

Joe Lombardo
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.



Marla McDade
Williams, MPA
Administrator

**Nevada State Juvenile Justice Oversight Commission
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
June 27, 2024, at 8:30 a.m.
TRANSCRIPT**

Roll Call:

(Members)

Elizabeth Florez
Michael Watson
Marla McDade Williams
Sharon Anderson
Matt Clapham
Perla Vega
Kelly Figueroa
Mike Whelihan
Jennifer Fraser

Absent:

Dylan Tedford
Brigid Duffy
Michael Wheilihan
Pauline Salla
Cindy Casselman

(Staff Members)

Leslie Bittleston
Jessica Villalobos

Elizabeth Florez: Good morning, everybody. This is Liz Florez. We will call this meeting to order. Ms. Bittleston if you could please take role.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes. Elizabeth Florez?

Elizabeth Florez: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Brigid Duffy I believe has a proxy, Michael Watson today.

Michael Watson: Correct.

Leslie Bittleston: Okay. Jennifer Fraser? Dylan Tedford? Marla McDade Williams.

Marla McDade Williams: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Sharon Anderson.

Sharon Anderson: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Matt Clapman?

Matt Clapman: Present.

Leslie Bittleston: Perla Vega is logging on in a minute. She will be here. Madam chair, we do have a quorum. Also on the line, we have Kelly Figueroa from Signs of Hope in Las Vegas. She is a pending JJOC member, and here comes Jennifer Fraser, I will mark her. For staff today, we have Leslie Bittleston and Jessica Villalobos.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent, thank you for that. For clarification purposes, my recollection was that the proxy question was asked and answered related to whether or not that was allowable under the rules, and I believe it was not, but if I could have somebody weigh in on that, please.

Michael Watson: That's correct. I've looked at it. It's not allowed as a proxy. I'm just here to take notes on her behalf. If anyone has any questions, I can answer them as well.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Mr. Watson. Noting that Ms. Bittleston, do we still have quorum?

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, madam chair. We still have quorum.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. I appreciate that clarification, and it looks like Ms. Vega is present.

Leslie Bittleston: As well as Ms. Fraser, and I have marked them both as present.

Elizabeth Florez: Excellent. Thank you. We have quorum. With that, we'll move on to Item #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. To provide public comment telephonically dial +1 775-321-611. When prompted to provide the conference ID enter 313 964 185#. If providing public comment during this meeting unmute your microphone prior to speaking. Persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record and to spell their name. Do we have any public comment? Okay, not seeing any. We'll move on to Item #4, Review and Approval of the April 4th, 2024, meeting minutes, which had been attached. Everyone should have been provided these minutes ahead of time. Are there any comments or discussion related to these minutes? Okay, not seeing any, I will seek a motion to approve the minutes from April 4th.

Sharon Anderson: This is Sharon Anderson. I move to approve the minutes.

Elizabeth Florez: I will second. This is Liz Florez for the record. Are there any abstentions to this vote? Okay. All those in favour of approving the minutes from April 4th say aye.

Members: Aye.

Elizabeth Florez: Any opposed. Okay, the motion carries, thank you. For discussion Item #5 is evidence-based resource vendor funding update. I will note that, this is Liz for us again for the record that at the last meeting we had discussed, at the request of NCJFCJ, we had been asked to reach out to the chiefs from NAJJA to determine what it was that they were looking for specifically in an evidence based Resource Center, we did have a meeting last month, or earlier this month, at which time the group narrowed down their focus to a few items. One was that the request, and we reviewed multiple different examples across the country of evidence-based Resource Centers and what the NAJJA chiefs really honed in on were some very specific requests related to having evidence base program evaluation. There are in Jurisdictions, unique programs that have been homegrown, and really absent the support of, like, a university or research arm. Sometimes it's difficult to submit those programs for review for possible categorization as an evidence-based program. If the evidence-based Resource Centers could provide that technical support, that's one request. The other is to have train the trainer opportunities for evidence-based programming, such as motivational interviewing, and other best practice, and evidence-based programs, and then the third was to act as a potential hub for information sharing within the site amongst Juvenile Justice professionals. My intention after discussion with this group is to move forward those recommendations in a report to the larger JJOC for further conversation. Are there any comments or additions related to the information I just provided.

Leslie Bittleston: This is Leslie Bittleston, may I make a comment? I just wanted to provide a little bit of context around the first ask of NAJJA, the program evaluation piece NCJJ recently created and piloted a quality assurance tool, or a tool to assess programs within probation departments, and that tool is quite extensive, and also does require somebody with the knowledge and expertise to review the information on that tool to make a determination if that program does meet evidence-based practices, or program requirements as outlined in the evidence based matrix that the JJOC approved a few years back. With having said that, will be a fiscal note or an additional cost, or fiscal increase for the vendor. Currently, the vendor only receives \$51,750 out of the formula grant, which is not enough to staff the evidence-based Resource Center with a fulltime person, or to provide that level of support with program evaluation. It's wanted to add a little bit of context around that. That's my comment. Thank you. Madam chair.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that additional information, Ms. Bittleston. I know at the last meeting we talked about the status of the relationship between, and the contract between the State and NCJFCJ. Do we know what that \$51,000 is providing now?

Leslie Bittleston: Currently, that \$51,000 provides some very basic technical support. There's an email address on the evidence-based Resource Center website that does get checked very infrequently, and the Resource Center does provide quarterly newsletters with updated or the most recent best practices in the field of Juvenile Justice. They do attend JJOC Full commission meetings to provide an update to the JJOC and periodically, when necessary, attend the State Advisory Group, the SAG Committee, JJOC SAG Committee meetings. That is the extent of what the funding provides currently.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Are there any comments or questions related to this item?

Marla McDade Williams: Yes, for the evaluation. I think I'm also kind of in line with what you're thinking about potentially looking at revision of the contract as Ms. Bittleston explained. It seems to be (indiscernible).

Elizabeth Florez: I'm not sure if I'm the only one, I cannot hear that full response. I think what I heard you say, there's a need to expand. Ms. McDade Williams, you're -- okay, go ahead.

Marla McDade Williams: I'm sorry. I'm driving, and I'm not able to talk. Connection might not be the best, but I will put in the chat my thoughts. I agree that we should move this forward. I would like additional costs proposal to go with it when it moves forward with the way the contract is now. What it would take additionally, and then have that discussion at the Full JJOC commission.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. We heard that last part of it. We appreciate that. I think putting that in the chat would be very helpful. I think, I did hear that a contract review would be appropriate at this time to understand what we are getting, with what this contract is now supposed to be providing, and perhaps what we would like it to provide. That would be very helpful. When I prepare a report for the next larger group meeting at the JJOC, I would like to include some of these comments, that way we can advise a larger body where our thoughts are related to this evidence-based resource program. Thank you. Any other comments. Okay, thank you for that. We'll move on to Item ##6 related to the Strategic Plan working document. There's an attachment #6, and Ms. Bittleston, you provided that attachment. Could you please give us an overview?

Leslie Bittleston: If you pull up attachment #6, Strategic Plan Working Ideas, for those of you who have been a part of the Strategic Planning Committee for the last several months, this Committee has gone over the current Strategic Plan and identified all of those elements in the current Strategic Plan that were completed, that were not completed, and the reasons why they were not completed and/or partially completed, and the reasons why they were partially completed. With that being completed, this group we'll move on to the next phase of the Strategic Planning process, which will be to identify what this group wants to see in the next Strategic Plan. The document attachment 6, just outlined some ideas that have been captured by the Programs Office over the last few years of this Committee meetings. These are some ideas that have kind of been tossed around in the past within this Committee, I'm going to share my screen, and just if I can find it, where is it? On your screen is, again, so goal #2 and goal 3, Proven Programs and System Collaboration are current goals, or goals in the current Strategic Plan, and the reason that these are here in these ideas is because those goals were not completed or partially completed. It may be beneficial to include these goals, these same goals on the go forward, and if you look under goal #2, we talk a lot about evidence-based programming, quality assurance, Chair Florez recently mentioned just in the last agenda item, one of the things that NAJJA would like is Program Evaluation. This first goal kind of talks about program evaluation, and then all those things that we just discussed a few minutes ago under the previous agenda item is listed under goal #2. Goal #3, this goal is up for discussion, and may be better suited for the Data Committee. The Data Committee met earlier this week, and one of the things that the Data Committee would like from this Committee is some clarification on what the Strategic Planning Committee would like from the Data Committee to include in the next Strategic Plan, for example, there is a program and performance summaries or performance summary scorecard. My apologies, I'm forgetting the actual name of it, but a document that outlines performance measures for the Juvenile Justice system. The Data Committee would like this Committee to identify, what it is that they would like to include in the next Strategic Plan from the Data Committee, and that's outlining goal #3. Then there are 3 additional options. What this agenda item does indicate is there are

four options, goal #1, goal #4, goal ##5, and goal #6 that are new, and options or goal #2 and goal #3 are current, just revised. That is how this attachment is laid out. Madam Chair, do you need any other information around that?

Elizabeth Florez: I apologize because what I had, this is Liz Florez for the record, what I had printed from a previous attachment is, looks different than this attachment. Was this recently updated or changed?

Leslie Bittleston: Recently updated. Yes, Madam Chair, with some additional information from the other Committees as they have met.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay because I was working off then. I'm not associated with the older one because I had printed this when it was posted earlier, and so this is new information for me, some of this, so I haven't had time to properly digest it. Does anybody have any comments related to this at this time? I'm sorting through it right now.

Leslie Bittleston: Mike Whelihan hand has his hand up.

Mike Whelihan: I guess, for me, some of the goals and option one, I have some other things that might be present to me. Just, one would be Community Service. I think statutorily there's a lot of requirements that are imposed on the judiciary. Where it makes it difficult for kids to get off probation, especially with gun charges. I know, Brigid, and DA Association worked with us last session, but we met an obstacle, but came out of the Senate 19, and nothing, but then it sat in the Judiciary Committee's desk and never came out for the assembly to see it. It would have passed, but I think that's an issue, especially down here in the South trying to get a lot of times with gun charges. A lot of our vendors won't even touch those kids. We're trying to get them back in school, and then they got to do all the stuff in the 62C, and, they're sitting there with, 400 or 500 hours of Community Service, and even one of our judges commented, a few weeks ago to me in a meeting that she has a child that's never been in trouble that had to do some Community Service to get accepted to College, and she had trouble getting her daughter in, and if it's hard for Judges to get their children and to get them into private colleges, it's hard for us to get these kids in, especially with transportation issues, sometimes you got to pay for things. I think it's just the limited. I know Washoe does a way better job. I'll say that right now when it comes to their Community Service approach, but, for us, it's hard being down 53 staff, figuring out how to get these kids, and not giving the Judge's discretion, and the DA some discretion to base on case by case, because if you get a kid with a soft air gun, he's getting the same Community Service as a kid that pointed a gun at someone's head in a robbery. Legally there's no discretion there. I'd like to see something from, or at least to get the thoughts on the, JJOC would like to see. Maybe detention criteria might be another one. We're sitting here at 196 kids, and often, there's not a lot of discretion at the door. I don't know if we would want to look at something like that, as far as criteria to control the door a little bit, maybe do a, see if we could get a study done or something to where maybe we get some funding to look at, appropriate kids that are dangerous to the Community being locked up, and maybe limit some other kids that shouldn't be in there, maybe looking at some options on how to relieve some the detention overcrowding for maybe kids that shouldn't be in there. That's just my thoughts.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you very much, Mike, and you're right, when you talk about Clark County sort of lives and has such unique considerations and challenges relative to virtually all of us, and the rest of

the State, and you make me nervous when you talk about changing detention criteria and some of the other things you mentioned. I think you bring up some really valid concerns related to the very significant challenges that are unique to Clark County, and I guess my question for you would be within the goals associated with the Strategic Plan, what would be the overarching theme, or goal that you would place these items under it?

Mike Whelihan: It would be under goal option one. One would be to look at the NRS for it'd be at several NRS is because it's just a Community Service lies in. I think I believe three statutes. I could be wrong, but I know graffiti lies in its own, and then the guns in general, just looking the law, like I said, we've got a good starting ground with, with I know you were part of that too, I believe, Liz, on the Community Service bill. It just softens it up and gives, it would give your DA some, more discretion and some, maybe sometimes need a little more, depending on the severity of it, but I think usually most of the Judges, and the PDs, and the DA's would argue that, if we've got 3,000 kids on probation, and there's not a lot of services down here, and, once you start trying to get them in school and get them in the counselling, you're not getting them off and, because that other stuff's got to get done. I think having a more realistic view on what in a case plan that could be, like a multi treatment team when we're talking recommendations to the court on how we want to impose Community Service. I think even in the bill that we proposed, we would be allowed to create some classes. The idea was based on the OJJDP, some of the things that they allow nationally that we don't in Nevada. You know civic engagement, some of the things in there that we could create our own programming. It doesn't have to be painting the wall, like the, the 1960s, 70s, let's go paint the wall and call that Community Service. Right? I think we could do more of an educational piece to really try to restore these kids instead of saying, "Oh, they went and painted the wall." Now they know what the damage you're doing, that doesn't work. Right? I think some of that is good, and then a blend of both would be good. I think statutorily that piece and as far as the detention criteria, that that's more of an idea on my end, because we always get from law enforcement, from the judiciary, that like we should be detaining more kids. We, our facility right now, we're over capacity, and we're sitting at 196 today. We only have staffing for about 152 kids, and we're sitting with 200, we're in a dangerous spot in, in Clark County, and I get we're different, but, when I even go through the goals of the list, we're going to look at Room Confinement hasn't been updated in 10 years, I get that. But we're going to try to impose some Legislative changes on that. Which is going to affect us the most, and then when you go back to Use of Force and Restraints, once again, when you're sitting with, 3,000 kids a year and at your facility, that is going to have, a lot of these things impact us the most. On both ends, good and/or bad. Right? We understand when we change these, we're going to take the biggest hit, but at the same time, I think for Community Service and some of these other things, I think we need to look at what's best for kids because there's not a lot, like, we're in the kid business, and when you look at a lot of things, we're talking data and I get eventually that could work with kids, but we're not looking at things that could truly help impact the system to keep kids out of it, and redefine some of the work that we do, I don't want to lose that, and that's the point at JJOC, but when you look at our goals, there's not a lot and I could be wrong, but that's just my feeling, and I would really like to see the Community Service. Of course, this is a group effort. This isn't my deal. Just seeing how you guys would support it, and I get the criteria thing is scary, but that's what I'm saying. If we could do a study, from the Universities, from Reno, and UNLV we kind of look it, maybe look at some national stuff and best practices, and right now we're starting to take runaways that are OJs. We're getting to the point where we're taking kids that we didn't take years ago because our West Care disappeared, and I get, we got different issues, but we don't have a facility, and maybe if we started looking at some of these things, maybe we could, then that maybe the next session, we could be looking at a new placement for kids that shouldn't be in detention, that should be at a runaway shelter, and maybe get something like West Care open back up, get some funding for it instead of, "oh, they're going to go to detention." These kids aren't criminal, but, you know, they got wants or

warrants being held, even from the DFS side from their State that they're coming from, and Mike, if I'm wrong or Jennifer, let me know, they're getting held in detention. Which to me, they're only a risk of running away. They're not Community safety more of a risk to themselves.

Elizabeth Florez: So, I'm going to open this up for response.

Mike Whelihan: One more thing, and I'm sure you get this too. I think some of the Mental Health. We still have never gotten to address that. I know, the DOJ came in, and did, but we're still sitting with kids. Maybe if we're looking at criteria, some of those kids, when they get fail out of some of these Mental Health institutions, detention shouldn't be an option. It shouldn't be unless they got crimes, right? Like, they're truly, but here we go, we send them to an institution. They're like, "Oh, they're dangerous for Mental Health." You're like, yeah, because with Mental Health, they want to hurt themselves are dangerous, right? So, maybe that conversation could come up because we have those conversations, but nothing's changed in the law. Nothing's changed in practice, and we still have. As soon as they go for a week, we get like a week's break from these kids, then they come right back, and it's crazy how they do better on our institutions and in a Detention Facility, but their Mental Health needs are being met, right? That's just what I'd like to say.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you, Mike, on all of those points, I certainly can understand specifically around the Mental Health and there are some things we're doing in Washoe County to I think, fill the gaps, where the services are not available in our Community, I think we always have to be very mindful about the importance of where Juvenile Justice lies on the spectrum of youth risk, and needs in the Community, and the responsibility lies across many facets. So, I do know, I am familiar with that Community Service bill. I testified in favour of it, it fell apart, and I know Ms. Duffy talked about that and in prior meetings and expressed, and Ms. Fraser expressed, significant concern about how that how that failed. I don't know if anybody has any information related to whether a bill draft will be brought forward again. I'm throwing that out to this group to see if anybody has any information on that. I'm unsure who sponsored that bill last time.

Marla McDade Williams: This is Marla. I don't know if you can hear me. I'm not sure if there's a recommendation. I do know that I just was asked to solicit recommendations by the Judiciary Interim Committee. All it can do is follow that piece and see.

Mike Whelihan: It was Senator James Ohrenschall. It was his bill. I worked on the bill myself with him, but I can't sponsor bill, because I'm the County Employee. I think he just wants a little support, then if someone reached out to him, other than myself, he knows how I feel about the bill. The County only gets four bills, so they're going to look at things that saves millions of dollars. Right? This isn't going to be a priority for Clark County, I think as far as, a professional in this industry, I think if someone else could kind of, maybe, headed a little bit this time, other than, DDJS it would be advantageous and that might get through. Because there's a political side to it. We need to get some Democratic support in the Assembly. In the Senate, it went out 190 and nothing, but the problem is in the Committee the individual that chaired the Committee didn't push it out, and that's the real issue, and Jennifer's raising her hand.

Jennifer Fraser: Senator James Ohrenschall is an Attorney in our office. I'll chat with him to see, I don't see why he wouldn't resubmit it this year, and I also received the email from the Judiciary Committee for solicitation. I can add that in. Maybe there's a chance it could just come out of the Judiciary Interim

Committee, and maybe if we have it on both fronts, that would be helpful, and maybe just now that we know what the obstacle was in the last session, kind of hit that on the front end instead of being surprised by it at the end, like we were last year or last session.

Mike Whelihan: It would be great if Marla could get a copy of that. Like, if James does decide to do that, he's the Senator, and maybe get this whole Committee, if it does come out, Jennifer, maybe we can just send that to this Committee. Anybody that has someone that can help support it to push this through because it was a good bill. Brigid did the major writing. So, did Senator, Ohrenschall, and I know Liz, and I worked on it too, as well as Jennifer did. It was really a solid bill.

Marla McDade Williams: Yes, I was just going to say, these gun issues and if that's what this is all focused on are very political. I'm happy to meet with every town representative, and the gun advocates. I think the important part of it is having some Data and seeing if they can come in and support some middle ground on it, but I'm happy to do that individually in my role as the Administrator of the Division of Child and Family Services, just kind of see where they're at, and get the lay of the land, , it's going to be very political, so I think that the way to actually help get some movement on it is to have Data. What is that? What types of gun charges, how are they affecting courts? How are they affecting Community Service? That type of information.

Mike Whelihan: It's not just gun charges. It changes the ability to conduct classes to be able to like educate kids on one what the impact is. It could be graffiti. They can put Community Service for almost anything. Right? Guns are part of it, but I think a lot of it too was because those are statutory with, you get one, whether you got an air softer, you got assault rifle, you get the same Community Service. I think it gives the discretion for the Judiciary, and everyone else to recommend, something that might be more, amenable, and more educational. It's just not the Data piece, and I get the Data part too, but it's also just having more modern law that allows probation departments to, and providers to create a meaningful education along with the traditional Community Service.

Elizabeth Florez: It allows for more discretion, while not upending the current allowances for traditional Community Service. Ms. Fraser, it looks like your hands up. Go ahead.

Jennifer Fraser: Yes, just to echo that, it wasn't removing. I don't think there was a lot of pushback regarding the firearm offenses or people being concerned about that because it wasn't removing even the number of hours that kids would have to do is just expanding the definition of what Community Service is using the OJJDP guidelines. It includes things like pro social activities. I think some of the pushback is in the bill it said that kids could do that Community Service at school, and there was some push back from teachers, just educators worrying that was going to be an additional task on them or an additional burden on them. If we could, maybe, I think if we address that issue, I think it would be a lot more successful.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. I'm expressing appreciation to Mike for bringing this forward and reminding us of what occurred last time. This is an important matter, and I appreciate Ms. Fraser offering to reach out to Senator Ohrenschall, and to Ms. McDade Williams in her administrative roles, supporting what comes forward. The data component is something that we probably all should start compiling if this bill draft does go forward, so that we can just indicate the level of impact potentially, and the reality is that in its current State, kids are not getting the benefit. I mean, the intention of the Community Service hours was one to hold accountable, to pay back the Community, but another component of that is to

ensure that kids are learning so that they don't make that mistake again, and they recognize their impact, and are educated on the on how to avoid those behaviours. It's in my mind, we all thought a win-win for on all sides. Mike, I don't know if there's any Data, first, I guess I'll ask, Ms. McDade Williams, do you know, is there a timeline by which we should provide Data, and to whom should we provide it?

Mike Whelihan: Yeah, I would say, let's look at if the bill gets if the senator agrees to push out the bill, and let's start looking at data, and we can kind of sit together as a group with, and figure out what would help, but I think the biggest thing that Jen was right about is, it really it was one assembly person who was a teacher, not during the session that felt they didn't want the kids at school, which to me is crazy because that's what probation is trying to do. Probation is trying to get the kids back re-enrolled in school, and in the bill, it did allow for pro-social activities outside of school hours to be able to be allowed to use for, I believe, maybe have been like half of their Community Service. If, you say, "Someone joined the chess club", and all they would have to do is say, "Yeah, they attended" and then, at that point, they could get some hours for that, or if they played. If they got back on the girls' volleyball team and completed the season, then they could get some credits for that. Right? Along with some counselling or some of the counselling allowed probation to create some civic training, like some of the stuff you've talked about, Liz, on like what the real meaning of Community Service is supposed to be is to re-engage them in their community, let them understand the damage they did and keep them from redoing it, right, re-offend it.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay, for purposes of moving on, that was goal #1. I appreciate the conversation, and we'll put this all in the report and appreciate the homework that others are going to be doing to move this the Community Service piece forward. Are there any other comments on this goal? Okay, we'll move on to goal #2, Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, let me share again, just to clarify on any of these goals. They are not set in stone. They are ideas at this point. It doesn't mean every goal listed has to be included. Some can be removed. Some can be added. I was taking copious notes. On goal #1 for those last 2 items, looking at Community Service and detention criteria. So those will be added to this living document. Goal #2, Proven Programs. This is a goal that is in the current Strategic Plan, and it was really cantered around the development of the evidence based Resource Center matrix, the development of the evidence based Resource Center, the assurance that the State counties and providers were using programs that met those evidence based requirements, the requirement for a quality assurance annual review, all of those items were under proven programs in the current Strategic Plan, and some of those were completed, and some were not completed, and just to remind this Committee of some of the things that have been talked about in the past, the CPC, the Correctional Program Checklist was the tool that was selected by the JJOC a few years ago to be the quality assurance tool to assess for the requirement to use evidence based programs and practices, and facilities. That tool was rolled out, and has been used with the State facilities, and the youth camps. The tool is proprietary. It is time consuming. It requires trained assessors through the University of Cincinnati. There has been some discussion around looking for a different tool rather than the CPC. That is just some history moving into the current proven program piece of the new Strategic Plan. In addition, the intent of AB472 was to roll out a quality assurance review tool to the State and the youth camps first, then to the probation departments, and to the providers. I recommend that this group address the fact that rolling it out to providers is, there are no resources to do that. There are no resources in the State, nor the counties to go out and assess providers programs. There is some discussion to be had on if a tool could be rolled out to probation and parole, but that's up for discussion. That's just a little bit of history and context around goal #2, Proven Programs.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that, Ms. Bittleston, and in review of this, related to the CPC, I know that from Clark County's perspective, they've been pretty vocal about how this tool seems most seems more designed for a Mental Health facility versus a Juvenile Justice or correctional facility, and my notes, I remember when looking through this were to have a conversation and bring forward reports from the users of CPC as to if the tool is working as intended, because what Mr. Whelihan him has shared in past meetings related to Clark County's experience. I'm also very curious about the camps experience with the tool. Well, he speaks on behalf of Spring Mountain, but I'm very curious about China Springs Youth Camp, and curious about the experience of the State facilities as well, just like we're exploring the agreement that we have with NCJFCJ related to the Evidence Based Resource Center. I think it would be beneficial for the JJOC to hear how this tool is using. Is it working as intended? What have the outcomes been? And is it, I think we just need a status update on the tool, and how it's being utilized, but I'd like to put that out for comment and response as well.

Mike Whelihan: I think let's see read last time. There's a lot of Mental Health components to it. Even some of the recommendations are that basically Mental Health should be running our institutions like Mental Health qualified staff running the juvenile, you know, placement. I hate to say correction, but juvenile placement facility, I'm sure China Springs aren't the same thing that even when you get a good score, it looks like a bad score too. It seems, and it is more for Mental Health placements, and yet in, somewhere in the statute we're required to do PBS too. It's kind of like, we're doing two statutorily, which makes no sense. We should be doing one. Personally, I like PBS more because it has a lot more indepthness to it, and then it looks for like, family engagement, family responses, how the kids feel safe in the facility. Are they getting treated properly? I mean, there's a lot to it. It seems more like, if you're trying to look for a best practice, and it compares you against other institutions of a similar size and a similar, they're not comparing Spring Mountain Youth Camp to our Juvenile Detention Facility because those are different. Right? They have different outcomes and different things. Then you can make an improvement plan based on your score versus other similar size, similar Jurisdiction. That's the thing that I like it. It's not even called PBS anymore. It's something else. Now there's another acronym for it, but it's still PBS. We're CPC. It's just it's a lot of work for, because I believe you got to send three people. You got to get retrained. It's just time consuming, you're not going to complete stuff because you can't have every person that deals with a kid in Mental Health, but yeah, we're a Juvenile Placement Facility. Like it's not a Mental Health facility. That's not what it is, right. We have counsellors in there that deal with Mental Health for the kids that have those, but not every kid has Mental Health, and some of them have drug addiction. Some of them are sex offenders and some of them have dual disorders. Some of them are medicated. I mean, there's a lot of things. We provide specific for in specific kids, but you don't need Mental Health facilitators to run an institution. It just it's odd to me.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you.

Sharon Anderson: Want to help clarify some things. I believe is helpful. There may be a need to do more training on what that the CPC is. Maybe it's not super clear. It sounds like it's not because of what is being you know, brought forth now. What I do know is that it's not necessarily Mental Health focused on the way that was just described. It's about, what is considered best practice when running a facility, and what that CPC does, it just looks at what you're doing and providing recommendations to adjust, usually at no cost that would allow for your program to be more evidence based heavy, right? The piece with the Mental Health, it's about any programming that is provided that has a Mental Health component, the recommendation is to have Mental Health Oversight, and have Mental Health, there to help the program succeed, not to necessarily run the facility, but to provide support because evidence says if you have

qualified Mental Health folks overseeing. Let's say with the groups that are done at most of the facilities, whether it's forward thinking, thinking for change, more recognition therapy or anything like that. If you have a clinical person, someone who's trained in running groups available to help process things you know, that may come up in group or help oversee that piece because that is part of what we do in our correctional settings, right? We do those types of things. The evidence says if you have that type of a person kind of overseeing that or being present to help, you know, feel things that come out of those groups, then that provides better outcomes. That's the way that it's supposed to be read, not to dictate to you to have a Mental Health person over that piece. Right? The challenging piece is that, you know, all of us being overachievers, everybody wants to get a 100%. However, that tool does not, that's not the way that it works, and no one will ever hit the 100% because there is no perfect program out there, but what it does is it provides different examples of what is been proven to be effective, and it just presents that information to the programs, and so I hope that was helpful.

Mike Whelihan: I know when we get our results, the recommendations are that we do have clinical, and we contract our clinical. We have a clinical department, so they want more, like, it reads that you're not in compliance. I understand what you're saying, but when I present this to the JJOC, I've gotten hammered, like, you need all the, we have a Mental Health team, but it doesn't meet the standard of the CPC, and we're not going to.

Sharon Anderson: Yeah, it's just about having them be a part of that piece of your program not running it, and so it's just a connection is all they're saying, and if you made that connection, if it even that person was available by phone in case something came up and you could say, "Hey, we just had this happening group, can you help us process or know how to how to move it through." That's kind of what that is talking about.

Mike Whelihan: I think it's more than that, though. I think it's requiring more because we have that, and we don't meet that standard, and we never have. Mental Health does the groups like when it comes to, we don't do PO's because we are PO's in Spring Mountain. They don't do a Mental Health at camp, but when you're looking at the overall, they want them. The way that our CPC reports breed over the last several times is that Mental Health should be the ones dictating what goes on in the institution, and that's not the way that we run our program, the way we've always run our program. This is a facility first safety and security are the most important thing. That's the first thing, right? Then we do Mental Health based on assessments, and, mazes and whatever assessments are using, and then Mental Health. The team would work on those issues, the POs wouldn't, but even when they're doing case planning, they want the Mental Health person who are really overwhelmed with what they don't even have time to go over and look at every kid's case plan to make sure and review everything. They wanted to review everything, and we don't have enough Mental Health people to do that, and the only way to do that would be to make all the supervisors and management and everyone else licensed therapist.

Elizabeth Florez: I think in light of the fact that many of us because really, it's Summit, it's the camps, which are some of you trying to spring Youth Camp and the State Correctional Facilities. If I'm correct, are the ones using this tool? Ms. Bittleston brought up that there had been conversations before about expanding it to outside of that to the other Detention Centers. I'm very unfamiliar with it because Washoe County has not been a part of it, and I think because of all the new Membership in the JJOC, I would like a report on this from the overseers of CPC, and I presume that's DCFS, is that who are the quality assurance folks related to CPC in the State? Can we have a report to the larger body?

Leslie Bittleston: That falls within the Program's Office. So that would come from DCFS.

Mike Whelihan: Liz, I just sent you our last one, that way you can kind of look at it and see what I'm talking about. I'm just asking that we look at something else that it's a little bit more. It seems to me a bit punitive, and when you're reading it, like, because these are public documents and when you got something that you can never do well at, and no matter how well you do, you're not going to do well. We're already doing PBS, and I'm not saying we use PBS, but I'm saying this and Leslie struggles with it too. We've all struggle is getting staff trained in it, and, the turnover, it is hard to maintain the integrity of that tool because every time, you're moving people around, especially at the State, and even our institutions, people get trained, they move on. We're doing it ourselves. As a State, it's not like a group of people that do it all the time because it's the turn of our know, Leslie's done it probably the most anyone in this State, but even her team's turned over my team's turned over, and so now we're getting basically, new people, I don't even know if the fidelity of it is that well, because it's not like Cincinnati's coming out here and doing it. Right? We're getting a report from someone that's been trained once on an institution that like PBS. I'll just do an example. I'm not saying to use it. We must use them somewhere else for the camps too. At least the PBS report is PBS staff. These are people that's their job. You can sit down and have conversations with them, on how do we improve? It's hard for me to have those conversations with the CPC because even my own people have been trained in it, I don't know. There's not like a resource to go to, we're not calling Cincinnati, and they're not providing us any support. I mean, to me, it's like, why use a tool when the person that developed the tool is not providing support to us. We do have to pay for PBS. I think we paid \$10,000 for both detention and Spring Mountain, but at least they sit down with us twice a year. We go over the Data. We create an action plan. It seems to be like a more methodological way of criticizing, and I'm all fine with being audited. Hey, we got to make changes. There are areas we stink at. I'm not going to say that we don't, because I'd be lying. I would like to be able to focus on things and have the experts be like, "Hey, if you do this," even when PREA comes in, we get PREA auditors that come in and they're like, "Hey, "and they give us a six month correction plan, and they actually, Shane Reed is the one that we use, and he actually sits with us and we go back and forth on like, "Hey, what if we do this? What if we do that?" You know because we want to be complying. What do we need to do to change to be in compliance? But with the CPC, I don't feel, and there's not, unless you can attest that there's no follow up from Cincinnati when it comes to anything.

Leslie Bittleston: That is correct. It has been very difficult for the State to maintain assessors who have been trained in the use of the CPC. We have trained more than 16 folks, and we probably only have three left, within can go out and do it. Some people have retired, and some people have moved on. Additionally, the CPC, is quite extensive, and it's an extra duty as assigned to those trained assessors. It's not like those folks have the time and that's their only job. They're doing it over and above any other duties to that they have. That was really something that the Programs Office would like this group to take into account is when you use a tool, somebody must be like an expert in it, and that's definitely not DCFS trained assessors. They could go out, and they can do the review, and follow the manual the best that they can, but providing that technical support, and all of that is just not been something that has been done. I guess it's the best way to say that. Sharon has a comment.

Sharon Anderson: I just have a question. When this first was rolled out, were there any other tools that were looked at, that maybe we don't have to start over if that is the direction that this group is looking to recommend or, if we need to do bring on more trainings or something to get to a resolve with this particular issue.

Mike Whelihan: I don't believe there was anything else. I don't know where it came from, and even after they implemented, they're like, oh, whoops. I mean, everyone was like, "Oh, my gosh," right? Leslie, we were all like, "oh, my gosh, what is this?" When we did the first, we're like, "Oh, my gosh, we're stuck with this now." I'm going to use Tyler Tech Enterprise, whatever it is, you know, probably Jack pushed that one through and guess what? We're all stuck with it, and it's not the best system. I'll be, now that Jack's not here, so it is a hard system. We're having trouble getting the Data we need out of it. I think that the Data stuff we're trying to do, the State would be easier if we could get because what we were sold with Tyler Tech is not, we thought once, if everyone was doing Tyler Tech, then we, the State could just jump on our system, pull the Data, but they're not even the same for each location. It's crazy.

Elizabeth Florez: I want to make sure; I'm going to go back to my original ask because there's a lot of conversation and communication around this item, and Mike, thank you for your memory of things because since we were excluded from it, I don't have as many details about it. I'll ask if the State would be willing to provide a presentation at JJOC related to just a status update. Maybe perhaps a historical how we got here. What is the tool intended to do? Is it doing what it's intended to do? What has been the experience of those who are utilizing the tool? I think without that information, we need that information in order for the JJOC to make intelligent comment on whether we should continue with this tool or examine other options or provide greater support, what will we need to bolster support for the users of the tool is that, does anybody have any concern or questions about my thought on that?

Sharon Anderson: What I would say is, you're asking, we would need to be able to get the Data for that prior to, and so it would be, I believe it would be a challenge to be able to do all the topics. I was just taking notes on what you're asking, and so maybe if we can get a formal request, then see how we can meet the needs, that we can bring this forward in a way that just makes sense. I would ask for that, and then we can work on putting together a presentation because a lot of this is also, we're getting different opinions. You asked about what are folks experiences with the tool, and so it would be nice to get feedback from folks, see what their thoughts are instead of us presuming because historically we know when it came into play. We know how we have trained folks. We could do that piece. That's not a problem. But the other piece, I think it might need, maybe we could get folks to provide Statements so that that could be a part of it, and it'd be a cleaner presentation. If that makes sense.

Elizabeth Florez: I believe as Chair of this Committee, I can make a formal ask. I will do that in writing. Would I direct that to you Ms. Anderson or to Ms. McDade Williams or both?

Sharon Anderson: That's fine. Yes.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. I will do that, and I appreciate that there's a lot of unknowns here, and it would likely take time to gather that information. In my conversations with the new China Spring Youth Camp director, she's new, she's transitioning in, and so she has a lot of questions about CPC, and I believe has been trying to educate herself, and reach out to the State resources related to that. This, I'm sure will overlap with those conversations she's having. Thank you for that. Under Proven Programs, it does overlap with the evidence-based Resource Center, which I believe we covered in the previous agenda items. I'll move on to goal #3, System Collaboration and Data Sharing. I know Ms. Bittleston has reported on this before. The Office of Analytics has come to the table and is having conversations with the two largest Jurisdictions being Clark County and Washoe County and proposed a Data sharing agreement. I'm very pleased to report that support from the Office of Analytics, and the time that they've provided us. That the Counties can have a direct conversation with the State on what is feasible for collection? What

would help tell a story about the trajectory of a child from beginning to end of their time in the Juvenile Justice? Their interactions with Juvenile Justice, and we have made a lot of strides and coming to agreement on what those data elements are, and the State is at the table in those meetings as well and DCFS is. I know that we have continued meetings. Each meeting we have, we get closer and closer to agreeing upon Data Elements and an agreement, and then eventually the goal would be that after this pilot with Washoe and Clark, that it would be expanded to the other counties. I just wanted to open with that, but I'll turn it over to Ms. Bittleston.

Leslie Bittleston: Just to reiterate what Chair Florez just mentioned, that is the goal to pilot and roll out the Data sharing agreements with both Washoe and Clark first, which would be an agreement and signing of Data sharing agreements with Washoe and Clark, and then obtaining a Data Submission from Washoe and Clark, and kind of looking at how that works, and that process, and to ensure that all of the things in the Data sharing agreement can be provided. If there are any changes needed based on those first Data Submissions, those will be made prior to rolling out the Data sharing agreements with the remaining Counties. With having said that, item #3, or goal #3 is really that Data piece that will be very heavily focused with the Data Committee. One of the things that is on here is the first idea for, is the identification of specific measurements for recidivism. Recidivism is a very broad term, and in Nevada recidivism touches many different areas, it touches Counties, it touches the State, and it touches the adult Criminal Justice System. Really looking at homing in and tightening up some of those measures around recidivism, that was a topic of conversation in the Data Committee on Tuesday of this week. You're really kind of tightening up those measures. Every County and the State are comparing apples to apples for example, if we're going to do re-arrests, we're just going to do re-arrests. We're not going to include technical violations or probation violations in a re-arrest, just really looking at those pieces and, and tightening those up. Another thing the Data Subcommittee is, will be working on is there is a Data Dictionary that was completed, and rolled out between all the counties, and the Supreme Court back in 2014. That was 10 years ago, and some things have since changed, for example, the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 2018, AB 472 in 2017 updated some definitions. The Data Subcommittee in conjunction, at the same time as this Committee will be working on the Strategic Plan, will be working to update that Data Dictionary. That could also be part of this Strategic Plan, knowing that that is a part of the Data Subcommittee. Another thing that is important to note as the Office of Analytics is brought into the conversation. There are still some missing Data components that even the Office of Analytics do not have access to. Currently, they do not have access to Court Data, and they do not have access to Data from jails. For example, when you're looking at a booking into an adult jail, there is no access. The Office of Analytics does not have access to that yet. These could be some conversations on the go forward as we start talking about these Data pieces, these high-level Data pieces, for example, like competency, it would be better to obtain competency hearing Data from the actual courts rather than Departments of Juvenile Probation because the courts have better records around that. Like I said, these are just conversations that are currently being had, within the Data Subcommittee. I believe from this Committee, Chair Florez, is the Data Committee would like some information on what it is this Committee specifically wants, like, the new Data Dictionary, and they will prioritize those things to include in the next Strategic Plans. That could be a formal ask as well from this Committee to the Data Committee. Anybody that was on the Data Committee Mr. Watson or Jennifer, were you on the Data Committee as well? Did I summarize that?

Jennifer Fraser: Yes. Leslie.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Just for clarification, the Data Subcommittee is asking for guidance from this Committee on.

Leslie Bittleston: What specific items that the Strategic Planning Committee wants to include in the next Strategic Plan related to Data.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. That wouldn't mean that this group would have to weigh in on that after doing some homework, and I'm really hopeful that that through our work with the Office of Analytics, some of that work, I think we're doing, and so in conjunction with that, it could be something, and there are, I'm trying to remember on our Data Subcommittee, if there are JJOC members on Commissioner Salla's on that group, I know there's Clark County representation on that group as well. I'm taking note of that, and that will be something that I'm going to have to work offline to put together, and then present to this group for agreement upon to make a recommendation to the Data Subcommittee. That's noted. Thank you.

Mike Whelihan: Just I think to help Liz, I think I don't know if the Data Committee can show what we're already collecting because that's such a huge, like, is there a way to get a list of things that for already collecting it, why are we going to ask for it again? I think to know what we're looking at already, and seeing if there's maybe it would just be cleaning up, and adding a couple things, and not to be something huge. If we're already collecting it.

Leslie Bittleston: I don't think that's quite what the Data Committee was looking for. I think they're looking for more high-level things. Should they update the Data Dictionary? Is that going to be a component within their Strategic Plan that the Data Dictionary will be updated within the next two years or whatever? Another thing is, looking at recidivism right now, recidivism Data is very difficult to collect because it does require Youth specific Data. It requires comparing the Youth, to the County, to the State to the adult system. There is some discussion around how best to ensure that we are tracking Youth from the first time of referral throughout their, their stay. I think there's some conversation around that. I don't think it has anything to do with what is currently being provided any additional asks. It's just what is the Committee's role? The Data Committee's role in supporting the Strategic Plan through things like defining recidivism measures or updating the Data Dictionary.

Marla McDade Williams: I think that there's a, the Data Committee should probably roll that up to the Full JJOC Commission, have that discussion, and then the JJ Commission can roll it back down to the Strategic Planning Committee. I think that's a large discussion for everybody as opposed to kind of bypassing the larger group.

Elizabeth Florez: Ms. McDade Williams, I like that idea that, because I was a little bit overwhelmed at digesting that ask. That would be, I appreciate that, and I would prefer it that way.

Mike Whelihan: My suggestion would be, because if you're looking at, or want to look at the definitions, I think the Data Committee should look at the definitions and say, "Okay, these ones highlighted, and then those ones go up to the JJOC" because if not, we're going to be redoing the whole Data thing all over the Data Committee, and then this Committee will wind up spending months, six months or more trying to figure out the definitions that are already established. I think if the Data Committee says, these 10, or kind of not valid, or maybe they're just not effective, or then we could send that up to the Full JJOC, and say,

“hey, we've got these 10 or 15 that aren't clearly defined well,” then let them send it back down for a new definition instead of the whole thing. I think the whole thing, it just creates a lot more work that is unnecessary.

Elizabeth Florez: I appreciate that. I imagine, I'm assuming that there were conversations at the Data Committee about, what continues to be an important data element and what perhaps are the ones that are challenging to either collect or define, and so I like the idea of that going to and refining it potentially recommendations that of refinement that they then go to the JJOC, and then there would be direction from there. I'm going to elect to move forward that way.

Mike Whelihan: Yeah, because some of those definitions are in NRS, so if there's an issue, you've got to change the NRS to change the definition. That's setting the whole thing up. Then we're going to be scrambling like at NRS again.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Are there any other discussion points on goal #3?

Jennifer Frazer: Just to clarify, I think too, the issue was when we were looking at the Data Dictionary, which is old, then you're looking at the definitions within, what was it? The performance evaluations, right? That they weren't matching the Data Dictionary, then the federal definitions are different, the statute. Basically, we're all using different definitions. I think the goal is that we kind of home that in, and then also make sure different Committees aren't duplicating work. I agree with Ms. Bittleston. It wasn't like an additional ask on anyone. It was just to make sure that we're not and even like NAJJA isn't doing something extra that the Data Committee. Just to kind of put it all out there because it will be a big lift on the Data Committee to kind of redefine the Data Dictionary. I think it was just to make sure everyone's on the same page with that.

Elizabeth Florez: I appreciate that clarification, that helps a lot. Thank you. With that, we'll move on to goal #four, Stakeholder Education, and I am being mindful we have 11 minutes left in this meeting. Ms. Bittleston?

The goal is Stakeholder Education, ensuring that all stakeholders within the Juvenile Justice system are educated on confidentiality, information, sharing restrictions and available and shareable Data to increase knowledge. Understanding, and effective working relationships between stakeholders, this includes courts and Departments of Juvenile Services, ensure that all prisons, jails, detention facilities, lockups, etc. receive education in the JJDPA.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, like I said, that has been something that has been brought up here and there over the last year. One of the things that came up during COVID, the Program's Office was unable to get out in person to a lot of these stakeholders, jails courthouses, Judges. Some of those visits were behind, so as we started to ramp up those visits again, we discovered that there has been a lot of turnovers in most of those areas. It's really looking at, re-educating all of these Juvenile Justice stakeholders in the area of the JJOC confidentiality, and all of the things that we deal with, and that are in NRS, and federal statute. It's just really a long-term goal to make sure that we are going out and re-educating our stakeholders, because we have seen a lot of turnovers out there.

Elizabeth Florez: Does the State have a strategy?

Leslie Bittleston: Not yet? Yes, it's just something that we want to indicate is a need, and I believe that there's some room to build a strategy over the next couple of years of as part of the Strategic Plan.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. Thank you for that. Are there any comments on goal #4. Okay. We will move on to goal #5, System Gaps.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, system gaps is really something that Mr. Whelihan was talking about. Under goal #1, when we were talking about the placement of out of State runaways, and detention criteria, and all of that. One of the things that that the Programs Office has seen an uptick in is the placement in Detention Facilities of out of State runaways, there is a gap in the system because they may not be best suited for a Detention Facility, but the State doesn't have runaway shelters. For example, another thing, the Juvenile Sex Offender treatment programs, to look at the providers that are available, and really looking at some other options rather than detention. This again is a long-term goal that's going to need some flushing out and probably some Data around it, but I think that this does tie in with what Mr. Whelihan was talking about under goal #1.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you. Are there any are there any discussion points on this item? Okay. This, of course, falls into the closure of a lot of our facilities that we use. There's just been a general reduction and bed availability across correctional as well as treatment related programs. I appreciate that this continues to be a goal. Moving on to goal #6, obtaining Data from courts and jails.

Leslie Bittleston: Yes, lastly, I just mentioned a few minutes ago when we were talking about working with the Office of Analytics. Two of the areas that our gap in Data still today is Data directly from courts and data directly from jails. The Office of Analytics does have access to arrest to records. They have access to hospital claims, Medicaid claims, Vital Statistics, and a host of other things, but two areas that they do not have access to because I did have this conversation with them about a month ago, is these areas that are missing and, the court data is quite important because if we had access to court data, we could obtain, you know, the competency hearings, the number of petitions filed, certifications, direct files, dispositions, adult convictions, all of that stuff directly from the courts, rather than relying on probation departments to provide that data based on their own records. Secondly, looking at the jail piece we do get or excuse me, the Office of Analytics does have access to arrest record, but not every individual that is arrested is placed in jail, and so looking at that jail data of the individuals that are booked into adult jails, specifically looking at those under 18 is vital to ensuring that the State is in compliance with the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act, and this ties into stakeholder education a little bit. As folks in jails and in courts change, and as their people turn over, folks don't understand that they have to provide, or they should be providing data around juveniles in adult jails. Really looking at honing in a process, and this may be a statute, I don't know, but it's ensuring that adult jails are reporting if they book and hold individuals under the age of 18. So that is the parameter of goal #6.

Elizabeth Florez: Thank you for that. I appreciate that. Are there any immediate questions on this? Otherwise, I would like to defer this for the next for the next meeting because I want to make sure we're not rushing. A discussion on this part, and we still must get through this agenda. Unless somebody has something immediately, I'd like to trail this piece. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Bittleston for putting together this report and collating all the elements that remained in the Strategic Plan that needed further conversation. With that, I'll move on to Item #7, which is to confirm next meeting date and time. I believe we had discussed previously setting a specific date and time I'm going to ask Ms. Villalobos if you can recall what that agreed upon set schedule would be I want to say it was the 3rd. I want to say it was the

3rd, Thursday of every month, which would put us on July 18th, but if you could please confirm that or no, that's I'm confusing that with the SAG Committee.

Jessica Villalobos: Yes, we need to schedule our next meeting. We have not.

Elizabeth Florez: We don't have a standing meeting.

Jessica Villalobos: No, we don't.

Elizabeth Florez: Okay. My recommendation would be then is to send out a doodle poll. Please, that we can pick a time that works for everyone in them on a future agenda, maybe we can arrive at a set time so that people can calendar it going forward. Thank you. We'll move on to 8 public comment and discussion. Is there any public comment? Okay. I'm not seeing any. With that, we will adjourn the meeting. Thank you everybody for participating in this discussion. I appreciate it. I think we have some ideas going forward. Have a great day. Thank you. Bye.