

MINUTES OF THE NEW MEXICO JUVENILE JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, December 16, 2021 10:00 AM
Virtual Meeting via ZOOM

I. Call to Order at 10:02 AM – Anthony Trujillo, Chair

II. Roll Call for Quorum: Cindy Varela, Grants Management Unit Manager

A quorum was established with the following members present:

Members Present

Anthony Trujillo, Chair	Ron West	Hon. Angie Schneider
Danielle Trujillo	Oscar Gonzalez	Keryl Work
Hon. Alan Kirk	Tina Harris	Kaski Suzuki for May Sagbakken
Sarah Gettler	Moneka Stevens	Roshanna Toya
Albino Garcia Jr.	Joel Hamilton	

Members Absent

Michelle Torres	Tom Swisstack	Jenavieve Salas	Ruben Barreras
Ted Lovato	Helen Cheromiah	Anna Maria Marshall	

Guests in Attendance

Grace Telles	Bianca Padilla	Lisa Zuhn
Desa Malina	Elly Hollon	Yassie Nieblas
Julie Sanchez	Alma Roberson	Nora Lovato
Rebecca Armstrong	David Sherman	Martha Youts

Staff in Attendance

William Kearney, Special Programs Manager	Consuelo Garcia, Grants Manager
Cindy Varela, Grants Management Unit Manager	Louis Pacias, Grants Manager
Patti Vowell, Statewide JDAI Coordinator	Samantha Rendon, Grants Manager
Samantha Armendariz, Compliance Coordinator	Jeff Kolenda, Operations Research Analyst
Kimberly Salazar, Administrative Assistant	Cynthia Ohrazda, D3 Chief JPO

III. Welcome and Approval of Agenda:

Chairman Anthony Trujillo welcomed all.

Roll call vote was conducted by Ms. Varela; a quorum was confirmed.

Chair Trujillo called for a motion to approve the Agenda. Judge Schneider made the motion, seconded by Judge Kirk. Roll call was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes:

Sep 16, 2021: Judge Kirk moved to approve the September 16, 2021 minutes as drafted. Ron West seconded the motion. Albino Garcia, Jr. expressed concern that the minutes did not adequately reflect a motion he had made as well as a counter motion regarding moving oversight of Racial Equity responsibilities from the Executive Subcommittee to the System Improvement Subcommittee, and then the withdrawal of the motions for a future meeting vote. Mr. Garcia did indicate he would support the motion to approve the draft minutes. Roll call vote conducted by Ms. Varela. Motion carried unanimously.

V. JJAC Subcommittee Updates:

a) Executive Subcommittee–Anthony Trujillo, Chair

Chair Trujillo shared that JJAC will move to bi-monthly meetings given the current scope of JJAC work. The bi-monthly schedule was in the Board handouts; the next meeting is scheduled for February 17, at 10 am.

Chair Trujillo shared that he planned on placing the request by the System Improvement Subcommittee to move Race Equity oversight to their Subcommittee, from the Executive Subcommittee, on the agenda for a January Executive Subcommittee meeting, in preparation for the February meeting. He asked JJAC members to direct any questions or input regarding this to him, and he will share with Albino Garcia, Jr, System Improvement Subcommittee Chair, for review by the System Improvement Subcommittee in order to prepare for the Executive Subcommittee meeting.

Chair Trujillo also brought up the question of youth participation with JJAC. Concerns about low youth member participation were raised (especially with Subcommittees), the federal definition of youth, system-involved youth (or their parents) requirements were shared, the process of youth members applying to the Governor’s Office to be on JJAC was described, and JJAC members identified training needs and resources were identified for youth partnership work. The members identifying training resources were asked by Chair Trujillo to reach out to Sarah Gettler and the Board Development Subcommittee to share the resources with them.

b) Grants & Programs Subcommittee- Judge Alan Kirk

Judge Kirk shared that FY22 Continuum expenditures have increased during the last quarter, and all Continuums have had program activity and invoice submissions.

ACTION ITEM: Approval of Interim Cycle funding recommendations: Judge Kirk asked for a motion to approve the recommendation to the Cabinet Secretary for four awards totaling \$101,582, modifying the four relevant Continuum contracts. Judge Schneider so moved. Ms. Gettler seconded the motion. Roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.

Judge Kirk shared that there is \$20,000 of federal Native American funding available, and there needs to be some outreach to interested parties to encourage application for this funding. The eligibility requirement that applicants be federally-recognized tribes was shared and members were encouraged to share the information with eligible tribal contacts.

Judge Schneider asked whether there would be another funding cycle; Judge Kirk responded none was scheduled given the time of year and the process for a funding cycle, but JJAC could make that recommendation. Judge Schneider suggested the Executive Subcommittee discuss this at their next meeting and Judge Kirk agreed.

c) Board Development Subcommittee – Sarah Gettler

ACTION ITEM: JJAC Bylaws (Revised): Ms. Gettler asked for a motion to approve the revision to the JJAC Bylaws as presented by the Subcommittee.

Mr. Garcia asked where the decision came from and what was the rationale for this change. Ms. Gettler deferred to Mr. Kearney and Mr. Kearney explained that this is memorializing the request that came from former Chair Doug Mitchell to address the question of whether an alternate for a member at a regular JJAC meeting, would also be the alternate for that JJAC member as Chair of their respective Subcommittee. Mr. Kearney stated that Mr. Mitchell made the request to take this question to General Counsel and the determination was made that if a Subcommittee Chair cannot be at their Subcommittee meeting their replacement should be another Governor-appointed member of that Subcommittee, serving as it were as a Vice-Chair

to run that meeting. Mr. Kearney explained that specifically Mr. Mitchell had designated Mr. Swisstack as the alternate Chair of the System Improvement Subcommittee in the event that Mr. Garcia was not able to attend a meeting. Mr. Kearney went on to explain that this change specifies that the JJAC Chair would appoint a Vice-Chair to Subcommittees to address this issue.

Mr. Garcia then outlined the sequence of events that prompted the examination of this issue. Mr. Garcia once again asked where individual JJAC members can go for legal advice and that he did not agree with the process that was undertaken.

Mr. Kearney responded that for JJAC, as an Advisory Committee, any questions or need for legal guidance goes to the Office of General Counsel, which would also apply to any member. Mr. Kearney stated that this was simply an attempt to provide clarity where there had been some confusion previously, and that it was determined that Subcommittees should operate under the same rules that JJAC as a whole operates, which is that JJAC, as required by Federal law and State law, is run by Governor-appointed members, which establishes the precedence that Subcommittee Chairs and Vice-Chairs should come from the Governor-appointed members of JJAC.

Mr. Garcia expressed his perception that this was undermining the authority of a JJAC member to appoint a “proxy” of their choice, and constituted a breach of contract or a breach of the rules, and this is now an attempt to change the rule. Mr. Garcia again expressed his concern about where JJAC members should seek legal counsel, stating that if members attempted to use General Counsel would this not present a conflict of interest scenario.

Judge Schneider shared her experience of chairing another commission by gubernatorial appointment in which their executive director sought counsel for this commission through the Attorney General’s Office, which was granted. Judge Schneider noted that there are differences in the way this commission is structured compared to JJAC, but that it would be worth a conversation, and possibly an Agenda Item for the next JJAC meeting, to inquire of the Attorney General’s office if they would feel that an appointment of legal counsel to JJAC is supported. Judge Schneider added that this is not a negative commentary on the General Counsel for CYFD at all, but JJAC, as an oversight body, may not wish to seek legal advice from CYFD General Counsel.

Mr. Kearney stated that this was not meant to undermine any member or their ability to have an alternate attend the regular JJAC meetings, and gave examples. However, the role of a Subcommittee Chair is that of a facilitator, and this change is to maintain the flow of how JJAC is intended to operate, with leadership coming from the Governor-appointed members. Mr. Kearney added that this section was indeed interpreted differently by Mr. Garcia and Mr. Mitchell and that was why it was taken to General Counsel to make a determination, and that General Counsel was not representing either Mr. Mitchell or Mr. Garcia, but they examined the intent, which was not clear, and this recommendation was forthcoming.

Mr. Garcia reiterated this is a change of the “proxy” rule, and that he did not agree with this proposed revision of the Bylaws.

Mr. Trujillo then asked for a motion regarding the Revision of the Bylaws. Mr. Garcia moved that no revision be made. Ms. Stevens asked for clarification about the motion. Mr. Trujillo responded that he was requesting a motion to approve the Revision to the Bylaws as presented.

Ms. Work requested additional documentation for all JJAC members to review before voting on

this Revision, so that all members fully understand what is being proposed.

Mr. Trujillo then asked if there needed to be separation of the authority granted to someone representing a JJAC member at a regular JJAC meeting and the authority individual Subcommittees have in appointing Vice-Chairs, in the absence of the JJAC member designated as Chair of that Subcommittee.

Ms. Work reiterated her request that documentation of the proposed revision be sent to all JJAC members.

Ms. Stevens posed the question of whether this revision should be tabled due to the confusion of the issue at hand.

Mr. Trujillo asked Ms. Gettler to elaborate on how this Revision was decided upon.

Judge Schneider asked if there was an original motion to adopt this Revision and if Mr. Garcia had presented an additional motion to reject, just for clarification of procedure. Mr. Trujillo stated there was no motion to approve.

Ms. Gettler stated that information from her Subcommittee was provided to the Executive Subcommittee during at least two different meetings of the Executive Subcommittee, so she is confused as to why there is so much confusion still about this. Ms. Gettler noted that her Subcommittee was given Article VII to be revised with language which would provide clarity with respect to defining who can appoint for specific duties of the Subcommittees and that as a group her Subcommittee submitted their recommendations of this language to General Counsel, who approved it and this is what is being presented today.

Mr. Trujillo asked staff to clarify the definition of "proxy". Mr. Kearney explained that the term "proxy" is actually not in the Bylaws, the term is actually "alternate", and that Mr. Garcia and Mr. Mitchell had different interpretations of this paragraph, which was not clear with regard to the function of the Subcommittees. Therefore, the request for determination was sent to General Counsel as to what the intent was and could clarifying terminology be put into the Bylaws with respect to this, and this revision is the end result of the give and take that occurred across several meetings with the ultimate request for review by General Counsel. Mr. Kearney restated that the determination by General Counsel was that an alternate could be appointed for a JJAC member, but this function did not carry over to serving as an alternate Chair of a Subcommittee, which should be someone who was already a member of that Subcommittee, who would be appointed and serve in that capacity.

Mr. Garcia again voiced his opinion that the existing language could not have been interpreted differently, stating that the existing Bylaws did not distinguish the difference between a member who is Chair of a Subcommittee and a member at large. Mr. Garcia asked if someone could read the "proxy" rule, and Mr. Trujillo agreed to do that. Ms. Lucas stated she would like to do a screen share of the document as well and Mr. Trujillo agreed that would be beneficial. There ensued some discussion as to what portion of the Bylaws was in question. Mr. Garcia stated he was referring to the "proxy" rule. Mr. Trujillo noted there was a difference, and then proceeded to read Article III of the Bylaws. Mr. Kearney noted that the portions in question are Article III and Article VII. Ms. Stevens then commented that Article III and Article VII are in direct conflict with each other. Chair Trujillo expressed his understanding that they have separation. Mr. Garcia stated that his rights as a member are equal to everyone else under the "proxy" rule and now with this Revision that is being challenged and he is being treated differently as the

Chair of a Subcommittee than anyone else.

Judge Kirk stated that he reads these as one addressing membership to JJAC as a whole and the other addresses being the Chair of a Subcommittee, which are different assignments. Judge Kirk continued saying that he understood the confusion and that he hoped this Revision would serve to clarify the issue for the future.

Mr. Trujillo stated that to him this does clarify the situation.

Mr. Trujillo then asked for a consensus from the Committee with respect to whether there would be a motion to approve the Revision as presented or to table this item.

Judge Schneider noted that she believed there was a motion by Mr. Garcia NOT to approve this Revision and that she believed there had been a second, possibly by Ms. Stevens, but that may not be correct, and that there had also been a suggestion that this be tabled.

Mr. Trujillo stated that there is one motion on the floor, the one made by Mr. Garcia to NOT approve this Revision and that Ms. Stevens had seconded this motion. Mr. Trujillo asked Mr. Garcia to restate his motion for clarification. Mr. Garcia responded saying, "Not to approve this". Mr. Kearney asked for clarification if this was to NOT approve the Revision to Article VII. Mr. Garcia stated that the Agenda Item is to approve this change and gave his reason for opposing this as that it put more authority in the hands of the JJAC Chair. Mr. Kearney gave further explanation as to the sequence of events which led to General Counsel being consulted for legal determination and how they interpreted the intent and purpose of JJAC and the organization of JJAC, and that this determination was made by General Counsel, not Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Garcia brought up once again that Mr. Mitchell had access to General Counsel and he did not.

Ms. Stevens asked for clarification with respect to language in Article III and if this was included in what Ms. Gettler's Subcommittee worked on. Ms. Gettler responded that her Subcommittee only addressed the language in Article VII. Ms. Stevens thanked Ms. Gettler for that clarification.

Mr. Trujillo suggested going back to the earlier proposal to table this item rather than rejecting it outright, which would not lead to further discussion or clarification, but would give the Board Development Subcommittee the opportunity to work with Mr. Garcia to clarify this so that this same issue does not continue to present itself. Mr. Trujillo also stated that this would give anyone else interested in participating in this discussion the opportunity to do so.

Judge Schneider commented that this might present an opportunity to send this to the Attorney General's office and get another opinion with perhaps a different view than that of the General Counsel to CYFD, citing that JJAC is an oversight body appointed by the Governor, not employees or volunteers for CYFD, so it would be reasonable to have this examined for a legal perspective on behalf of JJAC as she believed the General Counsel looked at this on behalf of CYFD. Mr. Kearney respectfully disagreed with Judge Schneider's comment, as this was not a request from him, with respect to his position at CYFD, this request was made by Chairman Mitchell on behalf of JJAC. Judge Schneider replied that she understood this, however, it was a lawyer for CYFD who did the review, not a lawyer acting on behalf of JJAC, which she believes is an important distinction. Mr. Kearney explained that the reason this went to the General Counsel for CYFD is because CYFD is the state agency designated by the Governor to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and in that role CYFD provides the administrative

support to JJAC and why this was not referred somewhere else. Mr. Kearney offered that this, too, may need clarification and can be requested.

Mr. Garcia amended his motion to postpone action on this item instead of not passing it, in order to give more time for examination by others that he feels more confident with from his perspective. Mr. Garcia restated that his motion is now to postpone the decision to change the Bylaws. Mr. Trujillo asked Ms. Stevens if she would withdraw her second to the original motion. Ms. Stevens agreed to withdraw her second to the original motion and would second Mr. Garcia's current motion to postpone/table the Revision to the Bylaws. Mr. Trujillo added the caveat that Ms. Gettler's and Mr. Garcia's Subcommittees communicate or perhaps that just Mr. Garcia be included in the discussion by the Board Development Subcommittee. Mr. Trujillo asked Ms. Gettler to make the meeting date available so all who are interested might participate, and stated that he would like to be part of this discussion also. Mr. Trujillo then requested the roll call vote. Motion to table this item carried with one "NO" vote cast by Mr. Joel Hamilton.

ACTION ITEM: Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form: Ms. Gettler then presented the action item of the Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form for JJAC members. Ms. Gettler asked for a motion to approve. Danielle Trujillo so moved, seconded by Judge Kirk. Mr. Trujillo asked for the roll call vote. When Ms. Varela got to the third name on the list of the roll call, Albino Garcia, Jr., Mr. Garcia asked if this would change anything with respect to him serving on JJAC or as a Subcommittee Chair, since his organization is a grantee of the Bernalillo County Continuum. Ms. Gettler deferred to Mr. Kearney on this but stated that she did not think that it would. Mr. Garcia asked for confirmation. Mr. Kearney noted that this would be distributed to all JJAC members and could possibly affect a member's ability to vote on individual issues in order to avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest. Mr. Kearney also explained that this information would be collected from all JJAC members and would be maintained by the Board Development Subcommittee so that if an issue arose decisions could be based on this information. Mr. Garcia stated that he just wanted to be clear and disclose that his organization is a grantee of the Bernalillo County Continuum and to be sure that this would not prohibit him from serving in any capacity on JJAC other than voting on something that might impact his organization directly as a grantee. Mr. Kearney stated that he was not in a position to make that determination. Mr. Garcia stated that without that determination/clarity he might be "shooting himself in the foot" if he agrees to this.

Ms. Stevens requested clarification from General Counsel who worked on this, and asked if the idea of this form was just for people to identify if they are connected to any one of these boxes, if this is just for information but does not determine that they would not be selected, it is just for transparency of what they are connected to and how they identify. She then restated this and asked if this was just demographic information. Mr. Kearney responded that this was more than demographic in that it identifies areas that would be a conflict or potential conflict, so that a member is not put in that position of conflict. Ms. Stevens thanked Mr. Kearney for this clarification.

Ms. Toya asked if this was an amended form or a new form. Ms. Gettler stated that this is a new form, however, Mr. Kearney noted that it is an amended form that had previously been used by the Grant and Programs Subcommittee and was updated from that original.

Judge Schneider expressed her concern that this item might also need to be tabled, as she would like to compare this new form to that which had been used in the past, in order to know what the distinctions are, giving the examples of Boards she sits on within different communities and is

concerned about conflicting herself out of the larger voice in statewide funding grants because of this. She agreed with Ms. Stevens that it might be helpful to have the Counsel who reviewed this available for questions.

Ms. Stevens gave the example of the School Board on which she serves, where they are required to disclose all conflicts of interest at the beginning of the school year so everyone on the Board knows where the conflicts exist and members would only exclude themselves from certain items.

Mr. Hamilton then called Mr. Trujillo's attention to the fact that there is currently a procedural problem in that the Committee is in the middle of a roll call vote and this discussion should have occurred prior to the action on the motion. Mr. Hamilton stated that he believed the roll call vote should continue to determine whether or not the motion would be carried and then other determinations could be made.

Mr. Trujillo then asked Ms. Gettler to explain the process the Subcommittee used to compose this new form. Ms. Gettler stated that the Subcommittee examined other conflict of interest disclosure forms as examples, composed this form and sent it to General Counsel. Ms. Gettler noted that in many instances any conflict of interest is noted verbally, and the individual identifies whether or not they can vote on an item, and that this form was intended to help clarify that process. Mr. Trujillo then asked Ms. Gettler, for clarification, if this item came to the Board Development Subcommittee as the result of discussions within JJAC about these types of issues in the past. Ms. Gettler responded that this was correct.

Mr. Trujillo asked that the motion be repeated. Danielle Trujillo repeated her motion to approve. Mr. Trujillo then stated that there was a motion to approve the Disclosure Form. Judge Kirk repeated his second of the motion. Mr. Trujillo asked Ms. Varela to repeat the roll call vote. Motion carried with eight yes votes and five no votes. "Yes" votes were cast by Anthony Trujillo, Judge Alan Kirk, Danielle Trujillo, Keryl Work, Kaski Suzuki for May Sagbakken, Ron West, Sarah Gettler and Tina Harris. "No" votes were cast by Mr. Garcia, Judge Schneider, Mr. Hamilton, Ms. Stevens and Ms. Toya. Response by Oscar Gonzalez could not be heard.

Judge Schneider asked that the original form be sent out to all members as a point of reference. Mr. Trujillo agreed with this and Mr. Kearney stated that this would be done and that some other examples would be provided as well.

d) Planning & Legislative Subcommittee – Judge Angie Schneider

Judge Schneider shared that the Planning & Legislative Subcommittee has been working on the Three-Year Work Plan. In addition, the Subcommittee is planning to do listening sessions with local juvenile justice boards/continuums to gain get their input on struggles they are seeing with the grant funding, the reporting requirements, or anything else they perceive as barriers to their day-to-day work which JJAC could address in order to make funding more accessible, within the framework of the requirements and fiduciary duty to the State.

Judge Schneider also reported that she and Chair Trujillo met with Secretary Vigil, and one of the major issues that came out of that meeting was that there should not be any reverted funds, that this funding needs to get out into the communities which is what it is designated for. Judge Schneider expressed her appreciation for the dialogue with Secretary Vigil regarding this. Judge Schneider added she hoped with more regular JJAC meetings and listening to the Continuums regularly that this will help ensure this funding gets out to the communities and is not reverted.

ACTION ITEM: Approve JJAC Talking Points: Judge Schneider shared that the Planning & Legislative

Subcommittee developed Talking Points for JJAC members to use when talking to others about the work and priorities of JJAC. Judge Kirk moved to approve the “JJAC Talking Points”. Mr. Hamilton seconded. Roll call vote was conducted. The motion carried unanimously.

Judge Schneider commented with respect to the 30-day Legislative Session coming up that she is not currently aware of any issues that should be brought to the attention of JJAC, and will share any information she becomes privy to in her judicial capacity during the Legislative session.

e) System Improvement Subcommittee- Albino Garcia, Jr.

Mr. Garcia reported that the work of Racial Equity is at the top of their list, even though it has not been formally assigned to this Subcommittee.

Mr. Garcia stated that they received aggregate data for the past six months from all four detention facilities combined. He requested that the Subcommittee continue to get this data on a continuing basis to identify any racial trends or patterns. Mr. Garcia referenced his ability to obtain data through Ms. Work for her facility. Ms. Work then outlined the process required for any data request, which must comply with the Children’s Code. Mr. Garcia commented that this process needs to be worked out for the Subcommittee to be able to navigate this information. Mr. Garcia also noted that the Subcommittee does not believe that this data is giving the whole picture and they would like to find out how to get information regarding out-of-home placement, including RTCs, shelters, group homes and treatment foster care, which would require partnerships with other agencies within CYFD.

Mr. Garcia shared that he also had a meeting with Secretary Vigil. He asked Secretary Vigil about the cost of Juvenile Justice on behalf of several community members in his area, something he had asked for in the past and had received a truckload of documents to try to sift through. Secretary Vigil asked a staff member to research this during their meeting and she later reported that Juvenile Justice costs the State of New Mexico 72 million dollars annually, which is part of the 368 million dollar annual budget for CYFD. Mr. Garcia noted that he was aware that the purview of JJAC is the Federal funding, however, all the different costs combined should be examined, and the hope is to narrow that data/information and get the disaggregated information on a regular basis to be able to report on the impact with respect to disproportionate minority contact, racial information, gender information/orientation, and the updated COVID reports.

Ms. Vowell, upon the request of Mr. Garcia, provided an update on the Subcommittee’s work on their 3-Year work plan assignments.

Mr. Garcia commented that his organization just received another grant from the Annie E Casey Foundation to interview and survey youth within the facilities and to provide a stipend to their families if they were interviewed, and the amount of this grant is \$15,000.00, all of which will go directly to those being interviewed or conducting the surveys. He noted that the surveys will be conducted by members of the Juvenile Justice Collaborative for Youth. Mr. Garcia stated how critical this information will be and the plan is to bring this information not only to the Subcommittee but to JJAC as a whole.

Mr. Garcia reported that the self-assessment for JJAC has been sent out and asked Ms. Vowell to summarize this. Ms. Vowell explained that this was a set of questions developed by the Subcommittee, which initially was a very long list, but was narrowed down to those that applied to the effectiveness of JJAC. Ms. Vowell also stated that questions related to Racial Equity will be added to this list. Ms. Vowell reported that so far there have been no objections to this list of questions from the Subcommittee. Mr. Garcia stated that this list of questions will eventually be shared with the Executive Subcommittee in an upcoming meeting for approval and then to hopefully be brought to JJAC as a whole at the February meeting. Mr. Kearney asked that since this is a JJAC Self-Assessment, would the System Improvement

Subcommittee be collaborating with Ms. Gettler and the Board Development Subcommittee, as this Self-Assessment would fall under the responsibility of this Subcommittee as well. Mr. Garcia responded that this could be addressed within the context of the Executive Subcommittee since Ms. Gettler is also on that Subcommittee. Mr. Trujillo asked if Mr. Garcia would share this information with Ms. Gettler prior to the Executive Subcommittee meeting, so she will have an idea of how it affects the work of her Subcommittee. Mr. Garcia agreed to do this.

VI. Open Board Member Discussion

Mr. Trujillo explained that this is on the Agenda to provide all members an opportunity to discuss topics and share information they would like to express to all JJAC members.

Judge Kirk reiterated his view on taking proactive approaches to funding, as well as the history of the Committee's funding to understand that these funds are not getting out to the communities and youth. Judge Kirk stated that these are his personal views, not those of the Grant Subcommittee. He shared information that reverted funds will occur this year as well.

Judge Kirk explained that in the past JJAC has relied on the Continuums to identify the needs, request the funding, and then the Continuums implement the programming, but there have been restrictions, policy and processes that sometimes make this difficult, especially with Legislative actions requiring evidence based programs. Judge Kirk expressed the need for JJAC to realize they could make a bigger impact if they work with Coordinators to identify topical needs, provide support and information to Coordinators on programs to address topical needs and offer funding if they are interested in implementing these programs. He stated he was not suggesting in any way that JJAC should stop the existing four-year contract process, but this process is not successfully expending the funds available.

Judge Kirk suggested to Mr. Trujillo that the Executive Subcommittee and the Coordinator Leadership Team meet to discuss several common areas of need in their communities and come up with a plan to recommend JJAC funding to go to the communities to fund these priority. Judge Kirk encouraged everyone to "think outside the box" and for JJAC to become proactive in examining the needs of the youth and communities in order to get this funding out where it is needed.

Mr. Trujillo encouraged all of the Subcommittees to consider these comments and how to approach this in order to create a productive discussion of really meaningful ways to move this forward. Judge Schneider added an "Amen" to Judge Kirk's comments. Ms. Stevens thanked Judge Kirk for his comments, passion and transparency regarding this need, and that she is excited about JJAC becoming innovative to solve this problem as the need in the communities is huge.

Mr. Garcia noted that upgrades in liability insurance placed by local fiscal agents, in his case Bernalillo County, as part of their RFP, were becoming cost prohibitive and operationally prohibitive to many programs and organizations. Ms. Stevens gave the example of how this increase in insurance costs and requirements by Bernalillo County reduced the number of jobs for youth in one program from 500 jobs down to 100 jobs.

Judge Schneider expressed her hope that through the listening sessions with the Continuums, which her Subcommittee is recommending, that more details and barriers like this will come to light and can be addressed in a multi-level fashion to improve the system and get this funding out into the communities in a more realistic and useable way.

Keryl Work explained that insurance requirements due to litigation and liability of counties and all governments are probably going to continue to increase, especially in terms of cybersecurity. She wondered if there were other ways to use the funding available to help organizations get the level of protection and liability coverage they need in order to continue to function.

VII. Updates – Written reports submitted by staff

a) Federal Update – Bill Kearney, Special Programs Manager/Juvenile Justice Specialist

No questions or comments.

b) Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – Patti Vowell, Statewide JDAI Coordinator

No questions or comments.

c) Grants Management Unit Update - Cindy Varela, Grants Management Unit Manager

No questions or comments.

d) Detention and Compliance Monitoring Update – Samantha Lucas, Compliance Coordinator

No questions or comments.

VIII. Continuum Coordinator Update

Bianca Padilla, Grant County Continuum Coordinator, provided the Coordinator update. She shared that Coordinators participated in a Question, Persuade and Refer (QPR) Training, a suicide awareness and prevention training and a mindfulness training due to this stressful time of year. She also shared that she presented the work of her Grant County Continuum for other Coordinators, outlining their programs, obstacles, successes, etc., emphasizing the need to make their Continuums their own, meeting the needs of the youth in their communities and being creative in doing this.

Ms. Padilla commented that the Coordinators also received their quarterly reviews from the CYFD JJS Grants Management Unit, enabling them to view their current status, identify what barriers they may encounter in expending their funds, and identify where they are being successful. She thanked the JJAC members for the work they do, serving on the Subcommittees and being leaders in their respective communities. She also expressed her thanks and appreciation to her colleagues, the other Continuum Coordinators, for their hard work and continued efforts.

Chair Trujillo thanked Ms. Padilla for the update and all the Coordinators for the important work they do for their communities.

IX. Public Comment

William Kearney, CYFD, provided an update from Tamera Marcantel, Deputy Director, Facilities, regarding the closing of the Camino Nuevo Youth Center by January 31, 2022. The closure reflects the continued positive decline in the number of youth under secure care (88 currently, down from 652 in FY 2001, and 128 in FY 2020) and the agency's commitment to implementing Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.

X. Adjournment

Chair Trujillo commented that the meeting discussions speak to the JJAC members' interests and concerns within their respective communities and for the youth in their communities, and thanked the members for this. Mr. Trujillo noted that these discussions have also spoken to the responsibility of this Committee with respect to clarity and transparency and the real need for the bi-monthly meetings being planned to

move forward. Mr. Trujillo thanked everyone for their participation.

Motion to adjourn was made by Judge Kirk and seconded by Sarah Gettler. Ms. Varela conducted the roll call vote. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

The next proposed meeting to be held on Thursday, February 17th, 2021, 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Minutes Approved on 2/17/2022.

by: Anthony Trujillo
Anthony Trujillo, Chair