

**STATE OF NEVADA COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
(BATTERER'S TREATMENT CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE)**

RURAL ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

**MINUTES**

*Thursday, January 10, 2013, at 3:00p.m.*

Public Access: **Via Teleconference**  
Office of the Attorney General  
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202  
Reno, NV 89511

**Please Note:** The Committee on Domestic Violence 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. The Committee may convene in closed session to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person. (NRS 241.030)

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 the 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, establish quorum.**

Members Present  
Kareen Prentice  
Sue Meuschke

Members Absent  
Cheryl Hunt

Attorney General's Office  
Jennifer Kandt, Admin.  
Henna Rasul, Sr. Deputy AG  
Public

**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. \*Review, amend, and approve minutes of meetings (for possible action).**

a) October 18, 2012

Motion: Sue moved to approve the minutes. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Kareen

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**4. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding obtaining information on convictions and caseloads from rural communities (for possible action).**

Jennifer stated that this item was on the agenda as it was her understanding that the subcommittee wanted to discuss alternative ways to get caseload and conviction information. She said that Robin Sweet had previously indicated that the courts do track this information, but were not releasing it at this time, as there appeared to be issues with the data.

There was discussion on whether the subcommittee wanted to send a letter to all the courts requesting the information, and Kareen indicated that all of the courts were already going to be receiving information on a new form to help with assessment collection tracking and she said she would be hesitant about sending them two requests at once.

There was further discussion that this new form would list the number of full payments and partial payments which could be a way to look at conviction numbers. Sue cautioned that it would not give any indication to the number of individuals convicted but paying nothing. There was general consensus that the subcommittee review the data that will be collected from the courts through this new form, and continue to request data from the AOC.

**5. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding ideas for increasing treatment options in rural areas. This item will include discussion of possible changes to NAC 228 (for possible action).**

Jennifer stated that at the last meeting the subcommittee discussed the possibility of changing the NAC to allow for all of the observation hours to be completed via distance media. She stated that she had been asked to reach out to providers to ask whether current certified agencies would even be willing to set this up and if there could be any potential costs. Jennifer read the responses from providers as follows:

Written response from Fran Zito: "I attempted to observe groups in the Reno area and no one called me back. I was willing to go to Vegas and spend a week there

to accomplish this but they wanted \$60.00 a group to observe and it was cost prohibitive with the cost of housing and travel.”

Written response from Walt Dimitroff: “I’ve done that in the past providing live Skype sessions to people in Winnemucca, Elko and Ely so that they could become certified. At that time, you might remember, I had a contract with the state to get rural agencies up and running. We were also successful in providing a training for the Ce hours out in Ely. So it’s doable. We did it with a hard wired laptop and a faster broad band connection. It worked pretty well, although a wide angle lens is helpful so that the observers can take in the entire group. As far as fees go I’d be willing to do it nominally if there is an appetite.”

Written response from Eileen Atkinson: “Healing Our Future, Inc. would be agreeable with supervisors ok. However, we would expect the costs to be handled by those observing. The observation would have to be limited and no reproduction allowed. The purpose would be for training only. This may be a step toward internet DV programs. It would have to be seriously restrictive to avoid the possibility of this step.”

Written response from Tim Hamilton: “With our current budget crunch I don't see us investing in the equipment to provide this capacity from our side.”

There was additional discussion regarding the possible change to NAC to allow for all of the observation hours to be completed via distance media. Jennifer indicated that she had talked with Mr. Sorenson from Rural Mental Health in Ely and that he indicated that while this could be helpful in getting someone trained, that there biggest issue is turnover with staff. Jennifer said that there was probably very little the subcommittee could do to alleviate that issue.

Sue suggested meeting with Rural Mental Health to discuss certification. It was requested that Jennifer try to set up a meeting with them in March. There was further discussion that the subcommittee should move forward with recommending the change to allow for all of the observation hours to be done via distance media, but that conversations with Rural Mental Health may result in further suggested changes.

Motion: Sue moved to recommend to the full Committee that NAC be amended to allow for all observation hours to be completed via distance media in counties with fewer than 50,000 people and further than 50 miles from a certified agency.

2<sup>nd</sup>: Kareen

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

## **6. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.**

There was general consensus that all items remain on the agenda and that a discussion of Rural Mental Health meetings become 5a on the agenda. Additionally, there was general consensus that the next meeting be scheduled for April or May.

**7. 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)

**8. \*Adjournment (for possible action).**

Motion: Sue moved to adjourn. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Kareen

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.