

Nevada VINE (Victim Information Notification Everyday)

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Monday, February 13, 2012 at 1:00p.m.

Via Video Conference:

Office of the Attorney General

Grant Sawyer Building

555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 4500

Las Vegas, Nevada

and

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
Lynne Cavalieri, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Catherine Krause, DPS

Governance Committee Members Absent:

Christine Davis, Executive Assistant to the Governor
Sue Meuschke, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence

Other Individuals Present:

Jennifer Kandt, Grant Accountant
Henna Rasul, Nevada Attorney General's Office
Frank Adams, Law Enforcement Liaison
Tom Nielson, Appriss

2. 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)</p>
--

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

a) November 7, 2011

Motion: Brett moved to approve the minutes. 2nd: Kathy

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

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

Frank reported that he had been meeting with agencies and that the project was moving forward. He stated that he had been contacted by Douglas County regarding an issue, but that he hadn't been able to talk to anyone yet regarding the issue.

Jennifer stated that the issue may have been resolved as Douglas County had gone down a couple of weeks prior and that there had been significant problems with how Appriss handled the situation. Jennifer stated that she was providing the agency with a breakdown of the steps that are supposed to occur during an outage so the agency is aware should anything happen in the future.

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

Jennifer stated that the financial tables provided were current through the end of December. She stated that the grant had expended \$505,718.70 and had offered \$656,411.64 in match dollars. She stated that the tables show how the match has substantially increased with the addition of Washoe County into the statewide system.

Jennifer reminded members to fill out the match forms, and to complete the sexual harassment training required by the governor and to return the acknowledgement form.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding options for Justice Exchange in Nevada.

Jennifer stated that a presentation had been given on Justice Exchange to the sheriffs and their had been some negative feedback. She stated that the governance committee had decided at the last meeting that there needed to be an agenda item discussing the product, and if any action was needed by the governance committee.

Tom Nielson from Appriss stated that while a previous comment had been made that VINE was separate from Justice Exchange, that was not entirely accurate as the data in Justice Exchange comes from the data generated by the VINE system. He stated that Justice Exchange is an investigative tool useful for locating offenders without having to go to multiple websites. Additionally, he stated that the system allows officers to set up "watches" for individuals that would alert the officer if the offender was booked.

Traci asked about the costs.

Tom stated that Nevada access is free to any sheriff who provides data to VINE, but that nationwide access required a license fee of \$85 per month per license.

Lynne asked Catherine how she thought this differed from NDEX. Catherine stated that NDEX would not have corrections data, and that NDEX would be investigative data that had been entered, but not necessarily all the data from jail management systems.

Tom stated that NDEX draws all of its booking data from Justice Exchange. There was additional discussion that offenders currently in custody or out of custody within 14 days will show in VINELink, but that Justice Exchange keeps a permanent record of when and where the individual was in custody.

Frank stated that he thought this would be a very beneficial tool to law enforcement.

Traci clarified that if a sheriff was interested in participating that they could contact Tom for access.

There was further discussion that each sheriff could decide individually if they are wanting to participate in Justice Exchange. There was also discussion that parole and probation would have free access since they would also contribute data.

Brett commented that he felt this item was information only and that Justice Exchange is outside the scope of the governance committee, the grant, and the contract with Appriss.

Frank said that he thought at one point there was concern about something within the contract for VINE that would prohibit agencies from participating, and asked Tom what that provision would be.

Tom stated that he was not an attorney, but that he did not see anything within the agreement that would preclude agencies from participating. He said he thought at one point there was concern about gaming laws that prohibited sharing of data between law enforcement agencies. He said he spent a great deal of time trying to find that language, but has been unsuccessful.

Frank stated that he wanted to make sure there was nothing standing in the way of sheriffs participating if they want to.

Henna stated that she did not think that Justice Exchange was even mentioned in the Appriss contract and that she felt it would be an agency's individual decision.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding future project funding and updates from the Funding Subcommittee.

Brett stated that he chaired the subcommittee, and that there had been two meetings since they were established. He stated that they looked at the initial cost letter that would be sent to participating agencies detailing potential costs should they need to be shifted to the agency. He said that the letter had been sent only to agencies that were online. Brett stated that there is concern about the SAVIN grant expiring December 2012, and that if there is going to be any funding through legislation, that wouldn't take effect until June 2013. He said that there have been meetings with the grant administrators of VAWA, VOCA, and JAG to see if any of those grants could assist with funding through June 2013. Brett stated that he and Keith Munro had met with the VAWA administrator who had put aside a portion of prosecution funds for this purpose. He said that he thought prosecution money could be used as prosecutor's offices have duties regarding victim notification. He also said that utilizing those funds would be limited to registrations against VAWA eligible offenses, so that it would only be able to fund a portion of their service. He also said it appeared that VOCA funds could be used for the project as well.

Kareen said that other states are using VOCA funds to pay for VINE, but that they would have to work on getting required data from VINEWATCH for VOCA reporting. Kareen stated that the office would be applying for VOCA funds and as part of the grant would request funding for a VINE program manager and victim advocate within the Attorney General's office.

Jennifer stated that she had also met with Keith Munro and Director Perry regarding JAG funding and that the meeting was very positive. She said Director Perry thought that there could be funding available through JAG, but there wasn't mention of how much.

Brett commented that it was his understanding that the office was going to seek another extension on the SAVIN grant and concurrently use STOP funding to get the project through June 2013. He also stated that he thought the office would be moving forward with legislation, but that it was still in the initial stages of development. He said that he also thought it was possible that the parole board would possibly be looking at legislation.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding vinewatch access for VINE participating agencies.

Jennifer stated that this item was on the agenda as there has been a lot of questions and discussion regarding who should have access to VINEWATCH within an agency and additionally, if agencies would be able to view data from other agencies. Jennifer stated that this should probably be referred to the Sheriff's and Chief's for discussion and recommendation, but wanted to get the governance committee's thoughts first.

Brett indicated that he would be attending the next Sheriff's and Chief's meeting and would be willing to discuss any VINE items at the meeting.

Kareen stated that she felt this decision would ultimately need to be decided upon by those agencies, so discussion at the meeting would be great.

Kathy asked if the people with VINEWATCH access could view information on the victim registrations.

Jennifer indicated that there is the option of allowing those with VINEWATCH access to view registration details. She stated that the system is anonymous, but that email addresses and phone numbers are shown. She said it might be useful to have guidelines in places regarding who should be able to view the data within each agency.

Kathy stated that she had concerns about victim data being visible to law enforcement.

Traci stated that she had a victim registered within DOC who had moved several times to avoid contact from the offender and his family who reside within Nye

County and have connections within Nye County Sheriff's Office. She stated that if her phone number was visible to deputies in Nye County there would be the potential for that information to get back to the offender.

Frank stated that the purpose of all of these systems is to share information, and that VINEWATCH has an audit trail to see who has accessed the information.

Kareen stated that the system is promoted as anonymous, so having access to the back end information causes concern for some victim advocates.

Brett stated that he could also see the potential for liability if the scenario Traci detailed resulted in any harm to the victim who assumed the system was anonymous.

There was discussion that access is easily set-up to block registration information, and every person within each agency can have different levels of access.

There was further discussion that Brett would briefly present this issue at the next Sheriffs' and Chiefs' meeting with the idea that if any sheriff has a concern over the issue or wants more information, they can contact Jennifer. Additionally, Bob suggested that a list of issues for review by the sheriffs be drafted and presented at the meeting.

9. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding charges and bail amounts appearing on vinelink.

Kareen suggested that this item also be referred to the sheriffs. She stated that the sheriffs offices that participated in the recent trainings requested that charge details and bail amounts be posted on vinelink for the public to be able to see. Kareen said that the agencies had indicated that they receive more phone calls requesting bail amounts than any other call and if that information can be pushed over, that it would be helpful to them.

Jennifer stated that if the agency is pushing out data on charges and bail amounts, that information can be released by the VINE operators, but it is not currently available on the website.

There was general consensus that the matter be presented to the sheriffs' and chiefs' and if they would like bail amounts and charges to show up, then Appriss can be contacted to see if it is possible to list those on vinelink.

10. Updates on Public Service Announcements.

Kareen stated that the Public Service Announcements were filmed in October and that they were sent back for edits and revisions which are now starting to come back. Kareen said that she was hoping that VINE would go live in Clark County during Victims' Rights Week, and that the PSA's could be released at that point.

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

Kathy stated that the subcommittee met in January and reviewed some of the public service announcements, and discussed upcoming trainings.

Jennifer thanked Maxine for all of her help with getting people to attend the trainings in her counties.

Maxine stated that there was good attendance and good participation.

There was brief discussion that additional promotional materials had been ordered. It was also mentioned that Appriss would be working with agencies to get a link to VINE from agency websites and links to VINE through agency phone systems.

12. Comments from Chair.

Traci thanked everyone for their time and effort on the project. She also said that DOC was going to be going live next week.

13. Discussion regarding future agenda items and meeting dates.

Brett requested that a meeting date not be set until there are issues needing to be addressed.

There was discussion that the PSA's, funding letter, and list of concerns could be provided to the governance committee as an update.

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.