

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Judicial Council of the State of Nevada

Date and Time of Meeting: May 24, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.

Place of Meeting: Remote Access via Zoom (zoom.com or zoom app, see “Notices” for access information)

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
 - A. Call of Roll
 - B. Determination of Quorum
 - C. Opening Remarks

- II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary*
 - A. February 2, 2024 (*Tab 1, pages 3-6*)

- III. Business and Action Items
 - A. Family Subcommittee Implementation Plan* (*Tab 2, pages 7-27*)

- IV. Reports of Standing Committees (Reporting period: January 22nd – May 12th)
 - A. Court Administration Committee (*Tab 3, page 28*)
 - B. Court Improvement Program (*Tab 4, pages 29-31*)
 - C. Legislative Committee (*Tab 5, pages 32-38*)
 - D. Specialty Court Funding Committee (*Tab 6, pages 39-41*)
 - E. Technology Committee – *No meeting held within the reporting period*
 - F. Family Subcommittee

- V. Summaries of Regional Judicial Council Meetings (Reporting period: January 22nd – May 12th)
 - A. Clark Regional Judicial Council (*Tab 7, pages 42-45*)
 - B. North Central Judicial Council (*Tab 8, pages 46-49*)
 - C. Sierra Regional Judicial Council (*Tab 9, pages 50-57*)
 - D. South Central Regional Judicial Council – *No meeting held within the reporting period*
 - E. Washoe Regional Judicial Council (*Tab 10, pages 58-62*)

- VI. Informational Materials
 - A. 2024 Judicial Council of the State of Nevada Calendar of Meetings (*Tab 11, pages 63-64*)

- VII. Future Meetings
 - August 16, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.
 - November 1, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.

- VIII. Adjournment

Notices

- Action items are noted by * and typically include, approval, denial, and/or postponement of specific items. Certain items may be referred to a subcommittee for additional review and action.
- Agenda items may be taken out of order at the discretion of the Chair in order to accommodate persons appearing before the Commission and/or to aid in the time efficiency of the meeting.
- If members of the public participate in the meeting, they must identify themselves when requested. Public comment is welcomed by the Commission but may be limited at the discretion of the Chair.
- The Commission is pleased to provide reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If assistance is required, please notify Commission staff by phone or by email no later than two working days prior to the meeting, as follows:
Almeda Harper, (775) 687-9810 – email: aharper@nvcourts.nv.gov
- This meeting is exempt from the Nevada Open Meeting Law (NRS 241.030)
- At the discretion of the Chair, topics related to the administration of justice, judicial personnel, and judicial matters that are of a confidential nature may be closed to the public.
- **Notice of this meeting was posted in the following locations:** Nevada Supreme Court website: www.nvcourts.gov; Carson City: Supreme Court Building, Administrative Office of the Courts, 201 South Carson Street; Las Vegas: Nevada Supreme Court, 408 East Clark Avenue.

Meeting ID: 899 2058 2500
Participant Passcode: 342131
Teleconference Dial-in: (669) 900-6833

TAB 1

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Judicial Council of the State of Nevada

February 2, 2024

2:00 p.m.

Summary prepared by: Almeda Harper

Members Present

Chief Justice Elissa Cadish (Chair)
Judge Stephen Bishop
Judge Bonnie Bulla
Judge Steven Dobrescu
Judge Kelly Giordani
Steven Grierson
Judge Eileen Herrington
Chief Judge Kevin Higgins
Judge Victor Miller
Judge Shelly O'Neill
Judge John Schlegelmilch
Judge Mason Simons
Judge Randall Soderquist
Katherine Stocks
Judge Dawn Throne
Chief Judge Jerry Wiese

AOC Staff

Zacary Casper
Paul Embley
Jamie Gradick
Almeda Harper
Shyle Irigoin
Chad Johnson
John McCormick

Absent

Associate Chief Justice Stiglich (Vice-Chair)

Absent Excused

Chief Judge Lynne Jones
Judge Joanna Kishner
Alicia Lerud
Judge Gloria Sturman
Judge Natalie Tyrrell

Guests

Alicia Davis
Jessica Gurley
Justice Doug Herndon
Judge Luis
Judge Michael Montero

I. Call to Order

- Chief Justice Cadish called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.
- Ms. Harper called roll; a quorum was present.
- Opening Remarks
 - Chief Justice Cadish attended the Conference of Chief Justices in Nashville, TN. One of the issues discussed was the decline of public trust and respect in the court system. She felt it is the responsibility of the judges to help support the Judicial Branch by not only continuing to perform their duties well, but also being positive and supportive when discussing the Judicial Branch family, friends, and members of the public.

II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

- The meeting summary from August 18, 2023, was unanimously approved.

III. Reports of Standing Committees

- Court Improvement Program
 - Mr. McCormick provided the following updates
 - Judicial Roundtable for judges and masters/magistrates will be held on September 18, 2024.
 - Community Improvement Council General Summit will be held on September 19-20, 2024.
 - CIP has established the Dependency Judicial Leadership Subcommittee established during the roundtable from the last summit. The subcommittee will review guardianship and out-of-home placement without court oversight.

- Legislative Committee
 - Mr. McCormick provided the following updates
 - Bill Draft Requests (BDR) are due to the Legislature by September 1, 2024
 - The Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction’s Legislative Committee will be working on potential corrections for AB116.
 - The Committee will be working with the Guardianship Commission to submit a Guardianship bill.
 - There will likely be a push to remove Administrative Assessment fees, if so, the Committee will be looking for ways to ensure funding is still available for courts that rely on AA fees.
 - The Committee discussed avoiding trailing misdemeanors by binding the cases with felonies and gross misdemeanors at the District Court level.
 - The Committee discussed revising the rule that requires capital murder preliminary hearings to be recorded by a court recorder.
 - A comprehensive preliminary hearing bill is being drafted and will be routed for review.
 - The Committee discussed potential issues and corrections for parole and probation and technical vs. non-technical and honorable vs. dishonorable discharges which may need to be reviewed by the sentencing commission.
 - The Committee discussed making the funding for 48-hour bail hearings permanent and expanding it to cover certain townships based on population.
 - Post-sentence, no-contact orders are not being processed and may need to be transferred to the repository for processing similar to pre-trial, no-contact orders.
 - The 8th Judicial District Court will be requesting additional judges.
 - The SB418 questionnaire is available for the current filing period, typos have been identified and corrected. The quiz/test is still under discussion but will be ready for the influx of new judges in 2025.
 - The next meeting will be held on Monday, April 15, 2024, at 3:00 p.m.
- Specialty Court Funding Committee
 - Mr. McCormick provided the following updates.
 - Judge Longly will be replacing Judge Sullivan on the committee.
 - The All Rise conference will be held in Anaheim, CA in May 2024
 - The Committee reviewed and updated policy language to assist specialty courts in finding appropriate treatment agencies.
 - The next Specialty Court conference will be held in October 2024.
- Family Subcommittee
 - Ms. Davis provided the following updates.
 - The Subcommittee is hosting a Technology Roundtable on Thursday, February 8, 2024, at 5:00 p.m. located at the Second Judicial District Court. Anyone interested is welcome to attend. Discussions will include guided interviews, Blue Sky protection order model, and an introduction to triage. Please email Ms. Davis directly for details.
 - The Family Subcommittee Strategic Planning Summit will be held on Friday, February 9, 2024, at the Second Judicial District Court. Attendees will discuss issues identified in the 2019 report on the family court model and what a sustainable statewide family court model looks like and how it will interface with other committees.

IV. Report of Regional Council Meetings

- North Central Regional Judicial Council
 - Judge Simons referred members to the summary in the meeting materials for more information.
- Sierra Regional Judicial Council
 - Judge Shelegelmlch commented that at the last meeting, the members welcomed Judge Lewis and Judge Johnson as newly appointed judges in the region.
- South Central Regional Judicial Council
 - Judge Dobrescu referred members to the summary in the meeting materials for more information.

V. Other Items/Discussion

- AOC Projects
 - Ms. Stocks provided the following updates.
 - All AOC projects outside of the Family Subcommittee are related to the three tiers of the Strategic Plan which will conclude in 2025. The largest portion of the plan is to increase access to justice.
 - A public hearing for ADKT 615 is scheduled for Wednesday, February 7th, at 2:00 p.m. The changes in this ADKT propose making e-filing mandatory once the program goes live for all trial courts in the state.
 - The Global Justice civil traffic platform will remain an option for trial courts, but the AOCs sponsorship of the program will end on June 30, 2023. Courts can use CourtView instead. The AOC will be upgrading to CourtView 3 which is cloud based.
 - The Statewide Jury project is still forthcoming. One side of the project is the jury pool that courts can pull from and the other side of the project is running jury trials.

VI. Information Materials

- 2023 Attendance Records
 - Chief Justice Cadish thanked the JCSN members for attending and participating in meetings and asked that member pass along a request to other judges to attend future meetings per the requirements of the Bylaws.
- A public hearing for ADKT 580 has been scheduled for Thursday, March 7, 2024, at 2:00 p.m. to discuss the Proposed Revised Rules for Appellate Procedures.

VII. Future Meetings

- May 3, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.
- August 16, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.
- November 1, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.

VIII. Adjournment

- There being no further discussion or public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

TAB 2

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council of the State of Nevada

FROM: Alicia Davis, Principal Court Management Consultant, NCSC

DATE: May 1, 2024

SUBJECT: Creating a Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model
Implementation Plan

In August 2023, the Judicial Council of the State of Nevada approved the creation of the Ad Hoc Family Subcommittee. Over the course of several months, subcommittee members came together to address recommendations from the 2019 Nevada District Court, Family Division Assessment Report, and to develop strategies designed to support Family Court operations across the state; this effort culminated in the development of the attached “Implementation Plan.”

Recommendation:

Approve the implementation plan to create a sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model.

Attachment



CREATING A SUSTAINABLE STATEWIDE FAMILY DIVISION OPERATING MODEL

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

PREPARED FOR:

**The Judicial Council of the
State of Nevada**

March 12, 2024

Creating a Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Introduction

The ad hoc Family Subcommittee of the Judicial Council of the State of Nevada convened on February 9, 2023, to develop an implementation plan to address the recommendations from the [2019 report](#) and the [2023 Internal Judicial Survey](#) in the creation of a Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model in Nevada. This report outlines the steps the Subcommittee will take to support these efforts. Pictures from the February 9th meeting can be found in [Appendix A](#).

The Purpose of a Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model

Subcommittee members focused on the issues identified in the [2019 report](#) and [2023 Internal Judicial Survey](#) to establish the purpose of a Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model.

The committee had an open and honest discussion, acknowledging that there had been some level of skepticism regarding the intentions behind the 2019 Report. The conversation touched on the role of the trial courts and the AOC, and the AOC's role in supporting trial courts generally and specific focus of tailoring support to the non-urban courts.

During the discussion, the following ideas emerged:

- Creating a committee to address family court priorities.

- Designating a full-time employee within the AOC's Court Services team to serve as a Family Court Liaison for communication and coordination with courts statewide.
- Broadening case management practices to address both complex dissolutions and informal domestic relations trials.
- Working towards concrete training opportunities with experience-focused education for judicial and non-judicial employees.
- Establishing a statewide ADR program and expanding services statewide.
- Developing a platform that allows family judges and staff to communicate and collaborate.

The purpose of a Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model is to increase communication and collaboration to help address specific pressure points that are seen in court and are experienced by families across its system. The JCSN Family Subcommittee members seek to establish timely case management practices that reflect the Court's 2019 initial priorities. By enhancing communication and collaboration efforts, Subcommittee members also hope the needs of judges are met. Additionally, by supporting these efforts, it will also help to build trust and support amongst judges, court staff and the AOC.

Building a Statewide Action Plan to Enhance Communication and Collaboration

Subcommittee members drafted an action plan listing objectives, tasks, and suggested timelines to facilitate implementation efforts in the next months leading into 2025, with these objectives, tasks, and timelines:

OBJECTIVE ONE: FUNDING FOR SMALL COMMITTEES.

Tasks	Expected Timeline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will be an immediate term. Establish a budget with line items that include the number of people and the number of meetings that need to be funded. 	To submit a budget request by May 2024.

Objective Two: Identifying Critical Judicial Education for Judicial Officers and Employees

Task & Leadership	Expected Timeline:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task: Conduct an analysis of existing Nevada court resources and available subject matter experts. 	Mid-March 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task: Create and convene a Court Employee Education Workgroup. The workgroup will consist of eight members. This task to be led by Jamie Gradick's team. 	Mid-March 2024
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task: The Court Employee Education Workgroup will work with the AOC to determine additional resources, subject matter experts, and needs. The workgroup will meet virtually on a bi-weekly basis for one-hour. See the next column for a detailed timeline of meeting dates and discussion items. This task will be led by Jamie Gradick's team with the support of Kim Free through August 2024 and the Court Services Unit (AOC) as needed. 	<p><u>Week of March 25, 2024:</u> Approve a survey for trial court employees on education needs.</p> <p><u>Week of April 1 – 12, 2024:</u> The education survey will be open to court employees.</p> <p><u>Week of April 15, 2024:</u> Review survey results, identify themes and outline training plans.</p> <p><u>Week of April 29, 2024:</u> Coordinate with NACCA on current education programming and how we can supplement or support the organization's offerings.</p> <p><u>Week of May 13, 2024:</u> Review the education plan outline.</p>

	<p><u>Week of May 28, 2024:</u> Have the final education plan approved.</p> <p><u>Week of June 10, 2024:</u> The workgroup's plan will be presented to the JCSN's Court Administration Committee for approval.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task: Create and convene a Judicial Family Education Workgroup. The workgroup is to meet quarterly once it's implemented. • This task will be led by the Judicial Training Group. The Judicial Training Group is currently led by Judge Grossman, Judge Young and Judge Hoskin. This task will be accomplished with the help of the AOC, through Jamie Gradick, Alicia Davis and Kim Free as support staff. 	<p>April 2024</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task: Work on a curriculum development that includes the following items: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include complex judicial decision-making training. 2. Identify training facilitation/delivery methods: training style, training locations/times and the availability of on-demand education. 3. Seek possible grants to support training, for example the State Justice Institute (SJI). 4. Seek for conference collaboration opportunities. • This task will be led by Kim Free (through August 2024) and the Judicial Family Education Workgroup which includes the AOC's collaboration with the support of Alicia Davis and Jamie Gradick. 	<p>The budget request is to be made in May 2024.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task: To create a library of resources and to organize all on-demand training and resources/materials in one place. These resources are to be accessible. • Led by and maintained by the Family Court Liaison. 	<p>The first quarter of 2025.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task: Draft and submit a budget request. • This task will be led by the Court Services Unit (AOC) and the support from Kim Free (through August 2024). 	<p>May 2024</p>
--	-----------------

Objective Three: AOC Online Bulletin Board That Includes Information on Available Community Resources

<p>Tasks:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying a central location to host all information and resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and analysis of Nevada legal and service providers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Judge Schreinert’s community outreach programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rural Outreach Program ○ 211 Health and Human Services • Check the Comprehensive Alcohol and Substance Abuse Treatment (CASAT) resource list made available throughout universities and contact Lydia Nussbaum. • Organize all domestic violence resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Judicial List Serv</u>: Court administrators/designees (SHC if available). To be conducted during the first and second quarters of 2024. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The listserv will be monitored by an appointee of the working group which may be changed from time to time as needed. ○ A summary of new cases in family court will be provided through the platform. ○ Once the position for the AOC Family Court Liaison has been established then they will be responsible for having the information summarized and disseminated. ○ Consider monitoring after the first quarter of 2025.

Objective Four: Establish A Full-Time Family Court Liaison Position Within The AOC’s Court Services Team. Onboarding To Be Supported As Needed By The Court Services Unit (AOC). The Family Court Liaison Will Start By The First Quarter Of 2025.

The AOC Family Court Liaison will help with managing the following items after the first quarter of 2025:

1. The Judicial List Serv: The Family Court Liaison will be responsible for organizing case summaries and disseminating them through a uniform process.
2. Manage a centralized location for all family court resources and information.

The timeline for establishing the position of Family Court Liaison will include:

- Drafting and finalizing a job description by the third quarter of 2024.
- Starting the recruitment process with workgroup judges by the fourth quarter of 2024.

Improving The Lives Of People And Family Court Users With A Sustainable Statewide Family Division Model.

Through ongoing conversations, the Subcommittee plans to also address how the system will be different for people and families involved in the family court system. The following objectives were discussed:

1. Improving efficiency of all family courts by:

- Promoting timely and effective case management. Currently there are no established performance measures to help determine a case's timeliness.
- Furthering communication jurisdiction-wide and statewide and strengthening the relationship with Nevada's AOC.
- Establishing a vehicle to rally support from the AOC and receive feedback from colleagues on what is working and what is not.
 - With the new Family Court Liaison position as part of the AOC's court services team will facilitate communication with family courts as provided under objective four.
 - Establishing a working committee to draft and promote family court initiatives. This committee will have the authority to communicate and implement change.
 - Funds will be established to support the working committee's efforts.

2. For judges or other court staff who hear and manage court cases, judges and court staff will:

- Establish a standardized training curriculum for judges. An established curriculum will help with JEAs and help with drafting court orders.

How To Support The Sustainable Statewide Family Division Operating Model Action Plan

To help facilitate the proposed action plan, the Subcommittee highlighted the reasons for their listed objectives and identified potential judicial partners and resources. By assessing local and state influence and support, the Subcommittee hopes to have a bigger picture of how communication and collaboration initiatives will be well supported moving forward.

This section will include: **1)** Reasons for highlighted objectives; **2)** The roles of current partners and future workgroups; **3)** The strategies for the implementation of the listed objectives; and **4)** A short summary of the Court's current ability to partake in the proposed action plan.

Reasons For Highlighted Objectives:

1. Establish the Court Employee Education Workgroup by March 2024. The workgroup will consist of eight members and will be staffed by Jamie Gradick's team. It will be responsible for identifying any concerns that family courts may face to help further the efforts and work of court administrators and staff. On the week of March 25, 2024, the workgroup will begin to virtually meet bi-weekly to plan and finalize the new court employee education plan which will be presented to the JCSN Court Administration Committee for approval. The workgroup will be expected to present their final education plan by June 10, 2024, for JCSN's approval.
2. Establish the Judicial Family Education Workgroup with five to six members by April 2024. The workgroup will meet quarterly and be responsible for identifying any concerns (such as domestic violence) family courts may face. The workgroup will also help with the 2019 implementation efforts, including the development of standard training curriculum for judges. This workgroup will be led by Judge Young, Judge Hoskin, and Judge Grossman. The AOC, through Alicia Davis, Jamie Gradick, and Kim Free will provide support to the workgroup until December 2024.

3. Developing a formal training curriculum for judges and court staff will enhance case management practices and move towards adopting standardized practices across family court jurisdictions that reduce backlog and delays.
4. A mentoring program should also be created to support judges with their case management practices.
5. Enhance communication and identify collaboration opportunities to strengthen the relationship between judges and staff within and across jurisdictions. As part of these efforts, develop a platform to communicate and share resources. Additionally, increase communication between the Court and the AOC.

Identifying Roles For Current And Future Partners And Workgroups

Individuals and Groups	What will be their role and responsibilities during development and implementation?
Kim Free	Through August 2024, Kim Free will assist with the creation and support of the newly established family court workgroups. These workgroups are to be created by April 2024.
Judicial Family Education Workgroup	The workgroup will be made up of five to six individuals, including three judges to help evaluate gaps and needs amongst judges and their courts. This workgroup is to be created by April 2024. The workgroup will help with developing a training curriculum for judges. Members will consist of Judge Young, Judge Hoskin and Judge Grossman. They will have the authority to add new members and will meet quarterly with Justice Lee and Katherine Stocks or her designee. The AOC with the help of Alicia Davis, Jamie Gradick and Kim Free (through August 2024) will be available as staff support.
Court Employee Education Workgroup	This workgroup will be created to help evaluate gaps and determine action plans for addressing any considerations. The workgroup is to be created by April 2024. A few key individuals have been identified to partake in the workgroup, including Steve and Alicia. Two more individuals are needed to be part of the workgroup, preferably from rural jurisdictions. Kim Free (through August 2024) with the Court Services Unit (AOC) will be helping with the development of these efforts.

Full-time AOC Family Court Liaison	The full-time AOC Family Court Liaison will help facilitate communication and coordination between the family courts and the AOC. The purpose of this position is to ensure communication is consistent between the courts and the AOC, as well as to help them build a strong relationship. Not only will this position be responsible for the effective flow of communication, but it will also provide technical assistance and training support for Nevada’s trial courts. This position is to be active by January 1, 2025. The Court Services Unit (AOC) will be helping with the position’s onboarding process as needed.
------------------------------------	--

Readiness For Change

Assessing readiness is crucial before making changes. This involves evaluating the court's and individuals' willingness and capacity to adopt new practices, policies, or procedures. It includes consideration of court-level factors like staffing, resources, and technological infrastructure, and individual-level factors like staff knowledge and skills.

Committee members determined readiness for these elements:

- **Sufficient Time:** Committee members found that there is sufficient time for initiating and finalizing the action plan.
- **Familiarity/Expertise:** There are local experts that can offer the envisioned training to both judges and staff. Experts need to be identified and contacted to help facilitate the planned judicial training.
- **Colleagues/Partnerships:** Legal aid providers and judicial partners exist and can be part of the newly created educational workgroups, as well as help with supporting initiatives. Legal aid providers should be looped in with planning efforts and assigned to tasks that will help further implementation. Through this collaboration, the Court hopes to establish connections to help further the availability of domestic violence resources and information that can be potentially shared internally with judges and court staff. The Family Court Liaison will be assisting with this work.
- **Data Collection:** New dockets have shown improved success rates. However, data collection is dependent on a court’s case management system. Additionally, the case management system needs to include complex divorce and custody data

points and will require data reporting compliance. Visualization of information will require work as well. The family court will work with administrators and their IT departments to ensure data can be collected properly.

- **Judicial Leaders/Champions:** There are leaders and champions that support these efforts. They need to be informed and provided with an opportunity to convene for implementation purposes.
- **Communication Plan:** A communication plan is needed to help with increasing communication between judges. Quarterly updates are preferred, but communication can be more frequent. Communication platforms should also be established through the judicial listserv. The AOC Family Court Liaison will be assisting with summarizing family court cases and disseminating the summaries through the judicial list serv. Additionally, the list serv will have information on calendared meetings regarding any family court administrative changes and updates for both members of the Bench and Bar to attend.

Members also shared that they have the capacity to meet deadlines and address any external factors. Additionally, members shared that they will address any legal/ethical concerns and review performance measures.

Strategies For Implementation

Committee members identified implementation strategies for their efforts. Effective implementation strategies are designed to introduce and integrate new practices effectively and are meant to facilitate the successful adoption and implementation of change.

The next table includes the list of objectives and strategies for the Committee’s implementation efforts:

Objectives:	Implementation Strategies:
Establishing formal education workgroups for both judges and court employees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify workgroup membership that represents both larger and rural jurisdictions. The Judicial Family Education Workgroup should consist of at least three

	<p>judges to participate in the development of training curriculum and enhancing communication efforts. The workgroups are to be created by April 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Judicial Family Education Workgroup will have the authority to help facilitate its work. These judges will include Judge Young, Judge Hoskin and Judge Grossman. They will also meet quarterly with Justice Lee. • Kim Free (through August 2024) and the Court Services Unit (AOC) will help support the development of these efforts.
Developing a curriculum and library of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build a curriculum and identify training delivery models as the workgroup drafts a budget request to ensure incoming funds and resources are sufficient to support this development.
Allocating a proper number of resources and funding to help support the work of the newly established workgroups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding will need to be identified and established to support the implementation efforts of all family courts. A budget request will need to be submitted by May of 2024 and should anticipate for the work of three people to help with efforts and the facilitation of six meetings per year.
A strong relationship between the Court and the AOC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a full-time AOC Family Court Liaison to help facilitate communication and coordination between the Court and the AOC. Support staff for the liaison may be needed. • Building a strong relationship will help with improving the organization and availability of community resources and will help link services to court users and families.

Upcoming Considerations

In the next couple of months, the Subcommittee will discuss the following considerations to help support their implementation plan to attain a sustainable statewide family division operation model:

- Developing informal rules and orders for family court operations. Model rules and orders can help with building uniformity between jurisdictions.
- Determining the ad hoc Family Subcommittee’s ongoing purpose.

- Whether the Subcommittee should continue meeting or convene as needed to help take on new issues.
- If the Subcommittee is to continue meeting, will it serve as an oversight group of the Court's implementation progress and continuing efforts?
- Transforming the temporary quarterly report into a permanent performance measure that can be assessed routinely by the JCSN to help monitor case management and triage practices between all family courts.

With these considerations in mind, the Subcommittee will be evaluating whether the planned objectives have achieved their intended outcomes. This may require waiting until objectives and their tasks are fully implemented; however, the Subcommittee will continuously examine how implementation efforts for ensuring measures are well supported. Assessing change can occur at multiple times through various methods and action plans can be modified as needed. Through intentional observations and collection of information, the Subcommittee will identify how to accomplish its action plan with existing resources and future internal and community collaborations.

The Subcommittee's next meeting will take place on March 6, 2024, to discuss further efforts for informal trials.

Appendix A – February 9, 2023, Workgroup Collaboration

Rules of Engagement

- The Public
- Dream big, big picture
- Participate, ^{even} awkwardly
- Breaking down complex issues
- Respectfully disagree
- Openness.
- Staying on task
- Single mindedness of purpose
- Aware of what others need.
- Active Engagement
- Recognize needs of all JXNS
- GRACE
- Pivot AS NEEDED
- Volunteer & volunteer others

- Be willing to consider new ideas.

TOPICS for W.G.

- * Complex Trials
- * Informal DR. TRIALS
- * Judicial Education & Mentorship

Problem we are solving

Lack of Judicial collaboration w/ education case

Understanding, collab / communication

To address pressure pts in F.C. vehicle to help address needs in F.C.

TO imp. 2019 priorities

process is not conducive to getting things done

Efficiency of F.C.

Timely / effective case management

Mistrust / misdirected support

Judges state mix

* Resolve pressure in F.C.

Emerging Themes

- * Liaison to AOC
- * Committee
- * Coordinate judicial committees
- * TRAINING NEEDS
- * Orders Bank
- Case Law
- legislative updates
- * Complex Dissolution
- Informal Domestic Relations Trials
- * Statewide ADR

CASE MANAGEMENT

other services.

Anticipated Outcomes

- increase communication
- make process more intuitive
- safety net for judges for sample orders
- knowing who to go to with questions
- case management / help write orders / cues / help with case
- If the working group "works"
- objectives + timelines (small, nimble ^{working} groups)

WG

- mechanism for feedback
- small & nimble
- if the WG works →
 - 1) put people on who are willing to work
 - 2) empower them - let them do it - give them power
 - transparency
 - effort → accountability
 - 3) give judges freedom to choose who is on it
- 2 → process → communicate w/ external champions
- 1 → funding to make committee meetings have meetings on the book for them to meet
- AOC Role is to sure up resources - support staff



Sustainable Statewide Family Operations: Implementation Plan

PREPARED FOR: JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA

May 24, 2024

2023 Judicial Survey Report Findings

The Court's Current Perspective

Respondents

- 48 responses.
- Respondents included Judges (75%), Judicial Hearing Officers (2) and Court Administrators (7).
- 52% of respondents had 6 or more years of experience working and serving in their current position.
- 72% of the Judges reported handling over 70 cases annually.

Top Five Recommendations from the 2023 Survey:

- Provide continuous specialized training for domestic violence.
- Plan carefully for future expansions in court facilities.
- Maintain the operational model of the family division.
- Undertake a comprehensive workload study for the family divisions.
- Expand the data collection of the District Court, Family Division to include public forums, judicial officers, and stakeholders in rural areas.

February 2024 Family Subcommittee Planning Meeting

The 2023 Survey was the basis of the 2023 February planning meeting. Ad Hoc Subcommittee members were able to discuss the 2023 Survey's five recommendations and outlined several steps for the purposes of accomplishing the following emerging ideas:

- Created a judicial committee to address family court priorities. This group is working on case management practices to address both complex dissolutions and informal domestic relations trials.
- Designated a representative within the AOC's Court Services team to serve as a liaison for communication and coordination with family courts statewide.
- Working towards concrete training opportunities with experience-focused education for judicial and non-judicial employees.
- Developing a platform that allows family judges and staff to communicate and collaborate.

Ongoing Efforts Since February 2023

For Judges:

- Informal Domestic Relations Trials
- Complex Dockets Discussion (April 2024)

For Court Staff:

- The Court Employee Workgroup has been convened and is currently meeting to develop a continuous learning plan for Nevada staff. The plan is to be presented to the Court Administration Committee in June.
- **Other Items:**
 - Workload
 - Training
 - Domestic Violence: Data-(sharing) improvement and grant-seeking.

Tab 3

Court Administration Committee Report Forthcoming

TAB 4

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

*“To unite and promote Nevada’s judiciary as an equal, independent and effective
branch of government.”*

COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Members:

Justice Elissa Cadish, Chair
Judge Paige Dollinger
Judge Gary Fairman
Judge David Gibson
Crystal Hallock
Amber Howell
Wonswayla Mackey

Fran Maldonado
John McCormick
Jennifer Merideth
Judge Michael Montero
Magistrate Kimberly Okezie
Buffy Okuma
Karen Perez

Jennifer Rains
Kate Schmidt
Jennifer Spencer
Stacy Stahl
Magistrate Alison Testa
Janice Wolf

Committee Meeting of April 19, 2023

May 24, 2024, JCSN Prepared by: Zaide Martinez, Court Improvement Program Officer

- The Annual Juvenile Dependency Mediation Training was held in Las Vegas at the Green Valley Ranch Resort and Spa Casino on May 2-3, 2024.
 - Training topics: Co-regulation as a tool in the mediation room; trauma informed mediation and the pervasive impact of multi-generational trauma, abuse/neglect, and substance use
- The 2024 Community Improvement Council (CIC) Summit dates have been set and will be held in Reno, Nevada. Venue information will be provided at a later date. The CIC Summit dates are as follows:
 - September 18, 2024, Judicial Roundtable for judges and masters/magistrates only
 - September 19-20, 2024, CIC General Summit for all CIC stakeholders
- The Dependency Judicial Leadership Subcommittee (DJLS), a statewide subcommittee of dependency judges and masters/magistrates have been meeting regularly. This subcommittee is an ad hoc subcommittee of the CIP Select Committee and provides significant benefits by allowing enhanced cohesion between CICs and dependency judges.
 - The current focus of the Subcommittee is addressing out-of-court kinship diversions
- The Judicial, Court, and Attorney Measures of Performance (JCAMP) Leadership Team has reduced the measures to 33. The Team is finalizing sustainability plans for practice measurement. The sustainability plans will support Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) timelines and CIP required areas of focus by the Children's Bureau (CB).
- CIP has been meeting with the Statewide Safe Babies Court Program Coordinator to assist with new jurisdiction implementation.

- CIP and the Family Programs Office (FPO) is working on the Language Eligibility Report to support implementation of the Standardized Child Welfare Forms.
- CIP is working closely with the CB and Agency partners to prepare for Round 4 of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR).
 - May 20-23, 2024, CB working site visit
 - May 23, 2024, centered around Agency and Court collaboration
- CIP hosted a group of eight CIP stakeholders from across Nevada who attended the American Bar Association Center on Children at Law National Conferences, in McLean, VA:
 - National Conference on Access to Justice for Children and Families (April 9-10, 2024)
 - National Conference on Parent Representation (April 11-12, 2024)
- CIP is working on the Annual Self-Assessment and updated Five-Year Strategic Plan. These reports are required by the CB and are due June 30, 2024.

TAB 5

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Legislative Committee

April 15, 2024

3:00 p.m.

Summary Prepared by: Almeda Harper

Members Present

Chief Justice Elissa Cadish (Chair)
Associate Chief Justice Lidia Stiglich (Vice-chair)
Judge Stephen Bishop
Judge Kathleen Drakulich
Chief Judge Michael Gibbons
(proxy for Judge Bonnie Bulla)
Steve Grierson
Jessica Gurley
Chief Judge Kevin Higgins
Cynda Horning
Chief Judge Lynne Jones
Alicia Lerud
Judge Victor Miller
Alisa Shoults
Judge Randall Soderquist
Judge Ryan Toone
Judge E. Alan Tyras
Judge Natalie Tyrell
Chief Judge Jerry Wiese
Bobbie Williams
Judge Tod Young

Advisory Members Present

Tom Clark
Jessica Ferrato
Mike Hillerby
Jill Hinxman
Keith Lee
John McCormick
Gabby McGregor
Joe Tommasino

Guests

Sam Anastassatos
Paige Barnes
Justice Linda Bell
Judge Kendra Bertschy
Judge Cynthia Cruz
AJ Delap
Rebecca Edwards
Judge Jessica Goodey
Judge Terry Graham
Justice Doug Herndon
Erin Tellez

AOC Staff

Paul Embley
Almeda Harper

I. Call to Order

- Chief Justice Cadish called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.
- Ms. Harper called roll; a quorum was present.
- The meeting summary from January 16, 2024, was unanimously approved.

II. 2023 Legislation Implementation Issues and Corrections

- 48-hour hearing permanent funding
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick stated this is an ongoing attempt to obtain continuous funding for rural counties and rural Clark County. He asked the attendees if this should be a Supreme Court bill or presented by another entity.
 - Mr. Clark notified the members that he had multiple conversations with leadership and the head of the Ways and Means Committee, who supported the bill. A legislator will be able to present the bill.

III. Possible 2025 BDRs

- AB116 Clean-up
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick requested volunteers to create a clean-up workgroup. Any limited jurisdiction judges who are interested should email him directly.
- Guardianship
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick stated this BDR will bring back items from [SB15](#) submitted last session. He would like to remove “Compliance” from the title as it gives the wrong impression of the department's role, remove the statutory cap on staff, and request additional staff. He recently heard that several of the Guardianship proposals from the last session, advocated for by the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, will be reappearing in the upcoming session.
 - Chief Justice Cadish is working on appointing new co-chairs for the Guardianship Commission and updating the membership list.
- Administrative Assessment Reform Bill
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick shared that the main concern for this bill is local fees for juvenile and collecting courts. There may be an effort to remove all AA fees which may or may not include specialty court, court security, or DNA fees. He suggested several options including requesting the Legislature to backfill for local jurisdictions, integrating the funds into local court assessments similar to 176.011 and 176.0613, discussing with Legislators, or adding this to the AB116 Clean-up Workgroup discussion.
 - Judge Toon felt it should be added to the AB116 Clean-up discussion and offered to gather statistics on the fees in question.
- Technical and Non-technical Parole and Probation (P&P) Violations and Honorable and Dishonorable Discharges
 - ♦ Chief Judge Jones commented that P&P is only allotted one BDR and is not inclined to use it on this topic. She also discussed this topic with the members of the Nevada District Judges Association and offered to begin drafting a BDR for the next meeting.
- Post-sentence No-contact Orders and Transmitting Protection Orders to DPS
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick explained that there is a concern the post-sentence no-contact orders are not being entered into the depository and law enforcement officers are unaware of them. A simple addition to the statute should correct the issue.
 - ♦ DPS’s interpretation of the following portion of the statute, “on a form prescribed by the department” means courts must enter data directly into their protection order portal system.
 - Judge Bishop shared that he was asked to sign an NCIC contract subjecting the court to certain liabilities. He requested additional details regarding the liabilities but has not heard from them and has not signed.
 - Mr. McCormick added that if the courts became the entering entity, they may need to operate 24/7 to verify hits on protection orders for law enforcement. He felt the courts should own the orders and be allowed to dictate the contents of the orders.
 - Ms. Williams agreed with Mr. McCormick and recommended updating the language. When her court tried to enter orders into DPS’s system, they were limited in what they could enter, or they had to fax orders to DPS instead of entering them.
 - Chief Justice Cadish requested details from a recent training that DPS provided to the North Las Vegas Municipal Court.
 - Ms. Tellez informed the members that the training went well. DPS staff were able to provide additional guidance for specific situations the staff struggled with in the past. Protection orders are being entered into the POP system by the Court Clerks.
 - Ms. Lerud shared that the domestic violence clerks enter orders into POP at her court. After-hours orders are entered by the pre-trial service team, as they are scheduled 24/7. They enter a minimal amount of information and additional information is entered by the regular staff the next day.
 - Chief Justice Cadish asked Ms. Lerud about post-sentence no-contact concerns.

- Ms. Lerud explained that her court’s staff enters their domestic violence protection orders. When there isn’t a domestic violence order in place, a no-contact order is issued post-sentencing in a criminal case. Victims, law enforcement, and advocates can be confused and do not understand the difference. They assume the individual in question cannot make contact, meanwhile, the post-sentence no-contact orders were not entered into the database.
 - Ms. Gurley recommended editing the statute and shared that the court administrators from the Clark County Justice Courts met with DPS on February 26th to discuss POP system concerns, including missing victim information and limited resources for data entry. DPS considered the idea of integration, but the meeting ended at an impasse regarding who is responsible for data entry. Erica Souza, the division administrator, planned to meet with their legal counsel and internal staff.
- ♦ Mr. McCormick read the current statute as “the court shall cause to be transmitted in a manner prescribed by the central repository for Nevada records of criminal history, any information required by the repository in a manner which ensures the information is received by the repository by the end of the next business day.” He suggested that entering data into DPS’ POP system is “transmission in a manner prescribed by the repository” and this may be the section that requires clarification.
- ♦ Judge Goodey reviewed the following statutes with DPS.
 - 200.597
 - 179A.350
 - 178.4845
- ♦ Mr. McCormick asked the members if all the statutes should be uniform or if one statute should be created for the transmission of protection orders pursuant to Chapter 33.
- ♦ Mr. Embley commented that other states have solved this issue. Courts enter orders into their system, to be transmitted to DPS to complete the hit confirmation.
 - Mr. McCormick added this option may require a new technology system.
- ♦ Chief Justice Cadish commented that there are two different, but perhaps related issues. One is who is responsible for entering domestic violence protection orders. The second is how to address no-contact orders in a sentencing context in a criminal case as opposed to separate, permanent domestic violence protective orders.
 - Mr. McCormick offered to pull all statutes regarding transmission for discussion during the next meeting. He will also find the pre-trial no-contact orders statute to be used as an example for the post-sentence no-contact orders.
 - Ms. Lerud offered to share previous correspondence with DPS to clarify how they process these orders.
- ♦ Chief Justice Cadish added that the AOC plans to hire a liaison between the courts and law enforcement.
 - Mr. McCormick explained the liaison will act on behalf of the AOC and the Judicial Branch, working with DPS and law enforcement, and will be funded through the American Rescue Plan Act funds.
- Protection Order Jurisdiction – NRS 4.370 (m)
 - ♦ Justice Bell commented that courts may not be processing Temporary Protection Orders (TPO) uniformly across jurisdictions.
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick explained that in townships with a population greater than 100,000, domestic violence and high-risk protection orders are processed by District Courts. In smaller townships, those cases are processed by Justice Courts. Domestic violence protection orders are processed by Family Court, except in rural Clark County. Stalking and harassment, sexual assault, harassment in the workplace, protection of minors, and high-risk cases are processed by Justice Courts. If the proposed adverse party is juvenile, all order types are handled by the District Court.

- ♦ Judge Miller commented that the current system works well for his court and similar smaller jurisdictions.
- Additional Judges for the 8th Judicial District
 - ♦ Chief Judge Wiese informed members that he needs the county's approval as they will provide most of the funding. This bill will be a continuation of one that was previously brought to the Legislature by Justice Bell. The original bill asked for 15 additional judges, but only six were approved. He said the Eighth Judicial District is asking for the remaining nine judges to complete the previous request. The bill will use a population increase of 60,000 to justify the additional judges. Rural jurisdictions expressed concern this may limit their ability to request additional judges in the future. Chief Judge Wiese felt the rural jurisdictions should not be affected as the bill to be modified deals with jurisdictions of 700,000 or more.
 - ♦ Justice Bell added that the Clark County District Court was behind in requesting additional judges due to many factors including the economic downturn, the pandemic, and a lack of resources. Recent population growth has increased caseloads.
 - ♦ Justice Cadish suggested ensuring that the current judges are present in the courthouse while holding hearings to assist in substantiating the bill. She also asked if there are caseload statistics available to ensure talking points are readily available when needed.
 - Mr. Grierson offered to distribute caseload statistics.
 - ♦ Chief Judge Jones commented that the Second Judicial District Court is considering adding judges but will need to confirm funding with the county as they are also requesting a new courthouse. She felt a blended request would better support the request for more judges rather than a population-based request.
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick felt the caseload of a judge in the Tenth Judicial District would compare with a judge in the Eighth Judicial District based purely on numbers. He also spoke with the Third Judicial District which plans to request additional judges during the 84th or 85th session.
- Preliminary Hearing and Charging Clean-up Bill
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick explained that a preliminary hearing for a potential death case is the only proceeding in the state that requires a court reporter and the statute should be amended. It was also discussed that misdemeanors charged along with felonies and gross misdemeanors should be grouped and heard at the District Court level. Unconditional waivers that are not truly unconditional will also fall under this bill. The charging and court reporter portions of the bill has been drafted. He offered to discuss details with Chief Judge Higgins outside of the meeting.
 - ♦ Chief Judge Higgins added that it's become increasingly difficult to obtain court reporters for any hearings in the Sparks Justice Court. He felt the work may be considered unpleasant, but there have not been any security threats to the court reporters. He would prefer to use a court reporter for domestic violence jury trials but settles with using JAVS. He currently uses certified court transcribers to transcribe JAVS.
 - ♦ Judge Drakulich added that her court clerks feel the number of court reporters may diminish over the next five years as many currently holding the position are approaching retirement. Her court only uses court reporters.
 - Mr. McCormick concurred with this statement.
 - ♦ Judge Bertschy commented that Reno Justice Court also has issues scheduling court reporters, but no security issues.
 - ♦ Judge Bishop sends his JAVS to Capital for transcriptions.
 - ♦ Judge Tyrrell's court reporter is a county employee who covers all three departments and performs all transcribing for the building.
 - ♦ Attendees stated they do not have trouble finding transcribers for court recordings.
 - ♦ Justice Bell explained there is a tremendous benefit to a court having a dedicated court reporter because then the court owns its record. Court reporters used to have a significant amount of political influence, making any suggestion to change very difficult.

- Mr. McCormick agreed with Justice Bell, stating the Nevada Court Reporters Association has not been nearly as active in the Legislature in the last few sessions.
 - ♦ Judge Bishop pointed out that the statute is written poorly, specifically the section that states, “in all cases other than that which the death penalty is sought.”
 - Mr. McCormick agreed and felt the suggested changes would correct this issue.
- Court Security Funding
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick commented that this topic was discussed at the District Judges Seminar and suggested the following options for revision.
 - Ask for a one-time appropriation, everyone’s needs are required for this.
 - Incorporate a more stringent requirement that counties and cities provide court security.
 - ♦ Justice Cadish shared the AOC is forming a state-wide court security committee to investigate these details. Chief Marshal Wright has gathered data via a recent survey that could be used to determine security needs.
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick added that the last court security bill was submitted in 2009 but received pushback from the Assembly judiciary committee. He suggested moving this topic to the watch list.
 - ♦ Judge Miller suggested the committee may need funding to gather the data necessary to gain a reasonable understanding of what’s needed.
 - Mr. McCormick added the AOC received two court services analyst positions that can assist if needed.
- General Title 1 Clean-up
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick is considering Chapters 1, 2, 2a, 3, 4, and 5 for this clean-up bill. Please forward any Title 1 corrections to him.

IV. Other Discussion Items

- Mr. McCormick and Judge Bertschy discussed the statutory authority for misdemeanor specialty courts and felt it was unclear.
 - ♦ Reno Justice Court would like to create an eviction program. NRS 40.365 only allows for 10 days which may need to be increased. Entry into an eviction or pre-prosecution diversion program is limited pursuant to 174.031, §2(a) and (b). Expanding pre-prosecution diversion eligibility is needed. Currently, the charge is a misdemeanor. If there are no previous convictions, the statute is restrictive.
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick suggested opening it up to specialty courts in general where sexual and violent offenders can’t go into a pre-prosecution diversion or set a specific felony level.
 - ♦ Judge Bertschy suggested that pre-prosecution diversion could be an avenue to move misdemeanors with competency concerns to competency court. She met with the specialty court judges to discuss AB236 which did not include misdemeanors so there are statutory irregularities causing issues.
 - ♦ Judge Bertschy added that, regarding eviction stay, potential funding has been secured and she feels 90 days upon the agreement with the tenant and landlord is necessary.
- Judge Goodey commented that the Las Vegas Justice Court Legislative Committee met and is interested in AB116, she will email Mr. McCormick accordingly. Another issue is an amendment to NRS 178.502 allowing parties to stipulate bail forfeiture. This comes up frequently, and she has proposed language to fix the issue and is requesting to use one of the Appellate Court’s BDRs. NRS 171.103 and 178.591 conflict with new electronic filing rules. The statutes require an image of a signature for electronic signatures. The electronic filing rules are specific to criminal complaints and motions. The District Attorneys are using the backslash “S” and typing their names which could potentially conflict with the requirement of an image of a signature.
 - ♦ Mr. McCormick offered to contact Judge Goodey outside of the meeting for additional details.

V. Watch List

- Small Claims and General Civil Monetary Limits
 - ♦ Other groups may be looking to increase monetary limits. It's not something this committee was considering but should be aware of.

VI. Future Meetings

- Monday, June 3, 2024, at 3:00 p.m.

VII. Adjournment

- There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

DRAFT

TAB 6

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

“To unite and promote Nevada’s judiciary as an equal, independent, and effective branch of government.”

SPECIALTY COURT FUNDING AND POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Members:

Justice Lidia Stiglich, Chair	Chief Judge Cynthia Cruz	Judge Thomas Stockard
Justice Linda Bell, Co-Chair	Judge Steven Dobrescu	Judge Ryan Toone
Judge Michael Montero, Vice-Chair	Chief Judge Lynne Jones	Chief Judge Jerry Wiese
Judge Tom Armstrong	Judge Jessica Longley	Judge Bitia Yeager
Judge Stephen Bishop	Judge Jim Loveless	
	Judge Deborah Schumacher	

Committee Meeting of April 19, 2024

Prepared by: Stephanie Gouveia, Specialty Courts Statewide Coordinator

- The committee approved fiscal year 2025 funding for the Clark region. Other regions will submit allocations by May 20th.
- The national Adult Treatment Court Best Practice Standards has been updated. The first edition is complete and available for download; the second edition is partially complete with the remainder to be released within the next two months.
- May is National Treatment Court Month. Multiple communities will be hosting activities and training to raise awareness.
- The states drug court case management system released an update and is working on CourtView integration for courts that utilize that system.
- There will be a Nevada Treatment Court Workers social hour at the RISE24 national conference. It will take place on Thursday, May 23rd, at 5pm.
- The peer review of the 2nd Judicial District took place February 1st and 2nd. They were reviewed by the Western Regional Specialty Court team.
- The next peer review is scheduled for the Western Regional Specialty Court on May 6th and 7th. The 2nd Judicial District will be observing and interviewing the WRSC team.
- The committee approved additional funding for the rural region to assist with training needs. This will allow more rural team members to attend crucial training courses for their programs.

- The state coordinator is working with the National Center for State Courts to identify domestic violence needs and concerns across the state.
- The state coordinator is finalizing the schedule for the Nevada State Specialty Court Conference, to take place October 16th-18th, 2024 in Sparks, NV. Registration should be open by the end of June.
- The next Specialty Court Funding & Policy Committee meeting will be July 22, 2024, at 12p.m.

TAB 7

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Clark Regional Judicial Council

March 8, 2024

2:00 p.m.

Summary Prepared by: Chad Johnson

Members Present

Chief Judge Jerry Weise, Chair
Judge Victor Miller
Judge Ryan Toone
Judge Gloria Sturman
Chief Judge Cynthia Cruz
Judge Natalie Tyrell
Judge Rhonda Forsberg
Chief Judge Barbara Schifalacqua

Absent Excused

Judge Dawn Throne
Judge Amy Mastin
Judge Bitia Yeager
Judge Bryce Duckworth
Judge Charles Hoskin
Judge Erika Ballou
Judge Joe Hardy Jr.
Judge Amy Zimmerman
Judge Kathleen Delaney
Judge Linda Marquis
Judge Jennifer Schwartz
Judge Joseph Sciscento

AOC Staff Present

Chad Johnson
Almeda Harper

Note: Members not listed were not in attendance and were not marked excused.

- I. Call to Order
 - Chief Judge Weise called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.
 - Mr. Johnson called roll; a quorum was not present.
- II. Review and Approval of June 15, 2023, Meeting Summary
 - The June 15, 2023, meeting summary was not approved.
- III. AOC Updates
 - Judicial Branch Training Unit
 - Mr. Johnson reported the Judicial Education Unit is now the Judicial Branch Training Unit. This change was done to better describe their growing mission and support for court staff training.
 - Mr. Johnson reported the Training Center build is ongoing in the Supreme Court Law Library.
 - Mr. Johnson reported Anne-Marie Mayeaux and Shyle Irigoien have been promoted to Judicial Branch Educators.
 - Mr. Johnson provided a reminder for the 2024 Nevada Family Law Conference. It will occur on April 8th, 2024, at the Aliante Hotel in North Las Vegas.

- Mr. Johnson provided a reminder for the 2024 District Court Judges Annual Seminar. It will occur April 9th -12th, 2024, at the Aliante Hotel in North Las Vegas.
- Approved ADKTs, effective 2/1/2024
 - Mr. Johnson provided a reminder that ADKT 581 went into effect on February 1st. The order is for the use of remote technology in Nevada’s general and limited jurisdictions and possible rule changes necessary for handling criminal, civil, and family courts.
 - Mr. Johnson provided a reminder that ADKT 613 went into effect on February 1st. The order is for the Amendment of SCR Part 9-B (A) The Rules Governing Appearance by Telephonic Equipment for Civil and Family Court Proceedings Rule 4. He stated that ADKT 613 is up for a public meeting again in 30 days.
- RISE 24 National Conference
 - Mr. Johnson reported that the RISE 24 National Conference will be taking place in Anaheim, California from May 22nd - May 25th, 2024. Mr. Johnson reported that Stephanie Gouveia, the Statewide Specialty Court Coordinator, will be speaking at a panel regarding peer review.
- Data Repository Dashboard
 - Mr. Johnson stated that Hans Jessup asked for any ideas from the council for data or metrics they may want in the dashboard. Any questions or information can be sent to Mr. Johnson.
 - Chief Judge Weise asked for more information about the Data Repository Dashboard.
 - Mr. Johnson offered further clarification about the Data Repository Dashboard and stated it could be used for data and metrics and anything the courts are trying to track.
 - Chief Judge Cruz reported that the specialty courts did this awhile back. She mentioned that it was used to track recidivism for grant funding. She stated that they look at someone who graduated from a program and what the recidivism rate is going out 3 to 5 years versus someone who has not graduated from a program to see what the recidivism rate is. She mentioned that it is always an interesting statistic. She stated at the front end of things they are always trying to gather statistics on demographics and the National Repository could help get recidivism statistics.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that someone already provides that for the Specialty Courts. He stated he thought the AOC or the Supreme Court provided that already.
 - Judge Toone stated that it could be used to track how long open cases are taking.
 - Chief Judge Weise asked if there were any other suggestions.
 - Mr. Johnson stated that any other suggestions can be sent to him.

IV. Discussion and Action Items

- Court Updates
- Vendor for Phone Free Courthouses
 - Judge Sturman stated that she has talked to a vendor who has a product that prevents the public from recording court hearings on their phones. She referenced the case *Falconi v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 543 P.3d 92, 140 Nev. Adv. Op. 8, where the Supreme Court of Nevada ruled it unconstitutional to close family law proceedings to the public. She mentioned that it would not be something the courts could use. She stated that for a high-profile case it may be useful if you do not want intimidation.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that there is still confusion about the *Falconi* decision. He mentioned that proceedings can mean documents as well as the hearing. He stated that the courts will continue to have a hard time with the public bringing phones into the courts and recording hearings.
 - Judge Sturman mentioned that someone can even record a Zoom hearing on a phone.
- Probate Caseload
 - Judge Sturman reported that every time she receives statistics it excludes Probate statistics. She stated the necessity of Probate statistics going to the Legislature. She mentioned that filing fees for Probate should be increased so funding can be raised for the Probate courts. She mentioned that the rest of the state would be open to the idea. She stated the probate filings occur and all parties only have to pay a \$400.00 filing fee that everyone pays for even smaller estates. She stated that the funding needs to be looked at and statistics compiled.

- Chief Judge Weise stated that keeping Probate statistics is important. He mentioned that a third party company will be coming in to talk about best practices in Probate and they will make recommendations about tracking Probate statistics.
- Open Discussion
 - Chief Judge Weise asked if a quorum has ever been present for the Clark Region.
 - Judge Miller asked what exactly is needed for a quorum.
 - Mr. Johnson reported that about 70 judges are needed for a quorum in the Clark Region.
 - Chief Judge Cruz asked if 70 judges for a quorum was correct for the Clark Region.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that there is 58 judges in District Court.
 - Chief Judge Cruz stated there is 16 judges in Las Vegas Justice Court. She mentioned there is 3 judges in Henderson Justice Court and 3 judges in North Las Vegas Justice Court.
 - Judge Miller stated that he understood that there was a Limited Jurisdiction judge representative on the committee. He mentioned that he does believe that not all of the representatives need to be present for a quorum.
 - Judge Forsberg asked if there was a voting committee and asked if that is how it works.
 - Judge Sturman stated that she believes the voting committee is representatives, chiefs, and representatives from the organizations. She mentioned that would be about 15 or 20 people.
 - Chief Judge Weise attempted a headcount of the meeting and a quorum was still not present.
 - Chief Judge Weise asked Mr. Johnson to provide what is needed for a quorum for the next meeting.
 - Mr. Johnson stated he would provide the quorum information for the next meeting.
 - Ms. Harper stated and explained the quorum process and explained why a quorum is difficult in the Clark and Washoe regions with the current bylaws. She mentioned that the bylaws are being updated and any suggestions are encouraged to help change the quorum status to make the meetings better for voting purposes.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that the last time the bylaws were updated there was an attendance provision added.
 - Ms. Harper stated that the provision was added to try to boost numbers for attendance. She mentioned that attendance is reported to the JCSN at the end of the year to show who attended. She stated again about any suggestions for improvement and some updated bylaws should be ready by the second or third JCSN meeting.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that for the next meeting that the bylaws for attendance be sent with the meeting materials so the bylaws can be discussed at the next meeting.
 - Mr. Johnson stated he would provide that in the next meeting materials.
 - Judge Forsberg stated that the upcoming judges meeting might be a good time to discuss the judicial council meetings since not everyone knows what they are about.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that he would discuss it at the judges meeting.
 - Judge Miller asked if the bylaws come from the regional councils or from the state council.
 - Ms. Harper stated that the regional council bylaws are a byproduct of the JCSN bylaws.
 - Chief Judge Weise asked if there is any changes to the bylaws if the JCSN would have to approve the changes.
 - Ms. Harper stated that the JCSN would have to approve any changes to the bylaws.
 - Judge Cruz stated that perhaps each chief judge could tell their bench that there is the Judicial Regional Council and the State Council. She mentioned that all the judges are eligible to attend but for the proxy that anybody that cannot attend so they would have the ability under proxy to vote.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated that Judge Albertson sent a message stating that maybe not having meetings on Friday afternoon would boost attendance for the meeting.
 - Judge Miller stated judicial council meetings were done at lunchtime in the past.
 - Chief Judge Weise stated we could do the meetings at noon and change the day too. He mentioned to have Mr. Johnson send out some other dates and times for future meetings.
 - Mr. Johnson stated he would send out other dates and times for future meetings.

V. Adjournment

- There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

TAB 8

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING

Friday, February 23, 2024

10:00 AM

Winnemucca, NV

(Prepared by Jamie Gradick)

Members Present:

Judge Mason Simons, Chair
Judge Randall Soderquist, Vice-Chair
Judge Kenneth Calton
Judge Bryan Drake
Judge Denise Fortune
Judge Bill Gandolfo
Judge Jim Loveless
Judge Michael Montero
Judge Dee Primeaux
Judge Kenneth Quirk (Remote)
Judge Jim Shirley (Remote)

Guests Present:

None

AOC Staff Present

Jamie Gradick

Members Absent (Excused):

Judge Kriston Hill
Judge Al Kacin
Judge Karen Stephens

Members Absent (Unexcused):

Judge Rob Hoferer

I. Call to Order

- Judge Simons, as Council chair, called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

II. Determination of a Quorum

- A quorum was present.

III. Approval of Meeting Summaries

- The summary of the November 17, 2023 meeting was approved.

IV. Business, Action, and Discussion Items

- AOC Updates

- Ms. Gradick reminded attendees that the ADKT 0581 Order Adopting Recommendations of the Commission to Study Best Practices for Virtual Advocacy in Nevada’s Courts was filed on December 22, 2023.
 - Rules go in effect February 1, 2024. The Court will hold a public hearing in about six months to review the effectiveness and any concerns regarding the Rules. Attendees discussed the possibility of submitting “public comment” as a group for consideration at the six-month public hearing/review.
 - Attendees discussed concerns regarding the feasibility of the requirements, particularly in the rural jurisdictions; some judges have already received push-back from parties.
 - Attendees discussed evidentiary issues with civil traffic proceedings; challenges arise when evidence is presented remotely.
 - Discussion was held regarding a need for additional clarification of case types in the rules (small claims, etc.)
 - Discussion was held regarding the conforming changes made to SCR 4 Part IX-B, (A), The language of the Order applies changes to telephonic appearances in civil and family proceedings; why not apply the changes to video appearances as well? And why are criminal proceedings not included?
- Ms. Gradick informed attendees of 2024 Judicial Education event dates; additional information will be made available closer to individual events.
- Ms. Gradick informed attendees that adult drug courts in various judicial districts have been participating in a “peer review” process.
 - The 6th and 7th Judicial Districts participated together; the 4th, 5th, and 8th Judicial Districts will be completing reviews soon.
 - The peer review process will, hopefully, be expanded to include other specialty court programs in the future.
 - Judge Montero commented that the process was beneficial. It involved interviews, observation, and was an important learning opportunity. Discussion was held regarding the possibility that this process could eventually lead to specialty court certifications and an expansion of specialty court programs.
 - Attendees briefly discussed the potential for increased limited jurisdiction court involvement as laws change and limited jurisdiction courts take on additional case types.
 - Attendees briefly discussed upcoming specialty court conference opportunities and the possible involvement of limited jurisdiction court representatives and/or administrators.
- Community Service Reports
 - Judge Fortune reported participation in the local high school’s “Winterfest”.

- Judge Calton hosted local forensic science students at the court and participated in the holiday “Tree Festival”.
- Judge Simons hosted students at the courthouse for a Q&A session and a tour.
- Judge Montero and his staff volunteered time at the local soup kitchen.
- Other Items and Discussion
 - Judge Montero expressed concern regarding decreased funding for the Reading and Robes program. Those participating in this program are struggling to find appropriate materials for the students.
 - Discussion was held regarding possible literacy foundations and/or organizations that may be interested in donating materials.
 - Attendees briefly discussed ADKT 616 and the potential positive impact it could have on the rural jurisdictions.
 - Attendees discussed the Department of Indigent Defense Services.
 - DIDS recently completed a weighted caseload study; the results indicate that some rural counties need to hire additional attorneys. Discussion was held regarding consequences if the counties can’t comply – will the State PD take over public defender services for those counties?
 - Discussion was held regarding the DIDS rate increase in criminal cases and the impact on dependency cases. Attorneys appointed in dependency cases make less than those appointed in criminal cases; this disincentivizes attorneys to take dependency appointments.
 - Concern was expressed regarding DIDS-appointed attorneys continuing to either miss or show up late for hearings; this seems to be a growing problem in many rural jurisdictions.
- Informational Documents
 - The NJC’s 2024 Course Schedule was included in the meeting material packet for attendees’ review.

V. Future Meetings

- The next North Central Regional Judicial Council meeting will be held May 24, 2024 @ 10:00 am in Elko.
- The next Judicial Council of the State of Nevada meeting will be held remotely on May 3, 2024 @ 2:00 pm.

VI. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

TAB 9

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SUMMARY

SIERRA REGIONAL JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING

Friday, January 26, 2024
12:00 PM

<p><u>Members Present:</u> Judge John Schlegelmilch, Chair Judge Tom Armstrong Judge Cheri Emm-Smith Judge Thomas Gregory Judge Michael Johnson Judge Kristin Luis Judge James Russell Judge Tom Stockard Judge Tod Young</p> <p><u>Guests Present:</u> Ms. Bobbie Williams Sr. Judge Deborah Schumacher</p> <p><u>(AOC) Staff Present:</u> Almeda Harper, Court Services Analyst</p>	<p><u>Members Absent (Excused):</u> Judge Leon Aberasturi Judge Paul Gilbert Judge Doug Kassebaum Judge Lori Matheus Judge Camille Vecchiarelli</p> <p><u>Members Absent (Unexcused):</u> Judge Eileen Herrington Judge Mike Lister Judge Ben Trotter</p>
---	---

I. Call to Order

- Judge Schlegelmilch, as chair, called the meeting to order at 12:13 p.m.
- Judge Schlegelmilch introduced Judge Michael Johnson, congratulated Judge Luis on her appointment to the district court bench, and welcomed Sr. Judge Schumacher to the meeting.

II. Determination of a Quorum

- A quorum was present.

Supreme Court Building ♦ 201 South Carson Street, Suite 250 ♦ Carson City, Nevada 89701 ♦ (775) 684-1700 • Fax (775) 684-1723

Supreme Court Building ♦ 408 East Clark Avenue ♦ Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

III. Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

- The summary from the October 13, 2023 meeting was approved.

IV. Business, Action, and Discussion Items

- AOC Updates
 - Ms. Harper reminded attendees that the ADKT 0581 Order Adopting Recommendations of the Commission to Study Best Practices for Virtual Advocacy in Nevada’s Courts was filed on December 22, 2023.
 - Rules go in effect February 1, 2024.
 - The Court will hold a public hearing in about six months to review the effectiveness and any concerns regarding the Rules.
 - Attendees discussed concerns regarding the feasibility of the requirements, particularly in the rural jurisdictions.
 - Judge Schlegelmilch suggested courts consider issuing administrative orders if they feel specific rules or presumptive case types should be modified; the rule allows for modification.
 - Concern was expressed regarding potential exclusionary rule issues.
 - Concern was expressed regarding a lack of proper courtroom respect and decorum among the parties during virtual hearings.
 - Ms. Harper informed attendees that the Nevada Supreme Court’s website is being revamped and asked for input regarding for what purposes attendees use the website and via what means they access it (mobile phone, tablet, etc.)?
 - Attendees reported challenges using the search feature and commented that the website contains broken links.
 - Judge Schlegelmilch suggested that the direct link to the “Advanced Opinions” be restored.
 - A suggestion was made that website traffic be monitored; self-help pages are likely drawing in high traffic.
 - A suggestion was made that a survey be sent out to the judiciary.
 - Ms. Harper circulated the National Judicial College’s 2024 course calendar and informed attendees that the Judicial Education Unit name has been changed to the “Judicial Branch Training Unit.” Additionally, the unit is adding several new staff positions and working towards expanding the unit’s goals and services.
- Guardianship Investigator Funds
 - Judge Russell asked for input regarding how other courts are utilizing guardianship investigation funds.

- The First Judicial District Court uses the AOC's Guardianship Office, so it has a surplus of statutory funds set aside for guardianship investigations.
- Judge Russell commented that his court plans to use the funds for service contract with Northern Nevada Legal Aid. Others commented that their courts do this as well.
- Attendees briefly discussed the role of the AOC's Guardian Office and the statutory fund distinction between minor and adult guardianship.
- Community Service Reports/Updates (*Parts of this discussion were inaudible on the recording*)
 - Judge Young reported participation with the Action Club.
 - Judge Matheus reported (via email) that she and her staff participated in Lyon County's 2024 Homeless Point in Time Count.
- Other Items/Discussion
 - Judge Young commented on Douglas County Commission's decision to move authority over the China Springs facility from the district courts to the county manager.
 - Judge Young will remain on the advisory board.
 - Attendees discussed possible reasoning behind this decision; Judge Young provided a brief, historical overview of the facility hiring and management conversations the court has had with the county.
 - Attendees discussed the ADKT to change Rule 49 to eliminate the 2-year bar passage requirement for rural practitioners.
 - This could be beneficial for those rural districts that struggle to get qualified practitioners; attendees discussed potential drawbacks and benefits of the proposed rule change and the impact it could have on improving access to justice.
 - A comment was made that all jurisdictions, even Clark and Washoe, are struggling to find qualified law clerks and practitioners.
 - The public hearing is set for February 22, 2024.
 - Attendees discussed the State Bar Conference and the limited funding for attendance this year.
 - Judge Schlegelmilch discussed scheduling changes for these meetings and proposed alternating live and remote formats.
 - The limited jurisdiction judges in Lyon County usually have hearings scheduled on Fridays.
 - Attendees discussed potentially modifying the April 19th date.
 - Attendees discussed the Western Regional Drug Court.
 - The coordinator position is paid through state grant funds and the funding hasn't allowed for a salary increase.

- Sr. Judge Schumacher commented that the WRDC isn't a legal entity so the coordinator isn't, technically, an employee of the program.
- Attendees discussed the need to reform that position and the structure of the program so the judges within the region can set the salary and determine raises, etc.
- Attendees discussed potential funding options, the possibility of making this a PERS position, funding structure, and who would have hiring oversight (*Several conversations took place at this point, much of the discussion was indistinguishable*).
- Attendees discussed potential authority limitations and the possibility of legislative changes needed to make this work.
- Attendees discussed which counties contract with CCC, the scope of work expected of the providers, and issues with having MOUs with a non-legal entity.
- No consensus was made, attendees agreed to revisit this at a later date and to continue conversation on whether to move forward and how to do so.
- Informational Documents
 - A copy of the NJC's 2024 class offering was included in the meeting materials for reference.

V. Future Meetings

- Sierra Regional Judicial Council: April 19, 2024 at noon.
- Judicial Council of the State of Nevada: February 2, 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

VI. Adjournment

- Judge Schlegelmilch adjourned the meeting at 1:09 p.m.

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SUMMARY

SIERRA REGIONAL JUDICIAL COUNCIL MEETING

Friday, April 26, 2024
12:00 PM

<p><u>Members Present:</u> Judge John Schlegelmilch, Chair Judge Leon Aberasturi Judge Tom Armstrong Judge Cheri Emm-Smith Judge Thomas Gregory Judge Eileen Herrington Judge Michael Johnson Judge Kristin Luis Judge Lori Matheus Judge Camille Vecchiarelli</p> <p><u>Guests Present:</u> Ms. Bobbie Williams</p> <p><u>(AOC) Staff Present:</u> Almeda Harper, Court Services Analyst</p>	<p><u>Members Absent (Excused):</u> Judge Doug Kassebaum Judge James Russell Judge Tom Stockard Judge Tod Young</p> <p><u>Members Absent (Unexcused):</u> Judge Paul Gilbert Judge Mike Lister Judge Ben Trotter</p>
---	--

I. Call to Order

- Judge Schlegelmilch, as chair, called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

II. Determination of a Quorum

- A quorum was present.

III. Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

- The summary from the January 26, 2024 meeting was approved.

Supreme Court Building ♦ 201 South Carson Street, Suite 250 ♦ Carson City, Nevada 89701 ♦ (775) 684-1700 • Fax (775) 684-1723

Supreme Court Building ♦ 408 East Clark Avenue ♦ Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

IV. Business, Action, and Discussion Items

- AOC Updates
 - Ms. Harper notified the attendees that Hans Jessup has taken a position with the Las Vegas Municipal Court and Sheldon Steel is now leading the Statistics Unit.
 - Ms. Harper informed attendees that, in preparation for the Courtview 3 upgrade, Amber Putz's IT team will be reaching out to courts to assist with data/case clean-up and implementation preparations. Please contact Ms. Putz or Ms. Gradick directly with questions or concerns.
 - Ms. Harper informed the attendees that the Specialty Court Funding Committee has allocated additional funds to send extra attendees from the Sierra region to the national conference. Please contact Stephanie Gouveia for more information.
 - Ms. Harper reminded the attendees that Trial Court Improvement ARPA Subgrant applications are due by April 30th. Details and documents can be found on the subgrant webpage. The AOC Grant Program is beginning preparations for the next grant cycle. The webpage will be updated soon, and the application submission period will open on July 1st.
- Community Service Reports/Updates
 - Judge Matheus reported that she participated in the elementary school's field trips and did a mock trial for two classes.
 - Judge Vecchiarelli attended the career fair for Dayton Elementary and Dayton Intermediate schools.
- Other Items/Discussion
 - Judge Vecchiarelli reminded the members of the upcoming Limited Jurisdiction Judges Seminar in Winnemucca.
 - Judge Herrington requested confirmation that the rules created by the Commission to Study Best Practices for Virtual Advocacy have been adopted. The rules have been published on her court's website.
 - Judge Schlegelmilch added that some presumptive and mandatory rules do not fit with the rural courts and has decided to augment where necessary to accommodate as many people as possible.
 - Judge Aberasturi inquired about ADKT 0619 – Adoption of Rules Governing Informal Family Law Trials and whether judges would be involved in discussions.
 - Ms. Harper will inform Ms. Gradick of the request for additional information.
 - Judge Aberasturi requested that if anyone develops a check order, to please share it with him.

- Judge Gregory commented that Judges Young, Grossman, and Hoskin are on a committee to address family court issues and may be open to discussions.
- Judge Schlegelmilch would like to find a venue outside of Carson City for the next Sierra Regional meeting. Please let him know if you have any suggestions. The venue must have a private room. His goal is to alternate between virtual and in-person meetings.
- Judge Schlegelmilch also requested input for the upcoming JCSN meeting. If anyone has items they want to be discussed, please let him know.

V. Future Meetings

- Sierra Regional Judicial Council: July 19, 2024, at noon. Venue TBD.
- Judicial Council of the State of Nevada: May 24, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.

VI. Adjournment

- Judge Schlegelmilch adjourned the meeting at 12:19 p.m.

TAB 10

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
Director and State Court
Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

Washoe Regional Judicial Council

April 24, 2024

Noon

Summary prepared by: Almeda Harper

Members Present

Chief Judge Lynne Jones (Chair)
Judge Erica Flavin
Chief Judge Christopher Hazlett-Stevens
Chief Judge Kevin Higgins
Judge Jessica Longley
Judge Cynthia Lu
Judge Tamatha Schreinert
Judge James Spoo
Judge Chris Wilson

Guests Present

Deputy Courtney Appleton
Mr. James Conway
Lieutenant Shatawna Daniel
Ms. Cynda Horning
Sergeant Mark Kester
Ms. Alicia Lerud
Ms. Veronica Lopez
Ms. Heidi Shaw

Absent

Judge Aimee Banales
Judge Kendra Bertschy
Judge Justin Champagne
Judge David Clifton
Judge Paige Dollinger
Judge Gene Drakulich
Judge Kathleen Drakulich
Judge Scott Freeman
Judge Terry Graham
Judge Dixie Grossman
Judge David Hardy
Judge Pierre Hascheff
Judge Shelly O'Neill
Judge Scott Pearson
Judge Tammy Riggs
Judge Bridget Robb
Judge Kathleen Sigurdson
Judge E. Alan Tiras
Judge Sandra Unsworth

Absent Excused

Judge Shirle Eiting (Vice-chair)
Judge Barry Breslow
Judge Connie Steinheimer
Chief Judge Ryan K. Sullivan
Judge Egan Walker

AOC Staff Present

Almeda Harper
Chad Johnson

- I. Call to Order
 - In the absence of the Chair, the meeting was called to order by the members present at 12:05 p.m. Chair Jones arrived later in the meeting.
- II. Call of Roll and Determination of Quorum Status
 - Ms. Harper determined a quorum was not present, however, the members elected to proceed with the meeting as information only.
- III. Approval of Meeting Summary
 - There being no quorum, the summaries were not approved.
- IV. AOC Updates
 - Updated Guide for Transferring Cases from GJS to CourtView
 - ♦ An instructional guide was provided in the meeting materials as a reference to court staff. To request instructions on additional scenarios not listed, please contact Amber Putz, IT Manager.
 - AOC Trial Court Improvement ARPA Subgrant

- ♦ The subgrant was opened and announced to all trial courts on March 15th. The deadline for applications is April 30th. Additional information and forms can be found on the Subgrant webpage.
- Office on Violence Against Women: Grants to Improve the Criminal Justice Response
 - ♦ If you would like to brainstorm what a proposal may look like in your jurisdiction, or what resources are available, contact NCSC at yawacourts@ncsc.org. Deadlines for grants are April 20th and May 2nd.
 - ♦ Mr. Conway added that he believed this grant is available annually.
- National Judicial College New-Judge Ethics Training
 - ♦ On April 18th, David Gordon announced the National Judicial College will offer a one-day training to satisfy the new-judge ethics requirement. It will be held on October 11th at the Las Vegas AOC Office. Additional details will be distributed as they become available.
- Judge Spoo asked why grant opportunities are being discussed so close to their deadlines, and if there is a way to get this information sooner.
 - ♦ Ms. Harper informed attendees that the AOC does not have dedicated staff to research grant opportunities, therefore, if staff come across grant opportunities, they share the information amongst AOC staff and trial court judges as a courtesy.

V. Discussion and Action Items

- Washoe County Sheriff's Office Collaboration provided by Lt. Daniel, Sgt. Kester, and Dep. Appleton
 - ♦ Sgt. Kester commented that they recently started working with the courts in receiving referrals from the Public Defender's office. In addition to the Inmate Assistance Program (IAP), they found that substance use disorder cases and homelessness and mental health cases that do not qualify for traditional court-ordered programs need case management and discharge services. The IAP has increased by 40% and completed nearly 430 transports to community-based programs. They are tracking Detention Services Unit (DSU) cases to provide them with similar services.
 - Chief Judge Jone asked for clarification between IAP and DSU cases.
 - IAP processes court-ordered programming, including residential inpatient transitional living. Dep. Appleton receives 50-60 people on their caseload every month and transports 400+ people. She and IAP will be targeting court orders for residential transition.
 - DSU helps with out-of-the-box intensive case management cases, including individuals in need of housing through Cares Campus, treatment through Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS), Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT), and transporting with medications to ensure a warm handoff.
 - Judge Hazlett-Stevens asked how to operationalize this from a DSU aspect. How would he do that if a person will not be assigned to specialty courts or community courts but still needs outside services such as NNAMHS?
 - Sgt. Kester informed attendees that it depends on the situation. If the individual is still under court supervision, they can stay in custody longer, similar to a judge's order stipulating where to send the individual. Sgt. Kester's team will then have time to research all options. Time-served sentences or same-day releases are problematic and do not allow sufficient time to find available resources. Referrals and concerns can be sent to the detention services unit email group. Having a substance use evaluation on file will help facilitate the process as certain community providers don't have an application process and base their criteria on that evaluation.
 - Judge Lu asked who to contact at the jail for warm handoffs.
 - Deputy Christopher Denn and Deputy Aaron Hogg
 - Judge Spoo asked if Dr. Kegel was associated with the Sheriff's staff.
 - Dr. Kegel is the mental health director in the jail and oversees the mental health team.

- Judge Spoo commented that he encounters issues requesting referrals during video arraignments. The deputies claim not to have any knowledge of referrals. Can this be remedied?
 - Sgt. Kester offered to speak with the staff overseeing video court bailiffs and ensure they have a point of contact. They may not be able to provide much information, but they can relay requests from the judges for additional follow-up.
 - ♦ Lt. Daniel added that she is working with Dr. Parrot at NaphCare and Dr. Drew at Lakes Crossing to start the jail-based competency program. Dr. Kegel is also assisting with this program. As a Sergeant, and now Lieutenant, Lt. Daniel saw a need for assistance through Social Security SSDI/SSI. They hope to provide housing to people in need as early as 90 days.
 - Court Updates
 - ♦ Second Judicial District Court provided by Ms. Lerud
 - District Court is continuing to implement Competency Court successfully for felony cases. 12 individuals have been transferred from restoration to treatment under Judge Lu's AOT court. They are still under court supervision and can receive treatment. Washoe County has sent two groups to Miami-Dade with a third group scheduled for the end of May.
 - District Court continues to track high-end jury trials and numbers have decreased compared to 2023.
 - Law Day is Wednesday, May 1st. The Court will host a free, walk-in legal clinic. The Northern Nevada Women's Lawyers Association will provide volunteer lawyers.
 - On May 10th the court will host a domestic violence training, put on by NCJFCJ, and will be open to all employees and judges. NCJFCJ will be presenting their Commings and Goings training at no cost to participants and will provide three CLE credits.
 - Judge Spoo commented that the Commings and Goings training is a very powerful experience of what domestic violence victims go through. He used the training when teaching the legal assistant sequence at UNR and recommended that members attend the training.
 - The District Court is applying for a grant through the AOC Trial Court Improvement ARPA Subgrant to get the National Sheriff's Association to provide court security training. It should be collaborative, and everyone will be invited to attend.
 - Jan Evans will host an open house on Friday, May 10th to celebrate 20 years of service.
 - The District Court has been working on returning jury fees and other bonds that weren't requested to be returned, the accumulated amount has decreased from four million to half a million.
 - ♦ Reno Municipal Court provided by Judge Hazlett-Stephens
 - Municipal courts have a substantial number of competency cases circulating through their courts and eagerly look forward to gaining access to Judge Walker's competency court.
 - ♦ Sparks Justice Court provided by Chief Judge Higgins
 - The court will be transferring from Oydesy to the AOC's case management system as it can run specific reports that Oydesy cannot.
 - There has been a recent spike in domestic violence jury trials. Their settlement process was derailed by the new District Attorney and Deputy Public Defender. Judge Flavin spent a significant amount of time working with the new staff to iron out settlement issues.
 - ♦ Sparks Municipal Court provided by Judge Spoo
 - With the help of the police department, the Sparks City Attorney's Office has created a risk assessment tool for officers to use on scene to assess lethality and other risks of domestic violence situations. The tool has been used nationally and has implications for the court also considering pre-trial restraining orders, no contact orders, and eventually will be useful in sentencing.

VI. Future Meetings

- Washoe Regional Judicial Council – July 24, 2024, at noon
- Judicial Council of the State of Nevada – May 24, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.

VII. Adjournment

- There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

DRAFT

TAB 11

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2024 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

<i>REGIONAL MEETINGS*</i>	<i>FULL COUNCIL</i>
<p><u>January</u> 1/8 Monday, South Central, 4:00 p.m. 1/26 Friday, Sierra, 12:00 p.m.</p> <p><u>February</u> 2/7 Wednesday, Washoe, 12:00 p.m. 2/23 Friday, South Central, 10:00 a.m., Winnemucca</p> <p><u>March</u> 3/8 Friday, Clark, 2:00 p.m.</p>	<p><u>February</u> 2/2 Friday, 2:00 p.m. Video-Conference via Zoom Reporting Period: November 14th – January 15th</p>
<p><u>April</u> 4/24 Wednesday, Washoe, 12:00 p.m. 4/26 Friday, Sierra, 12:00 p.m.</p> <p><u>May</u> 5/24 Friday, North Central, 10:00 a.m., Elko</p> <p><u>June</u> 6/14 Friday, Clark, 2:00 p.m. 6/24 Monday, South Central, 4:00 p.m.</p>	<p><u>May</u> 5/24 Friday, 2:00 p.m. Video-Conference via Zoom Reporting Period: January 16th – May 6th</p>
<p><u>July</u> 7/19 Friday, Sierra, 12:00 p.m. 7/24 Wednesday, Washoe, 12:00 p.m.</p> <p><u>August</u> 8/23 Friday, Clark, 2:00 p.m. 8/23 Friday, North Central, 10:00 a.m., Battle Mountain</p> <p><u>September</u></p>	<p><u>August</u> 8/16 Friday, 2:00 p.m. Video-Conference via Zoom Reporting Period: May 7th – July 29th</p>
<p><u>October</u> 10/11 Friday, Clark, 2:00 p.m. 10/16 Wednesday, Washoe, 12:00 p.m. 10/18 Friday, Sierra, 12:00 p.m.</p> <p><u>November</u> 11/22 Friday, North Central, 10:00 a.m., Carlin</p> <p><u>December</u></p>	<p><u>November</u> 11/1 Friday, 2:00 p.m. Video-Conference via Zoom Reporting Period: July 30th – October 14th</p>

Revised April 19, 2024

*Regional meetings will not be posted to the Judiciary Webpage, only public meetings.