

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

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday, January 28, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.

Via Teleconference with Public Access Located at:
Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202, Large Conference Room, Reno, Nevada 89511

AGENDA

Please Note: The Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence Legislative Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. 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)

At the discretion of the Chair, public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but will be heard only when that item is reached and will be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will also be available as the last item on the agenda. 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.

***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 and roll call of members.
2. *Review and approval of minutes from August 15, 2008 meeting.
3. *Discussion and possible action on Biennial Legislative Report.
4. *Discussion, review and possible action on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice Bill Draft Requests.
5. *Discussion and possible action on any upcoming or pending Legislative items.
6. *Discussion and possible action on actions of Legislative Committee/Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence during the Legislative Session.
7. *Schedule future meetings and agenda items.

8. 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)

9. *Adjournment.

This agenda has been sent to all members of the Committee and other interested persons who have requested an agenda from the Council. Persons who wish to continue to receive an agenda and notice must request so in writing on an annual basis.

Anyone desiring additional information regarding the meeting is invited to call the Council office at (775) 850-4119. We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify the Council's administrative assistant, Kathryn Menke, at (775) 688-1818, no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. Requests for special arrangements made after this time frame cannot be guaranteed.

THIS MEETING HAS BEEN PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED
IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

Office of the Attorney General 100 N Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701	Office of the Attorney General 5420 Kietzke Lane, Ste 202 Reno, Nevada 89511	Grant Sawyer State Office Building 555 E. Washington Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Jean Nidetch Women's Center University of Nevada, Las Vegas 4505 Maryland Parkway Las Vegas, Nevada 89154	Safe Nest 2915 W. Charleston Blvd., #12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	Reno City Hall One E. First Street Reno, Nevada 89501
	Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence 220 South Rock Boulevard, Suite 7 Reno Nevada 89502	

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

Minutes of Meeting

February 19, 2009

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

Committee Members Present

Mike Sprinkle

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference

Valerie Cooney
Vic Hutchings
Dr. Michael Freda
Andrea Sundberg
Sue Meuschke

Committee Members Absent

Brett Kandt
Elynn Greene

Public Present

None

Attorney General's Office Staff Present

Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Kathryn K. Menke, Assistant to NCPDV

1. ***Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.**
Mike Sprinkle called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from January 28, 2009 meeting.

Mike Sprinkle asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes. Dr. Freda mentioned one correction. On page 5, the next to last paragraph, the year on the date should be changed to 2009. Mike Sprinkle also added one correction; the Attorney General had joined the meeting via telephone and should have been listed as having attended on the front page of the minutes. Dr. Freda moved to accept the minutes with the two corrections; Sue Meuschke seconded the motion. The motion passed.

3. *Discussion and possible action on any upcoming or pending legislative items.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that Assembly Bills 161 and 164 are up for consideration. He began by discussing AB 161. He asked if people had a chance to read through it. Valerie Cooney mentioned she had read the digested version and did not think it was too friendly.

Sue Meuschke indicated she thought the bill would take us back twenty years. It would remove the requirement that law enforcement arrest whether or not the victim would agree to testify. It would also create a victim not willing to testify as a mitigating circumstance as to why an arrest did not occur. It would also remove a requirement to prosecute if a victim was recanting or refusing to testify.

Dr. Freda mentioned that would disregard an earlier statute from March of 1995. Andrea Sundberg recommended they oppose the bill. Dr. Freda suggested the committee oppose it vehemently. Mr. Sprinkle stated as far as the bill goes he is hearing a lot of opposition to it.

Sue Meuschke indicated the legislation states that upon determination of probable cause, officers shall make an arrest unless there are mitigating circumstances. Most of the mitigating circumstances that law enforcement has used are a variety of things. There are no specifics in the legislation, but now there would be.

Dr. Freda made a motion to oppose Assembly bill 161; Valerie Cooney seconded the motion. Mike Sprinkle asked if there was any further discussion; there was not. The motion passed.

Mr. Sprinkle then discussed how the committee wanted to go about opposing the bill. He suggested a strongly worded letter. He asked the committee if they wanted him or others to go down and give formal testimony to the committee. Valerie Cooney responded they need to track the bill; they need to be present when it is discussed. It is being heard on 3-2-09.

Ms. Cooney had a question about how the committee was going to be working this year. Keith Munro was involved last year, and she knew Mike Sprinkle was working with him. Mr. Sprinkle responded they could discuss this issue further under that particular agenda item. As per the last meeting, the decisions they make in the committee meetings need to be passed by Keith Munro and ultimately the Attorney General.

They have to be in synch with what is being presented to the legislature. It sounds like the committee would like to have formal testimony from someone on the committee. He said he would get together good talking points, or put together a formal written position, and make sure it is acceptable to Keith Munro and the Attorney General. Someone would then go down to Carson City and present it to the legislature.

Valerie Cooney asked Sue Meuschke if the Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence was going to take a position. She responded in the affirmative.

Vic Hutchings in Elko stated that if that bill passes, no one in rural Nevada will be arrested for domestic violence. Dr. Freda agreed with her. She further indicated that in that area, they already had a difficult problem with some of those very issues mentioned in that bill. She indicated the committee really needed to do something. Sue Meuschke responded they would go oppose the legislation and see what works out; she thinks it will be fine.

Mr. Sprinkle stated in the coming few days he would get together with Sue Meuschke, and make sure that whatever they are going to present from the council will be in synch with what the Network and other advocates are going to present. They can go down to the legislature and present a unified front. The committee members indicated this was acceptable to them. Mr. Sprinkle stated the bill is set to be presented at 8 a.m., on March 3, 2009, and any committee members are welcome to come down and be present for this.

Mr. Sprinkle then moved on to discuss AB 164. This was the strangulation bill that he and Brett Kandt had been working on for a few months now. There were actually two different bill draft requests that were addressing the same thing, one by Assemblyman Horne and by Assemblywoman Gansert. They were able to sit down and talk with Assemblyman Horne, who then approached Assemblywoman Gansert. The two came together and joined forces.

Mr. Sprinkle stated it is a rock solid bill, just alone based on the people who have signed on to it. They are expecting no opposition. The only thing they were a little concerned about with the bill is opposition from law

enforcement. This is because they use the carotid choke-hold in trying to detain violent perpetrators. There was concern that this might prevent them from being able to do that.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated he had some discussions with law enforcement. Law enforcement in northern Nevada does not even use that procedure any more, it is written in policy. He spoke with the Washoe County Sheriff who indicated to him that his office will go on record right alongside the committee, and there will be no opposition from them. Nearly everybody is strongly in favor of this legislation. Valerie Cooney made a motion to support the bill; Dr. Michael Freda seconded it. The motion passed.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated he did not feel the committee needed to do anything more than send a letter of support regarding this bill. They had spoken with the bill sponsors, and will reiterate their support in written form. This bill will be going before a committee where the committee chair has strongly indicated he does not want a lot of testimony. He did not see it as necessary, but if the committee wanted him to go down to Carson City and speak regarding the bill he indicated he would do so.

He would not actually get up and testify on this one unless called upon to do so. Valerie Cooney asked if the letter of support would be signed by the Attorney General on behalf of the Council. Mr. Sprinkle responded all the letters of support he had submitted thus far have been on Council letterhead, and were from him as the Vice-Chair of the council. The letters were sent to the Attorney General as well.

Valerie Cooney suggested that if the sponsors of the bill wanted anyone there as a sign of support for the bill, she thinks it is important. Mr. Sprinkle responded the letters stated if they wanted formal testimony from the Council he would be happy to go down to Carson City and do so. He had also expressed those ideas face to face with Assemblyman Horne. The Assemblyman indicated to him they do not want to overkill this. Valerie Cooney responded his plan sounded good.

Mike Sprinkle indicated he will put together a letter of support for AB164. He indicated those two bills were the only two that he had intended to present to the committee today.

Sue Meuschke mentioned one bill that was heard in the Assembly Judiciary just the other day. It would provide for diversion of batterers to specialty courts which would then allow for a non-conviction on their record, and the records being sealed. It is AB 47. Specifically it would address mental health courts, and substance abuse, and drug courts. She stated the Network has taken the position that they can support the diversion for the mental health court because of the safeguards in place in

terms of how they would determine who would be eligible for the diversion. They would have to be diagnosed, prosecutors would have an ability to object, and even if they were sentenced for a second conviction the first offense would still be counted.

She further stated the same is not true for drug court, there is no way to diagnose substance abuse, nor does the Network believe or know that substance abuse causes domestic violence. If someone is mentally ill, psychotic, and is violent against all persons, then that issue makes some sense. However, substance abuse is a much more difficult issue and the Network has opposed that section. She did not know if the Committee feels they need to deal with it, but she wanted them to know it is out there.

Mike Sprinkle did not know anything of this bill. He asked Ms. Meuschke if it had passed through Committee yet. She said no, they are currently trying to work out some agreements. She indicated people were supporting the bill but the Network was opposing it. She stated that every abuser would be deferred to drug court.

Mike Sprinkle stated if the committee wanted to take some sort of action they could go down to Carson City right now and do some lobbying work while they are still trying to work on an amended version of the bill. Or, they can wait until it gets amended and gets passed out of this committee since it has already had its hearing. They could wait to see what the new language is, and if it does move on to the senate, they could then take a more formal position at that point.

Dr. Freda said his interpretation of the bill was that once an offender completes drug court, their record can be sealed. He stated that right now, the way they do it, offenders have to wait seven years to have it expunged from their record, and that is only provided that they commit no other crimes after that.

Sue Meuschke stated it would be difficult for an offender to ever have more than one offense on their record. It is one of those bills that is moving society back several years.

Valerie Cooney stated that unfortunately for the people who care about those things, only a few of them can do anything at the legislature. Those people who can need to be active and involved.

Mike Sprinkle responded that was why he had posed his question earlier. If the committee feels it is necessary, he can go down to Carson City and talk with the Assembly people while amendments are still being drafted. Otherwise, they can wait and see what comes out of the assembly and then take a more formal role. The only problem with that is it has been his

experience in the past that, if you wait until it gets to the other house they kind of feel as if they have been blindsided.

Valerie Cooney responded they needed to start working on it right away. Sue Meuschke indicated it is being worked on now. She was not sure that the committee's taking a position on it at this time is necessarily going to be helpful. Ms. Cooney asked if they had created a subcommittee. Ms. Meuschke stated they had heard testimony at the hearing and they are going to have it in work session. Ms. Meuschke confirmed the Supreme Court had introduced the bill.

Valerie Cooney asked when the work sessions are going to be; she asked Mike Sprinkle to check on this, and stated the committee needs to have someone present at the work session. She asked Dr. Freda what he knows about the drug courts. He responded the drug courts have a high recidivism rate. It is therefore not a good idea to immediately expunge someone's record on completion of the program. The next year they can do the same thing, and it is offense number one again.

Valerie Cooney stated it made moot all of their efforts over the years to have some accountability in the legislation. That is lost when an offender can go through a program and it is no longer a matter of record. It cannot be used in court, and law enforcement will not be able to use it.

Dr. Freda stated he could not agree with this bill. There is already a provision in place for somebody who has been convicted of domestic battery and it is the only crime they have ever committed. After seven years, they can have it expunged from their record. Seven years is a reasonable amount of time, if they are going to commit battery again, it is most certainly going to happen within seven years.

Mike Sprinkle responded it had just been brought up that it would impact other things they are working on, including "Once a Felon, Always a Felon". Valerie Cooney agreed and stated this legislation would have a very broad impact. Dr. Freda recommended strongly opposing this legislation.

Sue Mueschke stated all of those arguments had already been put forward in front of the committee; the committee understands all of those issues. Vic Hutchings wanted to know if the committee realized that rural Nevada did not even have mental health courts for the most part. Valerie Cooney stated in the rural western part of the state they had traveling drug courts and mental health courts. Vic Hutchings stated they did not have that in her part of the state; she had serious concerns about the bill.

Mike Sprinkle planned to try and get in touch with Keith Munro, and see if the AG's office has been following this bill or if they have formed any kind of opinion regarding the legislation, or are working on it. If not, he would let Keith know of the Committee's concerns, and would at least find out what kind of work is being done on this bill, possible changes, etc. He had not previously known about the bill and so had not done any work on it. He assumed the bill had gone in front of the Assembly Judiciary but he did not have it in front of him and therefore did not know. He is not planning on talking to anyone at this point. Sue Meuschke had pointed out that if others are already doing that it might not be necessary. He would do some background work to find out what kind of discussions might be taking place at this point. He indicated they would make their concerns known, and reiterate the points they had come up with, if they are not already being addressed. He stated it sounds like others are already working on that.

Dr. Freda suggested sending a letter. Mr. Sprinkle responded they cannot formally send anything out until the background work has been done. He will get some background history on this bill and report back to the committee. He will distribute something out to the committee.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if there were any other bills the committee wanted to bring to attention. Andrea Sundberg stated that on Monday AB116 is going to hearing. It is a bill that would remove the contributory conduct standards as a basis of denial for domestic violence victims and sexual assault victims for Victims of Crime Compensation. While no one has a problem with removing contributory conduct for sexual assault, it is her understanding there will be opposition to removing the contributory conduct standards in the case of domestic violence victims. She is planning to be there to speak against it. She wanted the committee to be aware that there will be people stating that the contributory conduct standard currently in the legislation should remain in it for victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Sprinkle reminded the committee they have already taken action on supporting this bill. He had already submitted a letter to the legislature in regards to the committee's unanimous support of this legislation. Andrea Sundberg stated she had just today found out there was going to be an opposition to the bill. Mike Sprinkle said he had planned to be down there for that, to sit in on the hearing. Ms. Sundberg planned to be in Las Vegas to testify on behalf of AB 116 and AB 120. Mr. Sprinkle told her if the bill needs more support from the Council than what is already going to be presented, she should contact him as he will be there. They can do something. The committee cannot meet, but he can solicit Keith Munro's approval and possibly get up and testify.

Mr. Sprinkle reported to the committee that he had gone ahead and put together formal letters of support for the following: AB 33, AB 120, AB 116, SB 14, and SB 113. AB 116 and AB 120 are being heard on Monday, February, 23, 2009. They are starting at 8:30 a.m. On Monday, March 2, 2009, AB 161, AB 64 and AB 33 are being heard. The committee had taken action on all three of those.

Kareen Prentice mentioned that she wanted to give the committee a heads up on AB 114. It was put forth by the Attorney General's Victims of Crime Subcommittee, to the Advisory Commission. It extends the time permitted for Victims of Crime to appeal a denial of funding from fifteen days to sixty days. This bill would also allow for the Victims of Crime Subcommittee to not have to returned unused monies to the general fund at the end of the fiscal year. They would get to keep their reserve for Victims of Crime.

She further stated that on April 21, 2009, the Alliance for Victims of Crime in northern Nevada will be having an event from 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., displaying quilts made by Victims of Crime at the Legislature. She invited committee members to attend; it will be in the events room at the legislature. She will find out what room number and let everyone know. The quilts will also be on display in the legislature foyer all day on April 22, 2009.

4. *Discussion, review, and possible action on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice Bill Draft Requests.

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

5. *Discussion and possible action on Biennial Legislative Report.

Kareen Prentice stated Linda Fitzgerald had delivered it to the Legislature. Mr. Sprinkle stated the committee will not need to re-visit it for another year.

6. *Discussion and possible action on actions of Legislative Committee/Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence during the Legislative Session.

Mr. Sprinkle reiterated that committee members are welcome to and strongly encouraged to attend any of the hearings, especially those where they are going to be giving formal testimony. If you are going to speak for the Committee, it is necessary to go through him. He will then go to Keith Munro to make sure that everything that is being said is what should be said. Valerie Cooney responded that she was going to be going over to the Legislature, but that she was precluded from testifying unless invited. She intended to go and listen to what people have to say.

Andrea Sundberg asked if Mike Sprinkle wanted notification from committee members that they would be attending certain sessions. He responded that was necessary only if the committee member was going to be identifying him or herself with the Council. If the person is in attendance as their own personal issue, as part of the public, or with the other agencies they represent, that is not necessary. If the Committee member is going to present him or herself as a member of the council, then Mr. Sprinkle will need to be notified of their intended presence.

Andrea Sundberg asked if signing in support of the bill is tantamount to lobbying. Kareen Prentice responded she did not think so, but that Sue Meuschke would definitely know. Mike Sprinkle reminded the Committee that, when they sign in there is a section where you state who you are representing. He thought this issue depended on what you put into that box. Certain individuals representing certain agencies that are federally funded can only spend up to a certain percentage of their time lobbying, but they can still sign in as an individual citizen in support of or in opposition to a bil.

|

7. *Schedule future meetings and agenda items.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated they had previously discussed every three weeks. The date of March 13, 2009, at 4:00 p.m., was set for the next meeting.

8. *Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

9. *Adjournment

Dr. Mike Freda made a motion to adjourn; Valerie Cooney seconded the motion. Mr. Sprinkle adjourned the meeting at 4:47 p.m.

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

Minutes of Meeting

March 13, 2009

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

Committee Members Present

Mike Sprinkle

Committee Members Present Via Teleconference

Elynn Greene
Dr. Michael Freda
Susan Filon, Esq.
Ron Titus
Andrea Sundberg
Brett Kandt
Valerie Cooney
Vic Hutchings

Committee Members Absent

Sue Mueschke

Public Present

Kathy Jordan

Attorney General's Office Staff Present

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman
Kathryn K. Menke, Assistant to NCPDV

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

Mike Sprinkle called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from the February 19, 2009 meeting.

Ron Titus stated he should have been marked as “absent” for that meeting; the minutes did not reflect this. Mr. Sprinkle stated this correction would be made to the minutes.

Andrea Sundberg made a motion to accept the minutes with the proposed change; Dr. Michael Freda seconded the motion. He also noted one correction on the second page of the minutes. The motion carried with one abstention, Elynne Greene. She had not attended the last meeting.

3. *Discussion and possible action on any upcoming or pending legislative items.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated he wanted to give everybody a quick synopsis of what has been going on in the last two-three weeks since the Committee had last met.

He offered a status report on each of the bills the Committee had already taken action on. He started with AB33, which has to do with convictions of battery which constitute Domestic Violence. It was heard on the second of March; as of this morning there still had been no action taken on this bill. It is in the Assembly Judiciary. Brett Kandt further indicated the bill had been introduced and heard, and they had testimony on Monday, March 2nd. Mr. Kandt said the bill had not yet been voted on or scheduled for a work session yet.

Mr. Sprinkle also addressed the status of AB114. This was originally heard on February 23rd, and passed out of the Assembly on February 25th. It was heard in the Senate Judiciary on March 11th. As of this morning no further action had been taken on this bill. It did get out of one house, and is at this point sitting in the second house. This bill has to do with making changes concerning compensation to victims of crime.

Kareen Prentice stated it extends the appeal time from ten to sixty days, and that the funds not used for victims of crime will stay in the Victims of Crime account at the end of the fiscal year, rather than reverting to the general fund.

Ron Titus stated he knew there were a couple of last minute amendments added on that bill which were not very satisfactory. That is what is holding the bill up in the Senate Judiciary. Kareen Prentice asked where the Committee could find those amendments.

Mr. Titus responded they had been given to the chair but they were not public until there was a hearing on them. It was his understanding the bill

was all ready to go, until those amendments were added. He did not know what they were. He indicated his office was making a call to attempt to have those amendments removed. Mike Sprinkle indicated the Committee will keep track of that.

Mr. Sprinkle then reported on AB116. It was heard on the Assembly Judiciary and went into work session on March 12th. It was passed to the floor, with an amendment that was proposed by the Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Kandt indicated the amendment was requested by the Sheriff's and Chief's, and is regarding the time frame for responding to a request for a police report by a representative of the Victims of Crime program, and also whether or not any confidential information could be redacted from that report before it was released to the Victims of Crime Compensation Officers.

Mr. Kandt further stated that amendments were agreed to and approved to allow the redaction of any information deemed confidential by law, and to allow a reasonable time frame after completion of the report to get it to a Compensation Officer to respond to a request.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that under Keith Munro's advisement, they had decided to support this bill with this single amendment. There was another amendment that was suggested as well, that they considered extremely detrimental to domestic violence, which they did not support. That amendment did not make it into the bill.

Mr. Sprinkle then discussed AB120. It makes changes concerning orders for protection of victims of sexual assault. It was heard in Assembly Judiciary on February 23rd; it was slated for work session yesterday but he did not think they got to it. Mr. Kandt stated AB 120 had not been scheduled for work session yet. Mr. Sprinkle stated there had not been any action on it as of this morning.

Mr. Sprinkle reported on SB14. It was heard on March 9th, in the Senate Finance Committee. It has to do with increasing the portion of the fee for marriage licenses that funds the account for aid to victims of domestic violence. There was no action taken on it that day.

He stated SB113 creates statutory subcommittees for the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice, and it was heard in the Senate Judiciary on February 26th. It did pass out of the Senate Judiciary with one amendment. He did not know what the amendment was. It had not yet passed out of the house. It had not yet had its third reading on the floor. It did pass out of committee.

There was one other bill that the committee had not yet taken action on, AB64. It is a strangulation bill that revises certain provisions concerning the kind of battery, specifically strangulation. It was heard in the Assembly Judiciary on March 2nd, and went to work session on March 12th. It did get a due pass out of work session.

Mr. Kandt stated this bill was amended; the amendment is problematic. The amendment required defining strangulation as a specific intent crime, and required the intent to cause bodily harm. If they could prove someone intended to kill the person they would just charge attempted murder. So, they are going to try to get that amendment removed on the Senate side. It did pass out of committee with the amendment.

Mr. Sprinkle continued his report by discussing AB161. It is Mortensen's bill, and it covers provisions related to domestic violence. The Committee decided to strongly oppose this bill. Mr. Sprinkle reported he had spoken with Assemblyman Mortensen and many other people in the domestic violence community, and in the end they were able to convince him to pull the bill. It was not heard and is dead. He stated it is possible that some other legislators may rework the bill to deal with different aspects of domestic violence, but he thinks it is too late for that to happen.

Mr. Sprinkle also wanted to point out that he and Kareen Prentice had been asked by Keith Munro and Brett Kandt to go down to Carson City and do some lobbying on AB116 and AB120. They spent three days meeting with all of the legislators on the Assembly Judiciary to attempt to convince them to pass the bills. AB 116 has passed with the amendments they requested and they are hoping that same thing will happen with AB 120. He reported it has been a very active two-three weeks for both him and Kareen Prentice from the Attorney General's Office

Mr. Kandt mentioned that things got really backlogged because the legislators wanted their bills drafted, introduced, and referred to committee. With this, in addition to the pre-filed bills, there was a huge backlog. The legislative attorneys have been pulled out of committee hearings and are in their offices drafting bills. The deadline for legislators to submit their bills for drafting was last Monday, and the deadline for introduction into the house of origin is March 23rd. After this date there will not be any more bills coming online.

Mr. Sprinkle stated it was good that many of their bills had been pre-filed, because they had already been heard. He was not anticipating too much more additional activity in terms of upcoming bills that the Committee will need to deal with. It is more a matter of tracking what they have already taken action on.

He did state that if anyone hears anything of interest to this Committee, that they please inform other Committee members as soon as possible regarding what they have heard. He then solicited comments and directions from the Committee.

Ron Titus indicated that all of their bills are out there. Mr. Sprinkle stated that Valerie Cooney had asked him to do some research on Assembly Bill 47. This was a bill of much concern to Sue Meuschke and the Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence. Mr. Titus stated it was regarding the specialty courts, and that had been removed from the bill.

Mr. Kandt responded by stating that the bill got hijacked somewhat. When it went into drafting, a legislator apparently found out about it. It is someone who has a son who has a substance abuse problem and has been arrested multiple times for domestic battery. The legislator in question attempted to have the bill drafted in such a way to allow defendants such as his son to avoid charges and go to alcohol counseling.

They were confused when the bill first came out because it did not reflect what the people who originally sought it had intended. A number of people worked together behind the scenes to get the bill back to what they had originally intended. Mr. Titus indicated that bill had come from the Supreme Court. Mr. Sprinkle remarked the situation had been taken care of without the active participation of the Council. Valerie Cooney indicated this had addressed her concerns.

Mr. Sprinkle then addressed two bills given to him by Kareen Prentice during the meeting. They had just been introduced in the last couple of days.

The first one is AB309. Many assembly people had signed in on this. It revises provisions relating to the crime of stalking. Kareen Prentice gave a synopsis. The bill makes some changes to the law. It adds that a third person, based on being fearful for the safety of another person, can apply for a stalking/harassment order. It also changes it from a gross misdemeanor to a category D felony. She stated she really likes the fact that it also includes text messaging. She indicated this bill is something for the Committee to watch for.

The Committee decided to hold off on taking any action at this time regarding this bill. Mr. Sprinkle stated he will bring this back to the Committee in three weeks, and hopefully they can have some form of action at that point.

The second bill is AB283. This has to do with governing the payment of compensation to certain Victims of Crime. Kareen Prentice stated this bill was not approved by the Victims of Crime Subcommittee. It was not voted for unanimously when the Attorney General held comment on the bill with Brian Nix. Mr. Nix found Assemblyman Menendo to sponsor this bill for him. It removes the \$50,000.00 cap. If there is a catastrophic event, then they can pay more than \$50,000.00.

It sounds good, but after hearing testimony from the Washoe County District Attorney's office and the Clark County District Attorney's office, at the subcommittee they discussed the issue of larger payouts leading to some unpaid claims. They discussed how to make the process fair.

The Board of Examiners establishes its own cap of \$35,000.00. Mr. Kandt responded that even if the cap is increased the Board of Examiners can still leave the cap at something lower that reflects their budget and the amount of funding that the program has, given the number of annual claims they have, in order to be fair and equitable to everybody.

Ms. Prentice responded that the problem is that the subcommittee does not have a lot of trust in how Brian Nix manages his policy. Mr. Kandt stated if the Board of Examiners establishes that they cannot afford more than a certain amount, if he violates that, he is subject to some ramifications.

Mike Sprinkle noted that in their meetings last week with the assembly judiciary legislators, there was much concern regarding compensating victims of crime. He does not think this bill will get much support from his own committee, because they were already concerned about how much money was going to Victims of Crime and how they were awarding it. He thinks several members of that committee will not want to increase the amount paid to victims of crime.

Mr. Kandt found this interesting considering the fact that the State does not contribute any of the general fund to the Victims of Crime fund. Mr. Sprinkle stated a lot of it was legislators that had issues with domestic violence in general. This was an avenue for them to voice their opinions. He does foresee this bill having a lot of problems. He told the Committee there is not a single other legislator who at this point has signed on to this bill.

The Committee decided to not take further action on this bill at this point. Dr. Freda suggested they can see if it is going to go forward, and if they think it should not, then the Committee can take some action.

Mr. Kandt suggested the Committee should pick its battles. They do have some good bills this session. They are moving forward; they don't really have any bad bills that they are trying to defend against. Because the Board of Examiners can establish a lower amount and will probably keep a lower amount other than any statutorily advised cap, he does not think it is a battle the Committee needs to fight. Mike Sprinkle absolutely agreed with him. He did state he had heard some rumblings about the amount of domestic violence items considered this year. It might be a good idea to hold back on this bill if it is not something the Committee feels strongly about. Valerie Cooney stated this made sense. The Committee will hold off on taking a side on AB 283, but will keep an eye on it.

4. *Discussion, review, and possible action on the Advisory Commission on the Administration of Justice Bill Draft Requests.

Mr. Sprinkle indicated he would like to have this agenda item removed from the Agenda.

5. *Schedule future meetings and agenda items.

Mr. Sprinkle stated he would specifically like to have AB 209 and AB 283 on the agenda to be heard, as a subsection under Agenda item #3. He did not like having Friday meetings. Valerie Cooney suggested having a meeting before 4:00 p.m. in the afternoon. The date and time of Wednesday, April 1st, at 11:00 a.m. was selected for the next meeting.

6. *Public Comment.

Kareen Prentice introduced Kathy Jordan, a member of the public who requested an avenue to be heard, so that she could express some of her concerns. Ms. Jordan contacted Kareen with some concerns regarding the NRS in terms of sexual assault.

Ms. Jordan appreciated the opportunity to speak to the Committee. She wanted to speak to someone regarding issues to do with incapacity, people who lack the capacity to consent, particularly victims of therapists and mental health professionals.

She stated that her husband is a victim of a licensed professional and she is amazed at the manner in which it has been treated. She decided to address the issue on the public policy side, in an attempt to change the laws and possibly get some uniformity with regard to the applicable laws. There is quite a bit of differentiation between the states with regards to these laws.

When a therapist or a mental health professional enters into a sexual or a conversion of property relationship with a patient, that person is rendered incapable. There are laws in the state of Nevada regarding that, in terms of sexual assault and actions which constitute theft, but what she found is

that there are issues to do with sexism. There are also some issues connected to tracking what is going on in the State, with the State Board of Marriage and Family Therapists. She wanted to bring this to someone's attention, and is volunteering to dog the issue if she can find someone to assist her with this.

In terms of her husband's situation, he went to law enforcement groups in places where he was sexually assaulted by his therapist. The first agency he approached told him they had no understanding of how to deal with the situation because they did not understand the issue of a woman raping a man, and they did not understand the issue of a therapist having a power differential with a patient.

She was amazed at this. The second law enforcement group her husband went to was in a larger city, and they told him there was insufficient evidence for them to do anything for him. Ms. Jordan believes that law enforcement needs the assistance of forensic professionals in order to bring the charges. She does understand there are budgetary issues, but these are also problems. What she is finding in other states is that there is a count kept, whereas there is not a count kept here in the State of Nevada.

She had asked the Council of Clinical and Professional Counselors about this and received no response to her questions. She asked about the ratio of male to female counselors in the State of Nevada, and also the number of instances of contact of a sexual nature between professionals and patients, or issues of conversion of property. She also requested information regarding the number of complaints received and the number of complaints which were acted upon. None of these questions were answered.

She did applaud the council for the instructions they gave her when she contacted them. They told her this was an issue of alleged sexual contact, and that she needed to contact law enforcement that has jurisdiction. Ms. Jordan stated that in other states, the Therapists Boards do not do that, and it ends up that the therapists are not even ever reported as criminal cases to law enforcement.

She indicated this is quite devastating. Her husband has been in intense psychotherapy for the last three years, and in the last six months he has begun to determine the difference between what is real and what is not.

She has a concern about this issue in the State of Nevada. She was not sure where to go, but thought the Council might be a place to start. Her husband attempted to report this under the Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation, or Isolation of Older Persons, and Vulnerable persons, and

also attempted to report it to the Consumer Affairs Division, the Attorney General's Bureau of Consumer Protection, and the Department of Health and Human Services, and Aging Services. Each agency told him they were not qualified to take such a complaint. They did not know what to do with someone who has been mentally abused by a therapist.

Ms. Jordan indicated law enforcement personnel are not trained to understand the power differential between a therapist and a patient, and are not able to address the increased number of female therapists, and, conversely, the increased number of male victims in the State.

The mental health industry has not addressed the exponential problem of increasing numbers of unethical actions. They do not have treatment programs for either the victims or for licensed professionals. California has a zero tolerance law.

She does think Nevada should move to that. Under NRS 209.5001, there is no one prepared to accept the complaints. A forensic professional could be available under contract to the Attorney General's Office to assist in investigating these crimes.

It is her understanding that right now these crimes are not being investigated. Ms. Jordan closed her remarks by stating this might also be a huge recidivism issue.

After her presentation, Dr. Michael Freda asked Ms. Jordan if this person had been reported to the licensing board. She replied the person happened to be licensed in the State of Oregon, but that she had come down to Nevada and practiced, and it was reported to the licensing board here. Dr. Freda asked if Oregon had done anything about it. Ms. Jordan stated that Oregon has extremely terrible laws in regards to this, and the person is currently licensed and practicing. She basically goes wherever she wants. She took her husband to Utah, Arizona, and then assaulted him in Oregon as well as Nevada.

Mr. Sprinkle had two recommendations for her. First, he stated it sounds like an ethical issue. The person is licensed, and she needs to continue to report the person, and encourage disciplinary actions to be taken by the licensing board. It is his assumption that it is probably not legal for her to be practicing in the State of Nevada. Dr. Freda responded if she does not have a license it is not legal for her to practice in Nevada. Ms. Jordan stated the problem was getting a law enforcement agency to charge her.

Valerie Cooney suggested she make a formal complaint to the law enforcement agency. That complaint is investigated, and then it goes to the District Attorney in the jurisdiction who makes a determination about

whether to prosecute. Ms. Jordan responded that the district attorney had cited insufficient evidence. They don't know how to prosecute an issue to do with a woman raping a man, a female therapist raping her patient. Dr. Freda and Valerie Cooney both stated it is not possible for law enforcement to differentiate in the prosecution of such cases based on sex. The jurisdictions in question are Churchill County and Humboldt County.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested she continue to pursue this. She should continue talking to the prosecutors in the applicable jurisdictions. He stated if she is looking for legislative changes to statutes in the State of Nevada, it is too late for this legislative session that is going on now.

However, she can do the research, and come up with language for the next legislative session. There are plenty of legislators he can suggest she go to. If she is willing to do the legwork and really investigate what changes need to occur, then she may be able to get the ear of her local legislator.

He stated that once that has taken place the Committee would be happy to take a look at any of the legislation that is being presented and make determinations. That would be in the distant future. He indicated it would be incumbent upon her to do a lot of that homework. He recommended she contact her local legislator after the session ends this year.

Ms. Jordan appreciated his response. She indicated to the Committee that she and her husband had been able to handle this, professionally and financially. There is an exponential increase in these crimes. It is not being reported to law enforcement, and there is not a means to deal with it. People don't know how to deal with it, and it requires very specific help. She indicated the licensing boards are a big joke. This is a terrible situation. She stated most of the victims are not capable of understanding they need to report this.

Mr. Sprinkle responded that he believed that her strong voice would be a good advocate for that issue. Andrea Sundberg requested that Kareen Prentice give Ms. Jordan her phone number, and request that she contact her on Monday. Andrea is with the Nevada Coalition Against Sexual Violence.

7. *Adjournment

Dr. Michael Freda made a motion to adjourn; it was seconded by Valerie Cooney. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

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

Minutes of Meeting

April 28, 2009

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
Ron Titus
Andrea Sundberg
Sue Meuschke
Vic Hutchings

Committee Members Absent

Elynn Greene
Susan Filon, Esq.
Brett Kandt
Valerie Cooney

Public Present

None

Attorney General's Office Staff Present

Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General
Keith Munro, Assistant Attorney General
Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman
Kathy L. Boone, Assistant to NCPDV

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

Mike Sprinkle called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

2. *Review and approval of minutes from the March 13, 2009 meeting.

Sue Meuschke stated she should have been marked as “absent” for the 3/13/09 meeting; the minutes did not reflect this. Mr. Sprinkle stated this correction would be made to the minutes.

Ms. Meuschke made a motion to accept the minutes with the proposed change; Dr. Michael Freda seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. *Discussion and possible action on any upcoming or pending legislative items.

Mr. Sprinkle began discussion of AB 531 (SUMMARY—Revises provisions governing the distribution of the proceeds of certain administrative assessments. (BDR 14-1192)). He stated that even though the committee has gone on record in support of this bill, Mike Sprinkle is looking for a formal motion to add this bill to a list of bills the committee is supporting.

Dr. Freda stated that on the last page of the bill, the percentage allocation of the minimum of 49% was not enumerated (in contradistinction to the 51% on the previous page). Dr. Freda stated that he believes if the percentage allocation for the 49% is not enumerated, then any monies that are supposed to go to the AG for the DV funds may not get there (or very little will get there). Mr. Sprinkle said that he also noticed that the allocation was not stated in AB 531, but assumed it was written into somewhere else in statute.

Ron Titus stated that the allocation is determined by the Budget Office. When the Budget Office does the budget, they get an estimate of the 49% and then they divide it up the way it’s requested by the various budget accounts. It is not done by the percentage as it is on the judicial side. On the executive side, the Governor decides what to do. For example, the Attorney General would request a certain amount of dollars for their budget for DV. Mr. Titus quoted a figure of \$76,000 that the AG is asking for.

Dr. Freda stated that the point of his concern about the lack of percentage allocation for the 49% is this: If the Governor is upset with the AG, he may only allocate a very small percentage, and that would be in keeping with regulation. But if there is a certain percentage that is *supposed to be allocated*, the Governor doesn’t have a choice.

Mr. Titus stated that this is the way it has been since the session has begun, they're just adding in the AG as a possible person that the Governor could give nothing to, and that's the prerogative of the Governor. Mr. Titus stated that it is done this way in the Executive branch because it is a completely separate branch of government. Mr. Titus stated that if he was going to be concerned about something, he would be concerned about subsection #9 because before #9 was added all the money had to be distributed between those original five programs. Now, if the money isn't being distributed among six of the programs, you can see who gets it—the General Fund. Mr. Titus told the committee that he would abstain from a vote to change AB 531 because the first part under page 4 was drafted by his office and he doesn't want that part of the bill to be affected.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if AB 531 has gone to work session or has been voted on. Mr. Titus stated that it has not. Mr. Sprinkle asked Ms. Meuschke if she has heard anything secondary to the testimony that was done on AB 531 last week.

Ron Titus answered that he knows that his office has suggested a budget amendment to subsection #9: "What that amendment does is make sure that they are referring only to the 49% of the Executive branch. So right now with any monies deposited in the General Fund pursuant to subsections 5 and 6, which is all of the administrative assessments (AAs), there is a taxation question that arises if you apply this to all the AAs because the Judicial Branch is not a taxing branch. We cannot tax. So we limited it only to section 8b which is the 49%, although there is still a question of whether or not any of the AA monies can go directly to the General Fund. It could go to something related to those AAs and, frankly, the Victims of Domestic Violence is a little iffy. But we're not commenting on that particular aspect. That's the Governor's section, so the Judicial Branch is not commenting on that section, and we're kind of restricted anyway because we're in the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court would rule on any challenges to that particular aspect."

Sue Meuschke stated that she has not heard anything secondary to the testimony on AB 531.

Mr. Titus stated that he anticipated no problem with the bill going through. Mr. Titus's office had recently communicated with the budget people over at Legislative Counsel Bureau and they discussed that if AB 531 passes, then they can front the money for foreclosure mediation projects. The Administrative Office of the Courts and the Legislative Counsel Bureau are pushing to get this bill passed. Mr. Titus believes that there will be no problem getting AB 531 passed as it is now. But if we try to make an amendment to it, there is a chance that we all may lose it.

Mr. Sprinkle and Ms. Prentice haven't heard anything coming from the AG Office as far as amendments to this bill. Kareen stated that she would be surprised if there was something in the works from the AG office. Mr. Sprinkle stated that he and Kareen would follow up with Keith Munro to make sure we are all on the same page as far as the AG Office is concerned.

Mr. Titus stated that he spoke with the AG and gave her additional information as to how these AA's were written up, because every one of these other five individual agencies are kind of upset at subsection 9, but given the fiscal needs of the state at this time, that is one way they're addressing it.

Kareen Prentice stated that the AG made it clear in her testimony that she is not that happy with this avenue. Mr. Sprinkle stated that discussion so far on AB 531 helped him understand a bit more what the AG's testimony was and where it was coming from.

Mr. Sprinkle reiterated that the committee did go on record as supporting AB 531, and that it would certainly be helpful if a formal motion from the Legislative Committee could be made.

Ms. Meuschke made a motion to support AB 531. Ms. Sundberg seconded the motion. Mr. Sprinkle noted Dr. Freda's concerns regarding the enumeration of the allocations of the 49%. Since there were no changes proposed to AB 531, Mr. Titus decided to join in the vote. The motion passed: AB 531 can be added to the list of bills the Legislative Committee supports.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he doesn't have a breakdown of each of the bills the committee supports, since they're all in different places right now, so he opened up discussion of concerns to the rest of the committee.

Mr. Sprinkle brought up AB 164 (the Strangulation Bill), which the committee chose to support. At the time of testimony on this bill in the Senate, it had already passed out of the Assembly and Senate Judiciary. Mr. Sprinkle stated that the sponsor of the bill wasn't all that much in favor of it any more, and that definitely had to do with the amendment that was tacked onto it. Mr. Sprinkle, Ms. Prentice, Brett Kandt and Paula (Berkley) with NNADV went in and supported AB 164, but said they were actually opposed to the amendment that followed it from the Assembly. Mr. Sprinkle asked Ms. Meuschke the outcome of AB 164 after work session. Sue stated that she didn't think AB 164 was in work session. Mike thought AB 164 was going to be in work session last Monday, but maybe it didn't happen. It certainly didn't help that the sponsor for AB 164 came in and spoke against his own bill.

General Masto and Keith Munro joined the meeting at 4:19 p.m. Mr. Sprinkle got them caught up on most of what had been discussed so far in this meeting.

Mr. Sprinkle asked Ms. Meuschke what the status is of SB 14. Ms. Meuschke stated that SB 14 is currently in Assembly Judiciary—it was heard on Friday, April 24. General Masto asked Ms. Meuschke if all of the issues would be worked out with SB 14. Meuschke stated that they could probably get it out of the * _____ * committee. Ms. Meuschke stated that they were waiting for Mr. Anderson to schedule a work session, and she anticipates SB 14 will come out without any amendments.

Ms. Sundberg stated that AB 116 is going to hearing, and the status of the bill is that the Victims of Crime Compensation Program would remove the standard of contributory conduct for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence—their conduct would no longer be considered as a basis for denial. Ms. Sundberg stated that it is her understanding that somebody is going to be coming in and filing an amendment requesting that it go through and contributory conduct would no longer be considered for sexual assault, but they're going to be requesting that domestic violence be removed and that contributory conduct would still be considered a basis for denial for victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Sprinkle asked Ms. Sundberg if she knows who would be proposing that amendment. Ms. Sundberg stated that she thinks it would be Bryan Nix. General Masto asked if all in the committee would be there to testify in support of AB 116. Yes, the committee said. Mr. Sprinkle stated that this was one of the two bills that Kareen and he had actively lobbied for in the Assembly, and they will certainly be at the Legislature on Thursday.

Keith Munro said the he heard the same thing Ms. Sundberg heard regarding the above-mentioned amendment to AB 116. Mr. Munro stated that if Mr. Nix wants to appear and make that representation, more power to him. Mr. Munro stated that he doesn't believe Mr. Nix's actions will have much impact on the bill, and he thinks the bill will pass. Mr. Sprinkle offered his assistance with anything having to do with this bill. Mr. Munro stated that after the bill is heard, he would like to get on the track with the committee members and speak with Bryan Nix. Mr. Sprinkle and Ms. Prentice will also participate in speaking with Mr. Nix after AB 116 is heard.

Ms. Meuschke wanted to discuss AB 164 again. It was in fact voted at the Senate Judiciary the 20th as amend and do pass. Ms. Meuschke said she believes that the amendment is the same one that was proposed at the hearing. It will now have to go to the Senate floor and then it will go back

to the Assembly. Mr. Sprinkle stated that AB 164 came out of the Assembly with that amendment. Sue disagreed and stated that it came out of Assembly with the "intent" amendment. They have re-amended it in the Senate to remove the "intent" language. Mr. Sprinkle said he understood, and thanked Ms. Meuschke for her research on AB 164.

Mr. Munro commented that he heard Ms. Sundberg testify on AB 120 and thought that she did quite well. Andrea thanked Keith and stated that AB 120 passed out of the Senate Judiciary on Friday. Mr. Munro stated that AB 114 passed out also, and they amended a portion of it by giving victims a longer time frame to file an appeal within AB 114, and that passed.

Ms. Sundberg stated that AB120 and AB114 are on the general file for tomorrow (April 29).

General Masto thanked the committee for taking the time to show up at the Legislature to testify on bills and commended them on doing a fantastic job.

4. *Schedule future meetings and agenda items.

Mr. Sprinkle stated he would like to schedule the next meeting for Thursday, May 28 at 4:00 p.m. The date and time of Thursday, May 28, at 4:00 p.m. was selected for the next meeting. He commented that this would be the committee's last meeting before the session was over, unless they had a special extended session.

5. *Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

6. *Adjournment

Sue Meuschke made a motion to adjourn; the motion was seconded by Andrea Sundberg. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

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

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday, May 28, 2009, at 4:00 p.m.

Via Teleconference with Public Access Located at:
Office of the Attorney General
5420 Kietzke Lane, Suite 202, Large Conference Room, Reno, Nevada 89511

AGENDA

Please Note: The Nevada Council for the Prevention of Domestic Violence Legislative Committee may address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate persons appearing before the Committee or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting. 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)

At the discretion of the Chair, public comment is welcomed by the Committee, but will be heard only when that item is reached and will be limited to five minutes per person. A public comment time will also be available as the last item on the agenda. 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.

***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 and roll call of members.
2. *Review and approval of minutes from April 28, 2009 meeting.
3. *Discussion and possible action on any upcoming or pending Legislative items
4. *Schedule future meetings and agenda items.
5. 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)

6. *Adjournment

This agenda has been sent to all members of the Committee and other interested persons who have requested an agenda from the Council. Persons who wish to continue to receive an agenda and notice must request so in writing on an annual basis.

Anyone desiring additional information regarding the meeting is invited to call the Council office at (775) 688-1818. We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify the Council's administrative assistant, Kathy Boone, at (775) 688-1818, no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. Requests for special arrangements made after this time frame cannot be guaranteed.

THIS MEETING HAS BEEN PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED
IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

Office of the Attorney General 100 N Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701	Office of the Attorney General 5420 Kietzke Lane, Ste 202 Reno, Nevada 89511	Grant Sawyer State Office Building 555 E. Washington Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Jean Nidetch Women's Center University of Nevada, Las Vegas 4505 Maryland Parkway Las Vegas, Nevada 89154	Safe Nest 2915 W. Charleston Blvd., #12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102	Reno City Hall One E. First Street Reno, Nevada 89501
	Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence 220 South Rock Boulevard, Suite 7 Reno Nevada 89502	