

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eighty-First Session  
February 12, 2021**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 8:06 a.m. on Friday, February 12, 2021, Online. 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/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama  
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner  
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola  
Assemblyman C.H. Miller  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblyman David Orentlicher  
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst  
Ashlee Kalina, Assistant Committee Policy Analyst  
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel  
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Committee Manager  
Linda Whimple, Committee Secretary  
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Joe Garcia, Acting Deputy Administrator, Field Operations Support, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services  
Cathy Kaplan, Chief, Child Support Enforcement, Department of Health and Human Services  
Kimberly Smalley, Social Services Program Specialist, Child Support Enforcement Program, Department of Health and Human Services  
Karen Cliffe, Team Chief, Family Support Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office  
John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing the Nevada District Attorneys Association  
Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence

**Chairman Yeager:**

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have a presentation today and two bills relating to child support. We will open the presentation, which is an overview of the Child Support Enforcement Program.

**Joe Garcia, Acting Deputy Administrator, Field Operations Support, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services:**

Thank you for this opportunity to present a high overview of the Child Support Enforcement Program (CSEP). This is a brief overview of what we will be presenting today [[Exhibit C](#)]. The title for the program is a federal, state, and local partnership committed to ensuring the financial and medical needs of children are met through child support enforcement services. There are five basic services: (1) locating parents who have an obligation to support their children using interfaces and vendors that offer locate tools; (2) establishing paternity for children born outside of marriage through genetic testing or voluntary acknowledgement; (3) establishing financial and medical support orders; (4) enforcing support orders through income withholding, license suspension, and federal offset; and (5) collecting and distributing support payments.

The program works closely with family court officials and uses quasi-judicial processes to establish paternity and establish and enforce support orders. The Child Support Enforcement

Program operates through a combination of nine participating district attorney offices, three state program area offices, and a central administrative office. Some participating county district attorney offices only provide child support services or nonpublic assistance cases while others provide services to both public assistance and nonpublic assistance cases.

Federal Financial Participation in the program is provided for necessary and approved expenditures at a rate of 66 percent [page 4, [Exhibit C](#)]. In Nevada, the state and nine participating counties contribute 34 percent for the cost of the program. Most of the federal incentives are passed on to the participating county district attorney offices for future program enhancements. Penalties for not meeting performance levels are withheld from a state's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

The Child Support Enforcement Program [page 5, [Exhibit C](#)] collected over \$2.4 million in child support payments during state fiscal year (FY) 2020 compared to over \$2.2 million in the state FY 2019. Paternity establishment, support order establishment, collection of current support, collection of support in arrears, and cost effectiveness are the federal performance measures. Improvements in federal performance measures increases Nevada's ability to compete for federal incentive dollars, which are used to enhance CSEP. In state FY 2020 the program distributed over \$459,000 in child support to families receiving TANF benefits. The program also collected and distributed over \$49.7 million in child support payments to families who had previously received public assistance in Nevada.

NVKIDS is three years into the project and remains on schedule and within budget [page 6, [Exhibit C](#)]. System integration and performance testing began in August 2020 and is scheduled to conclude in April 2021. Implementation begins November 2021 with full implementation in May 2022.

This slide is a list of our two bills, [Assembly Bill 27](#) and [Assembly Bill 37](#), which we will be discussing in the hearing following this presentation [page 7, [Exhibit C](#)]. This concludes our presentation this morning.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Garcia about what he presented in respect to child support?

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

What is the percentage of outstanding child support?

**Cathy Kaplan, Chief, Child Support Enforcement, Department of Health and Human Services:**

Are you looking for the number of cases that have arrears or a dollar amount?

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

Cases.

**Cathy Kaplan:**

I will get back to you with that number; I did not bring it with me.

**Joe Garcia:**

I might have it for you. We have 67,000 obligors who are in arrears with their child support obligations out of 86,000 cases.

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

If someone is in arrears, are there people who could be trying to pay whatever they have but they are still considered in arrears? Or are those people who are just actively not participating at all?

**Cathy Kaplan:**

Just because a person is in arrears does not necessarily mean that they are not paying. It is just that they owe more than the current support amount.

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

Do you have a breakdown of people who are not actively paying anything? Or would they go into warrant?

**Cathy Kaplan:**

There are different enforcement actions that we could take on someone who is not paying at all on their arrears. I do not have the exact number of those cases, but I could get you that number.

**Assemblywoman Nguyen:**

Thank you. That would be great.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

This is actually dear to my heart. I was a child raised by a single mother who did not have the benefit of child support or, if so, very rarely. As an employer, I am so grateful that there is a streamlined program for employees to have their wages garnished for child support and have been appreciative of legislation over the years that has made that possible. I wanted to make a comment from in the trenches that I know what it is like to watch my mother struggle without the support that she and I were entitled to and the terrible stress it puts on families. For at-risk youth in particular as we look at our children who end up in the juvenile justice system, my questions are always, What other factors have led to this point? Were they from a home like I was, one with a single parent in child support and not getting the services that they need?

I appreciate your efforts. I am distressed to hear how much is in arrears, although I am glad to hear the clarification. I look forward to ways that we can work here in the Legislature to help streamline the process and make parents step up to the plate and be responsible for these children.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Thank you for the acronym chart at the end of the presentation. I appreciate it.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Thank you for your presentation. We will close the presentation and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 27.

**Assembly Bill 27: Revises provisions relating to the administration of child support. (BDR 11-300)**

**Joe Garcia, Acting Deputy Administrator, Field Operations Support, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services:**

Child support payments must be rendered to the state disbursement unit (SDU) stated in the child support order. When an obligee leaves the original state of the order and applies for child support services in another state, payments must be submitted to the original state's SDU and then forwarded to the SDU in the obligee's new state of residence. This causes a significant delay in distributing payments to the family who needs support. Section 319B of the 2008 Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) addresses this by requiring each state to redirect support payments upon request from the state's support enforcement agency when an obligee is receiving child support services in that state and neither the obligor, the obligee, nor the child resides in Nevada. Currently, Nevada allows only a tribunal to redirect support payments to another state's SDU.

Assembly Bill 27 seeks to mirror language found in UIFSA to allow a support enforcement agency or a tribunal of this state the ability to comply with this federal requirement. Including the support enforcement agency in existing statute provides for an administrative process to carry out this requirement, thus reducing the need for the state of the court proceedings and getting support to families faster and more efficiently.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from the Committee regarding A.B. 27?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I have a question about the situation in which neither of the parents nor the child reside in the state. Are we talking about a case where there had been jurisdiction in the state and everyone moved away?

**Joe Garcia:**

Correct. What happens is the payment has to come back through Nevada and then we send it back out. It causes a delay in the payments getting to the families.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

Are you saying that Nevada has jurisdiction because the divorce or proceeding happened here and the jurisdiction is remaining here? Would it have been simpler, or is it simpler for us, if jurisdiction is given over to where the children or child currently lives?

**Joe Garcia:**

I am going to defer that question to Kim Smalley.

**Kimberly Smalley, Social Services Program Specialist, Child Support Enforcement Program, Department of Health and Human Services:**

When a support order is established in Nevada, it becomes the controlling order until it is registered or modified in another state. If a custodian and child move to another state and the noncustodial party or the obligor is in a third state, then jurisdiction is up for grabs as far as modifying that order. Until that order is modified or registered, Nevada would have the control order and the SDU stated in the order or the disbursement unit figured in the order would remain in effect.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there testimony in support of A.B. 27?

**Karen Cliffe, Team Chief, Family Support Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office:**

We are in support of A.B. 27.

**John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing the Nevada District Attorneys Association:**

In the interest of brevity, the Nevada District Attorneys Association is in support of A.B. 27.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will close support testimony and open opposition testimony. Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 27? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to give neutral testimony? [There was no one.]

Mr. Garcia, please provide any concluding remarks.

**Joe Garcia:**

Thank you and the Committee for letting us present A.B. 27 this morning. We have nothing further.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 27. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 37.

**Assembly Bill 37: Revises provisions relating to the enforcement of obligations for support of children. (BDR 3-301)**

**Joe Garcia, Acting Deputy Administrator, Field Operations Support, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services:**

The Child Support Enforcement Program (CSEP) has over 86,000 open child support cases. Of those cases, there are over 67,000 with obligors who are in arrears with their child support obligation. Current statute allows past due support to be withheld from some but not all the lump sum payment that is allowed by the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement. As a result, children and families are not receiving the full amount of support due them. One barrier to obtaining increased collections through lump sum payments is the manner in which current statute addresses employees and independent contractors. Although the definition of income under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 31A includes the compensation of an independent contractor, the garnishment of that income under NRS 31.295 is written in terms of employees. Amending an existing statute to provide clarification on an individual subject to income withholding will result in obligors being treated equally, whether they are an employee or independent contractor. Employers will be required to report lump sum payments due an obligor who is currently under an income withholding order. They will withhold and remit payment for past due support upon receipt of written notice from the CSEP.

The implementation of Assembly Bill 37 will provide clear definitions from lump sums and allow for withholding of these payments from the earnings of independent contractors in the same manner as income earned by employees. It will establish a recording threshold of \$150 for employers and provide a mechanism and process for employers to report lump sum payments. The Nevada Child Support Enforcement Program will be required to provide arrearage information to an employer within five days of receiving notification that a lump sum payment is due from the obligor. The bill provides the manner in which an employer must remit payment and allows for the obligor to contest the withholding.

Although many employers voluntarily report lump sum payments for their employees currently, past legislation has proven that mandatory reporting increases support collections for Nevada families. When Senate Bill 33 of the 80th Session was developed, many insurance companies were already matching their claimants with obligors owing past due support. In federal fiscal year (FY) 2018, Nevada collected over \$1.6 million from insurance match intercept. After S.B. 33 of the 80th Session was implemented, federal FY 2019 saw a 23.5 percent increase with just over \$2 million collected and an additional 19 percent increase in federal FY 2020 with over \$2.4 million in past due child support collections. The Division of Welfare and Supportive Services requests to strike section 5, subsections 14 and 15, from the proposed language of the bill under definitions of lump sum payment to remove reference to "workers' compensation reimbursement" and "insurance settlement." These items have been addressed in previous legislation and income payors would not have access to these funds for withholding.

This concludes our testimony on A.B. 37. Are there any questions we can answer for you?

**Chairman Yeager:**

It sounds like you are putting forward an amendment—you would like to strike section 5, subsections 14 and 15. Is that correct?

**Joe Garcia:**

That is correct.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I would like to clarify so we have a legislative history. Starting in section 5, subsection 6, I would like to make sure "incentive payment for moving or relocation" is not a reimbursement of the cost of moving for relocation. Is that correct?

**Joe Garcia:**

That is correct.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

In section 5, subsection 10, regarding "retroactive merit increase," what if that retroactive merit increase is before the birth of the child or prebirth of the child's support order, and the child's support order does not go back to the time when the merit increase was earned?

**Karen Cliffe, Team Chief, Family Support Division, Clark County District Attorney's Office:**

We are not relying upon the date that the money may be attributed to. In other words, let us say an individual files back taxes and chooses to do that in 2021, but they might be for taxes that were owing to the obligor prior to the birth of the child. It is more of the date of the receipt of the money and not so much when the money was made; for example, a personal injury settlement. Perhaps the injury occurred prior to the birth of the child. Our system is designed to capture those funds when they are received by the respondent to be the year it is considered income. Does that answer the question?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Yes, thank you. In section 24 with the notices going to the income payer electronically or first-class mail, is a return receipt no longer requested? I cannot get behind electronic notices. It is too easy for it to be lost. Even the first-class mail is a little dicey for me, but especially that electronic notice. If someone has not signed up to agree for electronic notice, it is definitely an issue for me. I have seen too many times in which people did not get emails or they got lost, went to a filter, or they get so much spam that they are not even paying attention. They see something from child support enforcement and they just think it is a scam and honestly pass it by. It is a big concern of mine.

**Karen Cliffe:**

This is the notice to the employer, not to the obligor. Those wage withholdings are sent electronically or by mail. This would be the same for private practitioners who send wage withholdings. Generally, the notice to withhold income is not personally served. They are sent to the employer.



**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Section 24 is changing it from certified mail to first-class mail or electronically and the same thing in section 27, subsection 2. Those are also changing certified to first-class or electronic.

**Cathy Kaplan, Chief, Child Support Enforcement, Department of Health and Human Services:**

Our intent behind that is because we are building the new child support system called NVKIDS. We will have employers who will sign up to get the electronic notification of an income withholding order which would help the program not have the expense of sending a certified letter to the employer. The alternative would be to mail it to them if they do not sign up for the electronic notification.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I appreciate that. I thought the bill was looking to get away from the term "employer" because when we are dealing with income payer, sometimes those are not employers. Those people are not necessarily signing up. So electronic is only for people who sign up, and they register to get an electronic notice?

**Cathy Kaplan:**

Correct.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

If it is by mail, we are getting away from certified to first-class mail. I am still somewhat concerned about first-class mail. I understand there is an expense issue, but when you are dealing with someone who is not necessarily an official employer or big business that has different departments that handle things, I am concerned about the letters getting lost in the shuffle. Whereas, when you have a small independent business or someone seeing it, they do not realize, Oh no, this is real, this is not a scam.

**Cathy Kaplan:**

In our normal everyday business, we do just first-class mail notices to the employer or electronically if that is what they prefer. In the event we are not getting a response from the employer, we would take that next step to serve them with a certified letter and get a return receipt so we know they are getting that information. The other alternative would be to pick up the phone and call that employer and say, We mailed you a wage withholding and you are not responding. Is there something we need to be aware of?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

That is good to know. In sections 21 and 22, I am a little surprised because I know it is in existing language, but an order for support that is going to the enforcing authority has to be a certified copy. The enforcing authority has access to finding out the orders online. Do people really have to send a certified copy when the enforcing authority has access to the court records to check and make sure it is a valid order?

We are making things a little easier in getting the information out to the wage payer, but we are still saying that people who are trying to get orders changed with the enforcing authority have to go through the effort of getting a certified copy, which is an expense. If it is a long order—I do not know if it is still a dollar a page. So then they are having to go to court to get a copy of a certified order which, during COVID-19, lawyers are having trouble doing. Getting it to the supporting authority who has access to looking up the orders online to confirm whether it is authentic or not is why you would send a certified copy. Is there a way we could possibly change that so people do not have to go through the effort of getting a certified copy?

**Karen Cliffe:**

I understand the concern with that language. We could run into some difficulties in that we do enforce orders for every state as well as countries that we have reciprocity with. It is easier to look for the orders that are in Odyssey locally, but we would run into some difficulties as we do not have access to other state systems as well as other countries. A filed certified copy ensures that we are in fact enforcing the correct order, which would be a benefit to both parties.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

You cannot get them in the United States?

**Karen Cliffe:**

We would have to request them from the initiating jurisdiction or initiating agency on behalf of the other country. There is not a uniform system. If I wanted to access a different county in Florida, I would not have access to it electronically.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I looked in the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System and did not see any fiscal notes on this. I do not see any kind of revenue enhancement to the state on this. I am trying to figure out why this is a two-thirds bill.

**Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel:**

I do not see that right away as to what kind of revenue increase it would be—in section 13 specifically. The only change there is employer being changed to income payer and that it should be identified as the two-thirds.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I do not see any revenue to the state or the county. That is why it surprised me to see that two-thirds. It might be a little easier to get this through without it.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I wonder if by changing "employer" to "income payer" we are broadening the scope of who is going to receive these notices. It is essentially including people who employ independent contractors, so an additional few dollars would be generated to the State Treasurer.

The phrase "income payer" should be broader than "employer." I am just guessing, but that is the only thing I can think of why it would potentially be two-thirds.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

My question was answered with Assemblywomen Cohen's questioning regarding the first-class mail. I think the parties will pursue with certified mail afterwards or a phone call. I have a real estate brokerage and we get these. We handle them and it is no problem getting the notices.

In section 5, subsections 14 and 15, would you explain why we are striking the workers' compensation?

**Joe Garcia:**

Those items have been addressed in previous legislation. Income payers would not have access to those funds for withholding.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

So it is by statute?

**Joe Garcia:**

Yes.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

And it cannot be included?

**Karen Cliffe:**

It could be included. It would be duplicative, but if the state wishes to include it, Clark County has no opinion on including it. It would be a benefit, and perhaps be a bit clearer, because everything would be noted in one area in terms of income.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I do not know why we do not include it because it is a source of income and we already have ratios of how much the person has to pay out.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I think the reason it is not included is because the employer or income payer would not have access to those funds. Personal injury settlements are going to go through an attorney. For instance, subsection 15 that is being stricken, there was a bill from last session, Senate Bill 33 of the 80th Session, that was passed and enacted that basically put the mandate on insurance companies before they paid out settlements to notify the attorney or the claimant that they were going to be withholding that money and paying it directly for child support arrears. I think it does not typically flow through the employer, which I think was the reason we did not include it in the list here in terms of what lump sum payments when we give notice to the income payer. I do not know if it helps, but I think those two are covered in statute already.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

Are they included in statute already because now we are not using "employer," but we are using "income payer." It seems to me that if I were a single mom and I needed money and I knew my ex was going to get a settlement payment, I would want to make sure that I could collect some funds out of it.

**Chairman Yeager:**

When you have a chance, take a look at Senate Bill 33 of the 80th Session. There is a whole procedure in place for insurance companies before they can pay personal injury settlements. They have to actually go in and run someone in the system to see that child support and that money never gets paid to the claimant or the attorney. The priority has to be for child support; that is captured. I know that the workers' compensation reimbursement is captured too. I do not know the bill or the statute, but I can find it for you.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

So you are saying that it is already included under another bill.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Correct. It was included as its own procedure to make sure that we are getting at the actual entity who is paying the money out, which in this case would not be the income payer as defined in this particular piece of legislation.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I do not know if it hurts to leave it in there. Now I understand the comment that it might be duplicative.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Mr. Wilkinson said in the Chat that my analysis was correct. We are amplifying the category of income payer, so that could potentially generate additional revenue to the Office of the State Treasurer in the form of the \$2 fee.

I want to confirm that we are essentially amplifying the definition of income payer which includes the phrase "employer." An employer is someone who basically has an employee or an independent contractor. If I hired a person to do my landscaping at my house, that person is probably a contractor and not an employee. Is there any obligation on me as a private citizen? Do I now fit into the definition of income payer? I think the answer is not unless someone gives me notice that I have to withhold the money. I want to confirm it for the record that it is not going to touch circumstances like that unless there is notice given by the Division that money needs to be withheld.

**Joe Garcia:**

You are correct. That would not apply in those cases.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I did not think so, but I had some individuals approach me with that concern that I think is covered by the fact that unless you receive notice, you are under no obligation to withhold anything. That satisfies my concern.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I would like to build on the landscaper example. If I understand correctly, if I am a landscaper and I go around to different places and do all the private work, how do you ever know to collect money from me if I am in arrears? I can keep going house to house, they are not obligated, I am making money, and my child is not getting anything.

**Cathy Kaplan:**

We would hope that we would have an income withholding order to that person or that they would be court ordered to make their child support payment if it is their only business and have no other contractors that they have hired. They would be obligated by a court order to pay that child support.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

If I do not want to pay it, I just do not listen to the court order. It seems to me there is a loophole. If I am a sole employee cutting grass and I end up in arrears, you never know who to contact to withhold payments. I may be overanalyzing this.

**Cathy Kaplan:**

We do have additional enforcement remedies in our program that we could take you to court for contempt if you are refusing to pay your child support order.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

As an obligor, do I have to submit my income tax returns to you to show my income? Are there checks and balances, or are you just going to trust me?

**Kimberly Smalley, Social Services Program Specialist, Child Support Enforcement Program, Department of Health and Human Services:**

In addition to traditional income withholdings, we do have additional enforcement measures for those who are not paying directly if an income withholding is not an option. We have driver's license suspensions and contempt actions available.

To answer your question on whether or not an individual would have to submit their income or proof of income, that would be done in the establishment process when we are establishing that court order. Once that obligation is established, they are no longer required to annually or monthly submit proof of income. If we did not have a method to intercept that income, they would still be responsible for paying that directly. If they did not, that obligation would

still accrue and we would take further actions with other methods should they become delinquent.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

When someone is an independent contractor, is there a mechanism when they renew their licensing, whether a city license or state business license, that would catch an independent contractor? If they were in the system owing child support when they go to renew, does it catch them anywhere in there if they have not been paying it? If we were to take this scenario of an independent contractor and maybe he is the only person doing the work, is there a way to catch those people who might not be paying?

**Kimberly Smalley:**

Yes, we are able to intercept different types of licenses that people have been issued. We are able to suspend those.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to give testimony in support?

**Karen Cliffe:**

On behalf of the Clark County District Attorney's Office, we are in support of A.B. 37. It moves to treat obligors fairly and we are very much hoping for its passage.

**Serena Evans, Policy Specialist, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence:**

We are in support of A.B. 37. Many victim survivors rely on child support and we are in favor of any measures that would expand the ways in which victim survivors and others would be able to obtain the child support that they are entitled to.

**John T. Jones Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, Legislative Liaison, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing the Nevada District Attorneys Association:**

We are here in support of A.B. 37.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there any other testimony in support? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in opposition to A.B. 37? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in neutral? [There was none.] Mr. Garcia, would you like to make any concluding remarks?

**Joe Garcia:**

Thank you for the time to present A.B. 37 and thank you for your questions. We are willing to work with anyone who may wish to amend some of the language where we had some of those questions. Please feel free to contact me or any of my staff and we will get right to it.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 37. Is there anyone who wishes to give public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anything else from Committee members this morning? [There was nothing.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 9:18 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Linda Whimple  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

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

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services: Child Support Enforcement, Welfare and Supportive Services," presented by Joe Garcia, Acting Deputy Administrator, Field Operations Support, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services.