**NEVADA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (CDV)**

# *Meeting Minutes*

***Monday, July 12, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.***

**Virtual Location:**

Join the meeting: <https://call.lifesizecloud.com/9481838>

Passcode: 0610#

Join the Lifesize meeting using Skype for Business: <https://skype.lifesizecloud.com/9481838>

Click to call from Mobile (audio only)

United States: +1 (312) 584-2401,, 9481838#,,0610#

Call in by Phone (audio only)

United States: +1 (312) 584-2401

Meeting extension: 9481838#

Passcode: 0610#

Calling from a Lifesize conference room system? Just dial 9481838 with the keypad.

Other ways to call: <https://call.lifesize.com/otherways/9481838>

1. Call to order and roll call of members.
	1. The Committee on Domestic Violence (CDV) meeting was called to order at 1:30 pm.
	2. Present
		* Armstrong, Ross (Armstrong)
		* Gradick, Jamie (Gradick)
		* Green, April (Green)
		* Greene, Elynne (Greene)
		* Hall, Karl (Hall)
		* *Harig, Tracy (Harig) - pending swearing-in*
		* Hernandez, Cory (Hernandez)
		* Larson, Zach (Larson)
		* *Lynch, Patricia (Judge Lynch) – pending swearing-in*
		* Metherell, Leticia (Metherell)
		* Morris, Marla (Morris)
		* Moseley, Leisa (Moseley)
		* Ortenburger, Liz (Ortenburger)
		* Ramos, Suzanne (Ramos)
		* Scott, Annette (Scott)
	3. Absent
		* Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General (Chairman Ford)
		* Ingram, Tyler (Ingram)
		* Jones, Cassandra (Judge Jones)
	4. Staff
		* Adair, Jessica (Adair)
		* Reilly, Nicole (Reilly)
		* Mouannes, Jason (Mouannes)
		* Rasul, Henna (Rasul)
	5. Public
		* Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence (Evans)
		* Dr. Pamela Payne, PHD, CFLE, Assistant Professor, University of Nevada, Reno (Dr. Payne)
		* Shannon Horrillo, MS, PHD, Associate Director of Extension, University of Nevada, Reno (Horrillo)
		* Mary-Sarah Kinner, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff’s Office
	6. **Quorum established**

*Nicole Reilly asked all members and attendees introduce themselves as the renewal of committee member appointments brought in some new individuals.*

1. Public Comment.
	1. No public comment.
2. **For Discussion and Possible Action:** Review, discussion and possible approval of ***February 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes***.

**Attachment 1**

* 1. Reilly suggested members take a moment to review the minutes from the previous Committee on Domestic Violence (CDV) meeting. She asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Judge Lynch provided corrections ahead of time for meeting minutes. Motion to accept the minutes by Armstrong. Seconded by Scott. No further discussion. All in favor. Motion passed.
1. **For Discussion and Possible Action:** CDV Member Jamie Gradick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts, will facilitate a discussion on *Judicial Training Topics*. The members will develop a list of training topics to be provided to the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) with a request for these topics to be included on Judicial Training Agendas.
	1. Gradick shared that originally Judge Jones was going to lead this discussion, but she is stepping in during her absence. This agenda item was recommended by the Courts Subcommittee as it discussed potential training topics for Nevada judges. Judge Jones had suggested putting together one-hour CLEs (continuing legal education) sessions that could be presented through the Administrative of the Courts (AOCs) judicial education unit or NJLJ’s (Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction) associated education unit. There had not been a decision made as the input of committee members was being desired. She reached out to David Gordon, the AOC judicial education manager, who is eager for a list of training topics. In addition, he asked that members be informed of the process of bringing trainings forward:
		1. a list of judicial training topics will be compiled
		2. the list will be sent to David for review by himself and staff at AOC
		3. David will then reach out to the judicial association education committees and together they will decide which topics to move forward with and the best way to do so. This could be a series of one-hour webinars or a live module for presentation at the next in-person judicial association education conference.
	2. Reilly instructed committee members to utilize the raise-your-hand feature on Lifesize to indicate they have an idea for a judicial training topic.
		1. Gradick requested the list be prioritized after creation to aid the judicial association education committee on which trainings should be developed first.
	3. Ortenburger stated that she met regularly with the judges on the family and criminal side and there needs to be a better understanding of:
		1. Batterers’ motivations and mindset (first priority).
		2. The manipulative techniques of what batterers are doing to a victim and how they weaponize the judicial system to further harm that victim and maneuver in a way that is detrimental to the crisis.
		3. Overview of domestic violence and the issues unique to Nevada in comparison to the rates of our peers in other surrounding states.
	4. Greene agreed those are key topics to address and wanted to put some emphasis on the second point: the intersection of domestic violence and other crimes. Many times, a string of other crimes by the perpetrator are tagged as unrelated.
	5. Moseley encouraged education to judges related to cultural dynamics around domestic violence. Depending on the culture of victims and perpetrators, it influences how they may proceed (press charges or work with victim advocate, etc.)
	6. Judge Lynch agreed with Ortenburger. Judges think that they understand domestic violence but do not understand the dynamics. She was fortunate to participate in the first domestic violence training session put on by the National District Attorneys Association with a good overview on domestic violence fundamentals in a plenary session everyone had to attend. She added that batterer accountability is also imperative.
		1. Scott shared the views of Judge Lynch related to training on domestic violence fundamentals such as cultural dynamics and other intersecting crimes related to domestic violence. Furthermore, judges are reducing misdemeanor domestic violence crimes to disturbing the peace and other similar charges of a lesser degree failing to establish the first instance of domestic violence reported.
	7. Armstrong left a message in the Lifesize chat: “I'm sorry. I have to logoff for an urgent meeting. I think some training on the different types of protective orders (DV, stalking, harassment) and similarities and differences among them. I often witnessed court staff picking which application just simply based on the perpetrator. Also similar to previous comments, an understanding of a trauma-informed approach to courtroom and courthouse design, systems, etc.”
	8. Larson mentioned the importance of sharing manipulative techniques batterers use to leverage the criminal justice system against victims and survivors. He considered it a high priority item and requested access of training for public defenders and district attorneys through AOC.
		1. Gradick replied that would be possible as it has happened in various past trainings. It would be structured differently for those groups.
		2. Larson added educating judges on the process victims and survivors would be going through during cases.
	9. Ortenburger added her concern about the myth that many cases are false claims of domestic violence. This narrative needs to be addressed with data and facts. In addition, the complexity of jury trials related to domestic violence cases needs to be addressed as it leads to charges being plead down.
	10. Green expressed that family and temporary protective order (TPO) court judges do not seem to understand that there is an intersection between domestic violence and poverty. Education on financial abuse is necessary.
		1. Reilly appreciated the mention by Green about financial support as it impacts trauma in children experiencing domestic violence.
	11. Ortenburger stated 76 percent of children experiencing domestic violence in the household repeat the cycle of abuse in their lives. In addition, women at or below the poverty line are five times more likely to be victims of abuse. Furthermore, there are places where judicial solutions are working. We should not lose hope in creating a judicial system that meets the needs of victims related to Nevada’s dynamic.
	12. Larson added judges should understand the community resources available whether it be batterers’ treatment providers or victim and survivor services. If there is a documented increase in resources being utilized, it will support the case for an increase in funding.
	13. Reilly requested any additional recommendations be sent over by email for disbursement to Gradick.
2. **For Discussion:** *2021 Legislative update*, Serena Evans, Policy Coordinator, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence.

**Attachment 2**

* 1. Evans greeted the committee. She reminded CDV members about the role of the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence. She reviewed the bill details related to domestic violence located in **Attachment 2**.
	2. Green expressed her support for Assembly Bill 404.
	3. Reilly thanked Evans for the presentation and asked members if they had any questions or comments.
	4. No questions or comments arose after the presentation.
1. **For Discussion:** *Batterers’ Intervention Efficacy Project*, Pamela Payne, PHD, CFLE, Assistant Professor, University of Nevada, Reno.

**Attachment 3**

* 1. Dr. Pamela Payne introduced herself and greeted the Committee on Domestic Violence. The details of her presentation about offender treatment and ongoing research to evaluate the efficacy of offender treatment programs are available in **Attachment 3**.
	2. Reilly expressed her gratitude for Dr. Payne leading this project and asked if members had questions.
	3. Ortenburger asked if offender programs can continue to do both in-person and virtual treatments. In addition, she mentioned the local district attorney and public defender’s office have created a 13-week alternative treatment program requirement even though that is out of the statute. Essentially, how do we measure offender treatment programs with all these changes?
		1. Dr. Payne offered Ortenburger the opportunity to send an email with questions to incorporate them in the study.
	4. Moseley asked Dr. Payne if there is a deficit in data collected from participants and are there any agreeable data points offender treatment programs can collect and how that can be mandated.
		1. Dr. Payne responded that yes, there is a lack of data collected. Her understanding is that current providers are certified by the State of Nevada to offer treatment programs using curriculums that may or may not be evidence-based. There is not a clear data collection requirement. Most providers are collecting some form of intake although they vary widely regarding details and history of participants.
	5. Ortenburger added that it is very difficult to collect this information accurately as there are lots of complexities to consider while gathering the information if the offender is not truthful.
	6. Moseley expressed interest in working with Dr. Payne to continue research on another study around batterers if that is possible.
	7. Reilly noted committee members can work directly with presenters who are not committee members as this would not violate Open Meeting Law.
	8. Judge Lynch shared her frustration about judges approving sentences for batterers that do not follow the mandatory sentencing statutes. Ortenburger responded the cause of this issue is tied to the prosecutor’s and public defender’s office and she will be meeting with local officials to address this concern. Judge Lynch indicated that the judicial system and judges in particular need to hold the batterers accountable.
	9. Larson mentioned that batterers’ treatment providers may push back against any initiative that increases their costs so that should be kept in mind and some solutions to that issue may help increase participation in the proposal by providers.
		1. Ortenburger supported comments made by Larson about the business side as it could increase the capacity of providers which would serve more offenders throughout the state.
1. **For Discussion:** *High Risk Team Model update*, Shannon Horrillo, MS, PHD, Associate Director of Extension, University of Nevada, Reno.
	1. Horrillo greeted the committee. The details of her presentation about Multidisciplinary Domestic Violence High Risk Teams are available in **Attachment 4**. Dr. Payne is considered the expert behind the project, but Horrillo is supporting the statewide implementation of the project and securing additional funding to sustain the effort beyond the initial implementation. In the past two years, the Committee on Domestic Violence evaluated high risk teams through the Jeannie Geiger Crisis Center and recommended it be adopted by interested parties in Nevada. It increases victim safety and improves offender accountability. In addition, it reduced domestic homicides, lowered chances of re-assault, and increased use of access to service providers.
	2. Larson asked how perpetrators and offenders are addressed in the high risk team model.
		1. Horrillo responded that the model does not require the engagement of batterers’ treatment providers. The model can adapt to communities and may lead to increased offender accountability through the criminal justice system.
	3. Ortenburger expressed concern about the capacity limits of the high risk team model in Clark County.
		1. Horrillo responded it would require an anticipated increase in funding and personnel to mobilize multiple units.
	4. Ortenburger asked if zero fatalities using the Jeannie Geiger Crisis Center model relate to zero fatalities with cases that touched the program or zero fatalities within the jurisdiction where the model was taking place.
		1. Horrillo specified zero fatalities in jurisdiction where model was implemented. Again, implementation of the HRT model in Nevada will yield more understanding of the potential outcomes.
	5. Adair provided some feedback on comments regarding funding.
	6. Greene mentioned that there may be a history of domestic violence for transient individuals in other surrounding states.
2. **For Discussion:** *Training, Legislative, and Court Subcommittees Update* by Nicole Reilly, Ombudsman for Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking, Nevada Office of the Attorney General.
	1. **Item will be carried over to the next CDV meeting.**
3. **For Discussion and Possible Action:** Nicole Reilly, Ombudsman for Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking, Nevada Office of the Attorney General, will take recommendations from committee members for filling the remaining open CDV positions.
	1. **Item will be carried over to the next CDV meeting.**
4. **For Discussion and Possible Action:** Committee Chair, Aaron D. Ford, Nevada Attorney General, will facilitate a discussion to dissolve/add/or change Subcommittees and/or their tasks.
	1. **Item will be carried over to the next CDV meeting.**
5. **For Information Only**: the CDV’s future meeting dates:
* Committee on Domestic Violence: Monday, August 30, 2021 @ 1:30 p.m. | Location: Virtual Meeting.
* Legislative Subcommittee: TBD | Location: Virtual Meeting.
* Training Subcommittee: TBD | Location: Virtual Meeting.
* Court Subcommittee: TBD | Location: Virtual Meeting.
1. Public Comment.
	1. None
2. **For Possible Action:** Adjournment.
	1. Meeting adjourned.

Minutes respectfully submitted by **Jason Mouannes**

Edited by **Nicole Reilly**

Office of the Attorney General