

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
AND  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE  
SUBCOMMITTEES ON HUMAN SERVICES**

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
March 23, 2017**

The joint meeting of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance Subcommittees on Human Services was called to order by Chair Michael C. Sprinkle at 8:07 a.m. on Thursday, March 23, 2017, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Chair  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Paul Anderson  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo  
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams  
Assemblyman Jason Frierson  
Assemblyman James Oscarson  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

**SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Moises Denis, Chair  
Senator Ben Kieckhefer  
Senator Joyce Woodhouse

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst  
Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst  
Karen Hoppe, Senior Program Analyst  
Keaton Westergard, Committee Secretary  
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant



After the role was called, Chair Sprinkle proceeded to open the hearing on budget account 1383, Community Juvenile Justice Programs.

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES**  
**HHS-DCFS - COMMUNITY JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS (101-1383)**  
**BUDGET PAGE DHHS-DCFS-49**

Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, pointed the Subcommittees to page 3 of [Exhibit C](#), "State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice Budget Presentation," dated March 23, 2017, and briefly noted the budget accounts that funded the various juvenile justice activities. He added that budget account (BA) 1383, Community Juvenile Justice Programs, funded juvenile justice activities throughout the entire system.

Mr. Armstrong relayed that page 4 of [Exhibit C](#), showed an overview of the expenditure totals of the various juvenile justice budget accounts. It also included the juvenile justice programs' personnel totals. He stressed the importance of funding juvenile justice programs because the programs helped rehabilitate children and families as well as prevented the creation of future crime victims. Rehabilitation and prevention were the primary focuses of juvenile justice.

Mr. Armstrong explained that BA 1383 served as a resource hub for the juvenile justice programs' state facilities, community partners, and county partners. He said the bulk of the budget account's resources were used for the Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant programs (page 6, [Exhibit C](#)). The Block Grant funds were awarded to county probation departments for certain endeavors, such as front-end services and placements. He added that other significant budget account resources would be administered by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice, Formula Grants Program, for the proposed juvenile justice system improvements in decision unit Enhancement (E) 737. The improvements would correspond with Governor Sandoval's proposed Juvenile Justice System Reform Act ([Assembly Bill \(A.B.\) 472](#)).

Mr. Armstrong said BA 1383 included two Enhancement decision units that were related to the federal Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) and one Enhancement decision unit that pertained to the Juvenile Justice System Reform Act (page 7, [Exhibit C](#)). The budget account also included a decision unit that would transfer a clinical program planner from BA 3145, Children, Youth, and Family Administration, to BA 1383. The clinical program planner already serviced the juvenile justice programs exclusively, and the transfer was proposed to align the position accurately within the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services.

Kelly Wooldridge, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, gave the Subcommittee members some background information on the juvenile justice system improvements that were outlined in decision unit E-737. In 2015, Nevada participated in the Council of State Governments' (CSG) 50-state forum that was focused on improving outcomes for the youth in the juvenile justice system. She reported that after the forum, Nevada was the only state selected by OJJDP to receive technical assistance from CSG through the Statewide Juvenile Justice Improvement Initiative. The Initiative would focus on improving juvenile justice policies and practices.

Ms. Wooldridge explained that the CSG technical assistance included three phases:

1. Analyze quantitative data
2. Review policies and practices
3. Present system improvement recommendations and adopt new policies

She said the review led CSG to note that the Nevada juvenile justice system was shared between the state and the counties. It also revealed that Nevada spent more than \$95 million on juvenile justice supervision and services in 2015, and that fewer youths were under the supervision of Nevada's juvenile justice system than at any other time in the previous decade. She expressed that Nevada was spending significant resources on the juveniles in its justice system, but there was currently no method of determining whether the resources were being used efficiently on the proper supervision and services that would improve youth outcomes. Governor Sandoval established the Statewide Juvenile Justice Improvement Initiative Task Force to work with CSG technical assistance in developing recommendations for Nevada's juvenile justice reform. She said the recommendations were based off rigorous research and study regarding how other states successfully executed comprehensive juvenile justice reforms. The task force unanimously approved the recommendations.

Ms. Wooldridge explained that the first recommendation was to adopt a validated risk and needs assessment tool (page 8, [Exhibit C](#)). She said CSG noted that the state and the majority of Nevada's counties lacked the objective criteria and tools to match youth with the appropriate level and type of supervision and services. The misaligned services led to inefficient use of resources and high recidivism rates for youth on probation and parole. Using the proper risk and needs assessment tool was expected to reduce recidivism rates, reduce out-of-home placements, and allocate resources more efficiently. The results would stem from focusing supervision and services on the highest-risk offenders and improving statewide data collection and analysis on the juvenile justice system's performance and youth service needs.

Ms. Wooldridge explained that the risk and needs assessment tool would be used to guide supervision plans, reentry plans, placement decisions, and court decisions. The tool would be evidence-based and would require juvenile justice staff and stakeholders across the state to receive training before the tool was part of the system's processes and quality assurance

assessments after execution to ensure that the tool was reliable and effective. She said the projected cost of the tool was \$450,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2018 and \$50,000 in FY 2019.

Ms. Wooldridge continued with the second recommendation, which was to strengthen data collection, analysis, reporting, and usage to measure and improve juvenile justice system reporting and outcomes through a uniform system (page 8, [Exhibit C](#)). The Council of State Governments (CSG) found that Nevada's state and local juvenile justice agencies did not regularly or fully track juvenile justice system performance, recidivism rates, or other outcomes for youth. The CSG also determined that the agencies lacked the data structure and research capacity to analyze system performance and use the data to guide policy, practice, and improvement funding. She said the recommendation requested the state and county juvenile justice systems to use the same data collection tool and case-management program called CaseloadPRO. She explained that CaseloadPRO was chosen because it was recently purchased by Clark County and was already being used in Carson City and Douglas, Humboldt, and Lyon Counties. The request would fund approximately 800 users across the state and would fund a contract position to assist in data analysis and report development. She added that the recommendation would cost \$362,403 in FY 2018 and \$383,000 in FY 2019.

Ms. Wooldridge went on to explain that the final recommendation (page 9, Exhibit C) was the development of a juvenile justice resource center. Many youths cycled through the juvenile justice system multiple times without their key needs being met because of the lack of evidence-based services and support in the communities and facilities. She said the goal of this recommendation was to adopt and execute evidence-based services to ensure youth received services that were effective and met the youth's targeted needs based on their risk assessment. She said an evidence-based resource center should have the capacity to:

- Collect, process, and evaluate a broad array of data.
- Provide support, training, and technical assistance.
- Produce and disseminate reports, monographs, and studies regarding effective policies, programs, and practices.
- Demonstrate strong research and practitioner connections.

She said the recommendation also requested funding for a contracted quality assurance manager to assist with quality assurance for the juvenile justice facilities and programs across the state. The projected cost was \$204,597 in FY 2018 and \$50,000 in FY 2019. She noted that the FY 2019 costs were for the contracted quality assurance manager position.

Senator Denis asked what other components and associated costs were being recommended to go along with the CaseloadPRO program.

Ms. Wooldridge said the CaseloadPRO costs (page 8, [Exhibit C](#)) would cover data conversion and operating costs for 800 users in the Nevada counties that were not already using the program. The conversion would be necessary to convert the data from the users' current systems to CaseloadPRO, and the program had variable operating costs that were based on the number of users. She added that \$95,000 was also requested for each year of the 2017-2019 biennium to fund a contract research analyst to assist with developing the appropriate CaseloadPRO reports.

Senator Denis asked how many of the counties already used CaseloadPRO.

Ms. Wooldridge said Clark County bought CaseloadPRO and was currently in the conversion process. She reported that the counties with operational CaseloadPRO programs were Carson City and Douglas, Humboldt, and Lyon Counties.

Senator Denis asked whether the counties that did not have the program would be able to convert easily or whether it would be complicated depending on what program the various counties currently used.

Ms. Wooldridge said the understanding was that the data conversion would be somewhat complicated, but she wanted to note that the task force unanimously approved the recommendation.

Senator Denis asked how the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services, determined that CaseloadPRO was the best program to use.

Ms. Wooldridge said the Nevada representatives who attended the 50-state forum, the Governor's Task Force, and some of the current high-level employees of the Nevada juvenile justice system had all encountered CaseloadPRO at some point and agreed with adopting the program statewide. She also had reviewed the program and believed that CaseloadPRO would work in all of the state juvenile justice programs.

Senator Denis asked whether CaseloadPRO was expected to meet all of the juvenile justice system data needs. Ms. Wooldridge believed the program would meet all of the current data needs.

Senator Denis asked how long the data conversion was projected to take. Ms. Wooldridge believed it would take between three and six months, but she was unsure about her estimate and offered to provide the information at a later time.

Senator Denis asked whether CaseloadPRO required the user to create the data reports.

Ms. Wooldridge replied that the program came with several report templates that would be useful immediately. The quote that DCFS received from CaseloadPRO included the cost of

developing several custom reports for the Nevada juvenile justice system. She noted that the quote included \$8,750 for developing basic reports and \$6,500 for complex reports.

Senator Denis asked whether CaseloadPRO employees would be required to develop all of the reports in the future, or if in-house staff would be able to create additional reports when needed.

Ms. Wooldridge said it would probably be a mix of CaseloadPRO employees and in-house staff, but the goal was for the reports to last, and new reports would not be needed for some time.

Senator Denis asked whether CaseloadPRO was cloud-based software. Ms. Wooldridge replied that it was a cloud-based program.

Senator Denis asked what performance measures would be used to track the progress of CaseloadPRO and ensure that the program delivered the expected results.

Ms. Wooldridge explained the various significant performance indicators that the juvenile justice administrators would look for. She said the program would be used to track accountability information, including whether youth met their restitution and community service goals. It would help the program users monitor community protection by tracking recidivism rates and analyzing whether juveniles were returning because of new offenses. It would also help with evaluating whether youth were compliant with their case plans and determining whether youth had engaged in their victim restitution. She continued that another indicator was competency development, which assessed whether the juveniles' specific needs were being met in an evidence-based manner regarding their mental health, substance abuse, and family needs. She concluded that the users would also be able to assess whether the youth were participating in some form of education, attending class, and receiving the proper credits so they were able to seek gainful employment.

Senator Denis asked whether CaseloadPRO would be able to track all of the performance indicators that Ms. Wooldridge mentioned.

Ms. Wooldridge confirmed that the program would allow users to monitor the performance indicators that she mentioned.

Assemblywoman Carlton wanted to ensure that the state juvenile justice system did not plan to place the burden of service costs on the youth and their families.

Mr. Armstrong assured the Subcommittee members that the additional costs would not be placed on the youth or their families. He noted that the only fee administered to the youth was a small general support fee that the parents usually paid.

Assemblyman Anderson asked for a breakdown of the CaseloadPRO cost per user.

Ms. Wooldridge answered that CaseloadPRO offered the state a 20 percent discount because there would be 800 users. She said the discounted cost was \$30 per user.

Assemblyman Anderson asked whether the CaseloadPRO information would be limited in any way or the data accessible across the state.

Ms. Wooldridge said the accessibility to data would depend on the user. She explained that different users could be granted different levels of accessibility. She gave an example that judges could use the program and have the ability to view, but not change, youth information while in court. She reiterated that the user type would determine the level of accessibility.

Assemblyman Anderson asked whether other states used CaseloadPRO. Ms. Wooldridge said areas of California, Washington, Illinois, and probably other states used the program. She offered to provide a complete list at a later time.

Senator Kieckhefer asked Ms. Wooldridge to elaborate on the recommended resource center (page 9, [Exhibit C](#)), and why there were no requested funds for the resource center for the second year of the biennium.

Ms. Wooldridge explained that resource centers were usually evidence-based and associated with a university for research and analysis components. The juvenile justice resource center would be affiliated with one or both of the Nevada universities for research and analysis purposes. The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) was actively seeking private donations for the resource center, which was why there were no requested state funds for the second year of the biennium. She mentioned the goal was to complete the start-up operations in the first year of the biennium.

Senator Kieckhefer asked whether the resource center was expected to operate beyond the near future or if the resource center was a temporary project.

Ms. Wooldridge said the juvenile justice resource center would be a continuous operation. She wanted to see it expand beyond juvenile justice evidence-based services to eventually include child welfare and mental health services too. She reiterated that DCFS hoped to receive private donations to contribute to the costs.

Senator Denis asked whether the per-user fee for the CaseloadPRO software was an annual fee or a one-time fee.

Jason Benshoof, Information Technology (IT) Manager, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that the \$30 per-user fee would be a continuous monthly fee.

Senator Denis asked whether the program training would be a separate cost. Ms. Wooldridge said the training was included in the total cost.

Senator Denis indicated that support services and any software upgrades were also included with the monthly cost and would not require additional funds. Ms. Wooldridge confirmed Senator Denis' remarks.

Chair Sprinkle moved the discussion on to decision unit Maintenance (M) 595, which funded video surveillance improvements for the three state juvenile justice facilities. The improvements were required to comply with provisions in the federal Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA).

Senator Denis recalled that during the 78th Legislative Session (2015), funds were granted to improve the video surveillance systems over the 2015-2017 biennium at two of the state juvenile justice facilities. The two facilities were the Caliente Youth Center (CYC) and the Nevada Youth Training Center (NYTC). He understood that the improvement projects went over budget because of unanticipated problems with cables that had to be removed. He asked for some clarification about the over-budget projects.

Mr. Armstrong said the NYTC project was the first one to begin. He said the funds that were appropriated from the 78th Legislative Session (2015) were used to purchase new cameras for the facility. After the cameras were purchased, the project team discovered that NYTC lacked the technological infrastructure to support the new cameras. He said the decision was made to wait until the current legislative session to request the accurate amount of additional funds needed to update the infrastructure and improve the video surveillance at all three state facilities.

Senator Denis indicated that in 2015, the projected cost of the NYTC video surveillance project was \$75,000. He understood that the current cost of that project was already up to \$107,740. He asked why the project was already over budget when the infrastructure modifications had not yet started.

Mr. Benshoof explained that video-surveillance upgrades were requested for all three state juvenile justice facilities to comply with PREA requirements. The CYC and NYTC sites were almost identical with regard to campus layouts and the infrastructure modifications needed to support the upgraded video-surveillance systems. He mentioned that video surveillance required a reliable network, and both the CYC and NYTC sites needed network and infrastructure modifications.

Senator Denis asked whether the sites had network systems that were not advanced enough to support the new technology or whether they lacked network systems altogether.



Mr. Benshoof said the sites had network systems, but they were out-of-date and could not support the new technology.

Senator Denis indicated that the new video-surveillance system would be a digital system and not an analog system. Mr. Benshoof confirmed that the new system would be a digital system.

Senator Denis asked whether the new video-surveillance system would be in compliance with PREA when it was completed.

Mr. Armstrong said PREA regulations required the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) to take video monitoring into consideration when making any upgrades to facilities or youth supervision. He added that the decision unit covered both regulations.

Senator Denis noted that the request indicated that the new network would also support bandwidth-intensive applications, such as video surveillance, videoconferencing, and internet protocol (IP) telephony. He asked whether the sites currently supported any of those applications.

Mr. Benshoof explained that the three facilities had different types of network connections to the facilities. He said the Summit View Youth Center (SVYC) had a decent network connection that already supported videoconferencing and an IP phone system. The Nevada Youth Training Camp (NYTC) site's bandwidth was updated and could handle videoconferencing, but he was unsure about the site's IP telephony capability. He noted that NYTC had a functional circuit that connected to the facility itself. The Caliente Youth Center (CYC) site would be a challenge because of its remoteness. He said there were not a lot of options regarding circuit providers that could provide a quality business-class circuit at the remote location.

Senator Denis asked whether all three facilities would have the same technological capabilities and quality when the improvement projects were finished.

Mr. Benshoof said that was the goal, but it would not happen immediately. The NYTC and SVYC sites would improve as soon as the projects were finished. He said the CYC project would be focused on improving the internal network infrastructure so when better services were provided to the Caliente area, the CYC site would be ready to connect.

Senator Denis asked whether the Caliente area was expected to obtain better services soon.

Mr. Benshoof said he was unsure how long it would be before the Caliente area received better network services, but DCFS was monitoring the area so the site would be ready when the services were upgraded.

Senator Denis asked whether the bandwidth-intensive applications that the sites would use when the projects were finished would require additional funding that was not included in The Executive Budget.

Mr. Benshoof said the budget request was specific to video surveillance for security purposes, but the infrastructure upgrades would benefit other applications as well.

Senator Denis noted that the sites would need quality internal technology to perform internal video surveillance. He asked whether video surveillance was ever conducted remotely.

Mr. Armstrong answered that the system at SVYC was capable of some remote video surveillance. He mentioned that Juvenile Services, within DCFS, would benefit from eventually having remote video surveillance at all three state facilities, but remote video surveillance was not a requirement of PREA. He said the local video surveillance capabilities would cover the current PREA requirements.

Chair Sprinkle recalled that the \$150,000 for video surveillance upgrades that was appropriated during the 78th Legislative Session (2015) was granted with the expectation that \$75,000 would be spent on the CYC site and \$75,000 would be spent on the NYTC site. He said it did not appear that the split in spending between the two facilities was a requirement, but DCFS implied that each facility would be limited to \$75,000. He asked whether DCFS approached the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) when the infrastructure complications and over-spending started at the NYTC site.

Ms. Wooldridge did not believe that IFC was notified of the spending decisions for the improvement projects. She said DCFS would notify IFC in the future if similar spending decisions transpired.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked whether there were any discussions about alerting IFC about the spending decisions.

Ms. Wooldridge said she was unsure whether discussions took place, but she assured the Subcommittees that DCFS would consult IFC regarding spending decisions in the future.

Chair Sprinkle noted that decision units E-228 and E-495 proposed changing the funding source of the PREA coordinator position. He asked whether DCFS had investigated other federal funding sources to help support the position.

Mr. Armstrong relayed that DCFS constantly monitored federal funding opportunities for all of its juvenile justice services to enhance services for the youth. The Coalition for Juvenile Justice reported that federal funding for juvenile justice programs had been reduced by 50 percent over the previous 15 federal fiscal years, making federal funds a limited resource for Nevada's juvenile justice programs. He explained that the PREA position was originally

funded through federal grant money, but those funds were depleted and were not expected to be replenished. He added that the current available PREA grants were being awarded to universities for education and training instead of state institutions.

Chair Sprinkle asked what the consequences would be if the position was not approved for state funding.

Mr. Armstrong explained that under PREA Juvenile Facility Standards subsection 115.311, state agencies were required to employ an individual with sufficient time and authority to coordinate PREA efforts. The Division of Child and Family Services had tried a number of ways to achieve this goal with current staffing, but audits revealed that the arrangements did not comply with federal standards. The position's responsibilities would be spread among staff if the position was not funded, which would likely lead to a noncompliance audit and compromise federal funding for the state.

Chair Sprinkle indicated that DCFS's proposed budget included funds for the PREA coordinator to travel to each facility twice per year. He asked why the individual would need to travel to each facility twice per year when the PREA audits were required every three years.

Mr. Armstrong replied that having the PREA coordinator monitor the facilities twice per year would allow for consistent compliance upkeep and would be more efficient than allowing the facilities to go unmonitored for years at a time and risk noncompliance. He explained that the PREA coordinator could not provide remote oversight for certain PREA standards, and it was necessary for certain things to be inspected in-person, such as proper signage that female staff alerted youth when entering a male dorm, proper sign-in documentation for visitors, and hotline information postings. He noted that the facility administrators had a monthly phone meeting with the PREA coordinator to address facility conditions, but DCFS would prefer to have the facilities inspected twice per year to keep up with PREA compliance.

Chair Sprinkle summarized that the PREA coordinator performed remotely as often as possible, but there were some things at the facilities that needed to be evaluated in-person.

Mr. Armstrong said DCFS worked to ensure that the PREA coordinator was a resource for the three facilities. He confirmed Chair Sprinkle's remarks and added that the PREA coordinator served as an advisor for the three state juvenile justice facilities.

With no other questions or comments from the Subcommittees, Chair Sprinkle closed the hearing on budget account 1383, Community Juvenile Justice Programs, and opened the hearing on budget account 3147, Youth Alternative Placement.

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES  
HHS-DCFS - YOUTH ALTERNATIVE PLACEMENT (101-3147)  
BUDGET PAGE DHHS-DCFS-58**

Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that budget account (BA) 3147, Youth Alternative Placement, helped fund county camps that were considered an intermediate intervention before youth were passed from county supervision and were potentially committed to the state. The two county camps in Nevada were the Spring Mountain Youth Camp in Clark County and the China Spring Youth Camp in Douglas County. In addition to State General Funds, the budget account was funded through county fees. Clark County's fees were used to fund operations at Spring Mountain, and the rest of the Nevada counties' fees were used to fund operations at China Spring. He noted that The Executive Budget proposed one Enhancement (E) decision unit for this budget account that pertained to the China Spring Youth Camp.

Wendy Garrison, Director, China Spring Youth Camp, informed the Subcommittees that decision unit E-275 initially requested about \$7 million in General Funds over the 2017-2019 biennium for improvements to the China Spring Youth Camp. She said the request had been reduced to \$144,000 for fiscal year (FY) 2018 and \$179,000 for FY 2019 for operations, and the China Spring capital improvements request for the upcoming biennium had been retracted completely.

Chair Sprinkle asked whether amendments were submitted to adjust the amounts.

Mr. Armstrong said the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services, planned on submitting amendments to the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, and the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, to reflect the reduction to the budget request. He said there had been a collaborative effort between China Spring and the counties to determine the reduced amounts, and DCFS wanted to use the budget hearing as an opportunity to keep the legislators informed.

Chair Sprinkle asked how the additional General Funds would be used at China Spring Youth Camp.

Ms. Garrison replied that the appropriations would cover cost allocations from Douglas County and salary deficits.

Assemblywoman Titus mentioned that Northern Nevada had experienced severe winters in the previous couple of years and was concerned about retracting the request for capital improvements. She asked about the condition of the China Spring facility.

Ms. Garrison relayed that the facility experienced some flooding because of a recent winter storm and three buildings were damaged. She said two of the damaged buildings were repaired, and the third was in the process of being repaired. The repairs were insurance claims and were of no cost to the state. She said the actual grounds were also damaged, and some analysis would be required to prevent the same damage from happening in the future. The counties had asked her to review the facility's capital improvement needs over the following two years, determine which ones were urgent, and develop a plan that did not involve an unusually large increase in funds.

Assemblywoman Carlton was concerned that the cost of the capital improvements for the China Spring facility was the sole factor that was preventing future damage from happening. She was uneasy about letting problems with the facility and the youth go unattended just because it would cost money. She said it was the state's and Douglas County's responsibility to consider the cost, but the ultimate goal was to ensure the well-being of the youth and provide programs. She did not want problems with safety, security, or compliance to go unaddressed and lead to an adverse situation.

Ms. Garrison relayed that the China Spring Camp had improved its infrastructure and security over the previous two years and complied with the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). She said there were no facility problems that were security-related. Douglas County had assessed the facility in March 2016 and highlighted some water and mold problems, but they were problems that were maintenance-related. She reiterated that the facility had no unrepaired areas that created a security risk.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked whether the living conditions were appropriate.

Ms. Garrison said the boys' dormitory was her only area of concern, but the concern was not health-, safety-, or welfare-related. Two boys shared a room, and the layout prevented staff from seeing into the entire room without entering it. She would prefer if the facility staff could monitor the room from the outside. She relayed that it was just a preference; PREA did not require that ability, and it had not caused any problems at the facility.

Assemblywoman Carlton wanted to ensure that the youths' well-being was addressed and that the facility had the resources to administer the proper level of care.

Chair Sprinkle asked whether the counties had committed to contributing to the funding increases for China Spring.

Ms. Garrison said all except White Pine County and Elko County had committed to paying for the increases.

Chair Sprinkle noted that the China Spring Youth Camp and DCFS determined that the staffing ratios at China Spring were not subject to PREA requirements. He asked why the camp's staffing ratios were not subject to PREA mandates.

Mr. Armstrong explained that PREA contained provisions for different types of justice programs, but the juvenile standards were the only ones that set out specific staffing ratios. The staffing ratios only applied to juvenile justice facilities that were classified as secure juvenile facilities. He communicated that PREA required secure juvenile facilities to maintain 1:8 daytime and 1:16 nighttime staffing ratios. He said DCFS and camp administrators concluded that China Spring did not meet the PREA definition of a secure juvenile facility because it had a no-chase reaction policy to juveniles who attempted to escape. He said a federal PREA resource was consulted on the matter, and the resource agreed that China Spring would probably not be considered a secure juvenile justice facility and, therefore, would not be subject to the PREA staffing ratio requirements.

Chair Sprinkle asked what staffing ratios would be appropriate at China Spring Youth Camp.

Mr. Armstrong replied that the Annie E. Casey Foundation endeavored to reform juvenile corrections. He said the foundation indicated that a 1:10 daytime and a 1:20 nighttime ratio were considered safe.

Ms. Garrison reported that China Spring was currently at a 1:10 daytime ratio and 1:16 ratio during sleeping hours. She noted that the camp could sometimes be at a 1:9 ratio during the day. She explained that staffing ratios were discussed during the camp's PREA audit, and it was advised that the camp administrators should consult with the PREA resource center. After consulting with the PREA resource center, it was determined that China Spring was not required to meet the 2017 PREA ratios for secure juvenile facilities.

With no further questions or comments from the Subcommittees, Chair Sprinkle closed the hearing on budget account 3147, Youth Alternative Placement, and opened the hearing on budget account 3148, Summit View Youth Center.

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES**  
**HHS-DCFS - SUMMIT VIEW YOUTH CENTER (101-3148)**  
**BUDGET PAGE DHHS-DCFS-60**

Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that Summit View Youth Center (SVYC) was located in North Las Vegas, Nevada. The 48-bed facility was designated for Nevada's highest-risk youths in the juvenile justice system. He relayed that the facility used 67 full-time-equivalent (FTE) employees and contracted with the Clark County School District for educational resources.

Senator Denis indicated that Rite of Passage previously operated the SVYC facility, and upon Rite of Passage's departure, significant damages to the facility were revealed. He recalled that the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services, requested funds in November 2015 from the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to repair the damages before the state reopened the facility in 2016. He understood that the state and Rite of Passage reached a settlement agreement to allow the state to take over operations of the facility, but he wanted to know why the settlement did not require Rite of Passage to pay for damages.

Mr. Armstrong relayed that the total costs to reopen the facility, including damage costs, were about \$2.5 million. There was a litigation with Rite of Passage, and he explained that when litigations took place, it was important to assess the cost and risk of losing the litigation versus the benefit and likelihood of winning the litigation. In the original lawsuit, Rite of Passage demanded that the state return operations of the SVYC facility back to Rite of Passage, which would have resulted in an additional \$6 million from the state for Rite of Passage to complete the contract. After weighing the outcome possibilities and consulting with the Office of the Attorney General and the Office of the Governor, DCFS determined that a settlement that excluded reimbursements for damages was the best option because it allowed the state to move on from business with Rite of Passage and eliminate the uncertainty about whether Rite of Passage would move forward with a lawsuit. He reiterated that DCFS took all the factors of the litigation into consideration before it decided to settle.

Senator Denis summarized that DCFS used risk management and determined that the possibility of winning the litigation was not worth the uncertain and potentially detrimental outcome.

Mr. Armstrong added that another problem with the lawsuit would have been causation. He said it could have been difficult to prove that the damages were the fault of Rite of Passage and not general wear and tear. He added that the process would likely have been messy, lengthy, and expensive and could still have led to an unfavorable result.

Chair Sprinkle asked Mr. Armstrong to elaborate on the potential consequences had Rite of Passage moved forward with the lawsuit and no settlement was made.

Mr. Armstrong reiterated that Rite of Passage originally filed a lawsuit to recover operations of the facility.

Assemblyman Araujo asked about the use of correctional officers in the Summit View Youth Center (SVYC).

Mr. Armstrong explained that adding correctional officers to the Summit View staff was approved by the 2015 Legislature. He commented that it was unique from the other two state juvenile justice facilities. He said the addition of correctional officers increased

opportunities for cross-training and enhancing security and safety for the youth. There were some unique complications with the correctional officers because their background checks took extra time. The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) consulted with the Department of Public Safety because DCFS was new to the background check process for correctional officers. He noted that the correctional officers brought a unique expertise and experience in the safety and security aspects of the facility, which were aspects that the facility struggled with during both its private and state-run tenures. He said the correctional officers interacted well with the youth, and he added that it quickly became clear when an individual was not fit to be a youth correctional officer. He said having the officers at the Summit View Youth Center facility worked well given that it was the only physically secure facility for juveniles in the state.

Assemblyman Araujo asked for a description of the hiring and retention process for personnel at SVYC.

Mr. Armstrong said that the operations that went into reopening the Summit View facility were very different from the continuous operations of a facility that was well established, like the other two state juvenile justice facilities. He said DCFS hosted a hiring fair to attract individuals to work at Summit View. After the new employees were trained and youths transferred to Summit View, the facility experienced some turnover because the nature of juvenile justice work commonly led DCFS administrators or the individuals themselves to determine that juvenile justice employment was not a proper fit. He stated that careers in the juvenile justice field were stressful and required dedication. The DCFS projected some high turnover after the reopening of Summit View, and in anticipation of that turnover, DCFS decided to start with a small population of youths and increase the number incrementally to facilitate transitioning to a full facility. He said the current staff vacancy rates at Summit View were similar to the other two facilities, and he added that the turnover rate was currently the lowest it had been since the reopening, and DCFS expected more stabilization with Summit View staff as operations continued.

Assemblywoman Carlton expressed that she was happy to know that the development with Rite of Passage was over, the youth were safe, and the state could begin to move forward without any unnecessary attention regarding the lawsuit. She had seen the damages to the facility and was concerned that in the settlement, the state agreed to pay for Rite of Passage's attorney fees. She understood that the cost and risk of all the parts of the lawsuit were calculated, but she was uneasy about paying Rite of Passage any money after the way the facility was treated. She was unsure whether the state learned its lesson regarding how to approach these kinds of matters.

Assemblywoman Carlton moved on to discuss decision unit Enhancement (E) 225, which funded increasing training for Summit View Youth Center (SVYC) staff. She noted that the proposed amount was almost double the amount that was spent on training in fiscal year (FY) 2016. She asked what was generating the increase if the staff at SVYC was starting to



stabilize. She did not want to disturb the training process if it was going well, but she wanted to ensure that the training money was spent appropriately.

Mr. Armstrong said the Division of Child and Family Services believed that the proposed amount was the proper amount for training going forward. The initial training for the SVYC staff was simpler because all the staff was trained at one time before the facility opened. He said it could be more complex when DCFS would have to host several trainings throughout the year to accommodate newly hired members. The training requirements for juvenile justice facilities were extensively represented in Chapter 63 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. The juvenile justice system also adopted regulations that were displayed in Chapter 62G of the *Nevada Administrative Code* to enhance the training programs among the facilities. He added that the federal Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) directed some substantial training too. Well-trained staff kept the youth and the staff safe and would improve youth outcomes, and funding for training would be needed going forward.

Kelly Wooldridge, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, added that the juvenile justice facilities in the state were moving toward evidence-based programs. Additional evidence-based programs were administered at Summit View Youth Center because the facility hosted the highest-risk youths in the state juvenile justice system. She elaborated that a large portion of the youth at SVYC experienced severe mental health problems. Over the previous year, at least five of the youth at the facility encountered developmental disabilities. She said the high-risk youth required additional staff training and evidence-based programs to be administered at the facility.

Assemblywoman Carlton summarized that SVYC was not a standard correctional facility and was focused on rehabilitation, not incarceration. Ms. Wooldridge agreed with Assemblywoman Carlton's comments.

Assemblyman Oscarson commended DCFS representatives for their efforts with the lawsuit and the reopening of SVYC. He said he learned a valuable lesson from using contracted vendors for state operations and noted that he reviewed opportunities with private businesses more carefully than he did in the past. He agreed with the decision to approach the situation with a fresh start rather than drag it out in the courtroom. He thanked the facility administrators for the work they did at SVYC and recognized that reopening the facility was a difficult task. He was glad to hear that the facility was focused on the rehabilitation aspect of juvenile justice.

Chair Sprinkle echoed Assemblyman Oscarson's remarks and added that he toured SVYC when it was being remodeled and looked forward to seeing it again in full operation.

He commented that a large portion of the proposed funding for training was suggested to be spent on upper management and leadership-type positions. He asked how additional training for upper-level positions would benefit the entire facility staff.

Mr. Armstrong explained that the funds would go toward additional training for upper-level management through the Youth in Custody certificate program. He said many of the youth at SVYC were returning offenders who had spent time at one of the other state juvenile justice facilities. The youth experiencing their second cycle through the juvenile justice system required new and more intensive programs. The Youth in Custody training model was a practice that the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators recommended for troublesome youths. He relayed that the knowledge brought back from the certificate program would be used to enhance the abilities of the line staff and contribute to improved program policies and procedures.

Ms. Wooldridge added that the Youth in Custody certificate program would also increase stability in recruiting and retaining mid-level and upper-level management positions for the facility.

Assemblywoman Carlton discussed decision unit E-721, which funded staff uniforms and safety equipment for SVYC staff members. She recalled that the 2015 Legislature approved the use of correctional officers at SVYC with the understanding that the officers would be dressed in a way that did not intimidate the youth at the camp. She wanted to ensure that DCFS still planned to use funds for facility uniforms and equipment that made the correctional officers appear approachable.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the uniforms were not similar to uniforms for correctional officers for adults or standard police officers. The correctional officers wore polo shirts that had a discrete logo. He noted that the officers were equipped with a duty belt that contained the necessary restraining and safety gear in case of emergency, but they were fitted in attire that gave them an approachable look.

Chair Sprinkle asked why new equipment was needed and how it would be used to make the facility safer.

Mr. Armstrong said the equipment included mechanical restraints that were used when breaking up fights between youths. The restraints were also used to prevent self-harm. Many of the youth in the juvenile justice system suffered from anger management problems and would sometimes resort to hitting walls or other forms of self-inflicted injuries when they were upset. He relayed that the restraints were necessary to prevent further injury.

Assemblyman Frierson noted that problems with restraints had arisen in the past. He asked Mr. Armstrong to discuss the use of hog-tying, because he was concerned about the state paying for devices that would be used for harsh practices.

Mr. Armstrong explained that hog-tying was the use of mechanical restraints on both the hands and feet of an individual, and then securing the two restraints together. He assured Assemblyman Frierson that hog-tying was prohibited and not tolerated at any of the DCFS facilities. He noted that the only type of restraint that was used in conjunction with a hand restraint was a belly chain when it was necessary.

There were no other questions or comments from the Subcommittees. Chair Sprinkle closed the hearing on budget account 3148, Summit View Youth Center, and opened the hearing on budget account 3179, Caliente Youth Center.

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES**  
**HHS-DCFS - CALIENTE YOUTH CENTER (101-3179)**  
**BUDGET PAGE DHHS-DCFS-66**

Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that the Caliente Youth Center (CYC) was a 140-bed juvenile justice facility located in Caliente, Nevada. The facility contained 100 male beds and 40 female beds. The facility's occupants were the state's lowest-risk youths in the juvenile justice system, and the average age was lower at CYC than the average age at the other two state juvenile justice facilities. He added that the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) contracted with the Lincoln County School District to provide educational services at CYC. He pointed to the breakdown of staff at CYC on page 17 of [Exhibit C](#), "State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice Budget Presentation," dated March 23, 2017.

Mr. Armstrong said that decision unit Enhancement (E) 906 would transfer five mental health counselors from budget account (BA) 3179, Caliente Youth Center, to BA 3646, Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services. He noted that the positions would not change location. The transfer would align the counselors to fall under the supervision of the children's mental health unit within DCFS. The proper supervision would allow for better and more consistent technical guidance for the counselors and would increase continuity of care before, during, and after the youth spent time at CYC.

Mr. Armstrong noted that the budget account contained two additional Enhancement decision units. Decision unit E-226 recommended funding supplies for the Forward Thinking cognitive behavioral therapy program. Decision unit E-275 recommended transferring Title I, Part D grant revenue from the Department of Education to the CYC budget account

for Bastian High School. He noted that the funds for C.O. Bastian High School had to pass through DCFS, and decision unit E-275 would allow the funds to be administered through the proper budget account.

With no questions or comments from the Subcommittees, Chair Sprinkle closed the hearing on budget account 3179, Caliente Youth Center, and opened the hearing on budget account 3259, Nevada Youth Training Center.

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES**  
**HHS-DCFS - NEVADA YOUTH TRAINING CENTER (101-3259)**  
**BUDGET PAGE DHHS-DCFS-71**

Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that the Nevada Youth Training Center (NYTC) was a 60-bed, male juvenile justice facility in Elko, Nevada. The facility housed some of the state's higher-risk youths who required a more sophisticated level of care than the youth at the Caliente Youth Center (CYC), but did not require the intensive care of the Summit View Youth Center (SVYC). The NYTC budget account included a decision unit that transferred several mental health professionals to fall under the direction of Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services, as well as some Enhancement decision units for travel and training.

Chair Sprinkle noted that the proposed budget funded separate staff trips to both Carson City and Reno. He asked whether the trips to Carson City and Reno could be combined to save travel costs.

Mr. Armstrong indicated that the trips were listed separately to provide descriptions of how the travel funding would be used. He stated that the Juvenile Justice unit of the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) always tried to maximize travel efficiency and combine visits to neighboring areas of the state whenever possible. He said there were events that took place in the Carson City and Reno areas during the interim that required travel, such as meetings of the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice, and DCFS would look to cover other topics on those trips and maximize travel opportunities.

Chair Sprinkle offered that itemizing the Reno and Carson City travel amounts could be unnecessary when both cities were covered during the same trip. He said combining the travel amounts could make for a simpler budgeting practice because it would ultimately be funding the proper amount for one trip that covered two cities, not two entirely separate trips to the same area.

Mr. Armstrong replied that he would keep Chair Sprinkle's comments in mind for the future.

Chair Sprinkle noted that the travel budget also included funds for the NYTC superintendent and assistant superintendent to attend legislative hearings in person. He asked why it was necessary for both positions to attend the meetings in person.

Mr. Armstrong explained that both positions were budgeted to attend to strengthen employee development. The superintendent position was a turnover-prone position across juvenile justice systems nationwide. He said the assistant superintendent needed to be ready to step into the superintendent role, which included approaching the Legislature.

Chair Sprinkle said he could understand the need for employee development, but he relayed that usually the budget analysts, division administrators, and division deputies were the individuals who attended the legislative hearings. He asked why the superintendent and the assistant superintendents were budgeted to attend.

Kelly Wooldridge, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, said the employee development efforts were for all upper-management staff because the deputy administrator and administrator positions were also prone to turnover in the juvenile justice system. The experience of testifying and attending the legislative hearings would contribute to the goal of developing competent staff for the future.

Chair Sprinkle asked whether videoconferencing could be used to help reduce travel costs.

Ms. Wooldridge said DCFS would explore its videoconferencing options at NYTC. She added that it would be beneficial to have management positions understand the Legislature's role in juvenile justice. She remarked that it could be easy for individuals in management positions to get caught up in their individual work, and it would add value to have those individuals understand the broader scope of the juvenile justice system.

Chair Sprinkle noted that training had been reduced at NYTC because of the recent economic decline. He asked whether the reduced training had significant effects on the youth or staff at NYTC and what the benefits of additional training would be.

Mr. Armstrong replied that reduced training always put staff and youth at greater risk. He noted that problems with misusing restraints had come up in the past, and he relayed that an increase in training would help restore the facility to its maximum level of safety and keep staff and youth from harm.

With no further questions or comments from the Subcommittees, Chair Sprinkle closed the hearing on budget account 3259, Nevada Youth Training Center, and opened the hearing on budget account 3263, Youth Parole Services.

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES**  
**HHS-DCFS - YOUTH PAROLE SERVICES (101-3263)**  
**BUDGET PAGE DHHS-DCFS-77**

Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, explained that youth parole services were provided to youth after they exited one of the youth correctional facilities. The youth parole officers engaged with the youth and families while the youth were in the facilities and after they were released. He referred the Subcommittees to a breakdown of the youth parole personnel on page 23 of [Exhibit C](#), "State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Juvenile Justice Budget Presentation," dated March 23, 2017. He said the budget account included several Enhancement (E) decision units that covered position transfers, changes in contract services, revenue maximization, out-of-state travel, Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)/Nevada POST Academy, and equipment.

Chair Sprinkle noted that decision unit E-720 funded safety equipment and uniforms for youth parole services personnel. He asked whether the absence of uniforms had caused any problems.

Mr. Armstrong said the request would fund new polo shirts and hats for the parole officers. The parole officers would not be outfitted in traditional law enforcement attire, but the presence of a badge on the uniform could be helpful in certain situations. Several instances had occurred when youth ran from a parole officer and the officer was not wearing a badge, which led citizens to call the police because they thought an adult was attempting to kidnap a child. He added that at times, parole officers were denied entry to schools and jails because they were not wearing a badge. The parole officers were instructed to limit showing their badges to when the parole officers were expected to perform law-enforcing activities, such as making an arrest. He indicated that the officers concealed their badges when conducting house visits, office visits, or appearing in court.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked whether a badge would be displayed on the polo shirts and whether the parole officers carried hand badges.

Mr. Armstrong said the parole officers carried hand badges, and the parole officers would have a badge on the polo shirts and wear the hats for additional identifiers when appropriate.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked whether anything would be displayed on the back of the polo shirts.

Mr. Armstrong said the law enforcement gear included a body armor vest that displayed the word *PAROLE* on the back, which could be worn over the polo shirt.

Assemblywoman Carlton indicated that the vest was considered safety equipment and not part of the parole officers' standard uniform. Mr. Armstrong confirmed Assemblywoman Carlton's remarks.

Assemblywoman Carlton asked when the safety equipment was used.

Mr. Armstrong said the parole officers traveled in groups of two when they conducted fieldwork, and they primarily used the vests for home visits. He said the parole officers did not usually wear the safety vests at schools or in court.

Assemblyman Frierson asked what circumstance would require a youth parole officer to wear a safety vest in court.

Mr. Armstrong said a parole officer might wear a safety vest in court when the officer went straight to court after conducting a home visit. He noted that this situation rarely happened because most officers kept a set of court-appropriate attire in their vehicles.

Assemblyman Frierson asked whether wearing safety equipment in court was a practice or a specific rule.

Mr. Armstrong relayed that the parole officers were not supposed to wear safety equipment in court, but an officer could potentially wear the equipment in the court because his busy schedule prevented him from changing into different clothes.

Assemblyman Frierson remarked that the visual appearance of law enforcement sent a message that could be difficult to overcome. The first impression could create a challenge at the beginning of the relationship when the person who was supposed to be a source of help was dressed in a way that was intimidating and unapproachable. He said the consequences of wearing safety gear at inappropriate times could be enough of a reason to consider a policy regarding when the equipment was worn.

Kelly Wooldridge, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services, agreed with Assemblyman Frierson's comments and said policy regarding parole officer attire and what circumstances called for the safety equipment could be discussed.

Assemblywoman Carlton echoed Assemblyman Frierson's comments about the parole officers' visual appearance sending the wrong message. She said parole officers who went to a family's home wearing bulletproof vests sent a message to both the family and the youth that the officers were there to watch the youth make a mistake and not there to help. She maintained that the law enforcement mentality was not as necessary when the youth were in the probation and parole part of the juvenile justice system. She understood that some youths

were dangerous, but the parole officers should handle themselves in a manner that did not pose a threat to the youth or their families.

Ms. Wooldridge commented that the risk assessment tool that was recommended by the Council of State Governments (CSG) would help both parole and probation officers determine the level of risk in a situation and the proper safety plan.

Chair Sprinkle commented that the safety of the officers should be taken into consideration as well.

Assemblywoman Titus said that she was concerned about parole officer safety. She understood that entering a home posed a high-level risk for officers. She asked whether the DCFS had any data regarding threats that parole officers received. She would be anxious about policy that prohibited an officer from using safety gear when entering a potentially threatening environment.

Mr. Armstrong said he was not aware of any data regarding problems arising during home visits, but he could work on finding that information. The parole officers traveled in pairs and were taught defensive tactics. He said the youth parole officers were not armed and were given training on being cautious in the different field environments. Home visits were one of the more dangerous points of contact for the youth parole officers. The officers radioed juvenile justice staff when the officers arrived at a home visit and when the officers completed a home visit. The juvenile justice staff alerted regular law enforcement when too much time elapsed between contacts. He added that Nevada's juvenile justice system had an excellent relationship with the local law enforcement agencies.

In conclusion, Mr. Armstrong pointed out that an overview of the juvenile justice system's deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects could be found on pages 25 and 26 of [Exhibit C](#). He said the DCFS representatives would be available to answer questions regarding the juvenile justice system. He added that the three state juvenile justice facilities and the youth parole offices would welcome any of the legislators to visit the facilities at any time.

There were no further questions or comments from the Subcommittees. Chair Sprinkle closed the hearing on budget account 3263, Youth Parole Services, and opened the meeting to public comment.

Scott J. Shick, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Douglas County Juvenile Probation Department, stated that he visited the Douglas County juvenile justice camps on a weekly basis. He was a drug and alcohol counselor and trained the camp interns. He offered his support to Wendy Garrison, the director of the China Spring Youth Camp, and commended her on her accomplishments regarding facility maintenance, infrastructure, safety, and security of the camp. He added that Ms. Garrison worked well with Douglas County in



taking care of matters related to the health, safety, and welfare of the youth at the camp. He said the Douglas County juvenile probation office and sheriff's department supported Ms. Garrison with retrieving and returning runaway youths to the camp.

Mr. Shick gave credit to Jessica Jones, Mr. Shick's administrative assistant, for recommending the CaseloadPRO caseload management system. He explained that Douglas County's data system had malfunctioned and Ms. Jones researched replacement software systems and suggested CaseloadPRO. Mr. Shick was a member of the group of Nevada representatives who attended the 50-state forum that was held by the Council of State Governments. He said the group determined that CaseloadPRO was the best comprehensive software system to use for the state's juvenile justice system. The software system would allow the different counties and the state to review youth assessments and see the kinds of services youths received before and during their duration with the juvenile justice system. He noted that this kind of access would help with the on-boarding process because programs would know what kinds of services needed to be administered and continued for the youth. The software allowed the users to generate and review reports, such as disproportionate minority confinement reports and juvenile crime reports. He mentioned that Clark County was in the process of converting its data to the CaseloadPRO system.

Mr. Shick stated that the relationship between the county and state administrators of the juvenile justice system was strong. The new database system and evidence-based programs would help the juvenile justice administrators attain the goal of keeping youths out of the correctional system and from progressing into the adult justice system. He believed that the data system, screening and assessment, and programs would enhance the efforts of the juvenile justice system. He asked for the legislators' confidence in the system and its plans to use the proposed enhancements to accomplish the goal of serving the youth. He added that Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator of Juvenile Services, DCFS, was an available resource for the county juvenile justice departments and facilitated communication between the counties and the state. He concluded his testimony and thanked the Subcommittees for their time.

Assembly Committee on Ways and Means  
Senate Committee on Finance  
Subcommittees on Human Services  
March 23, 2017  
Page 26

With no other public comment, Chair Sprinkle adjourned the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Keaton Westergard  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Senator Moises Denis, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a PowerPoint presentation titled "State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services: Division of Child and Family Services Juvenile Justice Budget Presentation," dated March 23, 2017, presented by Kelly Wooldridge, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS); Ross Armstrong, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, DCFS, DHHS; and other DCFS staff.