

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

Minutes of Meeting

Monday, March 7, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

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

Committee Members Present

Mike Sprinkle

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference

Christine Jones Brady
Valerie Cooney
Dr. Michael Freda
Elynne Greene
Brett Kandt
Sue Meuschke
Andrea Sundberg

Committee Members Absent

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 Committee Chair Mike Sprinkle at 2:30 p.m. Roll call was taken and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from the February 17, 2011 meeting.

Andrea Sundberg made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Dr. Freda seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion carried. Brett Kandt abstained from voting because he was not in attendance at the February 17, 2011 meeting.

3. ***Review, discussion and possible action regarding SB66 which revises provisions relating to multidisciplinary teams to review the deaths of victims of crimes that constitute domestic violence.**
<http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/76th2011/Bills/SB/SB66.pdf>).

Ms. Prentice stated that the bill is scheduled for a hearing at the Senate Judiciary at 8:00 a.m. on March 14th. Mr. Sprinkle reported that he and Ms. Prentice met with Senator Wiener and that the interaction was positive. He said that Senator Wiener asked that anyone testifying make their presentations short and that there be no redundancy. Mr. Sprinkle asked Ms. Prentice about the schedule of speakers. Ms. Prentice stated that Rob Lundquist from LVMPD had been scheduled to speak but had notified her that he was unavailable. She was waiting to hear if he had found a replacement. Mr. Sprinkle commented that if LVMPD was unable to attend, a letter from them in support of the bill would be helpful. Ms. Prentice stated that Sue Meuschke would be there testifying in support of the bill on behalf of the Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence. She has also reached out to Kelly Vioria at the Washoe County Domestic Violence Task Force and is waiting to hear back from her. The Clark County Coroner's Office is neutral. Ms. Sundberg said that she would attend in Las Vegas and testify on behalf of the Nevada Coalition Against Sexual Violence. Brett Kandt stated that he and Karen Prentice will do the introductory testimony and that Mark Jackson, Douglas County District Attorney, will be testifying in support of the bill on behalf of the District Attorneys.

Dr. Freda asked if Ms. Greene had contacted the Clark County Coroner's Office to find out why they were neutral on the bill. She reported that she was holding off on that in an attempt to avoid creating opposition. Mr. Kandt stated that he had talked to the Clark County Coroner and that he had no problem with the bill. It is likely the Coroner is focusing on other bills. Ms. Greene said that her only concern was whether they would support the fatality review process long term.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if anyone had heard of any opposition to the bill. None of the Committee members were aware of any opposition.

4. ***Review, discussion and possible action regarding SB163 which revises provisions governing the procedure upon arrest of a person alleged to have committed a battery constituting domestic violence.**
<http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/76th2011/Bills/SB/SB163.pdf>).

Mr. Kandt stated that it was his understanding that there is no support for this bill and that he doesn't expect that it will make it out of committee.

Ms. Brady asked why there wasn't much support for it. Ms. Prentice and Ms. Cooney explained that no one wants to see the 12-hour hold removed from existing law.

Mr. Kandt added that the fact that this bill was introduced should be used as an educational opportunity because there may be counties where the sheriff's offices are not complying with statute as it is currently written.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if they should meet with the committee chair and see if they can prevent it from being heard in the first place. Mr. Kandt suggested that maybe someone should just speak to the sponsor and indicate why there are sound public policy reasons behind the law as it is written now. The current law promotes victim safety and offender accountability. If the sponsor still wants to have a hearing, then the Committee can send a representative to oppose the bill.

Ms. Cooney made a motion that, if need be, the Committee would oppose the bill. Christine Brady seconded the motion. Mr. Kandt clarified that opposition to the bill would be based on victim safety and offender accountability. Ms. Greene commented that if the bill went through it would have an affect on the emergency TPO process. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

5. *Review, discussion and possible action regarding SB57 which expands the circumstances pursuant to which a court is authorized to issue certain warrants. (<http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/76th2011/Bills/SB/SB57.pdf>)

Ms. Prentice stated that she had invited Vic Shulze to this meeting to discuss the bill but had not heard back from him.

Mr. Kandt said that he thought the bill was pretty straight forward. There is a Uniform Act in Nevada that provides for situations where a non-stranger, usually a non-custodial parent has abducted a child. There are statutory provisions for applying to the court for pick-up order which authorizes law enforcement to locate, obtain and return the child to the custodial parent. The statutory provisions were enacted decades ago and since then the law has evolved on issues of due process and search and seizure. SB57 updates the law on pick-up orders to make it constitutionally sound.

Ms. Cooney stated that she had some concerns about the bill, specifically, deletions in section 125 and the statutory construction of the bill. Ms. Prentice will send Mr. Shulze's contact information to Ms. Cooney so that she can contact him regarding her concerns.

6. *Review, discussion and possible action regarding BDR 34-143 which provides for the standardization of sexuality education curricula.

Ms. Sundberg stated that Planned Parenthood is the initial writer of the bill draft request. Currently, relationship violence and sexual violence are not included in any statewide sex education curriculum. These issues will be written into the bill to remove any hindrances in getting the programs into the schools.

Mr. Sprinkle sated that once the bill is drafted, the Committee will readdress the topic.

7. *Schedule future meetings & agenda items.

Agenda items will include SB66, SB163, and SB57. If language for BDR 34-143 is available, it will be added.

The next meeting was scheduled for March 22, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.

8. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

9. *Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.