

**STATE OF NEVADA  
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of Meeting**

---

*January 12, 2009*

---

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

**Committee Members Present**

Vic Hutchings  
Caryn Sternlicht

**Committee Members Present Via Teleconference**

Becky Smokey  
Suzanne Ramos  
Ellen Ewing

**Committee Members Absent**

Toni Downen  
Susan Filon  
Adriana Botello

**Public Present**

None

**Attorney General's Office Staff Present**

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General  
Kareen Prentice, DV Ombudsman  
Gabriel Caballero, Council Assistant

1. **\*Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.**  
Suzanne Ramos called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

**2. \*Review and approval of minutes from November 4, 2008**

Ms. Ramos confirmed that everyone had received the minutes. She asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes, and asked if there was a motion to accept the minutes as submitted, or to amend. Becky Smokey made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. Ellen Ewing seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the minutes were approved as submitted.

**3. \*Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee (TPO intake process, DV Program survey, Report on Bilingual Services)**

Ms. Ramos indicated she thought the Committee had tabled the third item, the Report on Bilingual Services. She indicated they were going to create a survey subcommittee, and that Toni, Vic, and Adriana were going to be working on the survey. Vic Hutchings replied she had been working on her part of it, but was not sure how to get a hold of the other Committee members to talk to them. She stated that she had planned to bring that up.

She requested that someone give her the contact information for the other people on the subcommittee, so they could coordinate that. Suzanne Ramos asked her if she received the list of all the Council members at the last Council meeting. Ms. Hutchings responded she had just received it last week and would look at it. Ms. Ramos responded that was the way to contact them so they can hold off discussing until the next meeting.

Ms. Ramos stated they had also discussed the TPO intake program, and Bilingual services statewide. She clarified with Vic Hutchings that those things would be included in the survey they are working on. Ms. Hutchings responded that she was addressing some of those issues for the rurals. Ms. Ramos responded it would be nice to get an overview for all of the programs statewide, to encompass everything, and possibly note some gaps in services; not just in the rurals, but also in Clark and Washoe County. Ms. Hutchings stated she would add that to it.

General Masto asked Suzanne Ramos about the purpose of the survey. Ms. Ramos responded they are looking to find what gaps there are. When they went to the rural tour meeting, people indicated there were gaps in getting the TPO's. So, they can look into what gaps in services there are, and so they can look into them further for legislative issues in the future. General Masto then asked who they are going to be serving. Ms. Ramos responded they are going to be serving the courts, the programs, prosecution and law enforcement. Hopefully the subcommittee will divide their research and see what services are out there under each category. Vic Hutchings asked if they could also include shelters; Ms. Ramos replied in the affirmative. Ms. Ramos further stated that one of the goals of the

survey, since they had not been surveyed in a while, was just to see where they are at right now. She thought that was what the committee had discussed. Vic Hutchings agreed with her.

Ms. Ramos indicated since they did not have all of the subcommittee members present, they would continue this item for the next meeting. Becky Smokey made a motion to table this item until the next meeting. Vic Hutchings seconded the motion; so did Caryn Sternlicht. The motion passed.

**4. \*Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting**

Ms. Ramos asked the Committee if had any ideas regarding what they wanted to have. She confirmed with Kareen Prentice that the upcoming Council meeting would be video-conferenced. Ms. Prentice stated there was no speaker scheduled for the upcoming meeting. Suzanne Ramos asked if they had anyone they should ask to come and speak, and educate the other Council members about the underserved issues.

Vic Hutchings stated that at the last meeting they discussed someone doing a presentation on kids and violence. She indicated Ms. Ramos had suggested A.C.C.S. Ms. Ramos responded they do a counseling program on the effects of violence in the home, for children and for other people. The municipal court judges in Reno have offenders go to this program, which is an 8 hour class that is offered on Saturdays. Ms. Ramos offered to contact this organization to see if they would bring their program presentation to the council. Becky Smokey made a motion that Ms. Ramos contact them to set up a presentation. Ellen Ewing seconded the motion. The motion carried.

A suggested time limit for their presentation was discussed. Kareen Prentice suggested approximately twenty minutes. Ms. Rasul responded that the speaker could choose the length of the presentation, since we want to give them enough time to introduce their program and cover their points.

**5. \*Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation Issue along I-80 Corridor for Victims of Domestic Violence.**

Ms. Ramos reported they had various people on the Committee that were going to be calling and checking with different states to find out how they deal with issue of getting domestic violence victims from the rural areas into the cities. She then indicated the areas assigned to different Committee members, and asked if anyone had anything to report back on.

Vic Hutchings responded she contacted the states she was given, and it was pretty much a crapshoot as to what kind of assistance is given. The

primary assistance, which was the case in every state where she spoke with someone, was family and friends; police will transport the victims, but the victims don't want to be transported. They apparently don't have a real plan. Ms. Hutchings reported that she had checked that Greyhound comes into Battle Mountain four times a day, twice from the east, and twice from the west. The same is true of Elko.

Regarding Amtrak, Ms. Hutchings reported it was basically the same case. Railroad personnel were not able to tell her when Amtrak was coming, or if it was coming. She further stated it is very chaotic in virtually all of the states. No one has a plan. Ms. Ramos mentioned that this was the issue they discussed at the November Council meeting; that it is very difficult for victims to flee their perpetrators in the rural communities. She referred to the difficulties with Amtrak in Elko, and also mentioned that as far as Greyhound is concerned, you cannot simply leave victims at stations.

Ms. Hutchings responded she was correct. She told the Committee members she had spoken with the Chief of Police in Wendover, who informed her that he wants to apply for funding and have his own shelter in Wendover because too many of the victims work and they cannot afford not to. If he had his own shelter he would head that up and get that going so that victims could be safe and also go to work. That was the only person she spoke with who had a plan.

Ms. Ramos responded that she knew Winnemucca had a program, and possibly a shelter. Ms. Prentice indicated they had a transitional house, a little apartment, but it is not called a shelter. They are working on a shelter.

Ms. Ramos inquired as to what services Battle Mountain has and Ms. Hutchings responded they have nothing. No shelter, no services. They do have a hotline that goes through the hospital, but they have to go to Elko if they want shelter. Becky Smokey asked if any of the domestic violence centers or social service agencies within northern Nevada had financial resources available to victims who leave an abusive relationship. These resources would be for transportation and food. She remarked that some agencies have money put aside to assist people in such situations. Ms. Ramos remarked that in the north they had food vouchers, but she did not know about transportation vouchers. She indicated she would check into that.

Suzanne Ramos stated it is especially difficult for victims fleeing in the I-80 corridor, because so many people know each other as they are such smaller communities. Becky Smokey stated that in Douglas County they had assisted clients to move from one location to another, and they did contact Greyhound and at that time they had given them free tickets for

the victims. She volunteered to contact them to see if anything is currently available.

Vic Hutchings stated that Elko County Social Services will give a bus ticket, but the problem is that domestic violence does not always happen between eight in the morning and five a night. Ms. Ramos responded they needed transportation assistance available twenty four hours a day. They can check on and report on various things at their next meeting.

Caryn Sternlicht asked if there was not a way to maintain a list of people who are available to drive, and asked if that had been explored at all in these communities. Ms. Ramos responded the issue had been liability. There is an issue with someone driving someone somewhere, should something happen. It was suggested that they have it underground, or have a phone tree. Ms. Sternlicht said she thought that might really work. She had previously lived in upstate New York, where there are several rural communities. In those communities, they do that. Ms. Ramos asked Ms. Hutchings if any of the states she had checked with had an underground phone tree system to get victims out of their situations. She responded that they did not. They said that the liability issues were way too high. Ms. Sternlicht was wondering if there might be ways to get around the basic liability issues. Ms. Ramos asked her if she had any people from New York she could contact to see how they operate their phone tree. This was several years ago, but she said she would see what she could find out.

She also suggested the Committee attempt to find some way around the liability issues, and explore the possibility of waivers. General Masto responded they would be talking about waivers at various levels, State, etc. She stated it was a great idea, and is something the Committee should be exploring. Ms. Sternlicht also suggested maybe they could obtain some statistics on how many victims they are talking about on an annual basis, who would need to be transported. She did not have an idea. Ms. Ramos suggested that would be something to find out when the domestic violence services in the rural communities are contacted. She will try to find out how many women needed to flee their jurisdictions in 2008.

Ms. Ramos stated she thought the committee had a big task ahead of them, especially since the issue of the I-80 corridor had been assigned to them by the Council at its October meeting. They really need to look into that, and take action and develop a plan for that. It is not going to be something that is going to be addressed in one or two meetings. Ms. Ramos also reminded the committee that the Attorney General had wanted them to set goals so they had goals for this coming year. She thought working on the rurals and the I-80 corridor issues, as well as doing

the Domestic violence program survey are two really important issues. Those can be two goals for the upcoming year. They can also set some other goals based on their findings once they begin to look into these two issues. That would be great to have by December of next year. Everyone agreed with this. Ms. Ramos then reiterated which Committee member would handle the respective projects.

**6. \*Discussion and possible action regarding survey questions pertaining to training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPO' s heard**

Suzanne Ramos clarified that, according to her recollection, this issue was part of the DV program survey from Agenda item #3. A Committee member responded that it was actually separate from that. Deputy Attorney General Henna Rasul clarified they are separate.

Ms. Ramos asked how the Committee had wanted to address the survey and the training for the hearing masters. She indicated that there would be quite a few new hearing masters. This was something that Susan Filon had brought up from Clark County Legal Services. General Masto asked her for some background on the issue. Ms. Ramos responded that the problem is with the hearing masters for Temporary Protection Orders. She was trying to remember how the subject had been brought up at their last meeting but was unable to do so. General Masto asked if Henna Rasul and Kareen Prentice had the information. Ms. Rasul did not remember, either.

At this point, Ms. Ramos suggested the Committee table this item until they have Susan Filon and Toni Downen present to discuss the issue. Vic Hutchings stated she recalled that someone had a concern regarding TPO extensions in certain jurisdictions. The initial order was being granted, but then the extension was not granted. The person who had mentioned this had indicated that they needed more training on the needs for extending the TPO's. Ms. Ramos stated that she would call Susan Filon and find out the information the Committee needed, so they could proceed properly. Caryn Sternlicht made a motion to table the item. Becky Smokey seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**7. \*Establish committee goals for 2009**

Suzanne Ramos reported that she thought their goals would be to work on the I-80 corridor issue; that is something they have to accomplish during this year. She stated that the DV program survey and the TPO issue pertaining to hearing masters for rural communities should also be goals the Committee should pursue. She asked if they needed more goals than those three, or if those would be adequate enough for them to work on. Vic Hutchings responded those three would keep her busy. Becky Smokey commented that she was wondering who would be working on

the mail order brides, and trafficking. Ms. Ramos responded they had not addressed that. Becky Smokey stated it had been discussed, so she had been wondering. Ms. Ramos responded the priorities they had from the past were to have a speaker at the Council meeting to deal with various underserved issues. That is ongoing. She reiterated the issues she would like the committee to work on. She thought this could be the fourth one they work on, but she did not want to take on so many goals that they do not accomplish anything. If they have time, they could address taking that issue on. She asked how the other Committee members would feel about that. The other Committee members agreed with Suzanne Ramos that they were already taking on enough. General Masto agreed that it was smart to not take on more than you can accomplish throughout the year. Having fewer goals will give the committee an opportunity to really work on achieving those. She thought it was great.

Kareen Prentice asked Ms. Ramos if she would be prepared to present the Committee's goals at the upcoming Council meeting. She responded she would. She confirmed the date of the meeting, indicating she would report on what the Committee is doing and their goals that they have established for 2009.

Henna Rasul suggested they make a motion to adopt the goals. Becky Smokey made the motion and Ellen Ewing seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**8. \*Schedule future meetings and agenda items**

Suzanne Ramos could not remember if the Committee stated they would meet quarterly. Kareen Prentice confirmed this had been agreed upon. Ms. Ramos indicated their next meeting would be in April. She was planning to send out the task list for the meeting at the end of January. A meeting date was discussed, either the last week of March, the first week of April, or the last week of April. The date and time selected was April 6<sup>th</sup> at 11:00 a.m.

**9. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**10.\*Adjournment**

Becky Smokey made a motion to adjourn; Caryn Sternlicht seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA  
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of Meeting**

---

*April 6, 2009*

---

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

**Committee Members Present**

Vic Hutchings

**Committee Members Present Via Teleconference**

Toni Downen  
Suzanne Ramos  
Ellen Ewing  
Caryn Sternlicht

**Committee Members Absent**

Becky Smokey  
Susan Filon  
Adriana Botello

**Public Present**

None

**Attorney General's Office Staff Present**

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General  
Rebecca Zatarain, Assistant to the DV Ombudsman  
Kathy L. Boone, Administrative Assistant

1. **\*Call to order, roll call of members, and introduction.**  
Suzanne Ramos called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.



**2. \*Review and approval of minutes from January 12, 2009**

Ms. Ramos asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes, if there was a motion to accept the minutes as submitted, or to amend the minutes. Ellen Ewing stated that she received minutes from a different committee—not the Underserved Committee minutes. Caryn Sternlicht made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Vic Hutchings seconded the motion. Ellen Ewing abstained from voting. There was no further discussion and the minutes were approved as submitted.

**3. \*Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee (TPO intake process, DV Program survey, Report on Bilingual Services)**

Ms. Ramos asked if the DV Program Survey committee met to begin work on this project. Ms. Ramos thought the DV Survey committee was going to consist of Becky Smokey and Vic Hutchings. Ms. Hutchings stated that the work on the survey has not been completed, and that she hasn't discussed the survey with Ms. Smokey. Ms. Rasul and Ms. Ramos reviewed the previous meeting minutes and noted that Adrianna Botello, Toni Downen and Vic Hutchings were to work on the DV Program survey. Ms. Ramos stated that she wanted to clarify who was going to take charge of that project. Ms. Hutchings stated that she would be willing to take charge of the DV Program survey project. Ms. Hutchings expressed that she would contact Ms. Botello and Ms. Smokey, and work with Ms. Botello and Ms. Downen on the DV Program survey. Ms. Ramos stated that Ms. Smokey has a copy of the last survey that was done, so it would be good to contact Ms. Smokey and see the copy that she has, then see how to incorporate and revise it into the new survey. Ms. Hutchings will collaborate with Ms. Botello and Ms. Downen, and report results to Ms. Ramos. Ms. Ramos stated that Susan Filon had some concerns with the TPO (Temporary Protection Order)/intake process in Las Vegas and how the hearings are administered. Ms. Hutchings will contact Ms. Filon and find out what her concerns are and, if applicable, would incorporate the information into the DV Program survey.

Ms. Ewing made a motion that Vic Hutchings be appointed as the chair of the DV Program Survey subcommittee. Ms. Downen seconded the motion. Ms. Hutchings abstained from voting. The motion carried, and Vic Hutchings will chair the subcommittee on the DV Program survey.

**4. \*Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting**

Ms. Ramos stated that she has tried to contact Walt at ACCS to have one of their representatives come to talk to the NCPDV on the effects of violence in the home on children. Walt has not contacted Ms. Ramos at this point. Vic will e-mail to Ms. Ramos Walt's cell phone number. Ms.

Ramos wanted to confirm that the next Council meeting date is April 21. Ms. Rasul stated that she believes April 21 is a tentative date, and that we would need to confirm this with Kareen Prentice, the Domestic Violence Ombudsman. Rebecca Zatarain stated that she would ask Kareen Prentice about the date of the next meeting and e-mail the information to the Council.

Ms. Ramos stated she would continue her efforts to get Walt to speak at the next Council meeting. The committee did not have suggestions for an alternate choice of speaker for the Council meeting at this time.

**5. \*Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation issue along I-80 Corridor for Victims of Domestic Violence.**

Ms. Ramos asked about Kareen's research report on Greyhound and Amtrak. Unfortunately, Ms. Prentice was unable to attend the meeting today due to illness. Ms. Ramos decided to table this part of the discussion. Rebecca will e-mail Kareen and remind her to contact Ms. Ramos concerning the report.

Ms. Ramos asked Caryn Sternlicht about the Buffalo Program (cell phone tree). Ms. Sternlicht stated that there was nothing that program could tell her that would be useful at this point.

Vic Hutchings stated that she contacted people in Montana/Kansas/Wyoming regarding transportation for victims, and it was pretty much a crapshoot as to what kind of assistance is given. Ms. Hutchings explained that family members and police officers will transport, although it is different in every community and there is no organized system.

Toni Downen reported the information she received regarding transportation for victims of DV in rural Ohio. In Ohio, they have people that volunteer on a monthly basis to answer calls and transport victims. There is a volunteer that takes phone calls. The person who takes the call can call other volunteers directly, and the other volunteers will actually go to different areas and pick victims up and bring them to a safe house. The Ohio representative stated that this works very well and volunteers are very willing to pick up people and take them to a safe house. The Ohio contact said that they have the same transportation problems that rural Nevadans have, i.e. no Greyhound, etc. Ms. Ramos asked if there is a liability concern with the volunteers transporting the victims. Does the organization in Ohio have liability insurance for their volunteers? Ms. Downen stated that the Ohio contact did not think that liability was a real concern. The Ohio person stated that they rely on a "trust" issue—nobody

pays anything to anyone, other than their car insurance, and the people are so happy to be picked up that nobody has addressed this issue.

Ms. Sternlicht stated that the people in rural New York do the same thing. She thought perhaps the committee could work on doing some kind of waiver wherein the person to be transported understands that they are a private passenger as opposed to being sponsored by an organization; in other words, they are covered under the volunteer's (driver's) auto insurance, as opposed to a liability issue for the company.

Ms. Ramos stated that she did speak with some DV victim advocates in Carson City, and they have no issues because they actually have a van and they have liability insurance for their staff to take victims out-of-state. What they have seen more are victims who are mail-order brides from Germany or Poland. Oftentimes, they use their van to transport people to locations outside of their jurisdiction. They also pay for airline tickets to get the victims out of Carson City also. They contact the victims' family, and they are willing to buy the airline ticket for the trip back. In one case, they even got the perpetrator to actually pay for the ticket to have the victim go back home. They say they average about two a year that they have to assist getting out of the county and/or the country.

Ms. Sternlicht stated that she thinks getting out of the country is a separate issue. Ms. Ramos stated that the victims that they've handled in Carson City are basically immigrant victims. For local victims, they will put them in a bus or on a plane to California or a different state, and they say that there are two to three victims on average per year that they have to do this for.

Ms. Sternlicht stated that she still wonders about the idea a list of volunteers and a waiver. Not only should there be a waiver for from the person being transported, the person who does the transporting should provide assurance that he/she has insurance on the vehicle. That might be a short-term solution, but it would probably be a feasible thing to do: The volunteers would affirm that they have auto insurance, perhaps by providing a copy of their declaration page and the person being transported would sign a waiver stating that they are getting transported by a private citizen and not by an organization. The person transporting would also include and sign the waiver to the effect that he is a private citizen with his own auto insurance operating as a volunteer and explain this to the passenger before the passenger signs the waiver.

The committee thought the idea of a waiver is good. It may alleviate the liability issue for a shelter—since everyone who drives a car could have coverage for a passenger.

The committee discussed contacting victim advocate organizations in Fallon, Minden, Winnemucca, Battle Mountain and Yerington to see if they could get volunteer transportation pools and also to discuss generating a transporter/rider waiver as discussed above. It's would be a situation wherein the volunteer may get reimbursed by the organization for gas, but not acting as an agent for the private contractor (organization), or perhaps instead of getting reimbursed for gas, the volunteer can get a stipend. Ms. Ramos stated would like to contact DV agencies on the I-80 corridor and get some feedback to see if this would be feasible in their jurisdiction. This item will be returned to the agenda of the next meeting, and by that time, input from those agencies should have been collected. Ms. Sternlicht stated that it would be useful to know what someone from Tonopah or Ely does when he/she needs to escape a battering situation.

Ms. Ramos stated that she spoke to Maxine from Elko and with one of their cases, basically the victim had a vehicle to escape. The Elko sheriff escorted her to the state line so she could be with her sister in California. Ms. Sternlicht asked "Do we first need to find out what's being 'done in the real world', since not everything avails itself to having an escort by a sheriff?" Ms. Ramos stated that the committee will need to contact these rural communities (Elko, Ely, Battle Mountain, Yerington, and Pahrump) to find out what they do and how often they have to do it. Is it when the guy is arrested; or when the woman is within an inch of her life?

The committee discussed how things are done very differently in rural areas and that Carson City, Reno, and Las Vegas do not have the issues that the rural areas have. For example, if you live in Austin and your intimate partner severely beats you, how exactly do you get some assistance? Do you have to call a relative? If it's the police, do they have to contact somebody? Do they have any protocol for escort?

Ms. Ramos and Ms. Sternlicht plan to continue discussion with programs in the rural areas as to their protocol in dealing with DV victim transport. This item will be on the next committee meeting agenda to report on.

**6. \*Discussion and possible action regarding training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPOs heard.**

Ms. Ramos stated that she and Ms. Sternlicht can address this issue when they talk to the rural agencies about victims of crime trying to flee their jurisdiction. Agenda items #5 and #6 can be combined, and be followed up on at the same time.

Ms Ramos stated that she wanted to speak with Susan Filon in Las Vegas regarding a training issue in Clark County with the TPOs and hearing masters not being uniformly trained on DV. Ms. Sternlicht added that we

may have the same problem in Washoe County, but not to the extent that Clark County has it.

Ms. Ramos and Ms. Sternlicht concluded that the urban areas (Clark and Washoe counties) as well as the rural areas will be researched concerning training of hearing masters and the hearing of TPOs. Ms. Ramos will contact Ms. Filon regarding her concerns about Clark County, then will coordinate the discussions with the urban and rural areas regarding training of hearing masters and hearing of TPOs. Ms. Filon will be invited to report on her concerns at the next Underserved Committee meeting.

Ms. Rasul suggested that agenda item #6 be rewritten thus: "Discussion of possible action regarding training for hearing masters and having TPOs heard statewide." The committee agreed that this language was appropriate.

**7. \*Schedule future meetings and agenda items**

Agenda items #3, #4, #5, will remain the same. Agenda item #6 will appear as modified above.

Ms. Ramos stated that she would like to hold another committee meeting in June prior to the Council meeting in July so that the committee could present its findings and prepare a report to present at the Council meeting in Hawthorne on July 16, 2009.

The date and time selected for the next Underserved Committee meeting is Monday, June 22 at 11:00 a.m.

**8. \*Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**9. \*Adjournment**

Ms. Sternlicht made a motion to adjourn; Vic Hutchings seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA  
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS COMMITTEE**

## **Minutes of Meeting**

---

*June 22, 2009*

---

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

**Committee Members Present**

None

**Committee Members Present Via Teleconference**

Toni Downen  
Suzanne Ramos  
Rebecca Smokey  
Caryn Sternlicht  
Vicky "Vic" Hutchings

**Committee Members Absent**

Adriana Botello,  
Ellen Ewing Ph.D.  
Susan Filon Esq.

**Public Present**

None

**Attorney General's Office Staff Present**

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General  
Kathy L. Boone, Administrative Assistant

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

Suzanne Ramos called the meeting to order at 11:03 a.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

**2. \*Review and approval of minutes from April 6, 2009.**

Ms. Ramos asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes. Is there a motion to approve or amend the minutes from anyone? Ms. Smokey suggested that the wording under item #2 was repetitive and to strike the first line and replace the word "She" in the second line with "Ms. Ramos". Under item #3 there is a duplication of a statement which says Vic agreed to accept leadership in the DV Program survey. Ms. Ramos agreed and suggested the ninth sentence be revised to read: "Ms. Hutchings will collaborate with Ms. Botello and Ms. Downen and report."

Ms. Smokey made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Ms. Sternlicht seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the minutes were approved as amended.

**3. \*Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee; TPO Intake Process, DV Program survey, Report on Bilingual Services, etc.**

Ms. Ramos stated that Susan Filon mentioned the TPO Intake Process as an area to be discussed, and that Ms. Filon has not been to a meeting since. Ms. Ramos asked Ms. Rasul if Ms. Filon had given a reason for not being able to attend today's meeting. Kathy Boone replied that she had received an email indicating that Ms. Filon had a prior engagement with court. Ms. Ramos indicated that she would speak with Ms. Filon before the next meeting to gather more input on that.

Ms. Ramos asked Ms. Hutchings for an update on the DV Program survey. Ms. Hutching replied she isn't clear as to what exactly the NCPDV Council is looking for, but she did share what she had put together as questions that could be added to the survey:

1. Is there a sliding fee scale?
2. Do they have co-facilitators?
3. How large is the group?
4. Do they have a female group?
5. What are the opportunities for the offender to attend; or in other words, do they offer one night or are there other options? And within that same subject, is the offender given one-on-one assistance?
6. Do they offer bi-lingual services for group process?
7. Do they do court reporting?
8. Do they interview the victim?
9. What is done about non-attendance?

Ms. Hutchings explained the reason for question #9: In the rural areas, there is a large problem of non-attendance. Some of the judges in the rural areas do not issue a warrant, they just don't do anything, and they don't attend.

Ms. Ramos observed that the questions just iterated are for basically batterer's treatment intervention questions. Ms. Hutchings agreed. Ms. Ramos said that other questions we could add could be aimed at the courts: How do they handle perpetrators for noncompliance of attendance, as well as what services they offer for DV victims. Ms. Hutchings reported that she is having difficulty getting the DV shelter in her rural area to work with her. She stated that that particular shelter does not want to deal with DV programming as far as perpetrators. Ms. Hutchings commented that perhaps she is not the correct person to approach the shelters with this task. Ms. Ramos remarked that for now, we need questions that can be asked statewide.

Ms. Hutchings asked about what the committee needs to know about bilingual services? What do we want to know about these victim programs? Ms. Ramos contributed these questions:

- Are there programs for children?
- What kind of counseling services do they provide?
- Are these counseling programs offered in any other language than English?
- What types of assistance do they offer (food voucher, transportation)?
- Do they provide any kind of legal assistance? Low-cost, no-cost?
- Do they work with any organization, such as Soroptomists?
- Will they assist victims who have addiction problems?
- Will they assist victims with mental health issues?

Ms. Sternlicht contributed this question:

- If legal services are provided, are there any requirements that need to be met before victims can access those services? For example, do they have to attend a group? Do they have to be in counseling?

Ms. Hutchings asked if asking how long a person could stay at the shelter is a valid question. Ms. Ramos answered that this is a valid question.



Ms. Ramos suggested that for input on the different areas of expertise such as batterer's treatment, victim programs, courts (prosecution and defense), Ms. Hutchings should send her survey questions out to the committee so they can add to the questions. This can be done by e-mailing the questions to Rebecca Zatarain at the AG office, then Rebecca will send the questions out to the committee for their input.

Ms. Hutchings stated that in Elko, if the victim doesn't leave the batterer, the victim does not receive services. Ms. Ramos said that this situation leads to another pertinent question for the survey: "Do you provide assistance if the victims are still with the perpetrators? What services, if any, will you provide to victims still with the perpetrators?" This question is important for persons ready to leave the batterer—so when they leave, they know where to go.

Ms. Ramos stated that questions regarding the TPO Intake process should be included in the survey. Ms. Ramos will contact Ms. Filon in order to generate these questions for the survey. Ms. Ramos stated that this survey is not something that is expected to be put together overnight and that it needs to be comprehensive so that the committee gets good information back. In order to be able to compile the information and present it to the Council as a whole, we need to know what is lacking out there and what we need to address.

Ms. Downen asked for a review of Ms. Hutchings's question #1 "Is there a sliding-scale fee?" Ms. Hutchings replied that her DV perpetrator group is required to offer a sliding-scale fee, but that is not happening in other groups. Ms. Ramos agreed that this is correct. Ms. Hutchings said that her group has to do a percentage per the AG's office—she thought that 5% of the total has to be at a reduced fee, and that had never happened in Elko until Ms. Filon and Ms. Hutchings started running a group, and now it's 20% or higher.

Ms. Ramos said that she believes that with the economy the way it is now, not to give any of our offenders any breaks, but if we have victims that are still with them, it is a financial burden. Ms. Hutchings agreed that it is tough, and that her organization has to make that judgment call primarily if the couple is still together.

Ms. Hutchings stated that she doesn't know the law, so she threw out this question for anyone who could tell her: "Can we interview the victim if the victim is willing to be interviewed?" Ms. Ramos answered that interviewing the victim is supposed to be done at the beginning, during the middle and at the end. Ms. Hutchings reported that she went to a workshop last weekend in Reno and, during discussion interviewing the victim," ...nobody literally knew what they were supposed to do." Ms.

Hutchings wanted to clarify that if the law says that she has to interview the victim.... Ms. Ramos asked Ms. Rasul if she is familiar with this. Ms. Rasul asked for the question to be rephrased.

Ms. Ramos stated that the question pertains to the Batterer's Intervention Program and that a person named Jennifer can be contacted for information regarding the law as it pertains to interviewing victims of DV.

**4. \*Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting**

Ms. Ramos stated that she left many telephone messages and e-mails to Walt Dimitroff at ACCS to have one of their representatives come to talk to the NCPDV about the effects of violence in the home on children. On the many phone messages and e-mails, Mr. Ramos explained to Mr. Dimitroff the purpose of our organization and the subject matter we deal with. Mr. Dimitroff still has not contacted Ms. Ramos at this point. Ms. Hutchings will contact Mr. Dimitroff and ask him to please call Ms. Ramos.

Ms. Ramos stated she would continue her efforts to get Walt to speak at the next Council meeting. The committee did not have suggestions for an alternate choice of speaker for the Council meeting at this time.

This item will remain on the agenda for the next meeting.

**5. \*Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation issues along I-80 Corridor for Victims of Domestic Violence.**

Ms. Ramos will provide Kareen's research report on Greyhound and Amtrak at the next meeting.

Ms. Ramos asked Caryn Sternlicht about information from her sources. Ms. Sternlicht reported that since none of her phone messages have been answered, and she will try a different approach to getting information.

Ms. Ramos is also having difficulty with organizations responding to her phone messages. There may be a gap in communication since DV offices in the rural areas operate part-time and personnel are not in the office at all times. Ms. Ramos stated that she also will try another route.

Ms. Ramos and Ms. Sternlicht will discuss how to get the information they need. This item will remain on the agenda for the next committee meeting.

**6. \*Discussion and possible action regarding training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPOs heard statewide.**

Ms. Smokey asked for clarification about the training of hearing masters in the rural areas. Ms. Ramos answered that this was an item that Susan Filon from Las Vegas had brought up. Ms. Filon was concerned that the hearing masters in the rural communities are denying applications, but are not fully trained in domestic violence. Ms. Filon was to report to the committee on this subject, but she is not at this meeting.

Ms. Sternlicht stated that this is also a concern of hers since she also believes that the hearing masters are inadequately trained and added that, in the rural areas, hearing masters do not have to be attorneys. Ms. Sternlicht explained that she doesn't have a bias, i.e. that not only attorneys can be hearing masters, but she is of the opinion that a person has to have a real grounding and understanding of the law and statute. Ms. Sternlicht remembered that when she was in private practice, the hearing masters in Yerington, Carson, Douglas County and Lyon County were not always attorneys.

Per Ms. Ramos, this item will be tabled until the next meeting. Ms. Ramos will contact Ms. Filon to address these issues.

Ms. Smokey stated that not only is her agency is looking into accountability for the batterers in anger management, but they are concerned that marriage and family counselors are trained in DV. Are there people in the rural areas who specialize in this sort of treatment? Are the marriage/family counselors well-versed in sexual assault and domestic violence? Ms. Ramos stated that for State certification, the counselor has to take so many hours of DV training. If the person is convicted of DV battery, the person must go to a State-certified program with State-certified counselors. The therapist who treats the victim must be State-certified also. Ms. Smokey said that she understands that for anger management, this is so. Ms. Ramos countered that anger management and DV are two different things. Ms. Sternlicht stated that Ms. Smokey is talking about the therapists who treat the victims, and that there is a concern that these therapists are not up-to-date on DV training.

Ms. Ramos stated that especially for psychiatrists and psychologists who are doing family counseling, the Education Committee is addressing training strategies through the State committees so that all of the people who are certified can get current training on DV and get CLE's for DV training. Ms. Smokey stated that she only brought this up because her organization is striving to obtain the best services for their clients.

Ms. Smokey also asked how many programs are handling stalking and harassment orders. Three weeks ago her office got a case in which someone was stalking a woman in Washington, but then came to Carson. The victim wasn't given that much service because there never was an intimate relationship between the victim and the stalker. Ms. Smokey stated that her concern is that they were charging her to get protection.

Ms. Sternlicht and Ms. Filon asked Ms. Smokey what she meant by "charging her". Was she charged for the stalking and harassment order? Ms. Smokey stated that the victim was charged \$70.00. Ms. Smokey called different agencies to get information for this victim. Ms. Smokey asked if anyone else heard of this sort of situation: wherein there is not an intimate relationship, so the stalking and harassment is not defined as DV, so the victim is not getting the protection that they need.

Ms. Ramos asked if stalking and harassment orders that are separate are done through the Justice courts? Ms. Sternlicht answered that in Carson, they are done in the same place; in Washoe County, they are separated. Obviously, the TPO's or APO's are done in Justice court. Ms. Ramos said when advocates from her organization go down to the court to get that service, the victims are not charged. Caryn Sternlicht stated that she did not understand, if this certain victim was low-income, why she did not get a fee waiver.

Ms. Smokey explained that the victim was from Washington and moved to Carson City. She reported the incident since the perpetrator showed up in Carson City. The perpetrator was infatuated and obsessed with her. She got a stalking and harassment order against him, and he was placed in a mental facility. He was calling her and harassing her before he was admitted to the facility. She then moved away and figured that he would stay in the mental health facility. Twenty years after his release, he found her unlisted phone number and her address. He sent her some bonds that were in his and her name. She contacted us (VARN) because she knew he was in Carson City and had been here since 2003 and was convicted of domestic battery of someone else. Her concern was that he found her again. He was calling her on the phone and sending her mail. She lives in Washington (state). She called the DV agency in Washington, and they are the people that told her that since it was not an intimate relationship, it is not domestic violence.

Ms. Sternlicht advised that every state defines domestic violence differently. Washington's definition is definitely different than Nevada's, as is California's is different from Nevada's and Washington's. People think that there is a standard definition. It may be that in some states this sort of situation could be included, but probably not in all states. Ms. Sternlicht continued that this was clearly a case of stalking. One thing she has

found with stalking and harassment orders, even in Washoe County, not to say that they're lax, but their training is different in Justice court here than if you go before the Domestic Violence Master; and so you have to be more prepared to present your case. Ms. Smokey stated that a person would have to go before a judge.

Ms. Sternlicht answered that she understands, but one has to have his/her case prepared, i.e. "ducks in row". Ms. Sternlicht stated that she thinks that when a person goes before the Domestic Violence Master, that's all they're hearing, and Ms. Sternlicht finds that there is more of an acknowledgment and understanding of the intricacies of domestic violence and/or of stalking and harassment violence. Ms. Sternlicht stated that she has not had a problem with fee waivers when she has gone forward with people in Justice court here. This sounds like a particular problem as opposed to a system problem. Ms. Sternlicht asked for Ms. Ramos's thoughts on this matter.

Ms. Ramos said that she thought the above-mention person should have applied in Washington for the stalking and harassment order and have him served in Carson City.

Ms. Smokey stated that her organization was going to do that, but first the person wanted protection, and so Ms. Smokey contacted the agencies in Washington because of her concern that the person had to pay \$70 for protection. The person thought about it over the weekend and she said "Well, I don't want him to know where I am" and so she decided not to go with the stalking and harassment order because he didn't know she received the savings bonds (the mail). She wanted to know if Nevada has a monitoring system that could inform her if he left the state. Ms. Sternlicht and Ms. Ramos said that Nevada does not have such a monitoring system, and Ms. Sternlicht added that she doesn't know of a state that does. Unless a person is a convicted felon and there is an issue when the felon is released from prison (on parole or probation), an organization cannot monitor a person's whereabouts. One option would be to hire a private investigator.

Ms. Smokey said she brought this up because she is wondering whether there are any other cases that we run into where there is stalking and harassment where there is not an intimate relationship. Ms. Sternlicht answered that she has gone forward on these sort of cases. Ms. Ramos also stated that she has had experience dealing with this sort of situation.

Ms. Ramos said that in Washoe County, if they are related or if the persons have had an intimate relationship, they are going send them to get a restraining order instead of a harassment and stalking order. They push it to go to the TPO office. Ms. Sternlicht said that they push them

back and say that “You need to get a stalking and harassment order” because there are bigger penalties there. If he is convicted of one, it’s a gross misdemeanor, so we have to go back to do the harassment order, we go with them. Ms. Sternlicht added that in Carson City, everything is done in Justice Court—the stalking and harassment orders as well as the TPOs. It is all done in the same place. They put different letters on—instead of “S.O.,” they put “P.O.” It’s all done before the same judge—the Justice court judge.

Ms. Ramos stated that this same discussion can be conducted regarding the TPO process (Item #6) in the rural areas because this is an issue that is coming up. This issue must be considered when discussing training of court staff and how they handle the TPO process.

**7. \*Schedule future meetings and agenda items**

Agenda items #3, #4, #5, and #6 will remain the same.

Ms. Ramos stated that would not be another committee meeting before the Council meeting in Hawthorne on July 16, 2009. Ms. Sternlicht confirmed that on July 16, Council members traveling to Hawthorne in the State motor pool van will need to be at the Reno motor pool facility at 7:15 a.m.

The date and time selected for the next Underserved Committee meeting is Monday, August 24 at 11:00 a.m.

**8. \*Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**9. \*Adjournment**

Ms. Smokey made a motion to adjourn; Ms. Sternlicht seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA  
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of Meeting**

*DRAFT*

---

*August 24, 2009*

---

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

**Committee Members Present**

Suzanne Ramos

**Committee Members Present Via Teleconference**

Toni Downen  
Ellen Ewing  
Susan Filon  
Vicki "Vic" Hutchings  
Rebecca Smokey

**Committee Members Absent**

Adriana Botello  
Caryn Sternlicht

**Public Present**

None

**Attorney General's Office Staff Present**

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General  
Kareen Prentice, Domestic Violence Ombudsman

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

Suzanne Ramos called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

**2. \*Review and approval of minutes from June 22, 2009.**

Ms. Ramos asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes and if there was a motion to approve or amend the minutes from anyone. Ms. Downen made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. Ms. Ewing seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the minutes were approved as submitted.

**3. \*Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee; TPO Intake Process, DV Program survey, Report on Bilingual Services, etc.**

Ms. Hutchings stated that she is working on the DV shelter survey. Ms. Ramos mentioned that Valerie Cooney is also working on a survey for the Education Committee, so we want to make sure we are on the same page. Ms. Ramos stated that Susan Filon mentioned the TPO Intake Process as an area to be discussed, and that this issue should be taken into consideration while generating the survey. Ms. Filon agreed. Ms. Ramos asked if Ms. Hutchings had received Ms. Filon's comments regarding the TPO intake process. Ms. Hutchings stated that she did not receive this information. Ms. Ramos told the committee that she will send out Valerie Cooney's survey to the Underserved Committee for review/comment and that she will also forward Ms. Filon's comments regarding the TPO process in Clark County to Ms. Hutchings. Ms. Ramos and Ms. Filon reviewed that it takes four days to get a TPO in Clark County and that it could take six to eight weeks to get an extension hearing despite, per statute the extension hearing should be granted in 30 days or less. Ms. Ramos acknowledged how busy the courts are in Clark County, but stated that the time it takes for the TPO process may be an issue for the committee to address. This may not be handled in the survey, because we already know that this is a problem, so perhaps the question should be "What can we do to address the excessive time taken to complete the TPO process?" It could be an issue best addressed legislatively. It is definitely a conundrum. Ms. Ramos asked Ms. Filon how many new family courts Clark County has. Ms. Filon replied that there are five new family courts. Ms. Ramos continued: "With the five new courts, do you think the delay is going to be addressed or do you think it has gotten worse?" Ms. Filon answered that the situation has worsened, since there isn't any money to add commissioners. Ms. Ramos asked who does the TPOs in Clark County. Ms. Filon replied that first hearing masters do the TPOs. The conversation continued:

Ms. Ramos: Is there an inadequate number of court masters in Clark County? Is that it?

Ms. Filon: I think that's the problem.



Ms. Ramos: Okay. It's not the issue with judges, because they hear the divorces. It's the court masters at the interim level—they're the entry level to get restraining orders. In our jurisdiction, we have two. How many court masters do you have at your jurisdiction?

Ms. Filon: Officially, there are two. There are others used, but for emergency purposes.

Ms. Ramos stated that this item should be kept on the agenda and that pertinent statute should be reviewed. Ms. Ramos will bring a copy of the statute to the next meeting and have the committee discuss what position to take in remedying, or what issues to raise, about the situation in Clark County. This could be discussed as a concern of the Underserved Populations Committee at the next Council meeting.

Ms. Ramos will send out by an e-mail through the assistant of the NCPDV a copy of the work Ms. Hutchings has done on the DV Program Shelter survey and get feedback from the committee, then bring the completed survey to the Council to ensure that we are not duplicating what our other committees are doing.

**4. \*Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting**

Ms. Ramos stated that she has spoken with Walt Dimitroff at ACCS, and he is willing to speak at the next Council meeting if he has notice of the date far enough in advance. The Hawthorne meeting was too far away for him to travel. Mr. Dimitroff plans to speak on the Effects of Domestic Violence in the Home on Children. Ms. Prentice has discussed dates in late October/early November with the AG, but at this time a date has not been chosen.

**5. \*Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation issues along I-80 Corridor for Victims of Domestic Violence.**

Ms. Ramos has spoken with some shelters in the rural areas, and their big issue with transportation is that there is no transportation available to leave the community. Kareen Prentice shared information from her research report on Greyhound and Amtrak: Basically, Greyhound in Reno has two round trips a day going to San Francisco, Sacramento and Salt Lake City. The Reno Greyhound buses does not stop in Battle Mountain, Winnemucca, Elko or Wendover if the bus is full, and the bus is full quite frequently. Ms. Prentice agreed that there is no public transportation out of those communities. Ms. Ramos stated that the Amtrak from Reno to Salt Lake City leaves every day at about 3:00 and is usually hit-or-miss since it is almost always delayed. The Amtrak from Elko supposedly leaves at 3:00 a.m., but usually leaves at 6:00 a.m.—so it would be

unwise, unfair and unethical to take a victim to the station and have them wait hours for transportation. Ms. Prentice read a schedule of stops for Amtrak: 3:48 a.m. Elko, 6:59 a.m. Winnemucca, 9:31 a.m. Sparks, 10:00 a.m. Reno. Ms. Ramos stated that it is pretty much hit-or-miss, and they normally don't get into Elko until about 6:00—that train does not usually leave on time. A person would have to call to see if the train is on time from Salt Lake, then estimate when the train would get to Elko. A lot of victims need to leave immediately. If they cannot leave immediately, victims need a place to wait. Ms. Prentice stated that her information for the Elko Amtrak states there is a "platform with a shelter", which is not a waiting room like the buildings/waiting rooms at Amtrak in Reno and Sparks.

Vic Hutchings (from Elko) stated that the place a victim would have to wait for any length of time is pretty much "out in the boonies"—there is absolutely nothing around it. The platform with shelter is literally out in the desert. Ms. Ramos asked if it was a place for a woman with children. Ms. Hutchings replied that it is not a place for even a person with a police escort. There is absolutely no public transportation option for victims in the rural communities, and it would be very difficult for the committee to do anything to improve the situation. Transportation companies are businesses, and they do not care enough and are probably not interested in working with coalitions/committees. It would be a tough problem to solve. Law enforcement is definitely doing the best it can. If a DV advocate were to offer transportation to a victim, the advocate (and victim) would become an easy target for an abuser. Ms. Ramos said that it would be nice to have the funds available to provide a car (etc.) for each shelter. Even if that is possible, many of these shelters are run by one or two people who must remain at the shelter and cannot leave the shelter to transport victims.

Toni Downen asked if there was some way wherein a monthly scheduling of one person picking up victims in the rural areas on assigned days and transporting the victim to a safer place. Ms. Ramos answered that if something like this was in place, it would be a liability for the DV program. In Reno, Ms. Ramos's agency is able to obtain bus tickets for the victims, make sure they have family members who will take them in, and purchase groceries for the victims and their families for the bus trip.

Ms. Hutchings asked if this committee could collaborate with the Legislative Committee since the transportation problem seemingly boils down to liability issues. Perhaps a law can be formulated that removes liability from someone transporting a victim of domestic violence to a safe haven. Ms. Hutchings added that if the law negates the liability, it may give more flexibility to the DV shelters affected counties in coming up with ideas to put together a service to transport victims. Ms. Ramos answered

that this may be another question to bring up for discussion at the next Council meeting.

Rebecca Smokey asked if we know how many shelters have the funds to transport victims. Ms. Ramos said that in talking to the rural shelters, “zero” shelters have to funds to pay for transportation. The funds the DV shelters do have are for essentials, and transportation is considered a nonessential. Ms. Prentice added that the rural DV shelters usually operate on very limited funds and are staffed by volunteers; for example, Lovelock and Battle Mountain. Elko does outreach to Lincoln, White Pine and Eureka. There is money in the Elko program for transportation, but it is usually in the form of reimbursement for mileage to the advocates for transporting victims. Ms. Prentice stated that all of the DV programs can submit an application to Jan Evans at the NNADV for funds to get cars fixed or for plane tickets, but still there is not enough money to fill the transportation needs of all of the Nevada DV programs. It is only the shelter programs who can apply for the funds. A victim advocate would have to go through a shelter program to apply for the funds.

So, another issue would be how to get additional dollars allocated to DV programs for transportation of victims. Many advocates in the rurals to transport victims for no remuneration whatsoever—it’s not about the money. But these advocates are putting themselves at risk, especially small communities where everyone knows everyone (and everyone’s vehicle). Victims need a safe option (other than police escort) for transportation away from batterers.

**6. \*Discussion and possible action regarding training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPOs heard statewide.**

Ms. Filon clarified that the issue for non-native English speakers regarding the TPO process is that this process is very frustrating and discouraging. Ms. Filon stated that even with interpreters present, the process is unnecessarily complicated and time-consuming. Sometimes people are asked for payment before the process can continue. Ms. Ramos asked if the courts do not have contract interpreters present for the express purpose of aiding non-native English speakers with the TPO/Family Court hearings/proceedings. Ms. Filon stated yes, there are contracted interpreters, but the problem is: the person needing the interpreter has to request the interpreter when they get to the courtroom—it cannot be done in advance due to no-shows which waste time. If it is the first time for a person, it is difficult to get your case heard in a smooth manner. Ms. Filon asked “What person representing himself would know better?”

Ms. Ramos posed this question: When a person gets an application and they are heard at the initial application phase, and they speak another

language (which the judge would know), are they advised at the EPO hearing of the process of obtaining an interpreter? Ms. Filon answered that if the person manages to make it “through the gauntlet”, arranging for an interpreter is done at the door of the court itself. Ms. Prentice asked if the person would need to ask the bailiff for an interpreter, Ms. Filon said yes, that is how it’s done. Ms. Filon stated that a lot of times, the person is directed downstairs again to request the interpreter and then come back upstairs to the courtroom to wait for the interpreter to come. Ms. Ramos asked if there is an advocate in Ms. Filon’s court that works there at the court that is with the victim when they go to their EPO hearing. Ms. Filon answered that if the victims are savvy enough to get in touch with someone from Safe Nest or Safe House, a person can request an advocate to go with them to court, but there is no one at the court full-time to help people get through the process except at the initial application phase.

Ms. Ramos asked: At the initial application phase, can the person assisting the victim advise what the process is, so they can get there early to arrange for an interpreter? Ms. Filon stated that this is not happening. Ms. Filon stated that there is a problem for people who are trying to file for protection orders. These people are told at the initial phase that they don’t have what it takes to get a protection order (i.e. “You don’t have this, so you can’t file that”). Before a hearing master hears it, people have been turned away. This has happened as recently as three weeks ago.

Suzanne Ramos acknowledged that TPO applications being denied before a hearing master hears it is another issue that will be brought to the table and looked at. Ms. Ramos stated that there was a problem in the justice courts with clerks making decisions and denying stalking orders. There was a complaint to the court administrator, and application for stalking orders has gone to the civil side where it is working out better.

## **7. \*Schedule future meetings and agenda items**

Toni Downen announced that every three months, the HS that she works for chooses a different group to donate money to. For the next three-month donation, the recipient will be Safe Nest. The organization will also put out an article about DV and how to watch for it. Also, there were two major nursing magazines that had absolutely awesome domestic violence articles this month. Ms. Downen will send copies of those articles to Karen Prentice or to the assistant to the NCPDV, and those articles will be disseminated.

Monday, October 5 at 11:00 a.m. was selected as the next Underserved Populations Committee meeting date.

Agenda items for the next meeting will be:

#3 Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee, i.e. TPO Intake Process, DV Program Survey, report on bilingual services, etc.

#4 Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting (Wednesday, October 28 at 10:00 a.m. in Carson City, teleconferenced to Las Vegas). Ms. Ramos will firm up the plans to have Walt Dimitroff speak.

#5 Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation issue along I-80 corridor for victims of domestic violence.

#6 Discussion and possible action regarding training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPOs heard statewide.

**8. \*Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**9. \*Adjournment**

Ms. Smokey made a motion to adjourn; Ms. Hutchings seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

**STATE OF NEVADA  
NEVADA COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS COMMITTEE**

## **Minutes of Meeting**

---

*October 5, 2009*

---

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

### **Committee Members Present**

#### **Committee Members Present Via Teleconference**

Suzanne Ramos  
Ellen Ewing  
Vicki "Vic" Hutchings  
Caryn Sternlicht

#### **Committee Members Absent**

Adriana Botello  
Susan Filon  
Toni Downen

#### **Public Present**

None

#### **Attorney General's Office Staff Present**

Henna Rasul, Deputy Attorney General  
Lorraine Webber, Assistant to the Council

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

Suzanne Ramos called the meeting to order at 11:03 a.m. A roll call was performed and quorum was established.

**2. \*Review and approval of minutes from August 24, 2009.**

Ms. Ramos asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes and if there was a motion to approve or amend the minutes. Ms. Ewing made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. Ms. Sternlicht seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the minutes were approved as submitted.

**3. \*Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee; TPO Intake Process, DV Program survey, Report on Bilingual Services, etc.**

Ms. Ramos asked that Ms. Hutchings send the survey she prepared to Ms. Webber for distribution for everyone's review and comments. Ms. Hutchings had been awaiting Susan Filon's comments on the TPO process in Clark County. It was decided that Ms. Ramos will send those comments to Ms. Hutchings and the survey can be added to later.

Ms. Ramos asked Henna Rasul to look at the section of NRS 33 relative to the TPO process. Problems with the TPO process in both Northern and Southern Nevada were discussed. In Clark County, the major issue is the amount of time it takes to approve a TPO which can take longer than 30 days. Extensions or hearings can take longer than 60 days. In Washoe County, the problem seems to be with the application process. Applicants must submit all of their information on a single piece of paper, even when the circumstances have an extensive history. Ms. Sternlicht believes this to be a violation of constitutional rights. In Clark County, applicants must have an explanation and adequate proof of Domestic Violence before they are even seen. Ms. Sternlicht would like to see some standardization of the process for the State or Counties. This item will be continued to the next agenda after the committee has made their presentation to the Council and received feedback and is something to look at for the next legislative session.

**4. \*Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting.**

Ms. Ramos confirmed with Walt Dimitroff that he and Con Sheenan Jr. will be speaking about the DV parenting class at the October 28, 2009 Council meeting.

**5. \*Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation issues along I-80 Corridor for Victims of Domestic Violence.**

Ms. Ramos stated that due to their policies, Greyhound and Amtrak could not be of assistance and she was not sure how to persuade them. It was

suggested that perhaps local sheriffs could work with private parties who would volunteer to transport victims to a safe place. This item will be on the agenda for next time.

**6. \*Discussion and possible action regarding training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPOs heard statewide.**

Ms. Ramos suggested talking to Ron Titus at the Council meeting to see how hearing masters, especially in the rural communities, get training on the TPO process. Ms. Ramos then suggested they invite Ron Titus to the next Committee meeting to hear his ideas.

**7. \*Schedule future meetings and agenda items.**

The next meeting was scheduled for January, 11, 2010 at 11:00 a.m.

Agenda items will include:

#3 Discussion and possible action on future plans for Underserved Populations Committee; TPO Intake Process, DV Program survey, Report on Bilingual Services, etc.

#4 Review, discussion and action on speaker for the next Council meeting.

#5 Discussion and possible action regarding Rural Transportation issues along I-80 Corridor for Victims of Domestic Violence.

#6 Discussion and possible action regarding training for hearing masters and how rurals are having TPOs heard statewide.

**8. \*Public Comment.**

There was no public comment.

**9. \*Adjournment.**

Caryn Sternlicht made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ellen Ewing seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 11:23 a.m.