we have six or five on the executive committee, we know a quorum is three. It's not those who are present. I think in my opinion it just needs to be clarified.

Going back to agenda, any more questions on that before I move on to the next one?

So, I also believe in the bylaws and again this is for the purpose of bylaws is so anyone can pick it up. If I were to leave tomorrow, I'm not, but if I were to leave tomorrow or one of you were to leave tomorrow, which you're not, someone could pick that up and go okay this is how we do it. That's the purpose of having bylaws. I think there also needs to be strengthening on what the posting requirements are, specifically when they have to be posted, handling the material that needs to be posted with the agenda, and procedures when a DAG is not present. According to DCFS, they have the authority if a Deputy Attorney General is not able to review and approved the agenda, they had the authority to approve that agenda.

I think that needs to be stated within the bylaws. With that, I was doing a lot of research on the open meeting law, and we know that agendas must be posted three days before the actual meeting, three working days before the actual meeting. And if there are attachments that are to be provided to the members, they also must be—that information must be provided at the same time the agenda is.

There is, however, because the situation came up a couple of months ago. If there is supporting material that is not provided to the members, for example, we have a working group, they have a—they're working on something, they prepare a document a day before a meeting is to occur, they can attach that document within 24 hours after that meeting. That is within open meeting law.

And I can see circumstances where that could be necessary. Is that confusing? Commissioner Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: Yeah, thank you, Commissioner Florez, for the record. Is it 24 hours before, or I think you said after the meeting? After the meeting.

Chair Carlson: Once it's presented.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay.

Chair Karlson: Because the situation is, none of the commissioners have seen it except for the individual who prepared it, or the individuals in the work group, or whatever. They did it the day before. They can present it at the meeting. And this is under NRS 241.020, Paragraph 7 through 9, Subparagraphs.

If it's presented just at that meeting, then it must be posted within 24 hours after that meeting, unless there's a weekend, it's working days or a holiday. So, since that practice has actually happened within the last couple of months, I think we need to codify that within the bylaws. And it's something that I think is probably going to be useful in the future. Thoughts?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I actually like that and I think it should be included only because I have found myself in situations where I felt very restricted in the information I could share based on all the rules associated with, you know, Robert's Rules of Orders or DCFS policies. So, in my mind, this is something that would allow for additional information so that we can actually be productive in meetings. So, unless I'm missing something, to me, that's a positive.

Chair Karlson: Thank you, Commissioner Florez. What brought this to my attention and why I did the research, as we are working on AB 384, we have a lot of requirements in a short period of time, especially through the Development and Planning Committee. And they've got work groups going on, and that material may not be available by the time the meeting is. And to delay it another two weeks, I don't—we don't have the timeframe to do that. So, that's why I started doing research on this. Since I know it had already occurred, so I thought, well, I'm going to look at that. Any other comments?

Pauline Salla: I agree. I agree with Liz. I mean, I think if it's allowable and helps us, I agree, especially with 384, we're moving, gathering a lot of information and trying to move quickly. So, I'm supportive of it to be included in our bylaws so that it's all clear and everybody has access to the same information.

Elizabeth Florez: And this is Commissioner Florez. Thank you, Commissioner Karlson, for doing that level of research. I appreciate that very much.

Chair Karlson: Oh, absolutely. Moving on, this was one that was, once again, was kind of a concern that I had at a prior JJOC meeting, where we're talking about voting, when we are voting for whatever may be placed on the agenda. Sometimes, agenda item has multiple things that we are voting on and it's not broken down within the agenda itself.

There is within open meeting law the ability to state prior to the voting that we are going to break these down into, in fact it was during my presentation of AB 384 when I broke it down into three different sections rather than voting for all three at the same time. That is allowed under open meeting law. It is allowed under Robert's Rules. I just feel again it might be helpful to have that in the bylaws where there are multiple steps, we can make the announcement we are breaking these down to separate votes and go from there.

Pauline Salla: Commissioner Salla, I like that idea.

Chair Carlson: Again, it just gives us the ability to function without having so many constraints which I have noted in the past, you know, since I've come on board and I'm trying to work within those constraints but also give the Commission and everyone the ability to have a little bit more leeway within the law. Going down to administrative support, I think under Section 5.10. It just, it's not—I think we can include a lot of information about the timeframe we'd like to have the DAG review something and bring it back which then would then trigger if that can't happen a request for the administration of DCFS to approve the agenda. I think that that would be that's important to have in there.

Pauline Salla: So, wait, Devere can you say that again. So, that without DAG approval DCFS could approve the agenda?

Chair Carlson: Correct. If they are if they are not available, let's say they're all on vacation or all at a conference or they're all involved in whatever and can't meet the requirements to do the review, I'm proposing that we put in the timeline for the—again, we're only making recommendations and it'll be the full JJOC that votes on this but to put in the recommendations, that we have a timeline where we request to have the DAG approve an agenda.

And I'm kind of working on a seven-day situation from when we present the agenda to when it's posted. If the DAG is unable to do that for whatever reason, there's no one available, then that timeline will then give us the ability to go back to the administration and go, they can't do it within this timeframe for whatever reason. We're asking you to now approve the agenda.

Pauline Salla: So, I'm wondering with that—I guess maybe we should find out if that's even something that DCFS would do without DAG approval. I don't know. I don't know if that's even something they could do.

Chair Carlson: Commissioner Williams has told me that she can. Again, I don't know if that's a written policy. When I get with Commissioner Anderson and ask about policy, it may be in there. But Commissioner Williams has let me know that she does have—matter of fact, she's done it on at least one occasion that I'm aware of.

Pauline Salla: Okay.

Chair Carlson: I don't recall what happened with—I think they were all in a conference, actually. They were all in a training. for my recollection.

Okay. Moving on to Article 7, Committee Structure. We don't have any working group rules. We're allowed to do it because of Robert's Rules, but again, I think it would be very helpful to have that structured within the bylaws. What is a working group? What is its structure? What are the rules? It can't be a quorum. There are specific tasks that you can do. If you go over that line, then you're violating open meeting law.

So, I think it would be very important to really clarify that and bylaws when you are required to be under open meeting law and when you are not required, which is a great advantage of having a work group is when you aren't required to be under open meeting laws. But there are specific things that you have to make sure that you are doing or not doing for that to happen. Does that make sense?

Pauline Salla: Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Yeah.

Chair Karlson: Also, let's take the Executive Committee since we're all on that. And again, I'm just going to be very clear in my communication. I had a section that we were going to put on for this agenda about committee updates. Because one of our roles under the Executive Committee is to—let me just go to it real quick, rather than guessing. I'm not good at guessing.

Coordinate duties of committees to ensure there is no unnecessary overlap. In my mind, that means that we have the authority to get updates from all the committee chairs in that meeting, so we can ensure there's no unnecessary overlap. However, since it's not implicitly implied that we can get these updates, that could not happen. We don't have the authority to do that.

So, my proposal would be to place that in here and anything else that you feel may be implied but not implicit, and any in your committees or in this committee that we need to look at that we think well that's implied but unless it's implicitly stated there may be issues with it. And that's just an example.

Commissioner Florez, did you—

Elizabeth Florez: No, I was just acknowledging that I recognize the value in this and have experienced this very confusion in my committee.

Pauline Salla: This is Commissioner Salla. I'm a little confused by that. I guess my question is, if we're sharing information from our committees that we chair, why does that need authority, if we're not voting on something, if we're just updating each other on what our committees are doing, so we're not duplicating services? I'm confused as to I guess, I don't understand why do we need authority to share information with the Executive Committee, that are the chairs of the committees and the chair of the Commission. I'm so confused by that and I'll probably need some help understanding that. I can't even say like, yeah, we need to do that because I'm like, do we? We're not voting on anything, we're not taking action, we're keeping each other updated.

Chair Karlson: I'm just going to be as transparent as I possibly can with you Commissioner Salla. That was my interpretation as well. But when that came back from the DAG, it was stated that it was not within our authority to have updates. That is a role of the full Commission to receive updates from the committee chairs. My response was the same as you just stated, that under Paragraph G, we are to coordinate duties. And how can I do that unless I know where all the committees, where everyone understands where all the committees stand? Kind of went back and forth. And that's when I decided, okay, we're just going to make it clearer in the bylaws. That's all I can state about that.

Pauline Salla: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I so appreciate, again, Chair Karlson, that you have done a lot of behind the scenes communications with DCFS and with the DAG in order to move forward and provide clarification to sort of our procedural—what the procedural rules are. At any time, was there a conversation or

was there any willingness that you could find where some of these things could be put into writing by the DAG?

Chair Carlson: That wasn't asked, Commissioner Florez. I did not ask that question.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. I was just curious because again, going back to having worked under many civil district attorneys who provide consultation to our department, there are, of course, variances and interpretations of the law and policies and rules. And so, just going forward, it would be great if there could be something provided in writing.

I know my personal experience in the past when I've asked for these things in the past 15 years, It's never really resulted in anything in writing, despite my request, but for posterity, I think it is important to get that but don't know if that helps us in this current situation right now.

Chair Carlson: I will certainly make that request. I have no problem with requesting it be in writing. The only thing I can tell you is that this has not been a one-off circumstance. There have been other circumstances where I have been shown that it's not within that authority. Therefore, I can't do it. I'm kind of like you. I'm not as strict. I'm not a strict [inaudible]. I'm more of an implied. That's because we are required to do that. That implies that I have to be able to, all of us need to be able to receive updates.

But it seems to be the interpretation now is very strict. And I'm just trying to work with what we have and just keep things moving. But I will absolutely put that in writing that there is confusion about this, we'd like to have this in writing specifically. What was that?

Elizabeth Florez: Oh, nothing.

Chair Carlson: Okay.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you.

Chair Carlson: Any other comments questions on that one? Okay. We already talked about the work groups, that there's a desire to add that. Under strategic plan under Commissioner Florez, under your committee, and I don't—I do not pretend I know 10% of what your committee does even though I'm on it. I'm still learning. But the alignment between the strategic plan and the three-year plan is implied, but is it specific enough, I guess, is my question?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez for the record. Truthfully, I have not put them side by side to really do that right now. And so, right now as I'm going through the plan and we've started the agenda item of identifying areas that require updates to the plan this would be a good opportunity for me to also include that too. So, as we as we're moving forward towards recommendations to update the plan that could be included and I can bring that forward on the next Strategic Planning agenda. The answer is, I don't know but my guess is that there's probably work to be done there.

Chair Carlson: And I state that only because we're going to be in a few days, because Christmas is only 10 days away. [inaudible] somebody. We are going to be entering our third year of our current three-year plan which means we are entering into our year we have to start developing our next three-year plan.

And those strategic plan and the three-year plan should be somewhat linked. And I think it would be advantageous perhaps to include language like that in there so they're not done in silos. Does that make sense? That we're not doing one, and then we're doing the other one. And I'm specifically talking about the three-year plan is not looking to see what the strategic plan is doing. That we're just creating something. Because right now, not sure how aligned they are and I'm not looking at a strategic plan issue. I'm looking at that as we need to take more care when we're updating the three-year plan to make sure it's capturing what is in the strategic plan.

Elizabeth Florez: That makes sense.

Pauline Salla: Can I add something to that?

Chair Carlson: Okay. You most certainly can Commissioner Salla.

Pauline Salla: So, historic, I just want to—I agree that they should not operate in silos and that the three-year plan can link in things with the strategic plan but the strategic planning committee was created to really move forward juvenile justice reform. And our three-year plan is a federal requirement that surrounds itself around only four core requirements. And I think that those of us who've been in juvenile justice for a long time understand that four core requirements doesn't automatically mean reform because if that was the case, you know, 1974 was the first act and we would have had reform long ago because they were the same four requirements.

So, although I do believe there's a link between them I hope that our strategic plan still really focuses on true reform and just not compliance.

Chair Carlson: I guess, my—very good points Commissioner Salla, I think what I was trying to communicate was I'd like to see the three-year plan kind of follow along with what they're required to do as the four core requirements. But I don't want them going off in a different—it just doesn't seem that when that's created, they're even looking at what the strategic plan is and trying to link up what is in the strategic plan that addresses those requirements. And are we doing two separate things? That's where I'm coming from.

Pauline Salla: [crosstalk]

Chair Carlson: If you don't think it's an issue, we can not—I mean, that's fine.

Pauline Salla: No, I mean, I think that how they support each other is critical. There's a lot of work that's gone into the strategic plan that is so much more than just core requirements. It's really true reform, right, efforts.

Chair Carlson: Absolutely. That wasn't my intent to make that—I absolutely agree with you.

Elizabeth Florez: And this is Commissioner Florez, for the record. I think there's implications. So, when we look at the various goals of the strategic plan, particularly the ones around data, we reference the US code. So, it is perhaps maybe not direct, but there is implication about our compliance required in the plan to adhere to. It

doesn't maybe say the three-year plan, but it does reference the JJDPA and the US Code. But I should be able to answer that more readily than I am right now. So, I will at least look at it and see if it prompts any recommendations for the Strategic Planning Committee for review.

Chair Carlson: Going on to youth engagement. Derrica, are you still there?

Derrica Daniel: Yes, I'm here.

Chair Carlson: Sorry. So, this one is you. Youth engagement. The term youth engagement is not fully described. Here is my concern. As you are all aware, Derrica is our youth advisor for our youth committee that she is working going to be working on. Hope to have a meeting maybe in January, February timeframe.

We are limited to have five youth members just based on the fact of, we can't have the more youth members that puts other things out of alignment. So, per the what's required in statute is five members. And under state law, it's under the age of 24, federal law, is under is the age of 28. And the new JJDPA reallocation are—not reallocation, but what they're looking to renew it. They are looking to have that be once you reach 28, you are no longer a youth member, period. The day you turn 28, you're no longer a youth member. It doesn't mean you can't be on the Commission anymore, but you're no longer considered a youth member. So, I just throw that out.

But there are a lot of youth out there with a lot of ideas, and one thing that we can consider, and this is what your input, is that we could have youth on that committee that are only in an advisory role and are non-voting members as far as the coalition is concerned or the Commission is concerned. What are your thoughts about that?

Pauline Salla: I like that. I mean, I like the ability of having more youth involved, especially, you know, we may be working on something that representation of a certain aspect, you know, isn't part of our youth members but we have youth who we can identify, you know, to give information and provide feedback, so I like that.

Chair Carlson: Once again, it's AB 384 that kind of kicked me in this direction. Yes, Commissioner Daniel.

Derrica Daniel: Yeah, Commissioner Daniel for the record. I was going to say I really love that idea as well.

Chair Carlson: Excellent.

Derrica Daniel: Yeah, I'm a fan of the idea. DeVere, can you remind me how many youth members we have on the committee right now?

Chair Carlson: You currently have four with the perspective of the fifth member, with that information I gave you a couple weeks ago.

Derrica Daniel: Okay.

Chair Carlson: So, we currently have four and with one vacancy.

Derrica Daniel: Okay.

Chair Carlson: So, yes, I just counted it and it's correct.

Derrica Daniel: Thank you.

Chair Carlson: So, I just think that that would be an advantage to have that, and I think a youth voice is so important, and I know that other SAGs do that, where they have non-voting members. They don't have to go through the process of being—they aren't appointed by the Governor. We can come up with our own, maybe, you know, Commissioner Daniel, that may be something you might want to look at.

Derrica Daniel: Yeah.

Chair Carlson: What kind of application process you think would be important. I would think we'd still want to have a mixture of those that are former SAGs, currently involved, and those that aren't. So, something we can discuss at a later date, but I thought I'd throw that out there. Okay. Any other comments about that one? No. Yes? No?

Okay. Article 9 of the amendment process. We have in there where it says we review annually. I'd like to change that to at least annually. There may be other occasions—I don't want to come to a situation where we've already reviewed it this year. We don't have to review it until next February. There may be other things that come up. And I don't want to have to spend a lot of time always having to update the bylaws. But I think if there are situations, I just don't want that to be an issue where it just says annually, if that makes sense.

Pauline Salla: Agree.

Chair Carlson: So, those were the things that I came up with. Does anyone have any other areas within the bylaws that they think we need to look at to discuss?

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez, for the record. Again, I'll express thanks for having put this together. Some of these, as chair of a separate committee, really jump out to me as areas that if we were to be able to bolster would really help with the work that we're attempting to do. So, that's my only comment on that. Thank you.

Chair Carlson: Thank you, Commissioner Florez. Anyone—

Pauline Salla: This is Commissioner Salla. I'm not sure if maybe we need to just strengthen some semantics in Planning and Development, but I know it says we have the ability to review legislation, but then when we are creating an agenda item, we were told we are not. It's not in our authority to do that. When AB 4 was coming out during the special session, so I don't know if maybe we need to bolster that part of it because we will have another session before we know it.

And clearly with our SAG 101 training, reviewing and discussing legislation is absolutely part of what we can do. So, I don't know, Devere, if you want me to work on that wording to clarify it or how we can proceed with that.

Chair Carlson: Thank you, Commissioner Salla. I think that kind of brings us to what would be the next steps. And in my—what I was thinking was that, As the chairs of your individual committees, I kind of rely on you that, if there's any bolstering of those sections that I would ask you to look at that and individually make any revisions you think would be appropriate. I, in turn, would take what we have gone over today and actually draft up what the actual policy would look like. And present that at our next committee meeting, which I'm hoping will be in early January. Because I'd like to be able to do the first reading at our February meeting.

I know once again that's a very tight time frame. What we can do also is you could email stuff to me. We can't do emails between the four of us or five of us but you could email me as the chair of this committee, things that you want to change. And then, I can incorporate it in one document for that meeting coming in hopefully the first week in January. Any thoughts on that?

Pauline Salla: That sounds good. I like that.

Elizabeth Florez: Yes.

Chair Carlson: So, Commissioner Daniel, I know you are very busy because you are starting a new business. We were discussing that before you came on. But if perhaps you could come up with some language regarding the youth. I'd like you to take a look at that section. Because when we wrote that, you were not officially the advisor. And I would really like to have your feelings and what you think that committee could be doing.

So, look at that. See if there's anything that you'd like to see in addition to. And also, maybe add that part about non-youth members and what kind of process you think would be appropriate for assigning them as a non-youth member, non-commissioned member. Does that make sense?

Derrica Daniel: Yes.

Chair Carlson: If you could do that and you can just directly email it to me. I know you're very busy.

Derrica Daniel: You're fine. Thank you. It's not a problem.

Chair Carlson: Okay. Great. So, with that being said, I think we, unless I'm missing something, I think we've covered the intent of Agenda Item 4 and we know what our next steps are going to be. Is there anyone who wishes to make any other comments about Item 4, which I have now lost, and now I found. Does everyone feel we're on a good track here?

Elizabeth Florez: Yes.

Pauline Salla: I do.

Chair Carlson: Okay. So, with that said, I'll just reiterate that I'm going to be responsible for coming up with the draft for the items that I presented. Each of you have your own committees that you can go back and draft whatever you feel would be appropriate in those areas, and we will come together again in January. Should we

just send out a doodle poll for early January? I'll ask Ms. Taylor to do that.

Elizabeth Florez: This is Commissioner Florez. I have my calendar in front of me if you want.

Chair Karlson: I have mine in front of me too.

Pauline Salla: I will pull up mine right now.

Chair Karlson: All right. That is awesome. Commissioner Daniel, do you have your calendar in front of you?

Derrica Daniel: Yes.

Chair Karlson: Okay. So, someone can just start off with perhaps a suggestion for next meeting.

Pauline Salla: What about January 12th?

Elizabeth Florez: That works for me, with the exception of 3:00 PM. That does not work.

Derrica Daniel: Works for me.

Chair Karlson: How about we say at 9:30? Does that work?

Elizabeth Florez: Yes.

Pauline Salla: Yes, works for me.

Chair Karlson: 9:30 on the 12th? Is that good for you, Commissioner Daniel?

Derrica Daniel: Yes.

Chair Karlson: Okay.

Derrica Daniel: Yes.

Chair Karlson: So, 9:30 on the 12th. I will have hopefully everyone's information by then. I can prepare that draft. The agenda will stay the exact same agenda. We will go over that and determine if those are the recommendations we wish to make to the full Commission in February or what changes we need to make.

So, that leads us to Agenda Item 6, for possible action, duplication of next meeting date and agenda items. We will meet on January 12th at 9:30. The agenda items will be to review the draft revisions that will be proposed for recommendations to the full Commission at the February meeting.

Moving on to Agenda Item 7, final public comment and discussion. Action may not be taken in any matter brought up under this agenda item until scheduled on an agenda for a later meeting. To provide public comment

telephonically, dial 1-775-321-6111. When prompted, provide the conference ID number, enter 581-642-784, number sign, and providing public comment during this meeting. Unmute your microphone. Prior to speaking, provide your full name and spell your last name for the record. Are there any public comments? Seeing none.

It is 10:30. And I will call this meeting adjourned. Thank you, everyone. I appreciate it.

DRAFT