

**Harrison v. Harrison, 132 Nev. \_\_\_, P. 3d \_\_\_ (Adv. Opn. 56, July 28, 2016)**

\*#\*

Two provisions of the parties' custody agreement raised: The first provision of the agreement provided that when a child reaches the age of 14, it is within the child's "teenage discretion" to determine time spent with either parent, so long as the joint physical custody agreement remains intact. The second provision provided for a "parenting coordinator" to resolve disputes, and authorized the district court to issue an order defining the coordinator's role.

Here, neither provision violated the paramount public policy concern in child custody matters—the best interest of the child, nor did the parenting coordinator provision improperly delegate decision-making authority.

Conversely, the dissent found that the "teenage discretion" provision encroached on the district court's jurisdiction, and that the parenting coordinator provision was an inappropriate delegation of the district court's responsibility. Therefore, both provisions should be invalidated.