

**Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention  
 State Relations and Assistance Division  
 Compliance Monitor Call  
 March 11, 2020**

**Welcome and Roll Call**

**Katie Penkoff, Senior TA Consultant, Center for Coordinated Assistance to States (CCAS)**

Good day everyone, thank you for joining the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), State Relations and Assistance Division (SRAD) Compliance Monitor call. We will begin with roll call and ask each State or territory to please let us know if they are present and if so, how many individuals from your State or territory are joining for today's call. Before we turn it over to conduct roll call, please just a reminder when you're not speaking please mute your line to help us ensure call quality. Also, once today's agenda begins, we will have content presented by the State Relations and Assistance Division and in between each segment we will have also question and answer periods. During the presentation content, we will be muting all lines and then opening them up for each of those question and answer segments. We will also wait on the line at the end of the call to capture any state or territory we may have missed. At this point I would like to turn the call over to OJJDP Leadership and Deputy Administrator Chryl Jones.

<b>Organization/State</b>	<b>Attendee</b>
<b>OJJDP</b>	<b>Name</b>
	TeNeane Bradford
	Julie Herr
	Tina Borner
	Kathy Manning
	Ashley Washington
	Chryl Jones
	Nicole McCrae
	Alyssa Malcomson
	Marisa Harris
	Vicky Taylor
<b>CCAS</b>	
	Lisa Hutchinson
	Okori Christopher
	Katie Penkoff
	Cassy Blakely
	Kia Jackson
	Kenya Roy

State	In Attendance/Mark with X
1. Alabama	X 3
2. Alaska	X 1
3. American Samoa	
4. Arizona	X 1
5. Arkansas	X 2
6. California	X 2
7. Colorado	X 1
8. Connecticut	
9. Delaware	X 1
10. District of Columbia	X 2
11. Florida	X 1
12. Georgia	X 1
13. Guam	X 1
14. Hawaii	X 2
15. Idaho	X 1
16. Illinois	X 1
17. Indiana	X 1
18. Iowa	X 1
19. Kansas	
20. Kentucky	X 1
21. Louisiana	
22. Maine	
23. Maryland	X 1
24. Massachusetts	
25. Michigan	X 2
26. Minnesota	
27. Mississippi	X 2
28. Missouri	X 1
29. Montana	
30. Nebraska	
31. Nevada	
32. New Hampshire	X 1
33. New Jersey	X 3
34. New Mexico	X 1
35. New York	X 2
36. North Carolina	X 4
37. North Dakota	X 1
38. Northern Marianas Islands	
39. Ohio	

<b>State</b>	<b>In Attendance/Mark with X</b>
40. Oklahoma	X 3
41. Oregon	X 2
42. Pennsylvania	X 2
43. Puerto Rico	X 3
44. Rhode Island	X 1
45. South Carolina	X 2
46. South Dakota	
47. Tennessee	X 2
48. Texas	
49. Utah	X 1
50. Vermont	X 2
51. Virgin Islands	
52. Virginia	X 3
53. Washington	
54. West Virginia	X 2
55. Wisconsin	X 2
56. Wyoming	X 1

**SRAD Introductions**

**Chryl Jones, Deputy Administrator, OJJDP**

Good afternoon to everyone. Thank you for joining the call today. This is really great representation. I was actually going through and we've got a good number of states on the call today. So thank you again for your time. I know that our State Relations Team led by Dr. TeNeane Bradford is excited about the work that they are doing. I wish you all could see the inner workings and how the sausage gets made here. TeNeane has this team doing so many neat things that hopefully you will get to see the benefits of that. I think you already started to see some of the benefit of the work that they are doing. We are formalizing processes. They are documenting procedures. I mean we are really tight-knit ship under her leadership, and you all are a big part of that. You give us suggestions and ideas and so really just want to applaud you and thank you for continuing to be patient with us as we continue to improve the work that we do on behalf of kids around the country under the Title II program.

So, I just want to say thank you and welcome to this Compliance Monitoring Call for the month. On behalf of Caren Harp and I only had two things I wanted to say is that we have been fortunate enough to be able to hire here at OJJDP and we are bringing in some new talent and exciting, energized folks particularly to SRAD. Gosh I am blanking on the number right now, staff that we are bringing. TeNeane is it four or was it five?

**Dr. TeNeane Bradford, Associate Administrator, OJJDP, SRAD**

We have got five. Two have already-

**Chryl Jones, Deputy Administrator, OJJDP, SRAD**

Five, thank you. So, two of those individuals have already started and I am going to introduce them and let them give you a couple of minutes to talk about themselves. Nicole McCray, stole her from the COPS (Community Oriented Policing Services) Office, which we have a habit of doing, stealing really good people from the COPS office like Dr. Bradford. And then Alyssa Malcolmson who we stole I think that was from SAMHSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration) that she came, but she will correct me if I'm wrong. But if Nicole would you start just by sharing a couple minutes about who you are and what you're doing in the states that you manage?

**Nicole McCrae, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Good afternoon everyone. It is wonderful to meet you all virtually. I am really excited to be a part of the SRAD Team. It is officially four weeks now, so getting into the big season. So, I am just really excited to be with you all. As Chryl mentioned I come from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, where we focus on providing funding for law enforcement. So, I am not foreign to the grant world at all, and I look forward to working with all of the different states. I heard a couple of my folks that I have already met on the call as well, so it is very nice to meet you all and to talk to you all. Thank you.

**Cheryl Jones, Deputy Administrator, OJJDP, SRAD**

Alyssa.

**Alyssa Malcolmson, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Thank you, Chryl. Hi, my name is Alyssa and I apologize for my hoarse voice. I actually came from FDA (Food and Drug Administration), previously I was Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration where I was in the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment and handled a variety of different criminal justice programs on the grants management side. So discretionary grants and block grants. I am currently assigned with Missouri, Maine, Michigan, Iowa and Colorado and I am excited to work with you all and get to know you guys better. And I am going to turn it back to Chryl.

**Cheryl Jones, Deputy Administrator, OJJDP, SRAD**

All right thanks Alyssa. So, I am going to turn it over to Brittany who is up next to talk about an update on Category 1 determinations. Thanks, goodbye. Oh sorry, just goodbye for Chryl.

**Category 1 Determinations**

**Brittany Ford, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Good afternoon, everybody. This is Brittany Ford. I am coming to you guys to give you a quick determination process update. So some of these reminders should be very familiar. We had some language in the CCAS (Center for Coordinated Assistance to States) reminders about the due dates, but I just want to highlight and emphasize those dates again. So, as you all know, we are going through our Category 1 review process. Many of you should have already had interviews with your SRAD State Program Managers about the review of Category 1 materials. So, as a reminder, Category 2 information is due March 30th. Please refer to the solicitation for the things that specifically go in [GMS \(Grants Management System\)](#) and those that go in the [CMT \(Compliance Monitor Tool\)](#). We also on our last call reiterated the due date for any potential extension requests which is this **Friday, March 13<sup>th</sup>, no later than 5 PM Eastern Time**. As a reminder, the request must include justification as to why your extension

is needed and must be on agency letterhead. Submit the request to the JJDP Compliance Reports email ([JJDPComplianceReports@usdoj.gov](mailto:JJDPComplianceReports@usdoj.gov)), and again that email is referenced in the CCAS reminder about today's meeting.

Please remember to be sure to CC your SRAD Program Manager. If approved by the OJJDP Administrator, the new due dates will be **April 29th**. Please note that that only applies to Compliance and RED (Racial and Ethnic Disparities) data submissions only. All other required categories through submissions are still **due March 30th**. So with that being said, just as a general update, we have received seven requests so far and they are working their way through the approval process. Once the approval is granted, your OJJDP State Program Manager will be sending you a signed copy of your extension letter.

Next topic on the update list is the eligibility determination letters. We just wanted to remind you all that for the eligibility letters we will no longer be mailing them to you, but you will receive a signed copy from your program manager via email. And a slight change from last year, for those of you that may have had issues related to your SAG (State Advisory Group) or your Compliance Manual reviews from last year, you might have received an ineligible letter. So any states that have those similar issues this year will receive incomplete application letters. The letter will detail the process going forward, but you will be allowed to submit your Category 2 information. And applicable special conditions will be applied based on your individual situations if those issues are not resolved by the time that OJJDP goes to make you award.

If you have any questions around your eligibility, or your Category 1 reviews or your Category 2 information, please feel free to contact your SRAD Program Manager. And that is it from me, and I will turn it over to I believe Julie.

**Julie Herr, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Yes. Thanks so much, Britt. Okori, could we maybe unmute the lines for a minute to see if anyone has any questions about any of the information that Brittaney just shared?

**Okori Christopher, Project Technology Specialist, CCAS**

Yes, all lines are unmuted.

**Julie Herr, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Thank you. Anybody have any questions?

**Tim Polasik, CA** - So this is Tim in California. I do have a question on the RED supplemental questions. So, do we submit those in the Compliance Monitoring Tool or do you submit it in GMS? Thanks.

**Tina Borner, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD** – This is Tina, and you will submit them in the Compliance Monitoring Tool. There is a tab that is associated to where you need to upload your plan.

**Julie Herr, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD** – Thanks Tina. Does anyone else have any more questions? Hearing none. If you have any questions or if you think about any throughout this call, we will again take questions at the end of the call from everyone or feel free to reach out directly to your

grant manager. Thank you.

Great. Brittany, thank you so much. There's one last additional piece of information that I'm not sure Brittany shared. As an FYI, there has been a slight change to the Category 1 determination process from what we shared on the last conference call. I believe I may have indicated that you would no longer be receiving a letter from OJJDP if you are determined to be eligible at the conclusion of the Category 1 determination process, that we would only be providing those ineligibility letters or the requests for additional information that Brittany mentioned a few minutes ago. But in fact there has been a slight change to that process and this year we will be providing letters once again to everyone. So just wanted to make sure that that piece is clear because that is a little bit of a change from the information that Kathy and I shared when we had our webinar to talk about the Category 1 determination process.

So anyway, that said. I know that you all are working hard now on your Category 2 submissions, which are coming due very, very soon so we are going to make an effort to keep this call short and sweet. Just wanted to talk with you a little bit about the compliance data reports that you are getting ready to submit hopefully **on March 30th**. Some of you are really Johnny on the spot this year. We have had a couple of states that have already uploaded your reports into the system so that is terrific. Just wanted to talk about one or two things that hopefully you all will be sort of thinking about carefully as you are finalizing your data reports for this year.

One of the things I noticed when reviewing last year's data reports was that we still had many people who, in the state profile section, were reporting the same number of adult lockups under question number five (which is the question where we ask about the number of facilities you have that meet the definition of an adult jail or lockup) as in question number three of the state profile, which talks about the number of facilities that meet the definition of a secure detention or a secure correctional facility. So I know many of you may not have that actual form in front of you right now, but when you are identifying the number of facilities that contain a secure detention or secure correctional facility you have 3A, 3B, 3C, & 3D, which list juvenile detention facilities, juvenile correctional facilities, adult jails and adult lockups.

Some states are telling us you have zero adult lockups that meet the definition of a secure detention or a correctional facility. And then in other instances, states are telling us that all your adult lockups in the state (all of the ones that are listed under question number five, which specifically deals with adult jails and lockups) also meet the definition of a secure detention or correctional facility.

So, this is a heads up that we would like for you to be thinking carefully at this point about those adult lockup facilities--police stations for the most part. Most states have at least a handful of police facilities that have, for example, cuffing rails only with no cells, or lockable interview rooms but no cells. We would generally consider those facilities not to contain a secure detention or correctional facility because, as you may remember, secure detention and correctional facilities are inherently defined as residential. So an adult police facility that does not have beds or benches where detainees can lay down, is generally not considered a residential facility and would not meet the definition of a secure detention or secure correctional facility. This is important because if a police station doesn't meet the definition of a secure detention or secure correctional facility you can't have a DSO (Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders) violation at that location.

I know many of you are continuing to work through the detain and confine guidance our office has provided over the past several years. Hopefully you are continuing to complete your facility visits, double-checking to see what part of a police station, for example, may be residential or non-residential. Or maybe the police station doesn't have any residential parts at all, and that's okay. The important part is that everyone is considering this information as you are filling out the state profile section of the compliance monitoring report, and not just automatically saying that none of your adult jails and lockups are residential or, on the flip side, that all your adult jails and lockups are residential. It is, I guess, theoretically possible that this could be the case, but we assume that it would be fairly unlikely for most of you. So this is just something to be thinking about as you're filling out the state profile section of your reports this year and trying to be sure you've entered the information correctly.

I hope all this makes sense. Apologies--I know it's a difficult issue to explain over the phone. Okori, can you unmute the lines for a minute to see if anyone has any questions?

### **Questions from the States**

**Mona Barnes, CO** – Julie this is Mona Barnes.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes Mona.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – I'm sorry you might have said this, I stepped out for just a second. So, for the residential classification does it have to be just where juveniles might be held or is it even adult residential areas in a jail that would count?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Right, residential is residential. So it doesn't matter if the area is adult or juvenile.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – Okay thanks.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – And there is a definition of residential that was provided in the glossary of the new [technical assistance tool](#) if anyone needs to refresh their memories. But basically it says that residential means an area that has beds or something like a bed where detainees are able to lay down and spend the night. Of course, the second piece would be that the facility must have 24-hour operating capacity.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – Right.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** - And as I mentioned a couple of times previously, we have heard from a number of you who have said, "Well you know I don't know if we necessarily agree with that definition of residential. We think that maybe it's a little bit of a stretch to say that just because somebody has a bench in their police department that that makes them residential." And we want you to know that we have heard those concerns and as we are looking at the regulatory process moving forward, that is definitely an issue we're considering and that is certainly subject to review. So for those who have additional thoughts on that issue, please feel free to send them our way. Does anyone else have any questions?

**Mike Rollins, AL** – Julie-

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** –Yes, go ahead.

**Mike Rollins, AL** – Julie, this is Mike from Alabama. How are you?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Good. How are you?

**Mike Rollins, AL** – Good, fine thanks. Just a quick question. If we had a finding on a federal audit, and of course we have already submitted our proposed reaction to correct that finding, the documentation to show where that finding has been corrected, should it be submitted separately from the annual report or with it or what is the deal there?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** - Documentation to show if the finding--

**Mike Rollins, AL** – Where the finding from a federal audit was resolved and was in the state.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – So, generally that is going to be information, it kind of depends on what the finding is, but in general most of the time findings can be addressed through edits to your Compliance Monitoring Policies and Procedures Manual. That would be the most common way to address a finding.

**Mike Rollins, AL** – So you guys do not need anything submitted with the annual report? In our case, it was just visits to correctional facilities, which have now been resolved. So, you do not need anything submitted with or prior to the annual report to address that? Just that is what I am hearing.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – It depends, but generally the audit response process is separate from the application process.

**Mike Rollins, AL** – Okay, all right, thank you.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – And we have a response that I believe you submitted to your audit.

**Mike Rollins, AL** – Right. Well that response was our plan to fix it and now that it has been fixed, I didn't know if you needed a follow up response to show how it had in fact been fixed. So anyway I will deal with that. Thank you.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Sure.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – Julie I have a quick question. This is Ryan from Oregon.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – A law enforcement facility that operates 24/7 but is statutorily prohibited from having any person detained beyond four hours, classified as residential or non-residential?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Okay, so repeat that for me again. They are? Say that one more time.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – Law enforcement agencies generally operate 24/7.



**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Okay.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – But some states have statutes which direct that no individual can be detained beyond four hours. So, they are temporary holding facilities by nature and so I don't know if you are looking at those as qualifying for residential facilities because they operate 24/7, but no individual will be there beyond four hours.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** - I am assuming they have beds or benches or something along those lines as well?

**Ryan Shands, OR** – I mean it would be a real stretch to try to say that they had any ability to accommodate overnight.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – You can definitely submit that question to us in writing if you want a more formal response, but my initial thought would be that the issue of whether they are residential or non-residential is independent of any law that limits the amount of time that a juvenile can be held. I have in the past kind of used the example of speed limits. Just because the speed limit is 55 on a particular highway, we do not automatically assume that no one ever goes over 55 miles an hour when they are driving on that highway. So although there might be a statutory limitation on how long a juvenile can be held in a facility, we do not automatically assume that there is no chance that there could still be a violation at that particular facility under some sort of an exceptional circumstance.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – Alright.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – If that makes sense, sure. Any other questions about this residential issue that I was mentioning earlier?

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Hi, this is Marcy from Pennsylvania. Hi Julie.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Hi.

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – I came in kind of late on the call and I just want to clarify if I heard correctly, when you were referencing question three and question five in the Compliance Monitoring Tool, were you saying that the numbers that we put in there should or should not be the same for each question?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – So what I was saying was, in most instances, I would assume that they would be different. Now, I don't want to say definitively that there could never be a circumstance where all of the adult lockups that you have in your entire state are residential, for example. But, in general, I'd think it would be the case that there would be some lockups, some police stations that have residential capacity and some police stations that do not have residential capacity. So we expect, when we are looking at the state profile section filled out, that some of your adult lockups would meet the definition of a secure detention or secure correctional facility and some of them would not. Does that help?

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Thank you. Yes for sure. Thank you. Can I ask a follow up?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes.

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – You made reference to the new TA tool.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes.

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – The new technical assistance tool, is that available on the OJJDP website?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes, it is.

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Okay.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – I don't have my-

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Is that what it is called or something else?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – I think that it is, hold on. I think I have it here in front of me. It is called, "[An Overview of Statutory and Regulatory Requirements for Monitoring Facilities for Compliance with the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders, Separation and Jail Removal Provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevent Act](#)".

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – September 2019, right?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – September 2019, yes, which is kind of why we refer to it as the TA tool for short.

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Okay, yes. I have that. I thought there was something different up there. Okay, thank you. I'm sorry.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – And I am just, actually Kathy is sitting here next to me and she just opened up the website so I could verify the location. It is on our website, on the [Core Requirements page](#), and it is under the Guidance and Resources tab. There is a little plus (+) sign and if you just click on that plus sign you will see the document there.

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Right, thank you so much.

### **Detain/Confine Updates**

**Julie Herr, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Sure. Any other questions about this issue? Okay, great. So, moving right along to a related issue that we just wanted to give everyone a heads up about. Many of you that I've talked to have indicated that you were holding off on making full updates to your Compliance Monitoring Policies and Procedures Manual pending release of the TA tool that Marcy and I referenced a few minutes ago, which we actually distributed in Kansas City back in September. We have been having some discussions here internally, as we were preparing to review Category 1 materials, about to what extent we would require everyone to have incorporated detain and confine updates into your compliance manuals and monitoring universes. The answer is that a decision was made to give one final pass to those of you who do not have this information fully incorporated into your materials yet. We know that not that much time has passed yet since we were all in Kansas City together last fall.

That said, we wanted to give everyone a heads up so you are fully prepared that next year will be very

important. You will need to be sure, by that time, that all new detain and confine information has been integrated into your manual. So, for example, if I turn to your manual's section on classification, there should be some discussion about how you determine, for each entity in your monitoring universe, whether it contains a secure detention or correctional facility, an institution, or an adult jail or lockup, which, as you know, is critical to determining where you can have a DSO violation, a separation violation, and a jail removal violation.

So hopefully, now that everyone has the TA tool in hand and we've had a few OJJDP trainings on the subject, you are feeling more comfortable with how to make those updates to your manuals. But we just wanted to give you a heads up that come next year at this time, we're going to be looking for that information and if we review your materials and we don't find it, then it most likely is going to be a change request. So, we don't want to have anyone next year unexpectedly finding out that you only have a three day turn around for example on getting your manuals fully updated with all of the detain and confine information because that would be a really big job in a short timeframe. So this is just something to keep in mind over the next year so you have plenty of time to plan and prepare.

Along with the narrative parts of your manual that need to be updated, you will also want to be sure that your Compliance Monitoring Universe has been fully updated in terms of all of the classifications. For those of you who were in Baltimore, I provided a sample Compliance Monitoring Universe that had some suggestions on how you might be able to maintain the way your universe is currently organized and still add that required information, hopefully without having to start all over from scratch. So if anyone would like us to send out another copy of that, we can.

We did send it out via email at some point after that conference, but we are certainly more than happy to share the information with you again. Essentially, this document showed how you could add a few columns at the end of your monitoring universe chart--which I think is how most of you have your universes set up--where you could indicate with check marks or X's for each entity, whether it contains a secure detention or correctional facility, an institution, and an adult jail or lockup. So again, if anyone would like another copy, if that would be helpful, then let me know and we can definitely send it out again. Be aware that it is not a requirement that you use this format. If you have another format for presenting the information that you think would be easier or makes more sense for you then you are certainly welcome to do that. Our intent is not to be prescriptive about how you provide the information, but we just wanted to be sure that you know this is something we will be looking at when we evaluate your Category 1 materials next year.

So, Okori, if you want to unmute the lines, we will see if anyone has any questions.

**Okori Christopher, CCAS** – The lines are open now.

### **Questions from the States**

**Mona Barnes, CO** – Hey Julie.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – So on that training tool that you were just referencing, the one with the long name, that only covers JJDP (Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act) right? Not the JJRA (Juvenile Justice Reform Act)?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Correct. We are working on hopefully trying to get that document updated with all the JJRA changes as well.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – Okay.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – But as you know, it took a fairly long time for us to get it approved with just the JJDP stuff in there.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – yes, I recall that.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes, I figured you would, but yes, we are working on that as well.

**Mona Barnes, CO** – Okay, thanks.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Any other questions? So is there anyone who does not have a copy of the sample monitoring universe and would like to have one?

**Marty Brown, NC** – Julie, this Marty Brown from North Carolina. Yes, North Carolina would like a copy.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Okay great. Well we will send that out. I'm sorry, someone started to ask a question?

**Marcy Szumanski, PA** – Pennsylvania would like one.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Okay, yes, absolutely.

**Jared Morris, DE** – Delaware would also like a copy.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – We will be sure to send the document out over the listserv so it comes to everyone. We will maybe include it when we send out the notes for today's call. Any other questions about that or anything else? We are at the end of our agenda for today. So if anyone has other questions at this point then I am happy to try to answer those and if not, then we will give you a little bit of time back so you can have some fun working on your Category 2 data submissions.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – Hey Julie.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – This is Ryan from Oregon.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – I had a question I was hoping that OJJDP could provide some clarity on around how we are defining in a little bit more detail the adult inmate definition under the JJRA.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes, you know what, Ryan? I actually have a short write-up that summarizes how we believe that adult inmate definition has changed. And I think we have provided that information to a few states that emailed questions, but it's probably information that should go out to everyone. So I'm going to check and see if there's a way we can get that summary out to everyone, because that whole adult inmate definition I know has raised questions for a lot of folks. Would that be helpful?

**Ryan Shands, OR** - Yes it would. As of right now I am operating under the old definition still which I do not think is helpful.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – No, and unfortunately, we were not super-happy with the way that definition was worded. It's very, very confusing and I'm not sure Congress ended up accomplishing what they intended to accomplish with that language. But they certainly succeeded in making a lot of people very confused, including some of us. We have actually spent a lot of time poring through that language and trying to figure it out. So yes, I will see if I can share some of the explanatory language we were able to come up with.

**Ryan Shands, OR** – Thank you, Julie.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Other questions?

**Chris Yeager, MO** – Hey Julie, it is Chris from Missouri. Do we have a timeline for the new regulation?

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** - We do not, unfortunately. I wish that I could be more specific for you than that, but we certainly hope to get a new regulation issued and we are going to be doing our best to get that accomplished as quickly as we can. But unfortunately, I do not have a timeline as it stands right now. We will definitely keep you all posted on that though.

**Chris Yeager, MO** – I appreciate it. I am getting lots of questions and I think we are going to have to do some statutory changes to stay on the road and the sooner the better, it would be helpful.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Yes, but you know I will say, as we're starting to get into that process, for those of you who have thoughts about things that you would like for us to consider with the new regulation, things that you might have concerns about, all of those kinds of issues, I would urge you to send that information our way because, as we are working through that process, it is always helpful to know sooner rather than later about any major concerns or issues you have. So, please feel free to share that information with your grant manager.

**Dr. TeNeane Bradford, OJJDP** – Julie, this is TeNeane, if I could just piggyback. So, there is an extension to draft obviously the regulations and get the updated TA tool done. We are in the middle of training now. We actually just concluded and will be engaging our partners and legal to begin that work. So more to come, more definitively as we check back in with our leadership for how we will proceed, but I know that the intention is to try to have something drafted before the end of the year.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Thanks. Great, thank you, TeNeane. Okay, any final questions before we let you all go and enjoy the day?

**Elizabeth Morris, VT** – This is Elizabeth from Vermont. I was just wondering if you had a date for when the eligibility determination letter for Category 1 would be sent to us via email.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – So, I do not believe we have established a specific date for when they are going to go out. Do you know TeNeane?

**Dr. TeNeane Bradford, OJJDP** – Yes, I am hoping Brittane is still on the line so she can pull the timeline out. But we do have a save the date. So is she still there?

**Brittane Ford, OJJDP** – Yes, I am still on. One second to pull up the timeline. One second, my computer is acting a little bit crazy.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – We are still here.

**Mike Rollins, AL** – While she's looking for that, there was a mention earlier that the roll call would be updated at the end of the call. I got on a little late after Alabama was called. I just want to make sure that we were represented as being on the call.

**Julie Herr, OJJDP** – Absolutely, we have that information.

**Brittane Ford, OJJDP** – Sorry for the delay, the timeline for that. So, I believe it is towards the end of the month so that we can give you guys enough time...

**Katie Penkoff, CCAS** – Brittane, you are cutting in and out just a little bit.

**Dr. TeNeane Bradford, OJJDP** – Julie, this is TeNeane. We will get you that out on the listserv as soon as possible. Okay? The date for when you get your eligible or not eligible letter. Apologies.

**Elizabeth Morris, VT** – All right, thank you.

### **Closing and Final Roll Call**

#### **Julie Herr, State Program Manager, OJJDP, SRAD**

Go ahead. Okay so any other questions? Okay. Great. Well thank you all so, so much for joining us this afternoon. Hope you are enjoying some of the same early Spring weather that we are here in D.C. It has been great. If anyone is planning to come for cherry blossoms this year, well maybe not with everything going on, but I was just going to say if you are you, probably want to come earlier rather than later because it has been super, super warm here so. Anyway, again, thank you all for joining us and I am just going to turn it over to Katie now.

**Katie Penkoff, CCAS** – Thank you so much, Julie. We want to thank OJJDP and the State Relations and Assistance Division for a great call and thank you all for attending and wish you all wonderful rest of your day. Thank you so much.