

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

**MINUTES**

**Thursday, August 15, 2013, at 10:00a.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  
Courtroom  
Carson City, Nevada

**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, establish quorum.**

Meeting called to order at 10:07a.m. by Tim Hamilton.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Attorney General’s Office</u>
Tim Hamilton	Meri Shadley	Henna Rasul, Senior DAG
Lt. Robert Lundquist	Cheryl Hunt	Jennifer Kandt, Admin. Coord.
Sue Meuschke	Neil Rombardo	Kareen Prentice, Ombudsman

Members Present

Traci Dory  
Carol Ferranti  
Judge Bunch

Public

Walt Dimitroff, ACCS  
Dr. Michael Freda, Ridgeview Counseling  
Craig Merrill, Sierra Counseling

**2. Public comment.**

Dr. Freda requested that items pertaining to Ridgeview Counseling be taken out of order.

**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. Conduct workshop to solicit comments from interested persons on proposed regulation changes to Chapter 228 of the Nevada Administrative Code regarding the following topics:**

a) NAC 228.XXX - Adopting a definition for "indigent".

Walt Dimitroff questioned the suggested language as he stated that based on how it read it appeared that the determination of indigent would be made at the beginning of the program and does not say anything about changing the status as the program progresses. Judge Bunch suggested that providers get together as a group to discuss a recommended schedule for re-evaluating indigent status. There was further discussion regarding changing the word, "applying" to "receiving". Jennifer said that the regulations had not been returned from LCB, so she would try to request the change prior to getting the regulations back from LCB to avoid having to do a revised proposed.

There was further discussion that this definition of indigent would then mean that the 5% requirement for programs would include clients that paid a reduced fee and no fee at all. There was also discussion about not being able to turn away clients that are indigent, and that "at least 5%" of the clients must be indigent.

Carol asked if any surveys had been done to providers on this issue, and Jennifer indicated that there had been prior surveys and that indigent and how to determine indigent as well as the 5% issue, was the number one concern of most providers.

Mr. Dimitroff stated that he would like to see the entire section eliminated and let competition rule as he did not know of any other boards that require licensees to provide services for free.

There was general consensus that a broader topic was being discussed which was not part of the regulation change and that an agenda item in the future could address the broader discussion.

b) NAC 228.110 – Amending qualifications for supervisors of treatment and providers of treatment.

Walt Dimitroff and Tim Hamilton commented that they liked the training topics. Dr. Freda asked if MFT training would satisfy the supervision training requirements and there was clarification that the training would need to be approved by the Committee.

c) NAC 228.115 – Amending language to clarify use of webcam supervision. Judge Bunch asked if providers were having a difficult time meeting the requirement within NAC 228.115 to review 10% of their files as he sees that as a common violation during site visits. There was discussion that the site reviewer may not randomly select files that had been reviewed as 90% of the files will not have been reviewed. Therefore, it would be possible that 10% had been reviewed, but that the site reviewer did not look at those particular files. Judge Bunch suggested that providers get together to standardize their paperwork and procedures, then bring suggestions back to the Committee.

Walt stated that Dr. Hughes has previously commented on standardizing certain aspects of forms. There was further discussion that the Committee could discuss this item in the future, and then possibly invite Dr. Hughes to attend a future meeting.

d) NAC 228.XXX - Adopting a new section pertaining to professional responsibility.

Walt Dimitroff asked if there had been problems with this as most people providing services are licensed in another form and already prohibited from this. Jennifer stated that the concern is that there are people who provide services who are not licensed.

e) NAC 228.130 – Amending language regarding timeline for submission of corrective action plans.

No comments were made under this section.

f) NAC 228.175 - Amending language to clarify contents of written agreement between offender and provider.

There was discussion surrounding the requirement for the offender to provide a copy of the police report. Judge Bunch requested that “if available” be added to that requirement. There was further discussion that if a defendant pleads guilty without a defense attorney, they will never be able to obtain a copy of the police report. Judge Bunch stated that the police report is provided to the defense attorney, but not to the offender.

Carol stated that police reports are available to persons listed in the report, but that certain information may be redacted including juvenile information. There was further discussion that certain jurisdictions are not releasing the reports.

Walt Dimitroff said that the police report provides valuable information at intake as offenders rarely disclose the full details of the incident, but that the police reports can be difficult to obtain, and he questions how much time should be devoted to obtaining the report.

Dr. Freda stated that this has been an issue since the inception of the Committee.

Judge Bunch suggested that this be a possible issue during the next legislative session to change NRS to require law enforcement to give the offender and/or victim a copy of the police report. He rescinded the request to add "if available" to NAC to the requirement to provide a police report. There was general consensus that this be a future agenda item.

g) NAC 228.210 – Amending language to require continuing education in supervision topics.

No comments on this item.

**4. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding review and approval of minutes of the following meetings (for possible action):**

a) May 23, 2013

Traci noted a correction to page 7 of the minutes. Jennifer stated that Cheryl had a correction to page 7 of the minutes as well.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**5. Updates by Domestic Violence Ombudsman Kareen Prentice.**

a) Budget

Kareen stated that the budget for FY2014/2015 was approximately \$1,000 less than previous year. She also stated that the expenditures do not include the recent invoice from Dr. Hughes of approximately \$7,000.

b) Court Assessments

Kareen stated that the FY2013 court assessments were down considerably from the previous two years. She stated that there was a new form in use that had been developed by the AOC, and that it is working and so far there is a good response. Judge Bunch stated that Austin Justice Court should be added to the spreadsheet.

c) Match

Kareen reminded members to fill out the match forms.

**6. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding ideas for increasing treatment in the rural areas. This item will include updates from the Rural Issues Subcommittee.**

Jennifer stated that there was a request from Victim Witness Services, LRS, and a Lincoln County judge regarding a pilot project to address the lack of batterers treatment in the rural areas.

Kareen stated that this issue came up during a meeting of the Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence in which several judges, Victim Witness Services, and Melissa Brown were in attendance. She said that they are very frustrated with the lack of treatment providers in their area.

Sue commented that one of the things needing to be done was to address some confusion with the requirements for out of state providers. Sue said that there seems to

be the idea that providers in other states have to meet Nevada's requirements as opposed to meeting their own state's requirements.

Kareen also said that there was discussion at the meeting regarding the Mesquite program not allowing providers to attend every other week, and that she had requested that Jennifer send out a reminder regarding that provision. Jennifer stated that part of the problem with that provision is that it states they can attend every other week for 3 hours and that the Mesquite program probably does not have back-to-back sessions.

Sue said that this discussion goes back to the long standing problem of how to address the lack of services in rural communities. She requested that this item be discussed by the Rural Issues Subcommittee and then brought back to the full Committee.

Jennifer stated that there probably needed to be research on doing a pilot project that could potentially violate the Committee's regulations and how that could be done.

Traci said she would have questions within the proposal as to where the funding would be coming from, and who would be letting the offenders into the court.

**7. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding treatment providers sending fees receivable to collection agencies.**

Tim indicated that this item was on the agenda at his request. He said it came about through the Safe Nest Board of Directors. He asked if there was anything that the Committee needed to approve, or if this was simply an independent business decision.

There was general consensus that this would be something that would be decided by the business as a matter of practice and that the Committee would not have any authority in the matter.

**8. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the following requests for domestic violence continuing education credits and/or formal training:**

- a. Application for 7 training credits

Michael Freda

"Blending Models of Intervention and Treatment for Persons who Commit Domestic Violence – Part I"

August 9, 2013 Reno, NV

(Reviewed by Neil Rombardo)

Jennifer stated that Neil provided a recommendation for approval of 7 perpetrator training credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Judge Bunch

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Application for 7 training credits  
Michael Freda  
“Blending Models of Intervention and Treatment for Persons who Commit Domestic Violence – Part II”  
January 10, 2014 Reno, NV  
(Reviewed by Neil Rombardo)

Jennifer stated that Neil provided a recommendation for approval of 7 perpetrator training credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Judge Bunch

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Application for 7 training credits  
Nevada Advisory Council for Prosecuting Attorneys  
“Effectively Investigating and Prosecuting Domestic Violence Strangulation”  
October 7-8, 2013 Reno, NV  
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval of 7 victim training credits.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. Application for 8 training credits  
Walter Dimitroff  
“Domestic Violence Group Therapist Training Part 1”  
August 18, 2013 Sparks, NV  
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 4 victim and 4 perpetrator training credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Application for 8 training credits  
Walter Dimitroff  
“Domestic Violence Group Therapist Training Part 2”  
August 25, 2013 Sparks, NV  
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 4 victim and 4 perpetrator training credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**9. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding requests for approval of the following providers:**

- a. Patricia Guzman  
ABC Therapy  
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**10. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding corrective action plans from the following agencies:**

- a. Healing Our Future  
Las Vegas, NV  
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke; Continued from May Meeting)

Sue stated that the agency had addressed the issues and she recommended approval.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Lt. Lundquist

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Mesa Family Counseling  
Las Vegas, NV  
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt; Continued from May Meeting)

Jennifer stated that a revised plan had not been received and that Cheryl recommended that this item be continued pending a revised corrective action plan.

Motion: Traci moved to continue. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**11. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following agencies:**

- a) Counseling Services Plus  
Las Vegas, NV  
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley; Continued from May Meeting)

Jennifer stated that the supervisor and providers still had not completed the required continuing education credits. Additionally, she stated that there needed to be clarification on the female co-facilitator and whether the person listed as their current supervisor was still providing services. There was discussion that there had already been a continuance, and that setting for a denial hearing would still allow the agency to remedy the deficiencies prior to the hearing.

Motion: Traci moved to deny re-certification and set for hearing. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- b) Healing Our Future  
Las Vegas, NV  
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke; Continued from May Meeting)

Sue recommended approval of the renewal application from May 31<sup>st</sup> to June 9, 2013.

Motion: Traci moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- c) ABC Therapy  
Las Vegas and Henderson, NV  
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- d) Ridgeview Counseling Group  
Reno, NV  
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim stated that there appeared to be a lack of face to face training credits. Jennifer asked Tim if he had received the additional certificates that she had provided and Tim stated that the certificates he had did not add up to enough hours. Tim stated that he also wanted the agency to supply a sliding fee scale.

Motion: Sue moved to continue pending proof of continuing education and sliding fee scale. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

- e) Mesa Family Counseling  
Las Vegas, NV  
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Jennifer stated that Cheryl recommended that the item be continued pending a revised corrective action plan. There was discussion on possibly denying and setting for hearing, but clarification that this was the first continuance for the renewal.

Motion: Lt. Lundquist moved to continue. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Carol

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Judge Bunch abstained.

**12. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the following requests for additional program locations for the following agencies:**

- a) American Comprehensive Counseling Services (ACCS)  
625 Margrave  
Reno, NV 89502  
(Reviewed by Lt. Lundquist)

Lt. Lundquist recommended approval.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Traci

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**13. \*Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding certification of the following agency located in another state:**

- a) A Balanced Life  
South Lake Tahoe, CA  
(Reviewed by Carol Ferranti)

Carol questioned some deficiencies noted by California and asked about follow-up on those deficiencies. There was discussion that California has approved the agency despite the deficiencies and that the Committee has no authority to follow-up on deficiencies found by California as long as their certification is current with that state.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve. 2<sup>nd</sup>: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

**14. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.**

November 14, 2013

There was discussion surrounding changing the meeting date to December 12th.

Additionally, due to possible regulation and denial hearings, it was noted that there may need to be two days of meetings.



**15. Public comment.**

Walt Dimitroff stated that there are problems with the current domestic violence laws and how treatment is done as there are many siblings and parents that end up in group treatment that may not be appropriate for the situation.

There was discussion that this was an issue being discussed for possible future changes to legislation.

<p><b>Note:</b> 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>
--

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

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

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.