

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Seventy-Third Session
March 7, 2005**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order at 1:32 p.m., on Monday, March 7, 2005. Chairwoman Sheila Leslie presided in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Sheila Leslie, Chairwoman
Ms. Kathy McClain, Vice Chairwoman
Mrs. Sharron Angle
Ms. Susan Gerhardt
Mr. Joe Hardy
Mr. William Horne
Mrs. Ellen Koivisto
Mr. Garn Mabey
Ms. Bonnie Parnell
Ms. Peggy Pierce
Ms. Valerie Weber

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Barbara Buckley, Assembly District No. 8, Clark County

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Allison Combs, Chief Principal Research Analyst
Barbara Dimmitt, Committee Policy Analyst
Joe Bushek, Committee Attaché

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mike Capello, Director, Department of Social Services, Washoe County, Nevada

Michael Alastuey, Legislative Advocate, representing Clark County, Nevada

Jone Bosworth, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Human Resources, State of Nevada

Lucille Lusk, Chairman, Nevada Concerned Citizens, Las Vegas, Nevada

David Schumann, Independent American Party of Nevada

Alicia Smally, Legislative Chair, National Association of Social Workers, Nevada Chapter

Jason Diaz, Graduate Student, School of Social Work, University of Nevada, Reno

Joni Reid, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Frank Schnorbus, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada

Chris Selcer, Graduate Student, School of Social Work, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chris Brooks, Mentor, Nevada Partnership for of Homeless Youth, Las Vegas, Nevada

Janine Hansen, President, Nevada Eagle Forum, Sparks, Nevada

Richard Siegel, President, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada (ACLU), Reno, Nevada

Marsha Simms, President, Foster Care and Adoption Association of Nevada, North Las Vegas, Nevada

Chairwoman Leslie:

[Meeting called to order and roll called.] Committee, we're going to hear two bills today, and we have a work session planned on the previous child welfare bills we heard. We'll go ahead and open the hearing on our first bill today, which is A.B. 42.

Assembly Bill 42: Makes various changes concerning protection of children from abuse and neglect. (BDR 38-670)

Assemblywoman Barbara Buckley, Assembly District No. 8, Clark County:

[Handed out Exhibit B.] I had the honor of serving as the Vice Chairwoman of the Legislative Committee on Children, Youth and Families, and have been on that committee since its inception. Its goal is to improve our foster care system and to make recommendations on how to improve our system for children, as

well as to oversee the end of the bifurcated child welfare system in Washoe and Clark Counties. Assembly Bill 42 would clarify our statutes with regard to the issue of siblings being kept together. It's hard to imagine coming into the foster care system, to have a police officer come to your house to take you away from your family, or to be placed in Child Haven or up in Washoe County or throughout the rurals being taken from your home, and losing everything you know—your mother, your father, your home, and your school. Research has found that the best thing to do for these children is to keep them with the brothers and sisters they know. Nothing can be more traumatic than losing your home, your parents, and then to lose your brother or your sister.

[Assemblywoman Buckley, continued.] Over the last several years, we have heard statistic after statistic of siblings being separated. It's not done because someone wants to be mean. Certainly everybody working in the foster care system knows it's better to keep siblings together. But it's hard. We recently had a group of eight brothers and sisters in Las Vegas pulled into the foster care system. It's hard to find a foster home that will take eight children. And that case, due to some herculean efforts down there and Judge [Gerald] Hardcastle, they found a place for those eight brothers and sisters, but it happens every day. We often will hear circumstances where one child is doing okay, but the other child is having some issues, whether it's because of abuse, because they were neglected, because of sexual abuse, or because they're a teenager. Teenagers act out. If there's a choice, sometimes—whether it's a foster parent or a natural parent—as to whether they should keep the child between the ages of 13 and 18, if that child has issues, it's very difficult. So there becomes this inclination or feeling of necessity that, in order to find a permanent home for a child, the siblings in fact have to be separated.

Allison [Combs] may be able to pull for you in a moment some of the stats from our studies. We've been getting a little bit better, but we're still nowhere near where we need to be. All A.B. 42 says is that it has to be presumed that it's in the best interests of a child to be placed with their siblings. That's contained on page 3 of the bill. Additionally, it requires that the agency give information to the court on the issue of siblings: whether they've been placed with the siblings; what efforts have been made to reunite brothers and sisters; what actions have been taken; if they're not with their brothers or sisters, why they're not; and actions to see whether they can be reunited. That, in a nutshell, is the purpose for the bill and what the bill does, and I'd be happy to turn it to Allison, as she staffed the committee, to see if she has anything to add.

Allison Combs, Chief Principal Research Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

We advocate neither for or against a bill. With regard to A.B. 42, there is some information in the interim committee's report [*Legislative Counsel Bureau Bulletin No. 05-17*] on page 15 regarding the placement of siblings—which was presented in April of 2004 to the committee—based upon the regions. There was information provided on the number of siblings, the number of sibling groups, the number of those groups placed together, and the number separated. I'll just run through those quickly, and I'd be happy to make a copy of this page of the bulletin for the Committee.

In the southern region, there were 429 sibling groups; 270 of those groups were placed together, and 159 of the groups were separated. In the rural region, 101 sibling groups are reflected; 17 were placed together and 28 were separated. Finally, in Washoe County, in the northern region, 252 sibling groups is the total number. The number placed together was 177, and the number of separated groups is 75. Of course, within each group there are multiple children.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

One last note is that I'm proposing an amendment to this bill ([Exhibit B](#)). Since the Interim Committee, we received a request from Judge Hardcastle in Clark County, who oversees most of these cases. What the amendment would do is to allow the court to make any reasonable orders of government entities to join the court proceedings, and then to make all reasonable orders for their care, supervision, custody, conduct, and maintenance in support of the child, including medical treatment. This is based on an amendment that came out of California, which is also attached. Right now, for example, in Washoe and Clark County, those counties are in charge of the abused child. Let's say, for example, they need mental health treatment of a significant level. That's the State's responsibility. If they want to make sure that the child is getting counseling at the school, for example, those other entities—the school, the state—aren't before the court. They just have the county agency. It's to make sure that the care can be continuous, and a judge can talk to those other government actors about how to provide the best treatment for the child. That's the purpose of the amendment.

Assemblyman Horne:

I know this is just on policy, but I was curious on why the fiscal impact was on here.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

We have not seen a fiscal impact yet. I would hope we don't.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I'm actually looking at the fiscal green book, and I don't see one here. I'll have to find that out. We don't have one as of yet.

Mike Capello, Director, Department of Social Services, Washoe County, Nevada:

[Handed out [Exhibit C](#).] Assembly Bill 42 is recognized by the Department as an important step in helping us to ensure that children in the foster care system maintain a very important connection. Setting expectations for child welfare agencies to facilitate the maintenance of these relationships during a serious family disruption is important. Sibling ties represent a special support system, one that is reflected in its uniqueness by being the longest-lasting relationship that a person may have. Splitting siblings in foster care interrupts the sole connection a child may have to his or her family of origin. The loss can negatively impact the child throughout his or her lifetime. As such, this Department is in support of the proposed legislation.

However, we think there are a few pieces of the legislation that we would need to be clarified—specifically, the definition of sibling—to be broadly interpreted. Children previously adopted through the child welfare system, or who are no longer in the custody of the Department, may be considered a sibling and subsequently entitled to visitation and/or placement together. While philosophically this may sound appropriate, in practice the Department has no authority to control for the siblings or their caregivers of children not in the Department's custody.

The second area of concern is half-siblings. A significant number of children who are placed into foster care have half-siblings. While there is a preference to be placed with the sibling, this cannot always be achieved at the onset of a case due to the licensing requirements or the time it takes to achieve licensure. Additionally, half-siblings may not be placed into care because they may reside with the non-offending parent or relative at the time of removal. As a result, these children may not be in need of protection. Additionally, the non-offending parent or relative is not blood-related to the removed child. Several issues arise regarding visitation and placement when half-siblings are involved. As currently written, this bill requires the Department to inform unrelated non-offending parent relatives of the reasons why a half-sibling was removed and placed into foster care. This potentially creates a confidentiality issue for the Department and the offending parent.

Visitation plans, and non-offending parents or relatives, cannot be included in a 432B action as their child is not in need of protection, and thus not party to the action. Therefore, ensuring participation enforcement of a visitation plan would be difficult to achieve.

[Mike Capello, continued.] Oftentimes in foster care, one child is placed into a different home because they require specialized therapeutic treatment. Placement of a child not requiring a high level of care into a therapeutic setting conflicts with the provisions of least restrictive setting. The current structure of therapeutic providers and contractual payments limits the opportunity to place children together when only one requires a therapeutic treatment. Medicaid provisions do not allow for reimbursement for a sibling's placement in higher level of care, if therapeutic intervention is not necessary. The financial costs will be borne by the State General Fund dollars, as federal funds cannot be accessed under those circumstances.

Finally, there's a direct relationship between staff time and being able to comply with the visitation requirements. The caseload reduction proposed by Governor Guinn's budget should allow adequate worker time to meet the requirements of sibling contact for those siblings in the custody of the department.

Where practicable, the Department supports the maintenance of those relationships between siblings not in the Department's custody, but recognizes the inability to always achieve this goal. Washoe County Department of Social Services supports the intent of A.B. 42, as long as the mandated sections are limited to siblings in the custody of an agency which provides child welfare services.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I think the intent obviously was that you can't control placement of children that aren't in your custody. Are you suggesting that we need an amendment to spell that out?

Mike Capello:

I believe that would be helpful, just to make sure that the interpretation is clear, and so that we're not caught into situations where we're trying to say, "Well, in this case it's this, and this case, 'sibling' means that." We could just potentially look at a provision that would clarify that under the jurisdiction of the child welfare agency.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

I'd like to point out that under existing law, on page 3, in determining the placement of a child, the child's not permitted to remain in the custody of their parents. Preference must be given to relatives within a third degree of consanguinity and, if practicable, together with his siblings. That's the law now. All we're saying is that we're giving a presumption that we want to keep brothers and sisters together. We can nitpick the bill all day long, but it's current law.

Michael Alastuey, Legislative Advocate, representing Clark County, Nevada:

We'd like to voice our support for A.B. 42 and the work in general of the Legislative Committee on Children, Youth and Families. We recognize that there's a lot of professional judgment involved, but the bill, as it would amend current language—while creating the presumption that it be in the best interests of the child to be placed with siblings—also clearly contemplates that there could well be circumstances where that is in fact not practicable. Some of the circumstances Mr. Capello pointed out could be among those. The language as it is—whether it requires any refinement or clarification for the record—we're not here to second-guess at all. It's a completely supportable concept. If additional clarification is required, it should only be for the purpose of bidding Godspeed to this bill.

Jone Bosworth, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Human Resources, State of Nevada:

I would just like to echo what Mr. Capello said. We'd like some clarification regarding the bill. Also, since we've just been handed this amendment ([Exhibit B](#)), I think the child welfare agencies need an opportunity to review, analyze, and get clarification on what the amendment entails.

Chairwoman Leslie:

That's fine. If you're not prepared to address it today in the hearing, we'd like you to get your thoughts to our staff as quickly as possible before our work session.

Lucille Lusk, Chairman, Nevada Concerned Citizens, Las Vegas, Nevada:

We're in support of A.B. 42. We strongly support sibling placement where it's possible and visitation where placement together is not possible. In circumstances where a youth is already disrupted, this tenuous connection to family can be an essential lifeline. It's also important to acknowledge that sometimes there are cases where it simply can't work, and A.B. 42 captures that balance by establishing a presumption that sibling placement is best, without creating a right that can't be upheld in all circumstances. The issues raised by Mr. Capello addressed that question—that it cannot be done every time—but A.B. 42 does not require that it be done every time, only that it be done when it can be done.

We had some initial questions about who the court orders apply to as well, and if they apply to those that are not currently in custody or jurisdiction of the Division, then there could be some questions. I did have an opportunity to speak with Ms. Buckley about this, and she assured me that it does in fact apply only in those cases, but as you can see, there are enough questions about it that it might be desirable to have some clarification as the bill proceeds.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Thank you. I don't have anyone signed against, but this is your opportunity if you'd like to testify against the bill. We'll go ahead and close the hearing on A.B. 42, and open the hearing on A.B. 43.

Assembly Bill 43: Establishes certain rights for children who are placed in foster homes. (BDR 38-672)

Assemblywoman Barbara Buckley, Assembly District No. 8, Clark County:

[Distributed [Exhibit D](#).] Assembly Bill 43 was another recommendation of the Legislative Committee on Children, Youth and Families. The purpose of A.B. 43 is to create a foster child bill of rights in our statute. In 1973, the National Foster Parent Association adopted a bill of rights for children in foster care. These general rights were reaffirmed in 1983. Three other states have statutorily adopted a bill of rights for children: New Jersey, Florida, and California. As you can tell, just by creating the rights doesn't make things better, because we've heard from two out of those three systems recently where they've lost children in the system.

Other states and organizations have issued booklets and statutes regarding rights of children: Maine, New York, South Carolina, and Vermont. I think I've given to your staff a list from the National Center for Resource Family Support—the Casey Family Programs ([Exhibit D](#))—of the exact provisions that are in each law of the states that I just mentioned. When the Interim Committee recommended this, we didn't have specifics. As you can see from this compilation, each state has different provisions—in California, for example, to live in a safe, healthy and comfortable home, treated with respect, and to be free from abuse and corporal punishment. Many of the rights in each one of the states are very similar, in that they recite what we would want for all of our children if they were not in our home and how we would want them to be treated.

In compiling this list, it appears that our drafters tried to pick a little bit from each one, and I think that some could probably be taken out. Some are probably a little bit too broad, but the intent is there, and that is to try to guarantee a certain number of principles on how children will be treated. There has been some concern about what these rights mean. In drafting, it appears that LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] also did an analysis of our existing *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC), so I'd also like to highlight that. The bill itself I won't really spend much time on, because I think it pretty well sets forth what each one of the principles are, and so instead what I'll do is—and I'll provide a

copy of this to each one of you—look at some of the comparable provisions either under our administrative code or our existing law.

[Assemblywoman Buckley, continued.] NAC 424.350 provides that foster care homes shall be conducive to the physical and emotional health, general welfare, and wholesome development of children, which includes an accessible outdoor play area. The home must be well-maintained, in a clean and safe condition, and free from hazards. NAC 424.255 states that foster parents shall accept and respect each child as an individual, including being nonjudgmental regarding the child's parents. NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 200.508 provides penalties for abuse and neglect of a child. NAC 424.530 states that the threat of or use of spanking as a form of discipline for foster parents is prohibited. NRS 432.020 states that an agency that provides child welfare services shall provide for maintenance of children. NAC 424.540 provides that food in a sufficient quantity shall be provided to a child, then it goes on in the next provision at NAC 424.585 to say each child must have his or her own clothing and personal possessions, as well as storage space for them. NAC 424.500 says that the foster homes shall provide each child with an opportunity to earn money or receive an allowance.

I've received a lot of emails saying, "What are we doing here?" By and large, I think what we're doing here is trying to set forth a standard for how we want children to be treated—incorporating much of what's already in our administrative code, but making it clear. I heard some concerns: should children have rights? If we create rights for children, are we going to have lawsuits when bedtime is set at 9:00 p.m. instead of 9:30 p.m. and the children want the bedtime later? I'm very familiar with this, and the answer is no. In all of the other states that this has been created, it doesn't create litigation like that. I would challenge any of you to find a lawyer who is going to bring a lawsuit saying that a child's bedtime should be 9:30 instead of 9:00. It's similar to our rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Even if we're not happy every day at the Legislature, we don't bring a lawsuit against government for failing to make us happy. I don't want to give anybody any ideas, but it's just not going to happen. What this is supposed to be is a compilation of how we think children should be treated.

I have met with a couple of people, and would request for the Chair to hold the bill so that we can make it better. There are certain provisions that I think are unclear. For example, "make and receive confidential telephone calls." Well, what if the telephone call is from someone that you don't want talking to a child for a good reason? We can take that out. That wasn't requested by the Interim Committee. That was LCB looking at each state's language. Someone said, "The question about storage space, what did that mean?" I'm sure LCB was

echoing already what was in the NAC; we can refine that language. There's no intent to allow children to be able to do anything that's dangerous, whether it's drugs or having unsavory contact. It's trying to encourage the child to have as normal a life as possible.

[Assemblywoman Buckley, continued.] What normal means is that you have the same boundaries that all of our children do. It doesn't mean a child gets whatever they want. They won't be raised well if a child gets everything they want. I talked to some of the folks who are here from the social work groups, and they had a suggestion to put in something regarding no prohibition on any reasonable time, place, or manner for rules in a house. So I'm going to work with a group of folks on making sure it's as clear as it can be, removing the provisions that are unclear, maybe re-looking at the other states, to make sure it can be the best version it can be. So I offer that, for anyone who has a concern about the bill, I'd be willing to do that with them.

Assemblyman Horne:

I'm glad you'll be working with them to clarify. Next, in subsection (j), "attend religious services and activities of his choice" Do you interpret that activity as being religious activities or just activities, period?

Assemblywoman Buckley:

I believe that's religious activities, because subsection (n) below talks about other activities that are commensurate with the child's age and abilities.

Assemblyman Horne:

What would you say to the parents in the argument that some of these provisions do take them outside what would be normally done in their household? We do have incidents where foster children spend several years in the same home, but under these provisions, they may have different rules than, say, the natural children do.

Assemblywoman Buckley:

With regard to the religious issue, I think that the research and the policy is clear that if you have a 12-year-old who has been raised in a certain faith, that may be one of their only lifelines back to their old life. In Nevada Administrative Code 424.290, it states that religious beliefs may not be imposed for foster children, and it goes on to say that we want the foster home to provide for the moral training of children in their care, but the children shall be permitted to participate in religious activities and to attend a church of their faith, or that of their parents, when possible. Again, what we're looking at is using the good judgment of the foster parent. If there's a strong tie to a faith, then most foster parents now allow for that. We have many foster parents of faith, which is a

good thing. They keep the connections with the old church, or if there isn't a faith, they see if the foster child wants to join that church. It really doesn't change anything with regard to the religion.

[Assemblywoman Buckley, continued.] It's one of those situations where children have faith, too. It's not just the adult's right to try to get that foster child to change their faith. We have some, especially—14, 15 years old—whose faith is probably stronger than some people in this building. Again it's to try to say that your life doesn't have to change. Everything you believe in does not have to change just because you were abused.

David Schumann, Independent American Party of Nevada:

I just have a few questions. Does "received medical care including, without limitation, dental and vision" mean you can go have expensive dental surgery to make your mouth like a movie actor or actress? My natural parents didn't do that, and I don't think that was their thing. Then we go down to where you're going to deal with the telephone calls. I had this vision of calling Hong Kong and France and all that, so you're not going to make or receive confidential telephone calls to wherever. I'm glad she's going to take that out.

Next, who determines how old these children are when they make these religious decisions, and who determines consistent with age in Section 1, subsection (k)? That seems kind of vague; it's not in there. Now, in regard to the social contacts: frankly, I and nobody I knew when I was a child had social contacts with teachers. From what I've been recently reading about social contacts, if I had young kids now, I would not be encouraging my 13- or 14-year-old boy to have social relations with his 26- or 27-year-old teacher. So that just seems strange to have social contacts with teachers. Think of the recent headlines in that particular area. Why would you encourage something like that? Did you all personally have social contacts with your teachers? I don't think so.

"Attend a class or program concerning independent living for which he is qualified." What is that, and who pays for it? And how many natural parents send their kids to a class for independent living? I mean, that's for people my age that have physical infirmities, but not for kids. It's just part of growing up and going through school. That teaches you over 12 years and four years of college, or whatever else, that it's a long, slow process. The idea that somebody has invented a course to teach young kids about independent living—I'd like to see the science that backs that up. Storage space for private use: it sounds like she's going to take care of that, because I instantly thought of one of those lockers that cost about \$90 a month. You know, you can store rifles, pistols, and whatever else you wanted to in there.

[David Schumann, continued.] Now, can a 12-year-old—subsection (t)—review any plan adopted for his permanent agency, pursuant to NRS 432B.553, if the child is over 12 years of age? Ms. Giunchigliani, a week or so ago, explained it was how myelination takes place, and until it's finished in your 20s, you're on a parallel track with retards. So now we're allowing 12-year-olds who really have a lot of myelination, and their brains aren't hard-wired yet, to be making these decisions at 12? And to be free from unreasonable searches of his personal belongings: if the kid has a gun under his bed or in his room, are we allowed to search for that? Is it unreasonable for me to come in and search his room? As a father, I would do that every once in a while. I wouldn't do it every day or every month, but when I thought something didn't appear quite right, I would go in and check it out. Is that going to be forbidden, and if all this stuff is forbidden, who in their right mind wants to be a foster parent?

Finally, have we determined at which age sexual orientation is determined? I, at ten years old, was not a heterosexual. I wasn't a homosexual either; I was asexual. I would like to know who is determining when sexual orientation takes place, and why is the state getting into this. This is a very vague and murky area, but I guarantee you most ten-year-old boys are asexual. So for a parent to indicate that maybe it's better that you go out with Susie or Sally than Bob and Dave, I think that's part of parenting. If you could steer the kid toward making relationships, when he gets further in high school, with people of the opposite sex, that's part of what we do. And why can't these foster parents do that?

Alicia Smally, Legislative Chair, National Association of Social Workers, Nevada Chapter:

We're in favor of this bill. Jason Diaz is one of our students at the University of Nevada, Reno, and he has some testimony prepared.

Jason Diaz, Graduate Student, School of Social Work, University of Nevada, Reno:

[Handed out [Exhibit E](#).] My comprehensive project is examining spirituality in relation to foster care, and I'm here today to speak in favor of A.B. 43. Assembly Bill 43 is proposed legislation, which was developed by the Legislative Committee on Children, Youth and Families, that outlines a series of rights for foster children. As part of those rights, this proposal seeks to amend page 2, line 27, by deleting the current line 27 and replacing that with subsection (j), "Express and participate in spiritual and religious traditions, services, and activities of their choice." As part of my master's degree program, I have examined the importance of spirituality and would like to provide a brief overview of why it is important for foster children to receive support for expression and participation in spiritual or religious traditions of their choice.

[Jason Diaz, continued.] The current status of foster children aging out of foster care is not good. Foster children are twice as likely to drop out of high school, and 50 percent of those who have recently aged out of care are unemployed. Twelve percent report living on the street or in a homeless shelter at least one night during the first year out of the system. Spirituality positively affects the adolescent development, protective factors against adolescent substance abuse, and is seen as meaningful in the development of adolescent identity and self-worth. Current statutes and regulations regarding spirituality and foster care do not encourage foster youth to explore spirituality. The only reference is NAC 424.290, entitled "religious beliefs and practices," and it's primarily about foster parents. It states: "The religious beliefs and practices of foster parents will be considered in relation to how they will affect foster children placed in the home." It goes on later to reference the foster children for the only time, when it states, "Religious beliefs may not be imposed upon foster children."

This is inadequate for use in foster care. What I propose is that we examine what might be best for foster children. These children have already lost a significant amount of who they are, and we should not take this away as well. If a foster child has an interest in spirituality or religion, I feel we should encourage it and use it as a tool to nurture the well-being of the child. I would like to ask that the Committee pass A.B. 43, and give the foster children the right to express and participate in spiritual and religious traditions, services, and activities of their choice.

Joni Reid, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I greatly acknowledge the excellent efforts that Assemblywoman Buckley and other Committee members made in the development of this bill of rights for foster kids. With seven years' experience as a foster parent, and as a professional child welfare worker, I just wanted to address two aspects of the bill. The first is the religious, as my colleague has just reported on. My family is a family with a strong Christian faith. If, God forbid, something happened, and my kids were placed in foster care, by all means I would be devastated to think they wouldn't be able to continue on in that at 11 and 16 years old. As a foster parent, I have always had the right to choose not to accept a child that was offered into my home, if I were very uncomfortable with a religious faith with another child. It would be my choice. So, I don't think that would be something that would be forced on foster parents. They would have to take the foster children into something. They would have the right in the beginning to make that choice.

As far as the independent living, very often the kids that come into care, and those that are teenagers, experience multiple placements, and yes, our natural children have the privilege of being provided independent living skills. We'll

teach them how to have checking accounts, we teach them how to drive, and things like that. But, because of multiple placements and other factors, they don't have that same benefit that most children have. So there needs to be a formalized program put in place to assure that these kids—as they reach adulthood—have the skills that are necessary. I appreciate Assemblywoman Buckley's meeting with some of us and that she is more than happy to adjust as needed. But the heart of this bill is great, and I support it as a foster parent, and I support this bill of rights for children.

Mike Capello, Director, Department of Social Services, Washoe County, Nevada:

[Handed out [Exhibit F](#).] We are in support of this bill. I think there are provisions, as Ms. Buckley already identified, that we need to take a look at. We recognize that the intent here is to set a standard for foster care and set a standard for what we expect, in terms of quality of care and fairness for our children in foster care. I think looking at it from a perspective of trying to normalize an experience for children who have gone through an abnormal experience is what we want to ensure—that they have a quality life experience, as well as get to do those things that most every other child growing up in a community has access to do. I've submitted some written comments ([Exhibit F](#)). We also have an attachment. As Ms. Buckley pointed out, many of the issues addressed by the bill are in the NAC and in the NRS already, and we, in conjunction with CFS [Child and Family Services], have done an analysis of that attachment.

Frank Schnorbus, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada:

We have currently four therapeutic children in our home, in addition to our four natural children. I'm also a CASA [court appointed special advocate], or guardian ad litem, as is said in the bill. So my perspective on this actually comes from two angles. As a CASA, when you look at a home, when you've been assigned to a case, and the child or children are there, you go into the home and you are looking for things that are of great concern to you that will cause something not to be right with the children.

When that happens, what you're doing is looking right into that family in every way. From the other perspective, as a foster parent, I live in a fish bowl, and my wife lives in a fish bowl. I do not support this bill, because I can assure you that the laws and the regulations that are there are already very clear and made abundantly clear to foster parents. We really already have so much scrutiny. People show up at your door all the time. I don't want to say it's malicious. I don't think it is, but often they're going to be here tomorrow, or they're going to be here in an hour. You just let people into your home, and they get a chance to be with the children, and they get a chance to interview, talk, and find out what's wrong. The real key here is that the guardian of the child is often, not

always, the State social worker. That guardian already has the right to force the movement of that child. If that child says, "I don't like it here," that guardian can move the child, or go to court, or whatever it takes. Sometimes it's mental health services that has the guardianship of the children, so these rights already exist.

[Frank Schnorbus, continued.] I want to say I don't represent any organization. When I say that I'm a CASA, I'm not saying that I represent all CASAs. Additionally, when I say I'm a foster parent, I don't want to say that I represent all foster parents. I do want to say that the repercussions I've heard from foster parents regarding this bill are very negative. It's a huge concern. Part of the real reasoning is that if you create special rights for these children that do not exist for other children who are in the home already—your natural children—it really creates enough of a problem. If you create special rights, it just makes it very difficult to be a parent to these children, to love them, to care for them, when they are actually using every tool at their disposal often to disrupt the placement. Children will blow out of a home intentionally because they get tired of the rules, and they don't want to hear it. We've had the sheriff out at our home. We've been doing our current foster care stint for the last three or four years. We've had teenage children, and I believe four or five times we've had to call the sheriff and say, "You need to come address this child, because we're not allowed to use corporal punishment."

What I would like to recommend or suggest, as a CASA, is that if there are concerns regarding these children being in foster homes, do whatever you can to expand the CASA program. It is such an outstanding program, and these volunteers go into the homes, and they do exactly what you're looking at right here. Then, it doesn't create special rights for these children who are in your home.

Assemblyman Horne:

You mentioned there were special rights that we'll be affording foster children. I was trying to find, other than what's been addressed—that they're going to work on—what special rights are we affording? None of the emails I received said what would be special that we wouldn't already give our own kids.

Could you identify somewhere, something that is just out of the ordinary that no other kid would get? I don't see it in the bill.

Frank Schnorbus:

What I'm saying is that the rules of this bill already exist either through existing law or through existing regulation. It's already difficult. That's why there aren't

an overabundance of foster parents, because you really do open your life to total outside scrutiny. It's very intimidating; it's very scary. Having been on both sides—as a parent and as an inspector—I can just assure you that this is going to have a very negative impact on foster parenting.

Assemblyman Horne:

If we were to pass this legislation, and you say these already exist, then the only thing the bill would be doing is saying they would apply to foster parents.

Frank Schnorbus:

There are a number of items. The phone calls—we need to monitor phone calls, occasionally. A lot of times we don't. It depends on the child. I don't remember how the search thing was, but that's not a right that my children have. I have the right to go through my children's backpacks, dresser drawers, under their beds, or wherever. Going by memory, having read the bill, these already happen. What I'm trying to do is place a responsibility more onto the guardian of that child to have that home inspected, which I can assure you they are, and move that child if religious concerns aren't being addressed, or any other one of these items that are already in NRS, or allowing a child to hit a foster parent in some way or another, in a way to blow out of the home. I had a foster son who basically was trying to get us into trouble so we would lose our licensing. When he thought he had done the job, he said, "Sorry about that. I sure hope you don't lose your license." That's actually their goal. When you give them more weapons, that's what will happen.

Assemblywoman Angle:

It takes a very special person to allow children to come into their home when they have children of their own in the home as well, because it disrupts your own parenting with your own children. I want to know, from your perspective as a foster parent, if you think this would have the effect of more people wanting to do this kind of thing, because I know there are a lot of compassionate people out there and they see needy children. What kind of effect do you think this might have on those who would want to be foster parents?

Frank Schnorbus:

Well, I have received emails and phone calls, and it would have a very chilling effect, because it's already very difficult. Hearing the stories that foster parents go through, a lot of people stay away from it because they don't want to expose their children to these outside children. They don't want to expose their own home to the potential of losing your children for being a foster parent, if I, as a CASA worker, came in and saw something that shouldn't be there. I could go and report that, and they could include all children, including their natural

children, so that causes a lot of people to shy away. They just don't want that in their home.

**Jone Bosworth, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services,
Department of Human Resources, State of Nevada:**

I did submit some written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)), which I will not go through because I think many concerns have been raised. I would like to state for the record that the Division very strongly supports synthesizing the provisions that reinforce the expectations for ensuring that the best interests, safety, and the well-being of children in foster care are protected. We think that communicating to children that they indeed have rights is very important. We have concerns that have already been mentioned about the overlay, which is the best interest language, as well as recognizing that sometimes adult caregivers—just like we ourselves—need to make decisions about children's behavior. It sounds to me like Barbara Buckley has already addressed that and is willing to work with us and other stakeholders to get that clarified.

**Chris Selcer, Graduate Student, School of Social Work, University of Nevada,
Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I'm here today to support A.B. 43. I have presented the Committee a copy of a white paper that I've prepared for you ([Exhibit H](#)), and I'd like to go over three key points regarding the bill while I'm up here speaking with you. The majority of my knowledge on this topic matter is related to research that I did earlier this summer on Title IV-E and Title IV-B funding, I'm going to look at it from a macro context, not necessarily in the context of homes and families.

I feel A.B. 43 complements Nevada's ongoing efforts to pursue the goals of safety, permanency, and well-being that are mandated in the Adoption and Safe Families Act [of 1997]. In light of the results of our recent child and family review, which I'm sure you're familiar with, the paper highlights some of the results, how A.B. 43 relates to them, and takes positive measures to focus the existing Legislature towards working to affect them positively. The final point I'd like to make is that there's a lot of discussion on the minutia that is inside the bill itself, which could be solved by working, but I'd like to point out that a lot of the details we're discussing may be meaningless if we don't garner a lot of federal support. I think by showing that we're proactive, that we're pursuing best practices, and working toward smoothing intergovernmental relations, it may help us achieve further federal support for child welfare.

**Chris Brooks, Mentor, Nevada Partnership for of Homeless Youth, Las Vegas,
Nevada:**

I'd like to give the perspective of a former foster youth. I came into the foster system with my brother at age five, and then went into 35 different

placements. At age ten, I was separated from my brother. At age 19, I was emancipated from the State, and thereafter was homeless for a little period of time. I am strongly in support of this bill for numerous reasons. I would like to address a couple issues that I heard.

[Chris Brooks, continued.] For the gentleman that stated that this is going to give youth more opportunities to get kicked out of foster homes, to have the parents lose their license, and things of that nature, the reason youth are trying to get kicked out of placement is because of a situation like mine. I went through 35 different placements. I'm going to make sure that I lose you before I get attached to you, and you lose me. After you get attached and lose so many times, the last thing you want to do is get attached, so you are going to fight off everything so you don't get attached. It's going to be less hurtful for you to do that than for you to get attached to somebody and then lose them. So this is, in that case—no matter what you're going to do—what they are going to do.

What this bill will do is hold foster families accountable. In our child welfare system, there's a real lack of accountability. This is going to hold people to that level, and for those foster families and group homes with the best interests, this will minimally affect them. This will stop those that have not-so-good interests and hold them accountable. One statement was made that they can receive confidential telephone calls. In a couple of my group homes, they didn't know how to handle me or my behavior. So they tried to do obscene things to try to control my behavior. For example, they would monitor all phone calls, thinking that that was going to control me. That's not going to change the behavior. All it does is make you more upset. What this bill allows is for you to have a personal life; it allows you to communicate with the outside world.

The next is subsection (j), attend religious service and activities of its choice. Going from 35 different foster homes, I attended almost every religion possible. At one point in time—I'm not a religious person—I determined that I was not religious. I would actually get kicked out of homes for not attending religious services, because that's what was mandated. It should be up to me to decide whether I want to be religious, if not what type of religion I want to be in. It shouldn't be forced upon me to decide that.

Subsection (p), where it says, "Have social contacts with persons outside the foster care system": someone brought up the idea of a teacher and having social contact with the teacher. The main thing that has been proven to help these kids become successful is having mentors. Most of these kids have no mentors; they have nobody. The people they turn to are teachers, football coaches, people at the grocery store, anyone that's going to give them attention. So not allowing them to turn to teachers is crazy.

[Chris Brooks, continued.] Subsection (q), where it says “attend a class or program concerning independent living for which he's qualified”: I now work with youth that are exiting the foster care system. I did not attend independent living classes. They were not provided to me. The only way I was able to obtain these skills was by going through home economics in high school. Independent living for a normal family is taught as a toddler—when you see your mom and dad cooking in the kitchen, when you see your mom and dad helping cleaning up the bathroom, when you see your dad mowing the lawn, when you see your uncle and aunt barbecuing, when you help with baking. These are necessary items you have to do to obtain self-sufficiency in life. You have to be taught to do these well-needed skills. The kids that we work with don't know how to budget money, how to cook, or any of these things. Until we teach these kids how to do these basic things, they're not going to be independent. They're not going to be self sufficient; they'll be in the adult welfare system. They'll be in prison, be dead, or on drugs. These are all major key roles.

I'm vice president of the National Foster Youth Advisory Council, and we're coming up with a sibling bill of rights. The main thing this does is it holds people accountable. There are always going to be loopholes. Foster kids are taught to be manipulative. Going from home to home, we're taught that we have to fight for what we want. We're taught that we have to sink into the cracks. That's what we're taught. We're going to do it no matter what. So, I strongly support this bill.

Chairwoman Leslie:

We appreciate you coming forward for your testimony. Were you a foster child in Nevada? You had 35 placements here in Nevada?

Chris Brooks:

That's correct.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I'm sorry for that. Thank you very much.

Janine Hansen, President, Nevada Eagle Forum, Sparks, Nevada:

[Handed out [Exhibit I](#).] These are issues that have been of concern to me. I'm a mother, stepmother and grandmother. I realized in my life how difficult and disruptive it was for stepchildren to be in a different environment. So, I'm very compassionate and concerned about those who find themselves in this difficult position.

After I read this bill, I said to myself, “Who in the world would want to be a foster parent in these conditions?” Perhaps the answer to that is not those

compassionate people, but only perhaps those that do it for the money. I think almost everyone that's involved wants to do it because they care about children, but this seems to limit a foster parent's right to guide, direct, and discipline their own child. What if you, as a foster parent, not only have your own children but foster children as well? You would be forced to have two sets of rules. This would create resentment from your own children, because the foster children under this bill, as I read it, essentially have no rules. Shall we do away with parents and just have providers for physical needs? What parent or foster parent, who really cares about a child, would have a home with unlimited freedom?

[Janine Hansen, continued.] I have some questions I'd just like to bring up. We all heard today that you can't use corporal punishment in any way. So now in the bill, it says in subsection (l) that they can't be locked in a room. Now, does that mean no time out is available? I have a two-year-old grandson, and my daughter-in-law, trying to deal with him—he is what I characterize as very energetic, and insistent, and demanding—sometimes she puts him in a room for time out, but he's smart and able to get out of the door by himself. So sometimes, she locks the door. So I wonder if that would not be available to parents anymore. It says that they have the right to receive, and certainly my own children and my grandchildren don't have the right to not be locked in the room for time out. That's one right it would give them that my children and grandchildren wouldn't have. You asked that question, Assemblyman Horne.

It says that they have the right to receive medical care without limitation. Certainly, my children and grandchildren don't have that right. They're limited by the finances of the parents and by what the parents think is good. Would that include the state in the far reaches of this, of being required, without limitation, to provide abortions, or experimental surgeries, or complete orthodontic treatment, or even in the far reaches of someone's mind, a sex change? My dear friend's sister had a sex change when she was a very young woman, and now she's older, and she's not so sure she made the right decision. Sometimes we have ideas when we're young that aren't the same as when we get older.

Attend religious services, in subsection (j): I'm very much in favor of children attending religious services, and if they had something with their parents, I think that's great. I certainly required my children to go to church until they were older, and then I let them make that choice for themselves. But what if it happens to be an occultic or Satanic religion that would disrupt your home, that would cause conflict with your natural children, or some other type of church that wouldn't fit in with your family, then are you going to be accused of not providing this for the children?

[Janine Hansen, continued.] We read about participating in extracurricular, cultural, and personal enrichment activities, which I think is wonderful. The more positive things children can do, the better off they are. But these are also limited to my children, and they didn't have the right to choose what they wanted to do. It depended on the time I had to take them there, it depended on the money that I had to take them there, and it depended on how it worked out in our whole family. You can't have five or six children going to different extracurricular activities at the same time. It's impossible for parents to deal with, just logistically. So I wonder if a parent would be in trouble if they decided that a rock concert full of drugs, sex, and violence wasn't good, or a party with underage drinking or an activity which is appropriate for a 16 year-old, but you had to tell the 12 year-old no. Will the child report the parent to the State?

It talks about having social contacts with persons outside the system. I always involved my children. I brought them to the Legislature, I took them to Washington D.C., I took them to all kinds of things, and I think that it is wonderful for them to meet many people, but it says, "without limitation." My children had no right to meet whoever they wanted without limitation. I had a couple of times when they would sneak out of the house to do it, and I had to provide some kind of discipline for that, but the discipline available here is questionable in terms of what a parent can do. Does it mean that you can't tell a child they can't have a relationship with a particular person because they are a bad influence, because they are on drugs, because they are in a gang, or because they're involved in pornography, profanity, alcohol, or violence? What about forbidding a girl from seeing an older man who is only interested in bedding her? I had some problems with that with my own beautiful daughter. I had to intervene in that, and I saw this happen with a dear friend of mine—with tragic results in her life—and it concerns me. Parents have to be able to be parents.

In subsection (v), we read that they must be free from unreasonable searches. I'll tell you my children never had that right. Now, I didn't do it often, but when there were firecrackers, possibly drugs, or maybe a gun, pornography, or other things, this mother had the right to search and take care of those problems of my own children and my stepchildren. I think it might be important for a foster parent to be able to parent that child and say, "These aren't acceptable, and you can't have them." They certainly need their space; I always try to do that. I had a special room for my stepchildren when they came. That was their room, and that was important.

Subsection (x), the last item, says that a child can't be discriminated against or harassed because of these many issues. Now I heard earlier—and I'm not familiar with the foster care system, so I may have said something that's not

appropriate, and I am just talking from the aspect of being a parent and a step-parent—if you have a particular religious belief, for instance, that says that marriage should be between a man and a woman, and you have a child there that has a particular sexual orientation, would you then be in trouble if you happen to mention your religious beliefs in the home? Would you be harassing that child? Would they feel discriminated against? Would that parent be on the spot then? Maybe they'd have to refuse to take those children, which may be the ones that are the most in need of care. Do foster parents have any rights under this bill to guide, direct, and discipline a child, or are they only to provide a place for children to eat and sleep? Who is responsible when a child without limits or discipline gets into trouble, when foster parents have no authority?

[Janine Hansen, continued.] I experienced that as a step-parent. You may have some moral authority with your children, but as a stepmother, that stepchild—especially a teenager—doesn't think you have any authority. I had to tell my husband that he couldn't work on the weekends when my stepchildren were there, because my stepson would not do anything I said. He was bigger than me, so I couldn't enforce anything. I had to tell my husband that he couldn't work while they were there, but a foster parent may have less authority. They can't have a responsibility when they have no authority. They cannot have responsibility for a child who is out of control. Shall we do away with parents and just have physical need providers? Some of my concerns have been addressed by those who spoke before, and a willingness to change those. I'm really concerned that we may have fewer foster parents under this bill.

**Richard Siegel, President, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada (ACLU),
Reno, Nevada:**

I think the point of view of the American Civil Liberties Union is an important one, because we'd be looked at to be the litigator if there was a lawsuit based on this kind of thing. I can tell you that we have bills of rights for mental health patients, and we have rights even for prisoners in our society. We would litigate only for high levels of physical or mental abuse, and we would then litigate against the agency of government that has the guardianship and control of the child. They're the ones that ultimately are responsible for any ward of the state, and this is a ward of the state. We would not look at these rights as an opportunity to go after a foster family. We would recognize that ultimately, a judge would have to decide the reasonableness of any complaints that were made, and the reality is that we live in a world where every day, state and federal judges insist that we go nowhere near what might be considered a frivolous lawsuit. That has been intensified in the last two to four years, as you know.

[Richard Siegel, continued.] So this is, as was stated by Assemblywoman Buckley a standard, a message that children, in principle, have rights in these areas. Now, it was mentioned that there might be a difference between the rights or standards applied to a foster child instead of a natural child. I have three children and four grandchildren. I recognize what those distinctions may be. Why would there be some difference? The answer is that foster children involve what we call "state action." That's what puts them similar in some ways with prisoners and with people in mental retardation and mental health facilities. There is state action involved. That means the Fourteenth amendment to the *United States Constitution* is applicable. The Fourteenth Amendment of the *Constitution* is not applicable to me for my natural children in the same way. I can be held to violations of law against my own children, but I will not be held to the standards of the Fourteenth Amendment, which are what hold the State of Nevada responsible for the care of foster children.

So, we have to have some standards that go beyond the standards of natural children. That is why you hear about lawsuits that are taken against State agencies for losing track of foster children, for not caring about abuse, and bleeding to death of foster children, because the Fourteenth Amendment creates a framework for that kind of protection. And it should. This is a guide to the kind of protection that should go, but it goes in a lot of different directions.

Now, I want to deal with three areas that have been mentioned and just very briefly touch on why they're important. One is religious freedom. It's kind of ironic that Janine [Hansen] and I would be taking the positions we would be here, I suppose, because the ACLU is mostly known for separation of church and state, but this is a foster home. This is a home-like environment. The issue is not the separation of church and state. It is the right of religious teaching, religious preference of both the birth parent and the child themselves. Some of you may know the history of the Holocaust and the history of Jewish children being put in Christian homes and denied their right to religion. There's a sainthood issue that's coming up—or has already come up in the last few years—over just that issue. It's profoundly important that the will of the birth parent and the will of the child themselves be furthered. Janine can mention things about Satanic and other things, but to me that's a red herring. Ninety-eight percent of the children are going to go to mainstream religions. The other two things have to do with general things that are in this bill. Eighty to ninety percent of this bill covers my children and grandchildren. Every child has rights to education, and it says in the bill "as applied by law," "require an education as required by law," "work and development of job skills to the extent authorized by law." So most of this is the same.

[Richard Siegel, continued.] There are two areas where we're saying that there would be some differences, at least in standards. One is privacy, and one is discipline. We're saying that the foster child, perhaps, has some additional rights of privacy that a natural child in your home might not have. I think some of the things were mentioned by the young man who was a foster child. The right of access to authorities is crucial in an abusive situation. And, remember, this is state action, obligation of the state, legal obligation of the state, and legal vulnerability of the state. We want the children to be able to communicate as far as this is concerned, and it does say unreasonable search and seizure. The courts are more and more putting an emphasis on "unreasonable." It does not mean that a child who has a drug problem cannot be searched for drugs. That is reasonable search and seizure. It does not mean that a child who has already been known to have a firearm cannot be searched for a firearm. That would be reasonable search and seizure. So you really don't have to worry about that.

The final area I'll just briefly comment on is discipline. There are very few differences in here about discipline. The one that has been mentioned has been not locked in the room. It doesn't say, for example, no time out and go to your room. It doesn't mean that you cannot have discipline. The point would be that neither us nor any kind of civil liberties organization—or child rights organization—is going to go to a court and say, "A great violation has taken place; this child has been given time out." "A great violation has been taken place; this child has been deprived of their privilege to have pizza tonight." That's not going to happen. If you want to take out "locked in their room," the point is that reasonable measures have to be taken. No corporal punishment, and nothing that will create a substantial degree of physical or mental abuse. The reality is that these are the standards, but the legal standard and the bottom line is, if the foster parent avoids genuine physical and mental abuse, the foster child and the foster parents really don't have anything to worry about with this bill of rights

**Marsha Simms, President, Foster Care and Adoption Association of Nevada,
North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Some other women lawyers and I have reviewed this document, along with some Supreme Court justices, and the issue that we have is it appears that some of the provisions are risk-shifting provisions. Once you codify abuse or neglect and corporal punishment as defined by the statute that is mentioned, our concern was that at the lower court level, if this ever goes to court, they wouldn't step up and protect the foster child. But what if somebody else brought a lawsuit based on this? You can't necessarily guarantee what a lower court judge will rule in this instance. Would you be making foster parents agents of the state? The Department is covered by judicial immunity. Would that

extend to foster parents? Because once you have state action, once you codify this, it leaves it open to interpretation, and we just view it as risk shifting.

[Marsha Simms, continued.] We're neutral in reference to the law. I had spoken to Barbara Buckley concerning two other provisions that I don't think are necessary to be talked about right now, because she said that they would probably be amended out, but if those provisions do go forward, there are some other serious concerns that we have. Also, there's a case that I don't have the name of—because it was a minor child involved, and her name has been redacted from the case—that discusses the rights of a foster child, the Fourteenth Amendment, the due process rights that yield to that child. I have talked with Barbara Buckley and I will give her a copy of that. We know that the law right now that you have before you is in the process of being modified.

There are some other serious concerns. Being a lawyer, when I reviewed it, I spoke with other lawyers, and they also had some of those same fears that I had. The gentleman here from the American Civil Liberties Union says it's the standard, but once you codify it, you bring it up to the level of being something other than a standard. I just wanted to make you aware of that. Also, I do know that several years ago, we lost liability insurance for foster parents. The State no longer carries that, and I was told that that would be a responsibility of the counties, now that it has shifted to the counties. If the counties do extend that liability insurance, will they defend a lawsuit on a foster parent we have?

I'm a foster parent, and I have four special-needs children. As one of the gentlemen said, I've had children that have lied on me. Via the fact that I kept good records, I probably could have been sued, even though you don't have this. But this might make it worse. The foster parents I've spoken to really think the intent behind this bill is good, but a lot of them are very fearful that it will open them up to lawsuits, that's not what they got into foster care for. We hope that you would think about the provisions. A lot of them shift the risk to the foster parent. I'd like you to be aware of that. I've spoken to Barbara Buckley about serious reservations I've had about the bill, and we thought it would be best if we talked about those at a later date.

Chairwoman Leslie:

That would be fine. Thank you for your testimony. We'll close the hearing then on A.B. 43. This meeting is adjourned [at 3:05 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Paul Partida
Transcribing Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Health & Human Services

Date: March 7, 2005 **Time of Meeting:** 1:32 p.m.

Bill #	Exhibit ID	Witness	Dept.	Description
	A	*****		Agenda
42	B	Assemblywoman Buckley		Proposed Amendment
42	C	Michael Capello	Washoe County Department of Social Services	Written Testimony on <u>A.B. 42</u>
43	D	Assemblywoman Buckley		Rights of Foster Children
43	E	Jason Diaz	Self	Written Testimony in favor <u>A.B. 43</u>
43	F	Michael Capello	Washoe County Department of Social Services	Written Testimony on <u>A.B. 43</u>
43	G	Jone Bosworth	Division of Child and Family Services	Written Testimony on <u>A.B. 43</u>
43	H	Christopher Selcer	Self	Written Testimony in favor <u>A.B. 43</u>
43	I	Janine Hansen	Nevada Eagle Forum	Written Testimony in opposition to <u>A.B. 43</u>