### ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 210–ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL

## MARCH 2, 2015

# Referred to Committee on Judiciary

SUMMARY—Revises provisions relating family to law. (BDR 1-818)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: May have Fiscal Impact. Effect on the State: No.

> CONTAINS UNFUNDED MANDATE (§§ 1, 2) (NOT REQUESTED BY AFFECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT)

EXPLANATION - Matter in bolded italics is new; matter between brackets formitted material is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to family law; requiring the resolution of disputes before a family court by nonadversarial methods under certain circumstances; revising provisions governing the mandatory mediation program in a family court in a county whose population is 700,000 or more; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

#### **Legislative Counsel's Digest:**

Existing law requires the family court in a judicial district, where practicable and appropriate, to encourage the resolution of disputes through nonadversarial or alternative methods of dispute resolution. (NRS 3.225) **Section 1** of this bill requires the family court to require the resolution of disputes through such nonadversarial or alternative methods of dispute resolution under certain circumstances.

Existing law requires the district court of a county whose population is 100,000 or more (currently Clark and Washoe Counties) to establish by rule approved by the Nevada Supreme Court a mandatory mediation program for cases involving the custody or visitation of a child. Under existing law, the district court of every county other than Clark and Washoe Counties is authorized to establish such a program. The program must authorize a court to exclude a case from the program when certain good causes are shown. (NRS 3.475, 3.500)

Section 2 of this bill requires the expansion of the mandatory mediation program in Clark County to include issues involving the property rights and financial issues of the parties involved in a family law dispute. Section 2 further requires a court, as necessary, to refer issues involving the property rights or financial issues of the parties to a special master, mediator, early neutral evaluator





1

234567

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

 or certain experts for assistance in resolving a dispute. Finally, **section 2** revises the circumstances under which good cause exists to exclude a case from the program.

# THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

## **Section 1.** NRS 3.225 is hereby amended to read as follows:

- 3.225 1. The family court, [shall,] wherever practicable and appropriate, [encourage] shall require the resolution of disputes before the court through nonadversarial methods or other alternatives to traditional methods of resolution of disputes [.] unless good cause is shown not to require the use of such nonadversarial or other alternative methods.
- 2. The family court or, in a judicial district that does not include a family court, the district court, shall enter into agreements or otherwise cooperate with local agencies [that] or qualified persons who provide services related to matters within the jurisdiction of family courts to assist the family court or district court in providing the necessary support services to the families before the court.
  - **Sec. 2.** NRS 3.475 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 3.475 1. In a county whose population is 700,000 or more, the district court shall establish by rule approved by the Supreme Court a program of mandatory mediation in cases that involve the *property rights or financial issues of the parties in a family law dispute, or the* custody or visitation of a child.
  - 2. The program must:
- (a) Require the impartial mediation of the issues [of custody and visitation and authorize the impartial mediation of any other nonfinancial issue deemed appropriate by the court.] listed in subsection 1.
- (b) Authorize the court to exclude a case from the program for good cause shown, including, but not limited to, a showing that:
- (1) There is a history of child abuse or domestic violence by one *or more* of the parties;
- (2) The parties are currently participating in private mediation [; or], a collaborative divorce process, a cooperative divorce process or early neutral evaluation;
- (3) One of the parties resides outside of the jurisdiction of the court , unless that party:
  - (I) Has previously appeared in the action; and
- (II) Is available by telephone or video communication to participate in the mediation; or
- (4) There is a history of mental health issues, personality disorders or substance abuse, or any combination thereof, with





one or more of the parties, such that the use of any form of impartial mediation would likely not result in a final resolution of the dispute, and would require court orders to manage the conflict between the parties to protect one or more of the parties or the children, if any, from abusive conduct by one of the parties. In finding good cause pursuant to this subparagraph, the court shall:

(I) Provide notice to the parties and conduct a hearing

on the record; and

(II) Make findings of fact to justify the exemption from participating in impartial mediation.

(c) Provide standards for the training of the mediators assigned to cases, including, but not limited to:

(1) Minimum educational requirements, which must not be restricted to any particular professional or educational training;

- (2) Minimum requirements for training in the procedural aspects of mediation and the interpersonal skills necessary to act as a mediator:
- (3) A minimum period of apprenticeship for persons who have not previously acted as domestic mediators;

(4) Minimum requirements for continuing education; and

- (5) Procedures to ensure that potential mediators understand the high standard of ethics and confidentiality related to their participation in the program.
- (d) Prohibit the mediator from reporting to the court any information about the mediation other than whether the dispute was resolved.
- (e) Establish a sliding schedule of fees for participation in the program based on the ability of a party to pay [...] for his or her participation in the program.
- (f) Provide for the acceptance of gifts and grants offered in support of the program.
- (g) [Allow] Authorize the court to refer the parties to a private mediator
- 3. The desire of the parties not to participate in a process of impartial mediation, standing alone, does not constitute good cause to exclude a case from the program established pursuant to this section.
- 4. At the time the initial pleading is filed in a district court for which the program is established, in a case that involves any issue listed in subsection 1, each party and his or her attorney must file a declaration with the court certifying that the party has received information both verbally and in writing concerning alternative dispute resolution processes.
- 5. Unless good cause is shown pursuant to paragraph (b) of subsection 2, the court shall refer any issue involving the property





rights or financial issues of the parties to a special master or mediator, appraiser, accountant, divorce financial analyst, mental health specialist or early neutral evaluator for assistance in resolving the dispute.

6. The costs of the program *established pursuant to this section* must be paid from the county general fund. All fees, gifts and grants collected pursuant to this section must be deposited in the county general fund.

[4. This section does not prohibit a court from referring a financial or other issue to a special master or other person for assistance in resolving the dispute.] This subsection does not apply to the payment of private practitioners for any services performed that are not associated with the program.

**Sec. 3.** The provisions of NRS 354.599 do not apply to any additional expenses of a local government that are related to the provisions of this act.





5

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

