

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
March 13, 2017**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Irene Bustamante Adams at 1:31 p.m. on Monday, March 13, 2017, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Chair  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Paul Anderson  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo  
Assemblyman Chris Brooks  
Assemblyman Skip Daly  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui  
Assemblyman Al Kramer  
Assemblyman Jim Marchant  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall  
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman Jason Frierson (excused)  
Assemblywoman Dina Neal (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9  
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kelly Richard, Committee Policy Analyst  
Judith Bishop, Committee Manager  
Earlene Miller, Committee Secretary  
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Bradley Yosaitis, Intern to Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9  
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas  
Metropolitan Police Department  
Susan L. Fisher, representing Nevada State Apartment Association  
David Cherry, Communications and Intergovernmental Relations Manager, City of  
Henderson  
Rocky Finseth, representing Nevada Association of Realtors  
Kimberly Mull, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual  
Violence  
Leonardo Benavides, Extern, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe  
Legal Services  
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Richard S. Carreon, President, Nevada Veterans Association, North Las Vegas,  
Nevada  
Kim Spoon, National Master Guardian, Guardianship Services of Nevada, Inc.,  
Reno, Nevada

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

[The roll was called.] We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 247.

**Assembly Bill 247: Provides for the early termination of certain rental agreements by victims of harassment, sexual assault or stalking. (BDR 10-655)**

**Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:**

I am pleased to submit Assembly Bill 247 to the Committee ([Exhibit C](#)). There is a mock-up of a proposed amendment on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System ([Exhibit D](#)). The amendment restores some omitted language. Assembly Bill 247 provides for the early termination of certain rental agreements by victims of harassment, sexual assault, or stalking. In 2013, Assembly Bill 284 of the 77th Session was presented by Assemblywoman Lucy Flores. That bill gave rights to victims of domestic violence to terminate their leases early without financial penalty. This bill seeks to build upon that legislation and give that same right to victims of sexual assault, harassment, and stalking. The motivation is to make sure victims are not forced to stay in rental properties where they are not or do not feel safe. Lack of money should not serve as a barrier to safety, especially when it comes to victims of these types of crimes. My intern will share information about the need for A.B. 247.

**Bradley Yosaitis, Intern to Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:**

I think this bill gives us an opportunity, with little to no down side, to help keep victims from being revictimized. Unfortunately, we live in a society where renters are more likely to be victims of sexual assault due to the age brackets in which they fall. Allowing them to terminate their leases early will not cause a great burden to landlords because of Nevada's low vacancy rates which are continuing to fall. According to the most recent study released by the Harvard Joint Center for Housing, after a long upward trend in homeownership rates, renting is again on the rise. Thirty-five percent of Americans now rent their homes, and a disproportionate number of these Americans are under the age of 40. Not only are young people disproportionately represented in the rental market but, as of 2013, families with children are just as likely to be renters as single people. A recent study by the Rayne Institute reported that 54 percent of sexual assault victims are between the ages of 18 and 34. There is a clear correlation in age between renters and individuals in our society who are more susceptible to being a victim of these types of crimes. A U.S. Census Bureau study states that rental vacancies in Nevada are at 5 percent. This number is down 3 percent in the last year and 4 percent in the last three years. This number is 2 percent less than the national average of 7 percent. Nevada's extremely low rental vacancy rate means a landlord whose tenants decide to terminate their leases will have little trouble finding new renters.

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores' bill, A. B. 284 of the 77th Session, did a great job in protecting victims of domestic violence by giving them a way to get out of a harmful situation if they thought moving would help protect them from being revictimized. Assembly Bill 247 extends this protection to victims of sexual assault, harassment, and stalking. We have seen that young people are disproportionately represented in the ever-growing rental markets while simultaneously being the most susceptible to sexual assault. Allowing these victims to terminate their leases to possibly prevent future victimization will have little to no adverse effect on landlords renting their properties while the vacancy rates in the state are low and continue to shrink.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I will go through the amendment mock-up ([Exhibit D](#)). In section 1, subsection 1, we are adding three categories of victims who can use this protection. We are adding "harassment, sexual assault, or stalking." In section 1, subsection 2, we are reorganizing the statute. The language specifies for victims of domestic violence how they can currently terminate a lease by showing proof of a police report, a protection order, or an affidavit.

In section 1, subsection 3, this specifies how the new categories of victims can terminate a lease early. There are two major provisions there. Section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (a) requires a copy of a written report from law enforcement. That would be a police report. Paragraph (b) says that they could also show a copy of a temporary or extended protective order. That would require that they go to court, receive the necessary findings, and have an order of protection to show the landlord. In subsection 4, it brings the statute into line. In the

current statute, the event had to have occurred within 90 days of the attempted termination for domestic violence victims. We are adding the victims of harassment, sexual assault, and stalking.

Section 1, subsection 12, paragraph (f), subparagraph (7) is the only part of the amendment that makes any changes. We did not intend to strike the language that is in red, so we are adding that back into the bill. Additionally, this section discusses who can fill out an affidavit for termination of a rental agreement when it relates to domestic violence. In the requirements, you will see that the person filling out the affidavit has to have received training related to domestic violence. The current statute only requires it to be an employee of an agency. The person completing the affidavit also has to be a resident of the state. We added that because if there is a dispute that later goes to court, we want the person who signs the affidavit to be a resident of the state so he can be subpoenaed to court.

The mock-up does not include sections 2 or 3 of the bill. Those sections make conforming changes and there are no new substantive provisions in those sections.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Kramer:**

I think this is good because there are probably some cases where it is necessary for someone not to be locatable by the harasser. I had a question about the added language in section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (a) where it says, "A copy of a written report from a law enforcement agency indicating that the tenant, cotenant or household member notified the law enforcement agency of the harassment, sexual assault or stalking . . . ." In those reports, is the assailant named? My concern is someone could use a report with no name on it to break a lease. How many incidents of people trying to break their lease do you think there will be?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

It is possible for someone to file a report without a name because they could be sexually assaulted by an unknown assailant. Filing a false police report is also a criminal offense. I think that is a valid concern, but I do not think it is likely to happen. I hope we do not have a lot of people who need to use this provision, but I have been told that it is more often than I would have expected. Some landlords say it is as often as one time per week that they have to let a tenant out of the lease. It is hard to answer the question, because this is not currently in statute. There are situations now where victims of crimes go to landlords and ask to get out of a lease. That is taken on a case-by-case basis. Some landlords allow people to get out of their leases because it is a community safety issue. Given the statistics we heard, I think there is a need for it.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

Was there any feedback from the statutes put into place in 2013?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

I reached out to the landlords, the Nevada State Apartment Association, and the Nevada Association of Realtors. They indicated that this was used on a regular basis. The procedure in statute does not require court intervention. The tenant brings the proof to the landlord. The landlord may bring a civil lawsuit against the adverse party, if known, to recover any damages. It was used on the domestic violence side more often than I would have thought.

**Assemblywoman Tolles:**

There is a concern that if a landlord has this happening regularly, it may cause a hardship and he may have to raise rents on the tenants. You said there is a way to recoup some of the losses.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

In the mock-up of section 1, subsection 6, it has the provision that currently exists in the law which allows the landlord to civilly sue the adverse party for any damages that result from the termination of the lease. That would include changing locks and loss of rents.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

Would this also apply to Canadian temporary restraining orders? Would this have to be a new order? If tenants move into a new home and their stalker finds them, could they use the existing temporary protection order?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

In the mock-up ([Exhibit D](#)), section 1, subsection 4, it says the conduct complained of would have had to occur within the 90 days immediately preceding the written notice of the termination of the lease. Regarding the Canadian restraining orders, the only requirement is that it happens within 90 days of terminating the lease and the victim has to have a valid protective order. Hopefully that would work together, but that is a unique situation. I think, typically, the protective orders would be from Nevada.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I still have a concern, as I did in 2013, that there are so many people who can fill out these written reports. I am concerned about the addition of harassment. Anybody who has any kind of bodily threat against you could be considered a harasser. Why did we expand it to be so broad? The landlord may be theoretically able to sue, but I wonder how many cases have actually occurred. Even if you successfully go to small claims court and get a judgment, the ability to collect is the real problem.

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

There were the same concerns in 2013 about the qualified third party being able to bring an affidavit to terminate a lease. For the new people added to the bill, it can only be done through a police report or a protective order. The affidavit option is not available for the new people we are adding to the statute. I worked with the Nevada State Apartment Association and the Realtors to talk about what would be a common-sense step forward. That concern would not apply to the new victims. In this bill, we tightened up some of the language for

the affidavit to make sure the person is a resident of the state and is trained in domestic violence matters. We went with harassment because the victim would have to file a police report or get a protective order. There has to be some showing that a harassment crime was committed. The victim would have to take some proactive measures to prove it. I understand your concerns with the definition and whether harassment might be subsumed with domestic violence, but it depends upon the situation. The hope was with adding the police report or the protective order that people would be hesitant to file a false police report just to get out of a lease. I understand your concerns about civilly suing somebody. That is probably only going to happen in cases where there are substantial damages. I want to get this bill to a place where we have consensus, and I think we have that even with the landlords and the Realtors.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

Domestic violence is typically with people living together in a home. Is there something in the law that requires the landlord to evict both parties? Can one party leave and the other remain?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

It would simply allow the victim to get out of a lease obligation. I think the other party would still be liable for the lease. It would be up to the landlord.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Are there any other questions from the Committee? Whom did you work with?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

The two entities I worked with were the Nevada State Apartment Association and the Nevada Association of Realtors.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

In section 1, subsection 1, it says the landlord gets written notice and the termination is effective at the end of the current rental period or 30 days after the notice is provided. There is still protection and that is currently in the law. Is that correct?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

That is correct. Current rental period is interpreted as whatever period for which you have paid your rent. The 30-day provision is in there in case a person has a unique lease. You would have to wait at least 30 days. It is very unlikely that you would be able to provide a notice right away. There is usually some kind of time frame there. That is why there is the provision in the law that the tenant can ask that the locks be changed if they are going to be staying for a period of time before they can formally get out of the lease.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Is there any support for A.B. 247?

**Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

We are here in support of the bill. We are always looking to assist victims to get out of dangerous situations and get on with their lives in a safe manner away from the people who are victimizing them. In regard to statistics, I do not have specific information today about how often this has been used because it is civil in nature. I want to make sure that the requirement for a police report is in fact an officially filed police report. That is important because it is a crime to file a false report which would deter a person from filing a false crime report to get out of a lease.

**Susan L. Fisher, representing Nevada State Apartment Association:**

We support the bill with the proposed amendment. One of our larger property managers has reported to us that they typically get about one request per week for early release from a lease. This bill makes it more palatable for the Nevada State Apartment Association, so we appreciate it. One additional question is naming the adverse party in the temporary protection orders. The current statute requires that the adverse party be named. We appreciate that because it is protection for our other tenants.

**David Cherry, Communications and Intergovernmental Relations Manager, City of Henderson:**

I agree with the statements of Chuck Callaway of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in terms of the importance of this bill. We have had several domestic violence victims who have been able to use the existing law. We would like to see this extended to those who may be facing a threat from the new categories the law would cover.

**Rocky Finseth, representing Nevada Association of Realtors:**

We appreciate Assemblyman Yeager reaching out to us in advance of the session to work with him on this bill. We think the proposed amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) further enhances the law and we support it.

**Kimberly Mull, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:**

We represent sexual and domestic violence programs around the state. We are in support of this bill. We think it is a good first step and that hopefully, we will be able to work to make it stronger in the future. More than half of rape victims are assaulted in their homes. However, less than one-third of all victims actually report to the police for a number of reasons. We hope that eventually we can make this stronger with an affidavit and put some things in place to help some programs mimic the tools that we are seeing for domestic violence victims. We try to make our programs aware of the specific measures for domestic violence programs and how they can help victims. Remember, this is a safety precaution to get victims away from their abusers. From our experience, it helps get them out of the lease so they do not have to stay in the situation with the abuser. We can hopefully keep them from being another statistic. Nevada has very high statistics of women being murdered by their intimate partners.

**Leonardo Benavides, Extern, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services:**

We were involved in the legislation in 2013 with Assemblywoman Lucy Flores to allow victims of domestic violence the ability to break their leases in certain circumstances. We feel those rights should be expanded to the victims of harassment, sexual assault, and stalking. We are happy to support this bill.

**Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:**

We support this bill and are glad to see it moving forward.

**Richard S. Carreon, President, Nevada Veterans Association, North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are in support of A.B. 247. Current U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) regulations allow recruiters assigned in Nevada, along with Nellis Air Force Base, Creech Air Force Base, and Hawthorne Army Depot, in conjunction with local authorities, to be released from their leases if they are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, abuse, or harassment. It does not give the same protection to National Guardsmen on temporary duty assignment, active reserves, and veterans. This bill would apply the DOD protections across the board throughout the veteran community along with their spouses and family members.

To respond to Assemblyman Hansen's question, the escalation from harassment to bodily injury is relatively short in my experience on active duty. The statistics in the veteran community mirror that.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Is there anybody else in support? Seeing no one, is there anyone to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone to testify from a neutral position? Seeing none, are there closing statements?

**Assemblyman Yeager:**

It has been a process to get to this point, but I think we are in a place where we all agree that this is a reasonable step forward.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 247 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 150.

**Assembly Bill 150: Revises provisions governing private professional guardians.  
(BDR 13-808)**

**Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30:**

The bill before you today is the result of a continuing process that began over two years ago. At that time, the Legislature, as the result of the sponsorship of one of my bills, Assembly Bill 325 of the 78th Session, chose to establish a licensure process for private professional guardians. Assembly Bill 150 provides cleanup language for those things that proved to be very difficult in the licensure process without undermining the premise of what



we were trying to do. We spent several hours going through the prior legislation to make it so the private professional guardians can conform to the desires we set in statute two years ago.

This bill removes the individual private professional guardian from licensure. The importance of licensure was for the Division of Financial Institutions of the Department of Business and Industry to be able to look at the business practices of the private professional guardians to make sure they were doing what was right by their wards. If a private professional guardian had three or fewer wards, he was not even required to fulfill this licensing process. If someone chooses to be a private professional guardian, he must now belong to a business entity. The business entity is required to be licensed. There is still complete transparency and the absolute ability for Business and Industry to look into any one of their client's finances or estate. It takes some of the burden off the individuals who are now working for that business entity. The private professional guardians still have to acquire and maintain certification. These national certification standards have already been spelled out in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) and have to be maintained. It still requires a background check. Every five years, even as an employee of an entity, they must submit fingerprints and go through a background check.

The bill adds language that clarifies that anyone who has discretionary decision-making capacity must also be allowed to be investigated by the Commissioner of the Division of Financial Institutions. There is a potential amendment to say a licensee shall maintain a separate guardianship account for each ward into which all money received for the benefit of the ward must be deposited unless ordered otherwise by the court.

**Kim Spoon, National Master Guardian, Guardianship Services of Nevada, Inc.,  
Reno, Nevada:**

This is my nineteenth year working as a private guardian. Prior to that, I worked for six years for the Washoe County Public Guardian. The reason we are moving from the individual to the entity is that there are certified guardians and private professional guardians. There has been a lot of confusion between those, especially in the licensure process. When the licensure bureau first started writing the original bill, they thought that all certified guardians were actually private professional guardians. Certified guardians are people who have gone through a certification process through a nationwide agency. It does not mean that they have to work as private professional guardians. Only about one-quarter of the certified guardians in the state were actually working as private professional guardians. Most of those were working for private professional guardian entities. Currently, there are only four private guardian entities left in the state. There are no private professional guardians working as individuals. If we put all of the providers into entities, that confusion is gone. Every private professional guardian entity must have a certified guardian who works in that business and is available in the day-to-day operations of the business.

Another issue is that not all clients can have an account titled under their name for various reasons. We have to be a little more creative in how we do that for certain people. No matter

how much money they have, if we do have an account, it still has to go through accounting on a yearly basis. It allows judges to have a little more discretion when they are doing their orders in how these accounts can be titled.

One of the provisions we would like put back in the statutes, or have removed from the present licensure in statutes that were changed under NRS Chapter 159, is the statute that says that summary administration is no longer applicable to private professional guardians or, now, the entities. Summary administration is a type of guardianship that once a ward's assets have gone below \$10,000, they can go into a summary administration and there no longer needs to be an accounting for that particular asset. The reason they do this is to prevent the money from being spent on accounting instead of being spent on the ward. It costs approximately a couple thousand dollars to have an accounting go forward for every ward through the court system, especially if there is an attorney involved, and there is in most cases. When there are no longer funds to pay for this, then the payment has to come from the account or it is done pro per through an attorney in the guardians office. The last change to the statute stated that this no longer applies to private guardians. In my business, we have at least 20 percent of wards who are no longer paying fees who would normally be under summary administration. We have to have our attorneys do these accountings for free. We do not know why this change was made, but the reality is, when the client has no money there is little opportunity for exploitation of funds. This bill removes that statute.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Is this bill just taking care of the licensure for the professionals?

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

This is simply a follow-up to what we did two years ago. This is not reflective of other bills that might be coming forward from other commissions or task forces that met during the interim.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

What does the picture look like for individuals who are in the profession?

**Kim Spoon:**

There are two companies in northern Nevada and two in southern Nevada. There are no individuals doing private guardianship at this point. That is another reason why we felt the entity made sense. We have wanted to be licensed for years. There was no place to get it done because there was not enough money to put a board together. The individuals are just finding this too hard. The money required for the licensure and what is being asked for them to do is already difficult work. They found that the requirements were overbearing and they were not able to do it. The four entities are what is left.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

What is the scope of work that they provide?

**Kim Spoon:**

There are two types of guardianship: the guardianship of the person and the guardianship of the estate. Normally, 99 percent of guardians do both. You need to get a court order to authorize the guardian, whether it is an entity or an independent, to give the guardian entity the authority to take care of everything in a person's life. Normally, a person becomes at-risk because of age or disability. So we have clients ranging in age from 18 years into their 90s. What we would do is try to cater to their needs to make their quality of life as best as can be within the restrictions of what they can afford.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

Where will the guardians get their training? Will the state be losing revenue from the licensing fees?

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

The entity is required to maintain that licensure. The training will be the responsibility of the owner of the company. It is their license that is in jeopardy if their employees are not acting appropriately or following the guidelines. I do not have the information about the fiscal impact from these changes. There has been a steady decrease in the number of people willing to be private professional guardians. There were not that many to begin with. There was a concern two years ago that it was driving more and more people out of this demanding and difficult job. Regardless of some of the issues that brought this to light two years ago, it is a very much-needed and necessary profession within the whole guardianship world. This was an attempt to ensure that we were maintaining a workforce willing and capable of providing this service.

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

The entity has to be licensed and they have to have a private professional guardian as part of the entity. Is that correct?

**Kim Spoon:**

What they need is a certified guardian who is involved in their day-to-day operations. It is not a private professional guardian but a certified guardian which has been in the statute for several years. This clarifies taking away the private professional guardian and centers it on the entity and the certified guardian. All the education and testing is done through the Center for Guardianship Certification, which is a sister agency of the National Guardianship Association, Inc.

**Assemblyman Brooks:**

Can the certified guardian who is working for the entity work for multiple entities?

**Kim Spoon:**

I believe they can, but under the licensure, there are certain criteria if they work for multiple agencies. It is in the original bill.

**Assemblyman Kramer:**

If a family member is a guardian for no compensation, would he be exempt from the reporting requirement?

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

This is about professional guardians. This is about people working for a business entity to receive compensation for their services. A family member is not a professional guardian licensed through the Department of Business and Industry.

**Assemblyman Kramer:**

Sometimes there are incidentals that go along with this, and my interpretation is that it is not compensation unless it is compensation. If you are being reimbursed when you have to pay for something, another family member might challenge and you would have to go to court. Is that how you see it?

**Kim Spoon:**

What type of reporting are you speaking toward?

**Assemblyman Kramer:**

I heard you say the business of professional guardians has some reporting that has to be done.

**Kim Spoon:**

All guardians fall under NRS Chapter 159 and have to do certain reports to the court. The only reporting private professional entities have to do to the licensure board would be our annual renewal of our application and anything they would require with the application as well as the audits they will do. There is no actual reporting to the licensing board. The reporting is always to the courts for all guardians.

**Assemblywoman Jauregui:**

It says that in order to be a guardian, you have to be a natural person. Is that defined anywhere?

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

It is defined in statute, but we will have to get back to you.

**Assemblyman Daly:**

It is in NRS Chapter 0.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Are there any questions from the Committee? Seeing none, is there anyone to speak in support of A.B. 150?

**Kim Spoon:**

The Nevada Guardianship Association has been very active in developing this legislation and that includes public guardians and private professionals. We support this legislation.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Can you talk about the working groups?

**Kim Spoon:**

It has been primarily private guardians in the four businesses in the state who have been working with Assemblyman Sprinkle. We have brought this forward to the Nevada Guardianship Association, which includes all entities in terms of professional guardians. We have discussed it with them, and we have a consensus on this bill.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Are you regulated by the Commissioner of the Division of Financial Institutions?

**Kim Spoon:**

That is correct.

**Leonardo Benavides, Extern, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Washoe Legal Services:**

We are in support of this bill. Both of our programs represent protected individuals in the guardian procedure. Many of the past abuses have come from private individuals.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

Are there others in support? [There were none.] Are there any in opposition? [There were none.] Are there any to testify from a neutral position? [There were none.] Are there any closing comments?

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

A lot of work was done on the Nevada Supreme Court Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships in Nevada's Courts. Kim Spoon and I were members of that Commission, and I do not believe there is any conflict with any of the work that came out of that Commission with this specific bill. I will always be open and willing to work with them.

**Chair Bustamante Adams:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 150. Is there any public comment? [There was none.]  
The meeting is adjourned [at 2:36 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Earlene Miller  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is written testimony submitted by Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9, regarding Assembly Bill 247.

[Exhibit D](#) is a mock-up of a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 247 prepared for and presented by Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9.