

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

MINUTES

Thursday, May 29, 2014, at 10:00a.m.

Via Video Conference:

Office of the Attorney General
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Avenue, Room 3315
Las Vegas, Nevada
and
Office of the Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Mock 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, welcome new members, establish quorum.

Members Present
Tim Hamilton
Judge Max Bunch
Sue Meuschke
Neil Rombardo

Members Absent
Lt. Loren Napier

Attorney General's Office
Henna Rasul, Senior DAG
Jennifer Kandt, Admin. Coord.

Members Present (cont.)

Traci Dory (via telephone)
Meri Shadley
Cheryl Hunt

Public Present

Craig Merrill, Sierra Counseling
Maxine Lantz, VWS (via telephone)
Judge Bishop (via telephone)
Jamie Gradick, AOC
Fatima Saeed, NNADV Intern
Wayne Fazzino, Funeral Board

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 review and approval of minutes of the following meetings (for possible action):

a) February 20, 2014

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

4. Updates by Domestic Violence Ombudsman Karen Prentice.

a) Budget

Jennifer stated that Karen had included an expenditure document for their review.

b) Court Assessments

Jennifer stated that the court assessment tracking spreadsheet was attached and that assessments were down considerably.

c) Match

Jennifer requested that all members complete their match forms for grant purposes.

5. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding LRS rural pilot project updates. (For possible action.)

Zach Larson from LRS reported that there had not been any progress in regards to the rural pilot project and he requested that they be able to go forward with a slightly different mechanism for implementation that would allow for attendees to be present through a webcam in a class that was being conducted live in Las Vegas. He stated that there had been issues with obtaining attendees from multiple courts and coordinating getting them online together. The new proposal would allow for 2-3 attendees through a webcam at a live class already operating.

There were a considerable number of questions regarding the intakes, who would collect homework, who is monitoring the program, and various aspects related to whether the online attendees would really be a part of the group process if they are attending remotely and the focus of the providers is not on the webcam.

Zach stated that there would be monitors at the court and/or Ely Mental Health who would collect fees, homework, and general monitoring. He stated that the intake would be done one on one through a webcam by an approved provider. He also stated that the offenders would show on a split screen during the session.

There were questions surrounding when the program could actually begin, and Judge Bishop commented that as soon as he had a conviction, he could refer an offender.

There was discussion surrounding whether the pilot project should be for six months or for one year, and Judge Bunch said the Committee had originally approved the project for one year and felt it should stay at that time frame due to absences and the actual length of time it may take an offender to complete a six month program.

Sue expressed concerns regarding whether the program would be beneficial, and asked if Committee members would be able to attend the sessions. Zach stated that they could attend anytime live, but that he would need advance notice for them to attend a session through the webcam. There was discussion that Jennifer would provide Zach Committee member emails so that he could update the Committee on the dates and times of the sessions.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve the pilot project in Lincoln, Eureka, and White Pine counties to allow for offenders to attend sessions via distance media for a period of one year with reports submitted to the Committee monthly. 2nd: Neil
Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

6. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding contract for site reviewer. This item includes written comments from Dr. Alfred Hughes. (For possible action.)

Jennifer stated that she had drafted a solicitation but that she had been asked by the Chief Financial Officer and Kareen to not present it at the meeting as they were still in discussions regarding how much funding would be available for the site review contract. Jennifer clarified that the current contract with Dr. Hughes was expiring at the end of December, but that there were no remaining funds in the contract, so the Committee would have to amend the current contract to add funding if they needed, or release a solicitation and do a new contract, and that four years is the maximum that the State allows.

Sue stated that any future contract, she would like to see in place for a four year period.

Jennifer said that this item would be listed as a pending item for the Committee to discuss at a future meeting.

7. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding police report letter sent to Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association. (For possible action.)

Jennifer said that the letter that had been sent to the Sheriffs' and Chiefs' was included in the packet along with several responses from various sheriff's offices.

Neil stated that the NRS clearly demonstrates that these reports are public record and that they should be released through the sheriff's offices and police departments, and that any suggestion that they should be released through the District Attorney was ridiculous.

There was discussion that in some jurisdictions, the offender can plead guilty without counsel and that those offenders would need to get the report through law enforcement.

There was discussion surrounding a standing administrative order that the judges could issue requiring the report to be released through the law enforcement agency and general consensus that Neil would draft a sample order and Judge Bunch would present the sample order to the judges.

8. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding training policies and procedures. (For possible action.)

Jennifer stated that the Training Subcommittee had discussed training approval policies and procedures and that a document had been compiled with existing NAC references and that the highlighted yellow sections of the document were not currently addressed within NAC.

There was discussion that some of the highlighted sections are implied and would not need a change to NAC, but that some may. There was general consensus that the document be provided to the new legal counsel with a request to advise which items may need a revision to NAC and which items could be addressed as a matter of policy.

9. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding joint meeting of the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Teams. (For possible action.)

Jennifer stated that this item was on the agenda as Committee members had been invited to this meeting, and if there was going to be any general feedback provided at the meeting on behalf of the Committee, that could be addressed under this item. There were no suggestions for any recommendations or positions.

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

- a. Application for 2.5 training credits
NNADV
"Teen Relationship Abuse: A Public Health Priority"
February 17, 2014 Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Napier)

Jennifer stated that Lt. Napier had recommended approval of 2.5 victim services credits. Motion: Neil moved to approve. 2nd: Judge Bunch. Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Sue abstained.

- b. Application for 6 training credits
CASAT
"Domestic Violence"
March 28, 2014 Reno, NV and April 18, 2014 Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Lt. Napier)

Jennifer stated that Lt. Napier had recommended approval contingent upon providing a syllabus. Jennifer stated that CASAT had emailed a syllabus and that based on the information on the syllabus, they would be eligible for 6.5 credits, but had requested 6 credits.

Motion: Judge Bunch moved to approve for 6 victim credits. 2nd: Neil Rombardo

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried. Meri abstained.

- c. Application for 7 training credits
Dennis Fitzpatrick
“Domestic Violence Regs for Providers and Supervisors”
Distance Media
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 3 victim and 4 perpetrator credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. Application for 16 training credits
Relationship Training Institute
“Staying Ahead of the Curve”
November 2013, San Diego, CA
(Reviewed by Traci Dory; Continued from December meeting)

Traci recommended approval of 14 training credits.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Judge Bunch

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Application for 4 training credits
Dennis Fitzpatrick
“Domestic Violence and Children”
Date to be determined, Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Judge Bunch)

Judge Bunch recommended approval of 2 victim and 2 perpetrator hours.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

11. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the following requests for approval of new providers and supervisors (for possible action):

- a) Dr. Michael Freda, Supervisor
Ridgeview Counseling
Reno, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim stated that he recommended approval contingent upon the current supervisor providing a statement that Dr. Freda completed the required observation hours.

Motion: Cheryl moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

12. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding corrective action plans from the following agencies (for possible action):

- a) Safe Nest
Mesquite, NV
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue recommended approval.

Motion: Meri moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

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

- b) Cornerstone Counseling Center
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt)

Cheryl detailed the violations and the agency's responses. She recommended that the plan be approved with a suggestion to provide the agency a sample form provided by Tim.

Motion: Neil moved to approve. 2nd: Meri

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

- c) Options
North Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Neil Rombardo)

Neil recommended approval.

Motion: Meri moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

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

- d) Ready for Change
Las Vegas, Henderson, Pahrump, NV
(Reviewed by Traci Dory)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Cheryl

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

13. *Discussion, recommendation, and possible action regarding the application for certification renewal from the following agencies (for possible action):

- a) New Beginnings Counseling Center
Las Vegas and North Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Neil Rombardo)

Neil recommended approval.

Motion: Meri moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

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

- b) LRS
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval, but noted that the annual evaluations on each provider are almost all the same and do not seem to be very specific for the particular provider. There was discussion that the Committee does not have authority to dictate the content of the evaluation, but just that it must be completed. There was a recommendation to make a note to the program.

Motion: Neil moved to approve with a request for more personal annual evaluations.
2nd: Sue

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

- c) Sierra Counseling Center
Sparks, NV
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

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

- d) Las Vegas Municipal Court
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Sue Meuschke)

Sue recommended approval with a request to the agency to provide more organization on the next renewal in terms of the frequent team changes to address the quarterly observation requirement.

Motion: Neil moved to approve. 2nd: Meri

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

- e) Ready for Change
Las Vegas, Henderson, Pahrump, NV
(Reviewed by Traci Dory; Continued from December and February meetings)

Traci recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

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

- f) Cornerstone Counseling Center
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Cheryl Hunt; Continued from February meeting)

Cheryl recommended approval, but stated that the agency had not returned the questionnaire from Dr. Hughes from the corrective action plan. There was discussion that the item should possibly have been addressed under the corrective action plan and not the renewal.

Motion: Neil moved to approve. 2nd: Sue

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

- g) Counseling Services Plus
Las Vegas, NV
(Reviewed by Meri Shadley)

Meri recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

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

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

- a) ABC Therapy
Bullhead City and Kingman, Arizona
(Reviewed by Tim Hamilton)

Tim recommended approval.

Motion: Sue moved to approve. 2nd: Neil

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

15. Updates from Committee Coordinator, Jennifer Kandt.

Jennifer stated that this would be her last meeting as she was leaving the Committee. She stated that she had completed a desk manual that could assist a new Coordinator with handling the Committee duties. She said that renewal reminder letters for the next meeting had already been sent and that she would ensure that all violation letters from the last round of site visits were completed prior to her departure. Additionally, she said that she would complete the minutes and all post meeting letters from the May meeting. She stated that she was unsure of the plans for a replacement, but thought the Attorney General's Office may support the duties in house. She said that she had been instructed to have all Committee inquiries forwarded to Karen.

16. Comments from Committee Chair, Tim Hamilton.

Tim thanked Jennifer for her work and stated that she had been a true asset to the Committee.

17. Discussion regarding future agenda items and future meeting dates.

No additional agenda items were discussed and the next meeting dates were kept for August 21, 2014 and November 13, 2014.

18. Public comment.

<p>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)</p>
--

19. *Adjournment. (For possible action).

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.