

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Seventy-Third Session
March 9, 2005**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order at 1:33 p.m., on Wednesday, March 9, 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
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:

Mrs. Sharron Angle (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Barbara Dimmitt, Committee Policy Analyst
Joe Bushek, Committee Attaché

OTHERS PRESENT:

Connie McMullen, Member, Accountability Committee for the Strategic Plan for Seniors, Washoe County, Nevada

Mike Willden, Director, Department of Human Resources, State of Nevada

Jim Wadhams, Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada Dental Association

Chairwoman Leslie:

[Meeting called to order and roll taken.] We are going to hear the two bills and then we're going into work session on the child welfare bills, but we are not going to take up Assembly Bill 84 today. We're not quite ready. There's just a little bit more we want to investigate before we bring it to work session. We will go ahead and open the hearing on A.B. 117.

Assembly Bill 117: Makes appropriation to Aging Services Division of Department of Human Resources for establishment of pilot program to provide assistance to senior citizens for vision care. (BDR S-445)

Assemblywoman Kathy McClain, Assembly District No. 15, Clark County:

Just to give you a little background: at the end of last session, we got \$100,000 for a pilot program to provide some dental services to seniors. It has been a great success story. This time, I have three bills. Assembly Bill 127 is just going to give the authority for the Division on Aging to provide dental or vision, and then I have A.B. 117, which is going to establish a pilot program for the vision care. Then I have another one, which is A.B. 176, that we will probably hear next week, which will actually fund a continuation of the dental program. So that's the background on these three bills. Assembly Bill 117 obviously will have to go to Ways and Means yet, and it is a request out of General Fund for \$200,000 a year. I am looking at it as a lot like we did on the dental program, the same eligibility requirements for seniors that they have under Senior Rx, and providing, maybe, a \$200 stipend for a senior to go and have their eyes checked and put towards a pair of glasses.

Connie McMullen, Member, Accountability Committee for the Strategic Plan for Seniors, Washoe County, Nevada:

I am here in support of A.B. 127, to expand on NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] 439.630 to include limited-scope dental and vision benefits.

Chairwoman Leslie:

We are on A.B. 117. We like to do the hearings bill by bill, just because it is too hard for secretarial staff.

Connie McMullen:

I am in support for any of them, for the record.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Let's talk about A.B. 117.

Connie McMullen:

This was in our initial strategic plan for seniors, and then again in our final report. As you may know, dental hygiene is so important for people, especially as they age, because they need to eat. It maintains good health, good muscle strength, and good nutrition. It is essential for the frail and low income seniors. I am behind this. I was in favor of this when Senator [Raymond] Rawson was looking into gathering data to have it here, and I think, statewide, it is a major problem. The Attorney General and Surgeon General even mentioned it as such. It is just essential for good quality of life and to maintain dignity, and I think that's what we are all about.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Assembly Bill 117 addresses vision care, and you are in favor of that, too?

Connie McMullen:

I am in favor of that, too. Likewise, that also promotes independence. If you can't see, there aren't many opportunities for you to engage fully in the occupation of life.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Thank you for your testimony. Any other remarks, Kathy, on this bill?

Assemblywoman McClain:

No. I think I am fine with that. We just need to convince Ways and Means.

Chairwoman Leslie:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 117 and open the hearing on A.B. 127.

Assembly Bill 127: Provides subsidies from Fund for a Healthy Nevada for coverage of limited-scope dental and vision benefits to certain senior citizens. (BDR 40-714)

Assemblywoman Kathy McClain, Assembly District No. 15, Clark County:

As I was stating before, I actually have three bills. They all have to do with senior dental and vision coverage. The pilot program that we started last fall—actually, we got the money at the end of the 2003 Session. We had a terrible time actually getting the pilot program started, but it was finally started about September of just this last year. It has been highly successful. As such, I think A.B. 117, the vision pilot, will be highly successful.

Assembly Bill 127 comes from the Task Force for the Fund for a Healthy Nevada. I convinced my Committee this was a good thing. It gives authorization to the Division on Aging to include future legislatures, or future governors when they see the wisdom, to include vision, dental, and the Senior Rx prescription drug program. It will all be contained in one program, be easy to administer, with the same eligibility qualifications for all three programs. Basically, that's all this does. It gives them the authority to be able to do it.

We have one problem with the bill. On page 5, on Section 5, it refers to the Aging Services Division. We cannot put this limited scope dental and vision in this particular section, because that will just allow some of the pilot programs they have going already in the dental program. I don't think it is needed there. I think LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] just threw it in. Every time they saw prescription drugs and pharmaceutical services, they plopped it there. I think we need to take it out there. I don't think there is a problem anywhere else.

Chairwoman Leslie:

You suggest we delete Section 5?

Assemblywoman McClain:

We can delete the whole section—I am not sure it is even needed anymore—or not include the limited scope of dental and vision in that paragraph.

Chairwoman Leslie:

That looks like the only change in that section.

Assemblywoman McClain:

If we want to leave it like it was before, we don't want to tie the hands of the Division on Aging when it comes to the dental and the vision benefits.

Chairwoman Leslie:

They did implement a pilot?

Assemblywoman McClain:

On dental, yes.

Chairwoman Leslie:

With Senior Rx or as a separate program?

Assemblywoman McClain:

It was separate. We went through Miles for Smiles, and it has been successful. We had \$100,000—I don't have these numbers exactly. Pretty much, they have helped 50 to 60 seniors, a lot of denture work. They were able to get a lot of lab work donated. The last I heard, it was well over \$100,000 worth of market value of dental care for around \$40,000. It was very successful.

Chairwoman Leslie:

We appreciate your advocacy on these issues.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

This bill—we are on Assembly Bill 127—doesn't have a Section 5. It is some other 5. I haven't figured it out yet.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Thank you for clarifying that. It is Section 2, subsection 5, on page 5.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

There it is. Okay.

Connie McMullen, Member, Accountability Committee for the Strategic Plan for Seniors, Washoe County, Nevada

I just think this is so needed. I had a publication in Las Vegas, and I had a writer that was going to Mexico to get antibiotics because he had a toothache, and he didn't make it because he was lifting his garbage. He was an avid athlete who worked out every day. He had a heart attack that was attributed to the tooth infection in his mouth. A lot of people don't realize how important these issues are, but it could be life and death, and I think a lot of people lose their health because of situations like this. If you don't have teeth, you can't eat. I think a lot of low-income seniors fall into that category. A lot of dentists do not do pro bono work. If they do, they don't want it widely known. I think this kind of coverage would really help a lot of people.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I know that through your publication, you have a lot of contact with seniors. Have you heard from them that they are happy with Senior Rx and/or that they want vision and dental included in that program?

Connie McMullen:

I know that a lot of people who are on Senior Rx love the program. They would like to see it remain. There is concern about the new wrap-around benefits. Those people, you have to understand, still fall into that same category, and prescription drugs come number one. If you don't have prescription drugs, you can't even take care of your teeth. I heard a lot of complaints when I chaired a committee at the City of Reno, the Senior Advisory Committee. This was one of our goals to try to do this. That's when I started talking to Senator Rawson about it. This is one of those problems you can't get your hands around. It is like transportation. Yes, it is going to need funding, but we need to start somewhere. A pilot program would really help.

Assemblywoman McClain:

I would like to mention, when I started the Senior Advocate Program in Clark County, we would have lots of focus groups with seniors. Behind housing and transportation, dental was the biggest issue that they had. They didn't have coverage. Dental costs are so expensive. Vision was high on the list, too. So it is very important, and you have to understand, when you hit this age—which I am getting there fast—it is a matter of nutrition that keeps you healthy. It is a matter of being able to see where you are going, so you don't trip and fall and break a hip or something. It is part of the whole wellness issue that we are going to deal with seniors. As so many of us are vastly approaching seniorhood, it is not going to get any less. I think it is something we really need to do, and I am happy I could bring this forward. Hopefully, the vision pilot will work as good as the dental pilot, and the dental pilot will convince everybody we need to fund it the full way.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I want to applaud you, Assemblywoman McClain. I did some work in the last year for the Nevada Public Health Foundation, and for a few weeks I was interviewing clients at the welfare office about their access to medical care. I was shocked at the end of that period of time, and I think interviewed approximately 100 clients. But, you are absolutely right, dental care. You mentioned dental services, and their eyes just got big. They said, "It is the one thing we can't get." I am living in Carson; it is pretty much going to Douglas County or into the HAWC [Health Access Washoe County] clinic in Reno. They are just frantic. They would love to get in for a cleaning or some kind of preventive work. I just wanted to echo your thoughts on, really, the severity of the situation for many.

Mike Willden, Director, Department of Human Resources, State of Nevada:

[Handed out [Exhibit B](#).] I hate to be the bearer of bad news. Our position is unchanged on this legislation from last session, when we considered Assembly Bill 283 of the 72nd Legislative Session on this. We are certainly supporters of getting dental and vision and other services for our seniors, particularly those on Senior Rx. As we said last session, we don't think we should be adding services when we are struggling to keep pharmacy services paid for to the Senior Rx group.

If I could expound on that a little bit: currently, the Senior Rx program is funded through tobacco dollars. In this last biennium, we had to put General Funds in the Senior Rx program to keep pace with the growing caseload in that program, along with the higher drug costs and more senior utilization. Going into the next biennium, we will have a carry-forward of tobacco dollars of about \$5.1 million; Senior Rx's portion is about \$5.96 million a year. When you take the carry-forward and our annual allocation from the tobacco dollars and you plug that into 9,000 seniors, trying to grow to 12,000 seniors, the higher utilization, and us trying to figure out the MMA [Medicare Modernization Act of 2003] program, we are having to put \$4 million worth of General Funds into the program in the next biennium. Our concern is to add dental and vision, and hardwire it to tobacco dollars. That means we would have to find more General Funds to support the Senior Rx program.

We have done a fiscal note on this. I know this isn't the money committee. I don't know if you want me to dive into that. We tried to skinny down the fiscal note from last time. It is still a big price tag.

Chairwoman Leslie:

The only reason I say not really is because this is the policy committee. I think the decision before this committee is, do we think we should add vision and dental to Senior Rx? Of course, we recognize you are going to make those arguments next door.

Mike Willden:

I would ask for one point of clarification. As I read the bill, it would be mandatory to provide the coverage because everywhere I read in the section, it says provide pharmacy and dental and vision. It appears to us it would not be optional, where we would have the opportunity to wait and see if there was money available after we sort out the impact of MMA, the Medicare Modernization Act. But it appears mandatory, at this point in time, that we would need to provide that service from day one.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Are you suggesting that you would prefer to see if we are going to process some language that makes it optional?

Mike Willden:

That has been our position from day one. We do not want to add benefits at the expense of the pharmacy program for seniors, and we have certainly been willing, as long as the pharmacy program has been kept whole, to look at other options. Last session we had some waiver language that was put in for both seniors and the disabled that we haven't been able to bear fruit with. I know there is legislation coming forward to amend those waiver provisions also. That's our concern.

Assemblyman Mabey:

I'm glad you got up and said what you said. I have been very concerned. As our population continues to age, it seems like more and more people are going to be dependent upon the government to provide for their services. As a state, are we doing anything to try to educate people that, one day, you are not going to work? You are not going to have insurance except for Medicare, which may not cover all these things, so people can save their money? It just seems like, one day, they turn 65, they start living off their retirement, and they just don't have the funds. I don't see people planning ahead for these times. Eventually we just aren't going to have enough money to pay for everybody's needs.

Mike Willden:

Yes, we are doing those types of educational programs. I point to one specific example. We are working with the federal Department of Health and Human Services. Recently, Governor Guinn announced a new campaign—we just started a long-term care planning grant that we received in the state—and that whole effort is trying to educate people to start thinking about long-term care specifically, not just general health care. As we all get older and age and that process takes place, you need to plan for that. Long-term care doesn't mean going into a nursing facility in all cases. It means the whole continuum of long-term care.

We've got ads running now. We have an educational campaign going. People can write and get a CD and a booklet, and it's a planning process to help them. We are looking at other opportunities, where we can educate individuals that Social Security won't be the end-all for you, and health care from the government might not be there for you. So, those educational campaigns are ongoing.

Jim Wadhams, Legislative Advocate, representing the Nevada Dental Association:

We are strongly supportive of Assemblywoman McClain's bill, A.B. 127. While dentists do a great deal of pro bono care, these kinds of programs actually enhance and expand that. So we are very supportive of this effort.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Anyone else who would like to testify on A.B. 127? I don't see anybody, so we'll close the hearing.

We will go to our work session on the first four child welfare bills that we heard that were presented by Assemblywoman Buckley from the Interim Study on Children, Youth and Families. I'm going to proceed through the bills in order, and have our Research staff person, Barbara Dimmitt, explain what the conceptual amendments are, then open it for suggestion and see if we can process these bills today. We will start with Assembly Bill 35.

Assembly Bill 35: Makes various changes concerning provision of public services for children. (BDR 38-667)

Barbara Dimmitt, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

I will be presenting these bills without regard to personal observations of support or opposition. Assembly Bill 35 deals with two issues. One deals with agreements that are authorized between the child welfare services agency and a child between 18 and 22 years of age. If the child is enrolled in an educational institution, that child can enter into an agreement for continued support, maintenance, and services. In addition, the bill also requires child welfare services agencies to develop transition plans to help children transition out of foster care.

The discussion on this bill dealt with three main points, which the amendments address: first of all, clarifying that there would be a definition of "youth," instead of "child," to avoid conflicting and confusion with other definitions of "child"; secondly, imposing some sort of a definition on "enrollment" and what that would constitute; and thirdly, switching from the need of court approval, simply, of these agreements between the child welfare agency and the child, and providing for an alternate method similar to one that's already being used when the child is 18 and still in high school.

Washoe County has submitted some amendments (Exhibit C). I will go through them one at a time. The first one amends subsection 1 of Section 2 of the bill—

that's on line 3; this would be page 2—by replacing the word “child” with the phrase “youth in foster care.” “Youth” will be defined elsewhere, but the intent of this particular change is to clarify that the continuation of services would only apply to a youth who did not terminate foster care, so that they wouldn't be bouncing in and out of that status. The second amendment is subsection 2 of Section 2. That adds a sentence to require that the youth must maintain a C average for each grading period, amending the third amendment, amending Sections 2, 6 and 7—this is where the word “child” is replaced by the word “youth.” And finally, in amendment 4, you get to the definition of the word “youth.” That indicates that the person has to have resided in foster care when he or she turned 18, be less than 22 years of age and also be enrolled. You can see the youth is very specifically defined for the purposes of this one program.

[Barbara Dimmitt, continued.] The fifth amendment is to amend Section 2 by deleting requirements for court approval of the agreements or their termination. The court approval for the transition plans, by the way, and the remainder of the bill is remaining in there. Amendment number 6 amends subsection 4(c) by adding a provision that allows the youth to terminate the agreement if he or she no longer wishes to receive the maintenance and special services. Number 7 adds a new section, subsection 5(b), that defines enrollment and discusses it in terms of full-time student status at a university, college, trade school, or technical school, as that institution defines full-time enrollment.

In addition, Assemblywoman Angle had asked for examples requiring satisfactory performance, and Assemblyman Hardy had expressed concern regarding students with disabilities who might not be able to meet the definition of full-time student status. Teresa Anderson, from the Division of Child and Family Services, offered something that might be helpful ([Exhibit C](#)). These are regulations for a federal education and training vouchers program. Satisfactory progress is pretty much left to the institution under subsection 3. They also require a 2.0 grade point average, but there is an out for those who can't make that and alternative grading systems, sometimes used for those with disabilities. That's one possibility for consideration.

In addition to that, I checked the Millennium Scholarship recipients. The Board of Regents has discussed this issue during the interim, and they have a measure in [Assembly Bill 153](#). This would require the Board of Regents to establish criteria, with respect to students who have a documented mental or physical disability, which would allow the board to have these criteria exempt for those students.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Thank you, Ms. Dimmitt. It looks more complicated than it is. It is easy to get confused. I think you did a good job in leading the Committee through the proposed amendments. We'll open it for discussion from the Committee. Anybody have strong feelings?

Assemblyman Mabey:

The Chair and I had the discussion earlier today on the floor. I support the bill. My only concern is—I hear this from my constituents—that sometimes they feel like they are a working family. They don't qualify for a lot of these benefits, and they see people that do get them. So my thought was, instead of doing it to 22, lower it to 20 or whatever. I certainly feel for these foster children. They need help. I would just try to maybe shorten the age from 22 to 20, but I wouldn't vote no either way. Those are just my feelings.

Chairwoman Leslie:

My response during that discussion was that these are foster kids who don't have families. They don't have the same advantages that, hopefully, most of our children have. So I guess my feeling would be that I would like to leave it at 22.

Assemblyman Horne:

I would agree with those sentiments. Dropping it to 20, you would have a situation where you may have a good foster kid, get them halfway through school, through college, and then pull the rug out from under them. What kind of message does that send? Fewer and fewer students are getting through college in four years only. I think 22 is saying you that have four years to get through school.

Chairwoman Leslie:

That's a good point, too. Other reactions to any of the amendments? Does anybody have any heartburn over the definition of "youth" and changing it from "child" to "youth," just to emphasize we are not really talking about children, we are talking about young adults? I don't see any problem with that. What about the performance and the exemption? Dr. Hardy, you had raised that issue, which I think is a good one—if somebody had a disability, whether they would be able to maintain a full load. Do you want to comment on your feelings on that part?

Assemblyman Hardy:

As I heard the explanation, one of those options would probably cover that. We heard testimony in the interim from somebody who was disabled, who was trying to get through, and who recognized there were circumstances that

wouldn't let them take a full load, but was still striving and making progress. That's where that was coming from.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Do you like the exemption language?

Assemblyman Hardy:

I do.

Chairwoman Leslie:

That's what I kind of like better, too. Thank you. Any other comments on that particular issue? What about the C average? The proposed amendment says the youth must maintain a C average for each grading period. Is the Committee comfortable with that? That seems reasonable, too.

The other one we need to talk about is releasing the court from having to approve these agreements, with the thought being, I think, that the court no longer really has jurisdiction over these youth at age 18. This is a voluntary agreement. Everybody okay with that? All right. I think that does cover everything, unless there is more discussion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN McCLAIN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 35.

ASSEMBLYMAN MABEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

So we will move to the next bill in our work session document ([Exhibit C](#)), which is A.B. 36, and I will turn it back to Ms. Dimmitt.

Assembly Bill 36: Requires Director of Department of Human Resources to include in State Plan for Medicaid requirement that young adults who have "aged out" of foster care are eligible for Medicaid. (BDR 38-668)

Barbara Dimmitt, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

Assembly Bill 36, again, deals with foster care youths who have aged out of the system. In this case, the Department of Human Resources is required to amend the State plan for Medicaid, to continue Medicaid services for these children.

This continuation would begin when the child reaches age 18 and continue until age 21. I did not have any amendments proposed on the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 36.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

Chairwoman Leslie:

That was an easy one. We'll move to A.B. 38 and turn it back to Ms. Dimmitt.

Assembly Bill 38: Authorizes release of information identifying subjects of reports of child abuse or neglect to persons engaged in bona fide research or audit under certain circumstances. (BDR 38-673)

Barbara Dimmitt, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

Assembly Bill 38 authorizes the release of information that the report of child neglect or abuse to person engaged in bona fide research or audit. During the testimony on this bill, a professor from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and Susan Klein-Rothschild, from the Clark County Department of Family Services, discussed barriers to research that they feel the bill did not adequately address. In addition, Sergeant Michelle Youngs of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office expressed concerns regarding the confidentiality of sheriff's office records when they participated in joint investigations. We have some amendments to address each of those issues ([Exhibit C](#)). I will try to put this in context with you a little bit.

Currently, the bill says the information must be necessary for the purposes of research or audit. I'm paraphrasing, but that's essentially what it is doing. This amendment would substitute the language "the information is obtained for research or audit that solely involves the review of written or electronic records, excluding records of other public entities." The stated intent of that was to deal with the sheriff's office problem, or any other law enforcement agency that may have records that could be subsumed under this. These are intended to be records just for the child welfare agency.

Then secondly, amending Section 1 by deleting lines 43 through [45], you would have to read above on your bill a little bit further to get the full impact of

this. The deleted language makes the furnishing of this identifying information contingent upon written consent by any person that is involved in the report. That includes parents or guardians of the child. The amendment would remove that language in order to eliminate what the proponents of the amendment say is a barrier to their research, because they don't have the sources to de-identify the data when it goes back and forth and to get the consent of every single person. Those are the end of the amendments that were proposed.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I had made notes when I was looking at this bill on HIPAA [Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1997] compliance. I had heard testimony that the State was not in a position yet to actually be compliant with this, so I have problems with what we are looking at.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Understood.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I'm not comfortable with the bill as it stands.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I think that's a very valid concern. My concern with this bill is taking out the consent. I understand the agency's position on why they think they need to do that, but that makes me uncomfortable also.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I had that concern when we were hearing this bill as well. I didn't even understand the consent because I think, at one point in time, we were told that individuals were not identified in it; therefore, who would give the consent to release the information? So I was fairly uncomfortable during most of this hearing, and probably would most likely be voting against it.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Other comments? Any Committee member want to make an argument for passing it? Well, I think we'll just pass right over this bill then, and we won't kill it, but we will just leave it alone. If you ever want me to reconsider it, let me know, but I don't see much support for it as it stands now. Let's go on to A.B. 46.

Assembly Bill 46: Makes various changes concerning provision of child welfare services. (BDR S-666)

Barbara Dimmitt, Committee Policy Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau:

This is A.B. 46, which extends the sunset of the Legislative Commission on Children, Youth and Families for another two years. It requires the Division of Child and Family Services, as well as Clark and Washoe Counties, to come up with a plan for funding the child welfare services by August 1, 2006. The amendments that have been proposed were proposed by Ms. Buckley ([Exhibit C](#)). You can see a little bit where she would put these amendments, because she has included the statutes. They are not currently in the existing bill, and they have to be added in. The statutes about the committee's duties would be amended to require that the committee study all youth and family issues. They already have a fairly broad section of children's issues that you can see in subsection 1, under (a), (b), (c) and (d), and this would include the words "and family issues" as well. The second amendment allows the appointment of nonvoting advisory members, as needed, by the committee.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I look at "require study of all youth and family issues" as being as big as the world.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I see what you mean. I think the intent is to allow the study of any child and youth and family issue.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I got the impression, if I may, that we were looking at the report card for children, or the children's advocacy report card, and that that's where the gist of this was going.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I'm not sure that it relates directly to that. I think, having served on this committee, we spent most of our time on child welfare, nearly all of our time on child welfare. I think there is a feeling that we want this committee to be able to also address other issues in youth and families. I think that's the intent. Are you saying you just want to make sure it doesn't sound like we are going to take on every single possible issue?

Assemblyman Hardy:

Are we looking at the bold letters "study of all youth and family issues" ([Exhibit C](#)) as study of all youth issues and their families, or all youth issues and all family issues?

Chairwoman Leslie:

I think it is all youth and all family. That's how I understood it.

Assemblyman Hardy:

That's as big as the world.

Chairwoman Leslie:

Right. I think the intent is to keep it open so, as issues come up in the Legislature that need further study, I think we want this committee to have jurisdiction over any and all issues that might come up.

Assemblyman Horne:

If you changed it to "may"—here you have "requires"—if you said to allow for them as issues come up, they would be permitted to delve into those issues.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I think that addresses my concern and the doctor's. Everybody is okay with that? Other comments?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 46.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PIERCE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairwoman Leslie:

I'm assuming the "may" language is what you want, not "require."

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Assemblywoman Angle was not present
for the vote.)

Chairwoman Leslie:

Is there any other business to come before the Committee? I don't see any, so we are adjourned [at 2:18 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joe Bushek
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Health and Human Services

Date: March 9, 2005 **Time of Meeting:** 1:30 p.m.

Bill #	Exhibit ID	Witness	Dept.	Description
	A			Agenda
AB 127	B	Mike Willden	Department of Human Resources	Written testimony for <u>A.B. 127</u> (2 pages)
AB 35, AB 36, AB 38, & AB 46	C	Barbara Dimmitt	LCB Research	Work Session Document