

Nevada VINE (Victim Information Notification Everyday)

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Tuesday, November 6, 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
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
Robert Roshak, Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Sue Meuschke, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence
Catherine Krause, DPS

Governance Committee Members Absent:

Christine Davis, Executive Assistant to the Governor
Lynne Cavalieri, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Monica Howk, Board of Parole Commissioners
Susie Lewis, Henderson Police Department

Other Individuals Present:

Jennifer Kandt, VINE Coordinator
Henna Rasul, Nevada Attorney General's Office

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

a) February 13, 2012

Motion: Brett moved to approve. 2nd: Catherine

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Sue Meuschke abstained.

4. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding reports and updates on current project status. This item will include an overview of VINE usage and statistics (Jennifer Kandt).

Jennifer stated that there were various issues with the agencies in Clark County that were utilizing Motorola as a JMS vendor. She stated that both Henderson and City of Las Vegas Detention and Enforcement used Motorola and that the interface would not allow for transfer notifications to be made as the system sees all offenders as released from custody of that particular facility. Jennifer stated that because of that issue, the scripting needed to be changed for those agencies to state that the offender may have been transferred to another facility and to please contact the jail for further details. She said there also continued to be issues with the data from the agencies, and Appriss was attempting to resolve those issues. Additionally, she stated that North Las Vegas jail had closed and that the offenders were being housed with the City of Las Vegas Detention and Enforcement. Because of this, there was a request to split the data feed for

North Las Vegas offenders and City of Las Vegas offenders which required additional work.

Jennifer stated that Parole and Probation was progressing. Catherine stated that implementation was a little slower than anticipated, but that things were moving forward.

Jennifer reported that there were possibly some setbacks with the Parole Board, as it appears that the Parole Board is uncertain whether the system will suit their needs. Jennifer said that it was her understanding that they were wanting to only utilize VINE and not use any other method of notification, but that there may be limitations that the Parole Board is reviewing. She stated that they were continuing to have meetings on how the system could best be utilized for them, and that it was possible that VINE may serve as an enhancement to the notifications already being made. There was discussion that the Parole Board utilizes the Department of Corrections database and that triggers could be set up to make notifications, but that the Parole Board has certain requirements regarding notifications. She stated that the Parole Board was required to notify victims' of their rights, and that it was a great deal of information to include in a telephone notification.

Traci indicated that because the system was anonymous there were issues surrounding in absentia hearings.

Jennifer said that Washoe County was currently offline due to jail data scraping. She said that certain websites, including renomugs.com, jailhouse.com, and others were writing queries to scrape names from the VINE service and then use those names to further scrape from Washoe County's website. Jennifer stated that they were having a conference call the following day to figure out additional steps that could be taken to make the scraping more difficult.

There was discussion that this issue was not specific to Washoe County and that scraping of public data was not illegal. Catherine commented that they have the same issues with the registered sex offender data.

Jennifer asked if there were any questions on implementation and then stated that all MOU's had been received with the exception of the Parole Board and Parole and Probation.

Jennifer provided details on VINE usage for each facility for each month.

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

Jennifer presented a spreadsheet detailing expenditures and match time and stated that they had exceeded the required match amount utilizing booking and

release data for the agencies. Jennifer requested that the Committee members fill out their match forms so that the time could be utilized for other grants.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding additional grant awards and future project funding (this item will include updates on interlocal agreements and proposed overall project budgets).

Jennifer provided a spreadsheet detailing the various grants the project had received and where the money would possibly be spent. She stated that a STOP grant had been received and was being concurrently used with the SAVIN grant. She also said that they had received a JAG grant, but that the funds had not yet been utilized as contract and work program issues were being resolved. She presented a possible FY2014/2015 budget which included agency contributions. She stated that she had worked with legal counsel to draft an interlocal agreement, but stated that legal counsel was actually recommending an intrastate interlocal agreement.

Jennifer said that at the VINE conference she had recently attended there were discussions with other states about how they were funding VINE, and she learned that there appeared to be a movement to negotiate with vendors for jail management systems and inmate phone systems to include the cost of VINE within those contracts.

There was some discussion on the Spillman contract with DPS and whether there would be the possibility to include negotiation of VINE within that contract. Catherine said the contract for implementation and maintenance had already been negotiated, so it was probably not an option.

Traci said that Department of Corrections had put the VINE service into their budget as a line item.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding legislation for the VINE project.

Kareen stated that the Attorney General's Office had submitted a BDR for the VINE project, but that it had not yet come back from LCB. She stated that the bill was very simple and would establish a home for VINE and the Governance Committee to be a subcommittee of the Domestic Violence Prevention Council to wrap it into something already established. Kareen said that she envisioned that the Governance Committee would be comprised of the same individuals. Kareen asked legal counsel if the subcommittee members would also have to be members of the Prevention Council, and legal counsel stated that she did not believe that would be necessary as subcommittees could be comprised of both members and non members.

Bob Roshak asked if the bill would have any fiscal impact on the sheriffs. Kareen stated that there wouldn't be any fiscal impact other than what was already being discussed in the agreements. Kareen also said that the sheriffs and chiefs being asked to pay for the service were already aware of the possibility of costs.

Additionally, she said that the Prevention Council had a funding stream that could assist with costs for the Governance Committee.

Bob said that in section 3, there was a reference to the sheriffs and chiefs cooperating in maintaining the service, and he assumed there is a cost in maintaining the service.

Kareen stated that there was a cost to maintain the service, but nothing in addition to what Jennifer discussed in item 6.

Brett stated he would call Bob when the draft came back from LCB to make sure he was comfortable with the language.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding best practices for failed notifications.

Jennifer explained that a “failed notification” was defined by Appriss as a call that had gone out twice without having a confirmation pin number entered. She said that emails were currently being sent to agencies detailing the failed notifications, but that agencies weren’t clear what needed to be done with those emails. There was discussion regarding the anonymous system and what follow up would be appropriate.

There was discussion on the difference between how DOC might handle these failed notifications versus how a county jail or parole and probation might respond. Additionally, there was discussion that it may be an agency decision on whether to receive the emails and what they should do with them. There was further discussion on reaching out to other states to see what their protocols are with these failed notifications.

9. Updates on Public Service Announcements.

Jennifer stated that all of the public service announcements were on the VINE website, and that the Washoe County version done by Undersheriff Vinger was being played. There was discussion that once Clark County goes live, the PSA’s could be distributed statewide. Lastly, Jennifer stated she would contact members of the Marketing subcommittee to meet prior to Clark County going live.

10. Comments from Chair.

Traci said she had SAVIN public awareness DVD’s available for members.

11. Discussion regarding future agenda items and meeting dates.

Jennifer stated that a review of the Standards and Guidelines was probably needed. There was general consensus that the next meeting be held in April or May, and that the Marketing subcommittee possibly meet in December or at least sometime prior to Clark County going live.

12. 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). Public Comment may be limited to 3 minutes per person.*

13. *Adjournment. (for possible action)

Motion: Brett moved to adjourn. 2nd: Tom

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.