

**Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice
Minutes of Meeting, December 2 - 3, 2010, Washington, D.C.**

Thursday, December 2

Call to Order, Welcome and Opening Remarks

The Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice (FACJJ) convened on December 3 - 4 in Washington, D.C. at the Office of Justice Programs. The purpose of this meeting was to hear reports from staff of the Office on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) on current topics of general interest and to review the FACJJ's report to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Coordinating Council), which was delivered by Richard Gardell and Cecely Reardon on December 4.

Designated Federal Official Robin Delany-Shabazz from OJJDP convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. FACJJ Chair Richard Gardell called the meeting to order, noting that this would be the last meeting of the FACJJ under its present structure. He praised the work of the committee, citing the excellence of its six annual reports, and thanked the members and staff who had contributed so much time and effort to write these reports, have them edited, and brought to the attention of the public. He thanked the Acting Administrator of OJJDP, Jeff Slowikowski, for his open communication policy and leadership. Ms. Delany-Shabazz read a letter of appreciation from the committee's principal writer, Kay McKinney, who was unable to be present at the meeting.

Mr. Gardell then introduced Mr. Slowikowski, who thanked members for their willingness to travel twice a year to further the work of the committee, noting the bittersweet nature of this final meeting. He stated that the purpose of the proposed reorganization of the FACJJ was to increase the ways in which OJJDP could best make use of the expertise represented by the members of the committee and other practitioners in the field of juvenile justice, and thanked Ms. Delany-Shabazz for arranging this meeting to coincide with the meeting of the Coordinating Council.

Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending Registering and Tracking (SMART) Update and Discussion

Linda Baldwin, Director of the SMART office of OJP, led a power point presentation to update FACJJ members on implementation of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA), which is Title I of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006. Her presentation is in the section of meeting materials on the www.facjj.org web site.

Ms. Baldwin's talk highlighted the difficulties faced by states, territories and tribes in meeting the first implementation deadline of July 2009. After a blanket one-year extension issued by the Attorney General, and individual extensions granted in response to requests from jurisdictions, the final implementation deadline is now set for July 2011. As of this date, four states and two tribes are in compliance, and the SMART office is in constant communication with all the remaining jurisdictions to help them cross the finish line by July 2011. Ms. Baldwin discussed the SMART office's extensive meetings with representatives of jurisdictions seeking supplemental guidelines to implementation and the topics addressed in these guidelines, which have been reviewed and commented on by FACJJ:

- Juvenile Delinquents
- Internet Identifiers
- International Travel
- Domestic Information Sharing
- Acknowledgement (Notice) forms
- Ongoing Implementation Assurance
- Retroactive Classes
- Newly Recognized Tribes

She noted that states have expressed a need to have more control over juvenile registration, or the posting of names of juveniles adjudicated delinquent of aggravated sexual assault-type crimes, so as to be in accord with their own laws and policies, which is a major challenge in meeting compliance deadlines. Many jurisdictions believe that SORNA requires registration of more juveniles than it actually does. Other major issues remaining to be resolved in ongoing communication between jurisdictions and the SMART office include the following:

- Costs
- Implementation deadline
- Conviction-based tiering
- Exclusion of PL-280 tribes
- Tribal/State coordination

Ms. Baldwin described the numerous grant funds, totaling over \$30 million under the Adam Walsh Implementation Program and more than \$13 million in Comprehensive Approach to Sex Offender Management (CASOM) and OJJDP grants, which are distributed to assist jurisdictions with costs of compliance with SORNA, especially in those jurisdictions which do not now have electronic systems in place, and she discussed the challenges in resolving differences between state laws and SORNA requirements in order to bring about full implementation of SORNA by all jurisdictions. Ms. Baldwin also discussed other SMART office work in Sex Offender Management apart from SORNA: community education and prevention; investigation, prosecution, sentencing, corrections and reentry policies; treatment, victim services and supervision practices. A Sex Offender Management and Planning Initiative in conjunction with OJJDP will assist in development and sharing of best practices across jurisdictions.

Following the presentation, Mr. Gardell asked Ms. Baldwin to clarify the consequences for jurisdictions which do not meet deadlines. Ms. Baldwin explained that there are financial penalties, which jurisdictions can recover after they are in compliance. Sandra McBrayer asked Ms. Baldwin what percentage of states were expected to fail to comply, and what SMART staff meant by “substantial implementation.” Ms. Baldwin and SMART staff members Stephanie LoConto and Scott Matson responded that because SMART has staff interacting with each state, all of which have widely varying populations and land areas, and are in different stages of the process, there is no way to predict such numbers, but assured the committee that SMART has the resources and staff to accomplish the task.

Jim Anderson of Pennsylvania and Yeura Venters of Ohio, along with Scott Matson and Lori McPherson, policy advisors for Pennsylvania and Ohio respectively, discussed conflicts between those states’ laws and SORNA, especially on the issue of juvenile registration. In answer to a

question from Cecely Reardon, Ms. LoConto noted that if a state's highest appellate court rules that a portion of SORNA is in contradiction to the state's constitution, that state is granted an exception from that part of SORNA.

Ed Palmer asked that SMART and OJJDP address the impact of the registration requirement on disproportionate representation of minorities (DMC) in the juvenile justice system, and in response to a question from Ron Rossitto, Ms. Baldwin noted that a ruling on mandatory vs. discretionary posting of juvenile offenders would most likely be issued by the end of January 2011.

Wiley Branson asked Mr. Slowikowski whether OJJDP had an official position on the mandatory registration of juvenile sex offenders, and was informed that throughout DOJ the consensus is for some mandatory registration, and that it applies to a much smaller population than originally believed. For example, a 16 year old boy who sends a cell phone picture of his half-nude girlfriend to a few of his friends would not be required to register under the law, which allows discretionary posting on public sex offender registry websites only if juveniles are adjudicated delinquent of aggravated sexual assault type crimes.

Mr. Gardell thanked Ms. Baldwin and the SMART staff for the informative presentation and discussion.

OJJDP: New Directions, Budget Update

Jeff Slowikowski first addressed three continuing issues:

- Reauthorization of the JJDPA: this is not likely to happen in the current lame-duck Congress. The Senate has passed S678 out of the Judiciary Committee, but did not take a full Senate vote, and a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives but not taken up by the Education and Labor Committee. With new committee chairs in the next Congress, new efforts will be required to achieve reauthorization.
- OJJDP permanent Administrator: there is still no nominee, despite the DOJ leadership's efforts to identify possible candidates.
- FY 2011 Appropriation: the current Continuing Resolution expires on December 4, and will most likely be extended for six months. Current spending plans for FY 2011 are based on historical funding levels, although four possible funding scenarios include figures in S678; figures to be determined by the House Appropriations Committee; a continuing resolution based on the 2010 budget; or one based on FY 2008.

Priorities for OJJDP in FY 2011 include continuing emphasis on the following initiatives from FY 2010:

- Children Exposed to Violence: Attorney General Eric Holder introduced Defending Childhood, a multi-agency initiative involving pilot programs in eight communities, in September 2010. The Attorney General's strong commitment to this program will insure its continuance, with or without a direct appropriation.

- Safe Start: new in 2011 will be an emphasis on Internet crimes against children, with 61 law enforcement task forces funded at \$30 million in FY 2010 working with DOJ on this issue, of which it is believed that reported crimes are only a small fraction of the actual scope of the problem.
- Gang violence and anti-gang strategies: OJJDP maintains the Gang Reduction Program, designed to reduce gang activity in targeted neighborhoods, and the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) program
- Tribal youth initiatives: funding to states for these programs from the JJDPA's Title V Local Delinquency Prevention Programs has been reduced, but tribal youth issues are a priority with the Attorney General, so DOJ will continue efforts in this arena. The Consolidated Tribal Assistance Solicitation (CTAS), launched in FY 2010, combines grant solicitations from the components throughout OJP as well as the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) into one application to simplify the application process to help tribes access available grant funding. Next steps in tribal initiatives will address underage drinking and tribal gangs.
- Two new fellowship programs in FY 2011 for Safe Start and Tribal Youth have brought experts working on these issues to OJJDP for one-year terms.

Other OJJDP Highlights of FY 2010:

- Juvenile justice system reform in states and communities: OJJDP is working with states to establish training centers for youth in custody in conjunction with the Annie E. Casey Foundation under the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI).
- Court Improvement Programs: guidelines have been in development for the past 10 years to train court personnel to implement best practices, doing for delinquency courts what the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and other entities have successfully done for dependency courts, and to help OJJDP forge a linkage between these two courts.
- Mentoring: the single largest appropriation in OJJDP, \$100 million for FY 2011 and a total of \$350 million between 2008 and 2010, has been for mentoring programs.
- The Second Chance Act will fund national, regional and small community organizations to develop strategic enhancement plans for youth re-entering communities similar to the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative on which DOJ worked with the Department of Education (ED).

Mr. Slowikowski then turned the conversation to the restructuring of the FACJJ. He reminded the group that the Federal Advisory Committee Act specifies that FACs are operated by federal agencies and are not operated as independent organization. OJJDP attorneys are examining the specific language concerning the FACJJ in the JJDPA. OJJDP is seeking to refashion the FACJJ

into a smaller group, up to 40 members rather than the current 56, representing different sectors of the field as well as geographic regions. Still under consideration are such issues as how these members will be identified, nominated and chosen, and their term limits and rotations. OJJDP wants more representation from specific sectors, such as tribal and youth, as well as from those who can focus on OJJDP's emphasis on children as victims. A smaller FACJJ could seek input from a larger number of voices, options and sectors through the use of subcommittees comprised of experts in the field who are not official members of the FACJJ. For example, in an effort to strengthen OJJDP's relationship with law enforcement, a subcommittee on law enforcement could be constituted of several members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)'s committee on juvenile justice.

Another change could come in the way the FACJJ makes its reports. The JJDPA requires that the FACJJ advise Congress, but does not specify what form this advice is to take, nor that it needs to be the same form every time. The current annual reports and their recommendations have been valuable tools, but there are occasions when smaller documents responding quickly to a timely issue are needed, such as the response letter to the SMART office during this year's open comment period. A more flexible FACJJ structure could more easily generate such documents.

In response to Mr. Slowikowski's remarks Ms. Reardon, Daniel Dawson and Steve Teske all raised the issue of loss of representation from each state and territory under the proposed restricting of the FACJJ, and urged that at least one meeting a year include all 56 representatives to insure that each state's lines of communication with the federal government remain open.

Richard Gardell commented on the discrepancy between FACJJ's mandate to give unfettered advice to Congress and the Administration and the requirement that its reports be funneled through the DOJ bureaucracy; Dennis Pickering asked about the process by which the reports are transmitted and deployed. Ms. Slowikowski and Ms. Delany-Shabazz responded that the OJP's Office of Communications sends both electronic and printed versions to every Member of Congress and to the President. Members of the FACJJ are provided with multiple copies of the reports in order to bring them to the attention of their individual Members of Congress as well as to their state legislators and governors. OJJDP also makes use of the reports as position papers and resources when commenting on proposed legislation or making program development and funding recommendations.

Heber Watts questioned how a smaller FACJJ would deal with "issues of emergence," noting that systems change as they evolve and the present structure of representation from all states and territories meeting twice a year allows issues to be seen at an earlier stage. Mr. Slowikowski responded that greater use of listening sessions, such as this year's sessions on DMC, could allow the FACJJ members to hear from experts on a variety of issues, and that the new structure would ultimately allow for more flexibility in identifying emerging issues and dealing with them directly.

Implications of Tribal Law and Order Act

Eugenia Tyner-Dawson, Senior Advisor to the Associate Attorney General and Executive Director of the Justice Programs Council on Native American Affairs, and Laura Ansera, OJJDP's Tribal Youth Coordinator, gave a power point presentation and commentary on the implications for juvenile justice of the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA) signed into law by President Obama in July 2010. The presentation is in the section of meeting materials on the www.facjj.org web site.

Ms. Tyner-Dawson noted that TLOA is largest reform act on tribal issues in more than a decade, covering all 565 federally-recognized tribes. It aims to enhance the effectiveness of tribal courts and justice systems and to clarify and simplify the jurisdictional maze which describes law enforcement in Indian Country, where the crime rate is significantly higher than in the rest of the U.S. She discussed the various provisions in the law, which covers such matters as tribal access to the FBI's National Crime Information System (NCIC) databases; reporting of crime data; detention plans and facilities; alternatives to incarceration: prisoner release notification; and training of law enforcement officers. She noted that TLOA sets new standards for penalties for felonies and misdemeanors as well as for warrantless arrests, and mandates that HHS's Indian Health Service (IHS) coordinate with DOJ, OVW and the Department of the Interior's (DOI) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to develop standardized sexual assault protocols. TLOA also clarifies and enhances relationships between tribes and U.S. Attorneys, and for the first time establishes a permanent Office of Tribal Justice in DOJ.

Ms. Ansera discussed the specific provisions of TLOA in which OJJDP will play a role, while noting that there are implications for juvenile justice throughout all of TLOA. Two principal provisions of the law are found in Section 246, which amends the JJDPA to allow a Tribal Youth Program authorized appropriation, and to add a tribal representative to the Coordinating Council.

Other sections of TLOA which specifically prescribe a role for OJJDP in training and technical assistance, funding, and inter-agency cooperation are the following:

- Section 211: Long-term Plan under Office of Justice Services
- Section 222: State, Tribal and Local Law Enforcement
- Section 233: Access to National Criminal Information Databases
- Section 234: Tribal Court Sentencing Authority
- Section 235: Indian Law and Order Commission
- Section 241: Inter-Departmental MOA, Indian Alcohol and Substance Abuse
- Section 242: Indian Tribal Justice: Technical and Legal Assistance
- Section 244: Tribal Jails Program
- Section 247: Improving Public Safety Presence in Rural Areas
- Section 251: Tracking of Crimes Committed in Indian Country

Ms. Tyner-Dawson and Ms. Ansera stressed that TLOA requires reports to Congress on implementation of all provisions by July 2011, one year from date of enactment of the law, which is forcing all involved agencies to act quickly and cooperatively.

Mr. Gardell thanked Ms. Tyner-Dawson and Ms. Ansera for the informative presentation.

Preview and Comments on FACJJ Presentation to Coordinating Council

Mr. Gardell and Ms. Reardon read to the group the oral presentation they had prepared to accompany the 2010 annual report and distributed the handouts that would accompany their presentation: a list of the FACJJ's Core Values; a list of the members of the FACJJ; and a two-page excerpt from the 2009 report summarizing key elements of all previous reports. A written copy of their remarks is posted in the section of meeting materials on the www.facjj.org web site.

The presentation enclosed the findings and recommendations in the report within the framework of a narrative, based on Mr. Gardell's police experience, about a youth who becomes caught up in the juvenile justice system, the very negative outcomes he experiences, and the positive outcomes that could have followed if the recommendations set forth in this report had been in effect at the time of his first contact with the system.

The group praised the presentation, and offered suggestions for strengthening it further. Yeura Venters noted that the presentation perpetuated a negative stereotype of public defenders, which, in his own experience as a public defender in an office supported by a coordinated response team, was not borne out by the facts. Ms. Reardon responded from her experience as a public defender to note that virtually all youth in juvenile justice cases through the country are represented by court-appointed attorneys with enormous case loads and limited time to spend on each case. Heber Watts concurred from his perspective in law enforcement that too many youth wind up in the juvenile justice system because their legal representation is inappropriate and "atrocious."

Ms. Delaney-Shabazz noted how well the narrative and recommendations of the report coincided with the Coordinating Council's four issue areas: Tribal Youth and Juvenile Justice; Racial and Ethnic Disparities; Juvenile Re-entry and Transition to Adulthood; and Education and Youth At Risk. She suggested that Mr. Gardell and Ms. Reardon emphasize a single idea to imprint on the Coordinating Council. Ms. McBrayer suggested asking the Coordinating Council to DO something in response to this report. Several other members joined the discussion about the purpose of their shared mission: to keep youth out of the juvenile justice system who don't belong there, to keep all youth out of adult jails, and to remember that the juvenile justice system should be a system of last resort. The group would like to Council to remember that the children in the system must be seen as individuals, each with a unique situation, and that juvenile justice systems are designed to allow judges to take these circumstances into consideration, rather than blindly follow sentencing guidelines or zero-tolerance policies. James Anderson reminded the group that juvenile justice is local: that youth who can turn themselves around within the system do so because adults in their own communities have shown they care about them. The Council has in its mandate the power to inspire leaders at the state and local levels to make that difference in the lives of these children, and should remember the words once spoken by Colin Powell that "youth are 100% of our future."

The group also focused on the economics of juvenile justice and rehabilitation: every child saved because the system works properly is one who is not going to end up in adult prison; but was reminded by Ms. Delaney-Shabazz that it is not appropriate for the Council to lobby for funding, which is determined by Congress.

Mr. Gardell thanked Ms. Reardon for her work on this and all the reports of the past four years, as he and Ms. Reardon withdrew to make the suggested changes in the presentation.

Small Group Discussions: Selection of Regional SAG Representation and Identification of Key Sectors under New FACJJ Structure

The members broke into four groups to consider two aspects of the reorganization of the FACJJ:

- to offer one to three options for identifying and selecting up to 10 regionally diverse members of the reconstituted FACJJ
- to recommend the sectors, disciplines and expertise needed to add to the restructured FACJJ.

The principal recommendations for selecting members centered on using the four regions within the Coalition for Juvenile Justice (CJJ), selecting two representatives from each region while paying attention to urban/rural diversity. An alternative suggestion was to divide the country into 10 regions of five states each, with each state selecting one person to represent the region. Delegates could be selected by governors, as in the SAG model, or by lottery, or by election. The consensus of the group was that lottery would be preferable to the other methods, especially if states within the regions were assigned delegates on a rotating basis, and insuring that each delegate would also have an alternate. Ms. McBrayer's group emphasized the need for SAGs to communicate within their regions so the delegate is also in a position to inform OJJDP about regional issues.

Recommendations of the sectors and disciplines to be included to add expertise in specific fields included law enforcement; the judiciary; public defenders and prosecutors; probation and parole officers; substance abuse and mental health experts; child abuse prevention and family strengthening experts; national mentoring organizations such as big brothers/big sisters; early childhood and adolescent development specialists; child welfare agencies; researchers; victim/witness experts; child advocacy foundations; business interests; faith communities; and foster care agencies.

An alternative suggestion offered by the group chaired by Mr. Dawson was to leave the FACJJ structure as it is presently constituted to convene for one meeting a year, and form subcommittees of small groups for more frequent meetings. This led to questions from the group about the mission of the restructured FACJJ and the reason for the change. At present it is primarily an information-sharing group, which makes an annual report. If it focuses more on the advisory function, they asked, will its purpose and "product" still be the annual report, and if not, what will replace it?

Mr. Slowikowski and Ms. Delany-Shabazz, reiterating some of the information shared in the morning session on "New Directions," explained that a smaller, more streamlined group would be in a better position to give OJJDP immediate feedback on specific issues such as pending legislation and its impact on the field. They noted that the mission and issues addressed by OJJDP are as large as those of the Department of Justice itself—but with a focus on youth. The annual reports have been excellent resources for OJJDP and the field, but that since the issues do

not change, the need for annual reports on a wide range of subjects has lessened. The purpose of restructuring is to make better use of the time and expertise of both FACJJ members and OJJDP staff, and to make sure OJJDP is able to give the FACJJ the resources it needs to accomplish its mission. The FACJJ's state-based composition insures that members are knowledgeable about formula and block grants, for example, but members do not necessarily have information or expertise that could be useful to OJJDP on emerging issues, such as Internet crimes against children. Further, while the FACJJ has a geographical diversity, OJJDP is seeking a more *intentional* diversity, so that its membership reflects the priorities of the Attorney General and the Obama Administration in tribal and other matters.

Mr. Dawson and Mr. Venters both spoke to the usefulness of the 56-member FACJJ to their respective states and the political implications of this change. Through their representation on the FACJJ, the states feel they have a voice in federal juvenile justice policy, while the reports and data emerging from the FACJJ have been useful in influencing state policies and practice. The information-sharing among the states also benefits the OJJDP. Mr. Slowikowski responded that OJJDP cannot continue to fund two large annual meetings unless there is a clearly defined benefit to the department, and it has been determined that that benefit will come from a smaller, more flexible committee that can respond in a timely fashion to issues of concern.

Ms. McBrayer and others thanked Mr. Slowikowski and Ms. Delany-Shabazz for facilitating this candid discussion.

Compliance with the JJDP's Core Protections: Issues and Discussion

Vice Chairman Gini Highfield introduced Elissa Rumsey, OJJDP's Compliance Monitoring Coordinator, who gave a power point presentation and led a discussion on OJJDP's youth in custody program; three states' compliance programs; and the changes in compliance monitoring to be made in the anticipated reauthorization of the JJDP. A printed version of the presentation is located on www.facjj.org.

Ms. Rumsey began by reminding all present that the OJJDP's compliance program exists to protect youth in custody. The majority of states have full-time compliance monitors; some have multiple monitors. In outlining the history of the JJDP and key elements of the program she noted that much of the written guidance for the program goes back to the 1980's, and that funding levels for the JJDP's formula grants are also stuck at 1980's levels. These funds could triple under S678. Amounts of grants to participating states are based on a state's *annual* compliance with the four core requirements of the JJDP:

- Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)
- Sight and sound separation of juveniles from adult offenders
- Jail removal (removal of juveniles from adult lockups)
- Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)

Ms. Rumsey described how the OJJDP examines and enforces compliance by the states with these four core requirements. There are matters pertaining to each of the core requirements that may be adjusted in the reauthorization of the JJDP, such as the following:

- Jail Removal: the Rural Exception, which is widely used in Alaska and other largely rural states, has not had new regulations since 1996.

- The Valid Court Order (VCO) Exception to the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO) would be eliminated in the new bill, which would also make it clear that youth who reach age 18 while in jail have the right to remain in the youth facility to complete their sentences.
- Separation of youth from adult prisoners: this also applies to “scared straight” programs, which violate the separation core requirement.
- Court Holding: in many older facilities it is impossible to maintain sight and sound separation.
- Collocated Facilities.

Ms. Rumsey then presented an analysis of state compliance data, designed to assess whether minority youth are overrepresented in law enforcement facilities (DMC). Pennsylvania, Maryland and Colorado, which all have excellent compliance programs, supplied data to a team of researchers from the National Center for Juvenile Justice on the number and types of holding facilities in their states and the populations they served. The data revealed a high incidence of DMC: in Pennsylvania, for example, a black youth is ten times as likely as a white one to experience a violation of the jail removal core requirement, but the causes of this are unclear. Further study would question why certain children are jailed and not others; whether there is an interaction between the offense and race; whether offenders habitually come from certain communities and certain schools; whether certain facilities have more violations because they have a higher minority population; whether violations are more likely to occur at certain times of day; and whether there are gender or age interactions among incarcerated youth.

Ms. Rumsey also discussed whether more data and analyses would assist OJJDP to do a better job of monitoring compliance, and offered these conclusions to the studies thus far:

- Police are key to both DMC and core requirement violations.
- Much can be gained from collaborations between DMC coordinators and Compliance Monitors.
- More study is needed to determine the relationship among DSO, Jail Removal, Separation and DMC core requirements.

In closing Ms. Rumsey described the new National Center for Youth in Custody, recently funded by OJJDP. Its initial focus will be on youth in juvenile facilities, although ultimately it will cover all incarcerated youth. It is hoped that this new center will achieve parity with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which receives \$30 million annual funding from OJJDP.

Mr. Gardell thanked Ms. Rumsey and adjourned the meeting for the day at 5 p.m.

Friday, December 3

Recap, Appreciation and Closing

Designated Federal Official Robin Delany-Shabazz from OJJDP convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. FACJJ Chair Richard Gardell called the meeting to order. Mr. Gardell and Ms. Reardon reviewed their final presentation to the executive committee of the Coordinating Council with the FACJJ members. No further modifications were suggested. Ms. Delany-Shabazz reminded

the group that FACJJ members are welcome to attend the executive committee session during the FACJJ presentation.

FACJJ members were presented with Certificates of Appreciation for their service by Acting Administrator Jeff Slowikowski.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 a.m.