

**NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

## **Minutes of Meeting**

---

**Thursday, February 17, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.**

---

Office of the Attorney General  
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202, Reno, Nevada 89511

**Committee Members Present**

Mike Sprinkle

**Committee Members Present Via Teleconference**

Dr. Michael Freda  
Christine Jones Brady  
Elynne Greene  
Andrea Sundberg  
Valerie Cooney

**Committee Members Absent**

Sue Meuschke  
Brett Kandt  
Ron Titus

**Public Present**

None

**Attorney General's Office Staff Present**

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General  
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman  
Lorraine Webber, Assistant to the NCPDV

**1. \*Call to order and roll call of members.**

The meeting was called to order by Mike Sprinkle at 10:04 a.m. Roll call was taken and quorum was established.

**2. \*Review and approval of minutes from November 10, 2010 meeting.**

Dr. Freda made a motion to approve the minutes with any necessary corrections. Elynne Greene seconded the motion. Since there were no suggested changes, Dr. Freda amended his motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Elynne Greene seconded the amended motion. A vote was taken and the motion

carried. Valerie Cooney and Andrea Sundberg abstained from voting because they were not in attendance at the November 10, 2010 meeting.

**3. \*Discussion and possible action regarding biennial legislative report.**

Mr. Sprinkle stated that this item had been addressed at the Council meeting. The report has been finalized and was sent to the legislature before the February 1, 2011 deadline.

**4. \* Review, discussion, and possible action regarding fatality review BDR (SB66 <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/76th2011/Bills/SB/SB66.pdf>)**

The Committee discussed SB66. Ms. Brady asked what fiscal impact is associated with the creation of a new body. Mr. Sprinkle stated that the Attorney General's Office would be absorbing the cost of it and so there is no fiscal impact stated on the legislation.

Ms. Sundberg made a motion that the Committee support SB66. Dr. Freda seconded the motion.

Ms. Cooney asked if anyone knew when the Bill would be introduced. Ms. Prentice stated that the bill was in Government Affairs but has been moved to Senate Judiciary and that she and Mr. Sprinkle would be meeting with Senator Valerie Wiener to discuss it. A hearing has been scheduled for March 14<sup>th</sup>, which is Grass Roots Lobby Day and that the Nevada Women's Lobby will be there to support it. She invited Committee members to be there if they are available. Mr. Sprinkle stated that they are hoping to have representatives from all the agencies that would be involved in the Fatality Review Team attend the hearing to lend their support. Ms. Prentice added that she has reached out to the Washoe County Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team, the Southern Nevada Domestic Violence Task Force, and LVMPD, all of whom are sending representatives. She stated that the Clark County Coroner's Office had indicated that they were neutral on the bill.

Ms. Greene suggested that the Committee needed to do some research to find out why the Coroner's Office is neutral. In the past, before Mike Murphy was Coroner, the Coroner's Office was in support of the bill but the effort died due, in part, to Mr. Murphy's lack of participation. If there is some reason the Coroner's Office is against SB66, besides the fact that it would involve extra work, the Committee needs to know that. The Coroner's Office is such a critical part of the potential fatality review team, that they can not be neutral. The bill must have the support of the Coroner's Office. Ms. Prentice asked if Ms. Greene had any suggestions on how to garner their support. Ms. Greene stated that she was hoping to get someone from LVMPD meet with the Mr. Murphy to discuss it.

Ms. Brady asked for clarification on the bill since there is already existing law. Ms. Greene explained that a statute does exist, but this bill will refine it and add to it.

In response to Ms. Brady's question, Ms. Prentice added that SB66 also gives the Attorney General the authority to pull together a statewide domestic violence fatality review team.

Ms. Brady asked about potential conflicts between state and local authority. Ms. Prentice said that Washoe County has a domestic violence fatality review team and that Clark County is in the process of creating one. The statewide team would look at other counties and then all three entities would come together to create one statewide report on their findings. Ms. Brady said that her impression after reading the bill was that the statewide domestic violence fatality review team's findings would supersede the local team's findings in the event of a conflict. Ms. Cooney stated that the bill does not create any such conflict and that local authorities may have the assistance of the statewide team only upon request. Ms. Cooney referenced the first part of Section 3 of the bill, "An organization that is concerned with domestic violence may apply to the Attorney General or his or her designee for authorization to appoint a member of the multidisciplinary team organized or sponsored pursuant to this section."

To address Ms. Brady's concern, Mr. Sprinkle read aloud Section 1(1) of the bill:

The Attorney General may organize or sponsor one or more multidisciplinary teams to review the death of the victim of a crime that constitutes domestic violence pursuant to NRS 33.018 if a court or an agency of a local government does not organize or sponsor a multidisciplinary team pursuant to NRS 217.475 or if the court or agency requests the assistance of the Attorney General. In addition to the review of a particular case, a multidisciplinary team organized or sponsored by the Attorney General pursuant to this section shall . . . .

Mr. Sprinkle also read aloud section 5 of the bill:

The organizing or sponsoring of a multidisciplinary team pursuant to this section does not grant the Attorney General supervisory authority over, or restrict or impair the statutory authority of, any state or local governmental agency responsible for the investigation of or prosecution of the death of a victim of a crime that constitutes domestic violence pursuant of NRS 33.018.

Mr. Sprinkle called for a vote on the motion made that the Committee support SB66. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Prentice stated that she would keep the Committee posted as the Bill moves through the legislature.

Mr. Sprinkle asked members to let the Committee know if they would be testifying on behalf of their agencies at the March 14<sup>th</sup> hearing so that all the different testimonies could be coordinated.

Ms. Sundberg stated she would attend and can testify if need be. Ms. Cooney reported that she would be there in support of the bill but was not planning to testify. Ms. Brady stated that she would try to attend in support of the bill and would try to find out if her office would be testifying either for or against the bill.

#### **5. \*Schedule future meetings & agenda items.**

Ms. Prentice suggested SB163 be put on the agenda. The bill revises provisions governing procedure upon arrest of a person alleged to have committed a battery constituting domestic violence.

She also suggested SB 57 be added to the agenda. SB 57 expands circumstances pursuant to which a court is authorized to issue certain warrants in child custody cases involving alleged abduction. Ms. Prentice will invite Vic Shulze from the Attorney General's Office to the meeting to speak about the bill.

The next meeting was scheduled for March 7, 2011 at 2:30 p.m.

#### **6. Public Comment.**

Ms. Prentice asked Ms. Sundberg if there was a sex education bill yet. Ms. Sundberg said that the BDR is reserved but there was no bill number yet. She will keep the Committee posted.

Ms. Sundberg said there are two other bills are coming up. One is AB 96 regarding psychological exams for victims of sexual assault. The other bill is AB 181 regarding involuntary civil commitment of sexually dangerous persons. Mr. Sprinkle asked Ms. Sundberg to have any bill she would like support on added to the agenda.

#### **7. \*Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 a.m.