

Nevada VINE (Victim Information Notification Everyday)

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Monday, November 7, 2011 at 1:00p.m.

Location:

Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Mock Courtroom
Carson City, Nevada

Please Note: The Nevada VINE Governance Committee may 1) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; 2) combine items for consideration by the public body; and 3) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time.

Public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but at the discretion of the chair, may be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will be available before any action items are heard by the public body and then once again prior to adjournment of the meeting. The Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his/her sole discretion. Once all items on the agenda are completed the meeting will adjourn. Prior to the commencement and conclusions of a contested case or a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public comment.

***Asterisks (*) denote items on which Committee may take action.
Action by the Committee on an item may be to approve,
deny, amend, or table.***

- 1. Call to order, roll call of members, introduction of new members, establishment of quorum.**

Governance Committee Members Present:

Traci Dory, Department of Corrections
Susie Lewis, Henderson Police Department
Maxine Lantz, White Pine County Victim/Witness Services (VIA Telephone)
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman
Kathy Jacobs, Crisis Call Center
Brett Kandt, Nevada Prosecution Advisory Council
Tom Ely, Parole and Probation

Monica Howk, Board of Parole Commissioners (VIA Telephone)
Robert Roshak, Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association

Governance Committee Members Absent:

Christine Davis, Executive Assistant to the Governor
Lynne Cavalieri, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Sue Meuschke, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence

Other Individuals Present:

Jennifer Kandt, Grant Accountant
Henna Rasul, Nevada Attorney General's Office
Catherine Krause, DPS
Lalla O'Brien, Appriss
Karen Williams, Appriss
Bruce Bridges, Appriss
Frank Adams, Law Enforcement Liaison

2. Public Comment.

Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)

3. *Election of new chair and vice-chair to the Nevada VINE Governance Committee. (for possible action)

Motion: Kareen moved to nominate Traci. 2nd: Brett
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Traci abstained.

Motion: Traci moved to nominate Kareen. 2nd: Brett
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Kareen abstained.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding minutes of the following meetings:

a) September 12, 2011

Motion: Brett moved to approve. 2nd: Maxine
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

5. Introduction of Appriss attendees and project updates from Appriss.

Karen Williams reported that they were on schedule to bring 3 agencies on-line the month of November, and 3 more were on schedule for December. She stated that a VINEWatch Webinar was being scheduled for all agencies that had recently come on-line.

It was also reported that White Pine, Storey, Lincoln, and Washoe had come on-line since the last Governance Committee meeting.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding reports and updates on current project status. (Frank Adams).

Frank stated that he had begun his work on the project by meeting with various agencies. He stated that he met with Carson, Douglas, Mesquite, Mineral, Esmeralda, Lyon, Churchill, Storey, and Lincoln counties. He reported that Carson was excited to move forward but that there had been some hold ups with Tiburon. He reported that there were agencies that were transitioning to Spillman and that Appriss would need to work with them to transition those agencies.

Frank reported that the Nye County Sheriff seemed ready to move forward after the Spillman install was complete. He also said that he had been to the Courts Conference with Jennifer and answered questions on the VINE project while attending. Frank stated that he presented on VINE at the Sheriffs' and Chiefs' meeting. He said that Tom Nielson from Appriss had attended with him to present on Justice Exchange. Frank told Henna that she needed to look at the State's contract with Appriss and work on getting changes made so that Appriss can share the data for Justice Exchange.

Henna stated that there is standard language in the State's contracts concerning ownership of data, and that she was not sure if that language could be modified.

Frank said that he felt Justice Exchange was vital to law enforcement and that there needed to be a change to allow Appriss to provide the product.

Kareen requested further information on Justice Exchange and a future agenda item to discuss it, and possibly invite Tom Nielson to present.

Brett said that based on some of the comments made at the Sheriffs' and Chiefs' meeting, he felt it was important to remember that the VINE Project is separate from Justice Exchange and that Justice Exchange was completely independent of this project.

There was further discussion that a change in the contract with Appriss for VINE would not be needed, as an entirely separate contract would be required for Justice Exchange. Henna stated that purchasing would have to be involved in the conversation in determining whether the contract language could be amended.

Brett commented that it also appeared that several law enforcement agencies had some reservations about Justice Exchange.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding SAVIN grant expenditures and match requirements (Jennifer Kandt).

Jennifer reported that \$438,601.99 had been expended and that \$378,351.99 had been offered in Match. She also stated that Washoe County had recently come on-line and that because they were such a large agency, it would make a huge impact on the overall Match dollars.

Jennifer said that she was still working on getting back some of the MOU's, but that it was mostly the larger agencies that had not yet returned them as those agencies had lengthy approval processes.

Additionally, Jennifer stated that she hoped to have all equipment purchases completed by the end of the fiscal year for all agencies.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding future project funding.

Jennifer stated that one thing that had been discussed was the possibility of sending out a letter to agencies letting them know what their potential costs could be should the Attorney General's Office not be able to secure future funding. Jennifer said that she had been asked to come up with possible costs to fund a Governance Committee and Program Officer. She said the breakdown for the agencies would be included with the letter.

There was discussion that the letter be hand delivered as opposed to sent in the mail. It was pointed out that agencies have requested to know what their potential costs might be so that they can plan their budgets accordingly.

Brett stated that he thought it might be a good idea to make sure that Frank let each of the Sheriffs know that if they had questions or concerns they could contact the Attorney General directly, and that possibly the Attorney General would be willing to attend a Sheriffs' and Chiefs' meeting to discuss. Kareen said she would check into whether the AG could attend the February Sheriffs' and Chiefs' meeting in Henderson.

Jennifer stated that the \$188,850.00 was the bare minimum amount that would be needed for the statewide system, and that if agencies pay separately outside of the statewide system, the costs double.

Tom Ely questioned the "number of beds" for Parole and Probation, and there was discussion that 17,000 was an estimate of the number of people supervised by Parole and Probation. Tom questioned the cost for the agency and asked what they would be getting for that money.

Traci explained that it would increase the number of notifications made to victims and would take the burden off of officers to make notifications to victims.

There was some discussion on the OTIS database and the fact that it is going to be replaced within the next year and a half. Tom expressed concern that they were already entering data into both OTIS and now Spillman. There was clarification that VINE would interface with one of those databases and that additional entry would not be needed.

Lalla said she felt it would be important to hand deliver the letter as the cost aspect of VINE can cause anxiety for agencies. Additionally, she recommended that this letter or a subsequent letter suggest to agencies that they consider utilizing their phone vendors to charge fees to offenders. For instance, charging offenders two cents per minute, or 25 cents per call.

Lalla said that South Carolina had a model program that is very well funded, and that Appriss could provide information on that program and assist Nevada with any lobbying efforts if requested. She also stated that many states are using VOCA funds to pay for VINE.

Kareen stated that the VOCA administrator had attended a previous Governance Committee meeting and that the VOCA grant would be one that would be explored further, and that a presentation on VINEWATCH would be given to the administrator to see if it could meet their needs for statistics. Kareen also said that court assessment fees could also be explored. She also said that the national VOCA administrator said he could come to Nevada to help with exploring using VOCA funds if needed.

There was discussion that the JAG grant would also be explored.

Lalla recommended creating a funding subcommittee to really address the funding issue.

Motion: Brett moved to create a funding subcommittee. 2nd: Tom Ely

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Brett, Bob, and Tom agreed to serve on the subcommittee with Brett serving as chair.

9. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review of resource list (Kareen Prentice).

Kareen requested that Committee members review the list that has been put together and check the information for errors and omissions. She stated that the list would be broken down by county on the VINE website.

Maxine stated that No to Abuse should be removed from Lincoln County.

There was discussion that this list would need constant update and review.

Susie stated that the Henderson page should include the victim advocates and the main number. She recommended several changes to the list.

Kareen said she would send the list to Kathy for review, and that she would send a reminder to Susie to provide some additional numbers.

10. Updates on Public Service Announcements.

Jennifer and Kareen reported that Appriss sent someone out to film and record several PSA's in the north and in the south. It was reported that Undersheriff Vinger, Sheriff Watts, Suzanne Ramos, Director Cox, Sheriff Gillespie, and Chief Freeman all participated in the filming. She also said that press releases continue to go out regarding agencies that come online.

11. Update from the Marketing and Promotions subcommittee (Kathy Jacobs).

Kathy reported that the subcommittee had met October 20th and had discussed the PSA's, the promotional materials, and community trainings.

Kareen stated that cups had been ordered, and it was recommended that brochures, tear-off pads, or informational cards be placed inside the cups prior to handing them out.

Brett thanked Jennifer and Traci for presenting to the prosecutors at a recent conference, and stated that the presentation was very well received.

12. Comments from Chair.

13. Discussion regarding future agenda items and meeting dates.

There was general consensus that Justice Exchange be discussed and that the Funding Subcommittee give an update.

Kathy suggested that the Funding Subcommittee look at the Check Fraud Diversion money administered by the DA's.

Next meeting date was set for February 13th at 1:00 p.m.

14. Public Comment.

| |
|--|
| <p>Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020). Public Comment may be limited to 3 minutes per person.</p> |
|--|

15. *Adjournment. (for possible action)

Motion: Brett moved to adjourn. 2nd: Kathy

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.