

Supreme Court of Nevada
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

KATHERINE STOCKS
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK
Assistant Court Administrator

MEETING SUMMARY

Date and Time of Meeting: Friday, February 21, 2025, at 1:30 p.m.

Place of Meeting: Remote Access via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT

Judge Denise Gentile	Dana Sisk	Jessica Padron
Judge Tamantha Schreinert	Karen Kelly	Melissa Brown
Debra Amens	Lynn Hughes	Shauna Brennan
Jennifer Rains	Michael Keane	Judge Kriston Hill
Julie Lindesmith	Tracy Bowles	Allie Caliendo
Elizabeth Brickfield	Judge Sturman	Debra Bookout
Kathleen Jones	John Michealson	

MEMBERS ABSENT OR EXCUSED

Jim Berchtold
Mary Bryant
Jennifer Christie
Jennifer Salem

AOC STAFF

Karla Scott

OTHER ATTENDEES

Mallory Nelson	Jonathan Bye
Andres Moses	Staci Anderson
Emily Reed	
Judge Throne	

I. Call to Order

- a. Call or Roll and Determination of Quorum
- b. Approval of Meeting Summary of December 6, 2024, with the following corrections:
There is an extra "E" in Karen Kelly's name on page 4.
- c. Opening Remarks

II. Public Comment:

Jessica Padron, AARP, introduced herself to the rest of the Guardianship Commission. Ms. Padron discussed a new bill introduced by Assemblyman David Orentlicher. She stated it is still in BDR form. She stated she has already had an initial discussion with Assembly Orentlicher regarding the bill and has a meeting set up on March 4, 2025, with him. Ms. Padron stated that she would be interested in working with the Commission on legislative matters.

III. Report out by Workgroups

a. Forms Workgroup

Emily Reed informed that the Forms Workgroup has not met, but their next meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2024. She reported that the workgroup is waiting until the end of the legislative session to work on forms to ensure any changes in legislation can be incorporated.

b. Rules Workgroup

Ms. Brickfield reported she volunteered to be chair for this workgroup. They will meet next in March. She stated they have shared some information in the workgroup that they will send out. She stated the workgroup is looking at legislation and some of the rules that were proposed last time. She stated they will not be proposing any rules or changes until after the legislative session.

c. NCSC Workgroup

Judge Schreinert discussed the Guardianship Portal and how it will address the recommendations related to access to justice issues. She also mentioned at the last meeting that there was discussion about creating a standard form order, which was referred to the Forms Workgroup.

d. Legislative Workgroup

Judge Schrienert reported that this workgroup had a long meeting in January to discuss the LACSN minor guardianship bill. An updated version of this bill has not yet been sent out by Jonathan Norman. She stated the minor guardianship bill is lengthy and the workgroup has provided input to the bill. The current status of the bill is not known at the current time. Andres Moses offered that the bill has not been released at this time and is still in BDR form.

AB 65 was presented to the Judiciary Committee. John McCormick with the AOC presented the bill. This bill is a clean up bill for both minor and adult guardianship. With regard to the background check language in the bill, Mr. McCormick was informed by the Department of Public Safety that they already have authority to get background checks without this legislation based on the fact that the Guardianship Office would be qualified as a qualified entity in these types of cases. Due to this, the background check language in the bill will be pulled. The rest of the bill is for fixes in things like service. Mr. Moses added that Mr. McCormick received no questions from committee members regarding the bill. However, LACSN did oppose the bill as he has a problem with the seven-day service issue. Judge Schreinert stated that the

workgroup continues to work with stakeholders regarding the proof of service language. Additionally, with the LACSN bill there is also language regarding service and the goal is to ensure the guardianship statutes are consistent and will allow any type of service that is allowed through the NRCP. There was further discussion related to the service language, allowance for judicial discretion, and electronic service. The committee continues to work on the language.

e. Mental Health Workgroup

Karen Kelly reported that the workgroup has agreed to take a two-prong approach. The first prong will review the concerns they had previously discussed regarding individual with dual diagnosis and mental health being taken to jail in many situations. She reported the group will work on a community educational initiative to provide guidance to guardians when this occurs. They will additionally have educational and guidance materials to group homes, nursing home and other facilities so that when a mental health crisis occurs, they have information on other options than calling 911. Additionally, they plan to have a stakeholder group within the community to assess when this is happening. The second prong involves researching how other states have implemented. They are looking at California, where there are two guardianship tracks with different processes for people with only mental health issues and then for people with a dual diagnosis. They plan to meet prior to the next Commission meeting and hope to share some information at that time.

Judge Schrienert suggested that a future topic for this group could address mental health issues with minor guardianships. Ms. Kelly stated one of the primary issues is the lack of resources for mental health. Judge Schrienert added that there is a lack of services and providers for children with mental health needs, as well as adults. She indicated a lack of funding, even with Medicaid, and she would be interested in exploring that. Ms. Kelly concurred and also stated that it would be beneficial to include the Department of Children and Family Services and other agencies and suggested adding this as a third prong to their workgroup.

Kathleen Jones and Ali Caliendo have volunteered to become members of this workgroup.

f. SIJS Workgroup

Judge Schrienert added that Judge Throne has been added to this work group, though they have not yet met yet as the Legislative Workgroup took priority given the session. Judge Throne reported an uptick in SIJS cases over the last year and Judge Schreinert agreed that the Second Judicial District Court has also seen an uptick in this case type. She suggested it would be interesting to track these cases. Judge Sturman offered that in New Mexico, many who practice in immigration dockets have lost funding and she wondered what impact this might have for Nevada. She stated concerns related to lack of representation for these children if funding were to be cut. Judge Schrienert offered that this may be a problem, though in her district most of these cases have private attorneys but Washoe Legal Services do represent a few of these children. Judge Schrienert intends to have a meeting when the session ends to discuss the SIJS issues. She also

reported that AB65 includes adding the SIJS language into the minor guardianship statutes.

IV. Introduction of New Commission Members

Judge Schrienert introduced the newest Commission Members:

- Julie Lindesmith, Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Program Manager
- Melissa Brown, White Pine District Attorney and Public Guardian
- Kathleen Jones, Elko County Public Guardian
- Tracy Bowles, Washoe County Public Guardian
- Dana Sisk, Supervising Attorney for Adult Guardianship, Northern Nevada Legal Services
- Alie Caliendo, Executive Director, Foster Kinship
- Honorable Kriston Hill, Fourth Judicial District Court
- Shauna Brennan, Advocacy Rights Attorney, Aging and Disability Services Division
- Jessica Padron, Director, AARP
- Debra Bookout, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

Judge Schrienert stated there will be an ADKT coming out that will appoint new Commission members. Debra Bookout discussed the possibility of adding family member guardians. She informed that the majority of guardians are family members and are an important part of the administration of guardianship. She also recommended someone to the committee who had been in guardianship. Lynn Hughes clarified that the recommendation be for former guardians, rather than current guardians, after discussing possible conflicts if a sitting judge and current guardian were on the same commission.

V. Legislative Update by Commission Members

Jessica Padron discussed a BDR that Assembly Orentlicher is sponsoring. She stated he is working on incorporating the Uniform Healthcare Decisions Act in Nevada. She stated he does not feel this will be contentious. Ms. Padron offered to provide the link to the American Bar Association's overview of the act.

Mick Keane stated that he saw in Nevada Lawyer magazine an article about Assembly Bill 217, which will revise provisions relating to support decision making.

VI. Educational Needs

There was general discussion related to the research and development of the Guardianship Assistance Program. This will be added to the next meeting's agenda.

VII. Survey of County Recording Fees

There was discussion related to the recording fees that are set aside for both minor investigation and counsel for protected persons. Judge Schreinert stated that Washoe county is seeing a decrease in recordings. There was discussion of a survey tool so that the Commission can gather information from each county on the amount they have collected through recording fees, as had previously been done several years ago. Debra Bookout mentioned that Clark and Washoe county also provide statistics on guardianship, and this might be beneficial to look at as well. Judge Schreinert stated she could provide statistics for the Second Judicial District Court, as they are posted on their website.

Judge Gentile will work on getting a statistical report for the Eighth Judicial District Court. Judge Hill reported that the Fourth Judicial District Court has a new case management system, and she is not sure what data she can obtain, but they should be able to get some statistics in the future. Kathleen Jones indicated that Elko County can provide information related to the recording fees. Judge Schreinert stated that it would be good to track recording fees are going up or down, as well as caseload. She further elaborated that if recording fees are decreasing but caseload is increasing, then there will need to be other mechanisms to help fund legal services for protected persons, as well as minor guardianship investigations. Mick Keane suggested also it might be beneficial to obtain information on how representation is working throughout the state might be beneficial.

X. Future Meetings

TBD

IX. Public Comment

None