

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Seventy-Third Session
March 29, 2005**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order at 8:08 a.m., on Tuesday, March 29, 2005. Chairman Morse Arberry Jr. presided in Room 3137 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:

Mr. Morse Arberry Jr., Chairman
Ms. Chris Giunchigliani, Vice Chairwoman
Mr. Mo Denis
Mrs. Heidi S. Gansert
Mr. Lynn Hettrick
Mrs. Ellen Koivisto
Ms. Sheila Leslie
Mr. John Marvel
Ms. Kathy McClain
Mr. Richard Perkins
Mr. Bob Seale
Mrs. Debbie Smith
Ms. Valerie Weber

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Joseph M. Hogan (excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Steve Abba, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Susan Cherpeski, Committee Attaché
Carol Thomsen, Committee Attaché

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani opened the hearing on Assembly Bill 5.

Assembly Bill 5: Provides for development and implementation of pilot program for mentor teachers. (BDR S-478)

Carol Stonefield, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, addressed the Committee and said she had been the primary policy analyst for the Legislative Committee on Education, which was the sponsor of A.B. 5.

Ms. Stonefield explained that A.B. 5 had an interesting history because the Education Committee had not initially intended to study the issue of mentoring teachers. For the last three sessions, the Legislature had considered bills that would have established mentor programs or tiered licensing. Usually those bills had not been passed out of committee due to the large fiscal notes that had been attached. She said the bills had also had a “top-down” structure, and the

Legislative Committee on Education had not had any particular interest in pursuing mentoring bills, although it had heard testimony from a variety of sources on mentor teacher programs.

Ms. Stonefield said that some of the testimony had been from state officials and from the school districts, and the Education Committee had invited Dr. George Ann Rice from the Clark County School District to present alternative teacher certification programs. While describing alternative teacher certification programs, Dr. Rice had described the mentoring program in the Clark County School District.

Ms. Stonefield said that the Education Committee had also invited a staff person from the Education Commission of the States, Jennifer Azordegan, to speak regarding teacher evaluation. In the context of evaluation for improving performance, Ms. Azordegan had mentioned the importance of a mentor teacher program as well. Ms. Azordegan had observed that between 40 and 50 percent of beginning teachers leave the profession within the first 5 years, and a mentoring program assisted in the retention of teachers, which had an impact in cutting recruiting costs and creating stability in schools.

Ms. Stonefield indicated that the Education Committee had also invited Craig Jerald from The Education Trust to talk about strategies for closing the achievement gap, and Mr. Jerald had commented that highly effective teachers made a big difference in closing the achievement gap. He also talked about mentoring as a strategy for creating highly effective teachers and retaining teachers. Based upon that "unsolicited" testimony from those sources, the Legislative Committee on Education had decided to propose the contents of A.B. 5.

Ms. Stonefield explained that A.B. 5 proposed a pilot project. The Education Committee had thought, since there seemed to be interest and yet there seemed to be some reluctance to pursue a program with a large fiscal note, that there should be a pilot project to determine how to implement a program. If the state was going to invest money in a program like that, perhaps some of the questions should be answered first.

Ms. Stonefield outlined the contents of the bill and said that Section 1 would appropriate \$1 million in the second year of the biennium. She noted that there had been no particular commitment to \$1 million, it was chosen by the Education Committee, but it was subject to any changes the Committee and the Legislature wished to make. Section 2 established the pilot program: the Commission on Professional Standards and the Superintendent of Public Instruction were to design a program in the next school year for implementation in the fall of 2006. That plan would be submitted to the Legislative Committee on Education for approval.

Ms. Stonefield said that the pilot program would include the criteria used to select the districts that would participate in the program, require that each school and school district create a committee to oversee the pilot program within that school or district, and determine the responsibilities of the local committee, which would select the mentors and provide for training of the mentors, select the teachers to be mentored, estimate costs, and provide for an evaluation.

Ms. Stonefield said that Section 2, subsection 3, established that the school district that participated would volunteer and must submit evaluations regarding teacher satisfaction and how that might lead to increased teacher retention and

increased pupil achievement. Subsection 4 required that each district report to the Commission on Professional Standards and the Commission would summarize findings and make recommendations to the 2007 Legislature. The report would be essentially a status report because the actual pilot project would only have one semester of implementation, so it would be more or less a progress report.

Ms. Stonefield indicated that the Education Committee had assumed that the 2007 Legislature would most likely provide for an appropriation to evaluate the program, and it could then choose whether or not to continue the pilot project.

Ms. Stonefield concluded her presentation of the bill and said she would be happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Denis asked how many teachers would be mentored in the pilot program. Ms. Stonefield responded that the Superintendent of Public Instruction would be better able to answer that question and commented that there were approximately 2,100 beginning teachers in the current school year. The design of the pilot project would determine how many of those new teachers would be mentored.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani remarked that the mentor program had been debated for several biennia and noted that the school districts had opposed a mentoring bill several years earlier. She said that she had been deemed a mentor before she left the Clark County School District, and she had been a mentor to three teachers; however, all the teachers were on a different track and had different preparation time, so it had been difficult to actually mentor.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani indicated that A.B. 461 was another bill that would come before the Committee that offered a different approach to mentoring and performance-based and skills-based pay. It was a broader approach and would bring the teachers "to the table" along with the school districts and allow for salaries commensurate with the additional efforts. She added that there were other bills addressing similar issues and dialogue would occur. She said the question was no longer whether or not there should be mentoring as it did not require "a rocket scientist to realize that teachers were not paid very well, they were isolated, and were left alone in a classroom," which was an approach that had not worked. She said she was pleased there was discussion regarding those issues.

Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, spoke in support of A.B. 5. Mr. Rheault said that the benefits of mentoring had long been documented, particularly for beginning teachers. Sixteen states currently had funded statewide mentoring programs. In some states, such as Delaware, Iowa, and North Carolina, the programs were actually funded for second- and third-year teachers. He said the requirements as set forth in A.B. 5 were not new. The Commission on Professional Standards, which was the regulatory body that set licensing standards for Nevada, actually had a bill draft in 1999 requesting something very similar to what was in the current bill. For that reason, he was in support of the bill and he added that the Commission had reviewed the bill and the Commission's responsibilities under the bill and had determined that it was feasible.

Mr. Rheault pointed out that the results of the evaluation of the program would only be based on six months of work, and he did not think that would be an accurate reflection of the program. He said it was not surprising that the attrition rate of beginning teachers was extremely high, when the fact that new

teachers were expected to perform the same job that a 20-year veteran did was considered. For that reason, it was important that new teachers be provided assistance, and mentoring was a concept he had long supported.

Mr. Rheault responded to Mr. Denis's earlier question regarding how many teachers would be mentored in the pilot program, and said he thought there were many determining factors. There had been 1,680 new teachers with no experience hired in the past school year, and there had been over 2,000 new teachers with some experience. How many of those would be served by the program would depend on location. He said that it would be more difficult in the elementary schools, as many of the mentor teachers could buy out a period at a high school giving them time to work with the teachers; at the elementary school a teacher could not buy a period. Mr. Rheault indicated that it might be necessary to hire outside full-time retired teachers, which would depend on what program was submitted for approval. He hoped that 400 to 500 teachers could be mentored with the amount of money in the bill.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani asked how many school districts currently had a mentoring program. Mr. Rheault said that Clark County and Carson City did, but the majority of the rural school districts did not have a program.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani noted that time was always a factor, and she commented that perhaps the school year and the school day should be lengthened because schools were being asked to do so much more without being given the additional time to do those tasks, including mentoring. She added that mentoring was only one component, instructional time was also a component that was tied to a longer school year rather than just a longer school day. She asked if the State Board of Education had examined the possibility of lengthening the day and the year.

Mr. Rheault opined that the Board had "almost given up" and had not made any recommendations in the budget for the next biennium, although there had been recommendations made in the past. Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani asked if there would be a way to obtain cost estimates. Mr. Rheault indicated that those could be provided.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani asked how many states had a 180-day school year requirement. Mr. Rheault replied that he would need to review that information, but he believed that a majority of the states had a 180-day requirement.

Craig Kadlub, representing the Clark County School District, spoke in support of A.B. 5 and said that many key points had already been made: the high attrition rate of new teachers and the expectations when a new teacher was thrust into a classroom. Mr. Kadlub opined that, with a mentoring program, the benefit ultimately would be reflected in the performance of students, and research had shown that to be the case. He stated that the Clark County School District fully supported A.B. 5.

Mr. Kadlub added that the training for the mentors was an appropriate and important component of a mentoring program. The mentors would assist new teachers in a variety of ways, from offering encouragement and helping a new teacher understand the workings of the school and the school community to instructing a new teacher how to communicate effectively with parents. According to current research, when new teachers felt supported and were provided assistance during their first year of teaching, the retention rate had been higher. Since the Clark County School District hired several thousand

teachers each year, an attrition rate of 50 percent within the first five years for new teachers created a huge cost in terms of ongoing training and lack of stability in the classroom.

Mr. Kadlub concluded his remarks by saying that “because we want new teachers to not just survive their first year, but to be as effective as they can be and remain in the profession, the District respectfully encourages your support of A.B. 5.”

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani commented that the 50 percent attrition rate referenced by Mr. Kadlub was higher than it had been a few years earlier, and she noted that the school districts had begun administering “exit interviews.” She asked if the Clark County School District was conducting those interviews to gather information as to why teachers were leaving. Mr. Kadlub responded that the District had conducted those, but the surveys were voluntary and leaving teachers did not have to explain why they were leaving. Typically, those who filled out the survey were angry about something, although there were those who said teaching was a wonderful experience, but a job had become available somewhere else. The survey was not a “scientific” survey.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani requested a blank copy of the questions asked in the exit survey. Mr. Kadlub indicated that he would provide a copy. Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani commented that mentoring was one component, but more information was needed, especially with such a high attrition rate. She remarked that “anybody in business would say your up-front money is in your first year of training and time, and if you leave within three to five years, then you’re losing a ton of money just in experience that’s going out the door.”

Mr. Kadlub added that the District had conducted a survey and asked several questions, including what the teachers’ impressions were of the reasons other teachers were leaving the District, and the issue of mentoring had been mentioned several times. He said that, especially with large class sizes and inexperienced teachers, a support system was necessary.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani asked if the school administrators had been trained in mentoring. She recalled how, at a school where she had worked, a teacher hired in the middle of the year was simply handed a roll book and sent into the classroom without any explanation of grading procedures or anything else. She pointed out that such situations set teachers up for failure. She asked if there was a procedure or program in place.

Mr. Kadlub said there was a program, but it relied less on the administrators and more on the new teacher induction program. Regardless of when a teacher began to work for the District, he or she did go through an orientation and receive materials, a manual called “New Beginnings,” and there was some assistance provided by other teachers in the District. Currently, there was a mentoring program at all schools in Clark County, but the programs were voluntary, which automatically imposed some restrictions.

Ananda Campbell, eighth grade teacher of English and history, Carson Middle School, Carson City School District, spoke in support of A.B. 5. Ms. Campbell said a mentoring program was important, and she herself had been mentored eight years earlier when she had begun her teaching career. She said that she had been very confident in her abilities when she had started teaching because she had had a fantastic experience as a student teacher, but she realized immediately that she did not know what she had “gotten herself into.” She said she had felt overwhelmed and isolated, and went from an experience where she

had had a teacher with her in the classroom, who had set up at the beginning of the year and done the preparation work with the students and with management and procedures, to walking into a classroom on her own.

Ms. Campbell said she thought she was ready, but she had been overwhelmed. She indicated that she had gone through the mentoring program in Carson City when it started, and she was grateful for the training that the mentors had received, which was called "cognitive coaching" where the mentors did not give answers, but utilized a question and answer approach so the new teacher could find the answer. She said it was important as a new teacher to have someone to go to that was non-evaluative, so the new teacher knew that it would not "get back" to the administrators that she was having a difficult time. A mentor was someone "safe" that a teacher could talk to and get ideas from, not only for management or instructional information, but also basic information such as how the grade books were done, how attendance was taken, how any reports were turned in, and other information that was not taught in college.

Ms. Campbell stated that it was important for the mentors to be there to help new teachers, and said that she, even as a more experienced teacher, still went to the mentors if she was having difficulties with a student. She would go to a mentor, explain the situation, and ask the mentor to come into the classroom and provide feedback. Ms. Campbell indicated that she was now a mentor for other teachers, and although she did not have all the answers, she knew where to find help. She felt she was finally at a place where she could help new teachers coming into the school, she could see their frustration, she could see that they needed assistance, and she was grateful for the mentoring program. She commented that a mentoring program was needed in the rural districts as well.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani remarked that teaching was a "wonderful profession," but teachers were isolated, particularly in at-risk schools, and there was a difference between student teaching and walking into one's own classroom for the first time.

Terry Hickman, President, Nevada State Education Association, spoke in support of A.B. 5. Mr. Hickman made the following statement:

The Nevada State Education Association has long been a proponent of mentoring. We believe it is vital for new teachers, as well as veteran teachers, to be in a mentoring program that concentrates on the important issues: our students and their welfare.

We support A.B. 5, and we agree that the Commission on Professional Standards, along with the State Superintendent, is the best group to develop the mentoring program. We are concerned about statistics, which bear out the fact that in this year's new hire class of nearly 2,000 teachers, in five years, nearly half of them will be out of the classroom. We look forward to implementation of A.B. 5.

Mr. Hickman added "on a personal note" that he had been a mentor years earlier to Mary Pierczynski, who had since become the Superintendent of the Carson City School District, and he felt that mentoring was very important.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani added that the Committee would be hearing another bill at a later time which would present a different approach focusing on bringing the districts and the teachers together to formulate a plan.

Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani asked if there was anyone else present who wished to testify on A.B. 5. There being no one, she closed the hearing on A.B. 5. Vice Chairwoman Giunchigliani relinquished the chair to Chairman Arberry.

Chairman Arberry opened the hearing on A.B. 172.

Assembly Bill 172: Makes appropriation to Women's Research Institute of Nevada at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (BDR S-349)

Assemblywoman Kathy McClain, Clark County District 15, explained that A.B. 172 would provide funding for a "wonderful" program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). The bill contained an appropriation of \$150,000 for each year of the biennium, which was the absolute minimum needed to fund the program. She added that she had been trying to get funding for the program for six years.

Assemblyman Marvel asked how the program was currently funded. Ms. McClain replied that it was funded primarily through donations. She opined that the program should be statewide in the university system. Mr. Marvel asked how much had been donated. Ms. McClain said she was unsure, but there were others present who might have more information.

Ms. Giunchigliani inquired as to how long the program had been in existence and if it was only at UNLV. Ms. McClain said the program had existed since May of 1999 at UNLV. Ms. Giunchigliani asked if UNLV had ever funded the Women's Research Institute and commented that if Basque studies could be funded then women's studies should be funded also.

Ms. McClain indicated that other speakers would address those issues. She pointed out that the Committee had received a folder ([Exhibit B](#)) with information regarding the National Education for Women's (NEW) Leadership Nevada program, and a pamphlet ([Exhibit C](#)) summarizing the program.

Trudy Larson, Assistant Chancellor, University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN), spoke "enthusiastically" in favor of A.B. 172. Dr. Larson thanked Assemblywoman McClain for "the leadership and dedication she had demonstrated through her ongoing support of the program and for her tireless efforts over the past two sessions to try to secure funding for the Women's Research Institute of Nevada."

Dr. Larson said that, on behalf of the UCCSN, Chancellor Jim Rogers, and UNLV, she wanted to voice support of A.B. 172 and thank the Committee for their time and consideration. She explained that the Women's Research Institute of Nevada (WRIN) was initiated in 1999 with a mission to "foster the social and economic development of Nevadans, recognize diversity, and build leadership skills through the collection, preservation, and analysis of information on women in the state." The goals for WRIN to accomplish included: stimulation of new research, communication of research findings, and coordination of existing research.

Dr. Larson stated that there was a statewide impact of the program. An example of WRIN's statewide outreach programs was the National Education of

Women's (NEW) Leadership Nevada program. The NEW Leadership Nevada's mission was to educate and empower the next generation of women leaders throughout Nevada.

Dr. Larson indicated there were two women present to provide the Committee with additional information regarding the program.

Caryll Batt Dziedziak, Assistant Director, Women's Research Institute of Nevada, UNLV, addressed the Committee and said:

I am here today to testify in support of A.B. 172. I'd like to begin with a succinct overview of our institute. The Women's Research Institute of Nevada received its official approval by the Board of Regents as a statewide research facility in May of 1999.

Since then, we have collaborated with numerous partners across the state. I will give you just a few examples of our work.

We produced the "Looking Back at Las Vegas Women" video series, chronicling the lives of women who have shaped our communities. This series is run regularly on Clark County public television and is available statewide.

The Las Vegas women's oral history project, begun in 1995, continues to chronicle the lives of women in our state. To date we have published over 30 oral histories of women who have impacted our state through politics, gaming, entertainment, education, or civic activism. Additionally, we are processing dozens of oral histories that are in various stages of completion.

We also collaborated with the Nevada Institute for Children to produce Nevada: People and Stories from Nevada's History, a textbook for fourth grade students. This textbook has been used for the past year by pilot schools across our state, receiving outstanding reviews by teachers.

In 2001, we partnered with the Women's Bureau, Region 9, serving as their liaison in the southwestern states to coordinate a team of high-tech experts. This team studied women's underrepresentation and the expanding career opportunities of the high-tech industry. The Women's Bureau utilized the findings of the study in their women and technology national report.

We worked closely with you in our Center for Applied Research, the Women's Fund, and the Institute for Women's Policy Research in Washington, D.C., to produce the status of women in Nevada report in November of 2002. The findings from this report provide our legislators with key information needed to address critical issues facing women and their families. I hope that each of you has received a copy of this report, if not, I would be happy to provide you with one.

One of our most visible educational programs, NEW Leadership Nevada, is now entering its third year. Graduates of this program have referred to it as "life-altering." We don't believe that is an exaggeration. Our program manager, Julianna Ormsby, will be

testifying after me, so I will defer to her testimony for the details of this program.

Lastly, we are in the process of becoming a member center in the National Council for Research on Women. This national organization is comprised of over 70 Women's Research Institute member centers across the nation and internationally. Our membership will place Nevada on the national map, providing access to a wealth of resources for collaborative research on women and gender issues.

Our institute has operated without a budget for the past six years. While UNLV has provided cost-share assistance for space, utilities, course reassignment, and graduate assistantships, we have been faced with the onerous task of raising the funding for all of our projects, programs, and remaining personnel. We have accomplished this through grant writing and soliciting both corporate and personal donations. This has indeed proved challenging as the annual budget for our NEW Leadership Nevada program alone is \$75,000. We have no full-time staff or development office, but instead rely on individuals willing to work creatively toward furthering our institutional goals.

We fully understand the process of proving institutional credibility to the state; we believe we have done so, and now ask for your assistance in securing legislative funding to ensure the long-term viability of our research and educational programs.

Julianna Ormsby, Program Manager, NEW Leadership Nevada, WRIN, UNLV, addressed the Committee. Ms. Ormsby stated:

The NEW Leadership Nevada program was created in 1991 by the Center for American Women in Politics at Rutgers University in response to studies that showed that women were less likely to become civically engaged than men, particularly in the areas of voting and running for elected office.

Since 1991, the Center for American Women in Politics has expanded NEW Leadership to 12 sites nationwide. Potential sites must undergo a rigorous approval process and be able to demonstrate that they had the infrastructure and backing to support the program.

In 2003, the Women's Research Institute of Nevada was honored to be chosen by the Center for American Women in Politics, and we remain the only site in the southwestern United States to offer this program. After two very successful years, we are working on what promises to be yet another outstanding program.

So what does NEW Leadership Nevada do for Nevada? NEW Leadership Nevada is the premiere leadership program for college students in Nevada. NEW Leadership Nevada puts students on the fast track to becoming the next generation of leaders in our state by connecting them with successful Nevada leaders and providing them with the tools they need to develop practical leadership skills.

The program begins with a six-day summer residential institute on the UNLV campus. Students meet with practicing leaders from around Nevada who share their stories, offer valuable insight into the leadership process and the issues facing Nevada today, and act as mentors to our students. Participants come to us from all schools in the UCCSN and represent a diverse cross-section of students.

The six-day institute is only the beginning. NEW Leadership is unique in that we continue to provide students with developmental opportunities long after the program ends. An example of this is "Grassroots Lobby Days." We brought a number of our graduates here earlier this month to meet with their legislators so that they could observe the political process firsthand and learn how they could participate in the process. Many of our students left feeling like they knew more about critical issues facing Nevada and were eager to share their heightened awareness with family members, friends, and coworkers.

Graduates of our program are already having a profound impact on their communities. Three of our graduates are interning in Governor Guinn's office, one of our graduates is currently in Senator Reid's Washington, D.C., office, and another graduate is working for a lobbying group this session. Still others are attending law school, medical school, and working on community projects in areas such as domestic violence awareness and prevention, teen pregnancy prevention, and voter education and registration.

We are privileged to have the support of some of Nevada's most recognized leaders, and we have an impressive list of community partners. If you invest in NEW Leadership Nevada, you are investing in Nevada's future leaders. Our students come from your communities, and they take what they learn at NEW Leadership back to your communities where they put their skills to work in your local businesses, government, and community organizations. Students come to NEW Leadership with a vision for their communities, and they leave with the tools they need to make the vision a reality.

Ms. Giunchigliani verified that the program was funded through gifts and grants, and asked if staffing was paid through the statewide program. Ms. Dziedziak explained that the staff was composed of four individuals, none of which were full time. She said the director, Dr. Joanne Goodwin, received course reassignment so she could teach one fewer course and spend time at the institute. Ms. Dziedziak said there were two graduate assistantships, one at the Ph.D. level, which paid Ms. Dziedziak's salary, and one at the M.A. level, which paid for another graduate student.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked what percentage of the gifts and grants received was "taken off the top" for administration. Ms. Dziedziak said the amount varied and was negotiated every time a grant was received.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked who was involved in the negotiations, and Ms. Dziedziak said the WRIN had negotiated with the UNLV Research Foundation, the UNLV Foundation, and UNLV Grants and Contracts.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked how much they delivered for the benefit of that grant. Ms. Dziedziak said they did receive a “cut” for administrative oversight, which was understandable. She added that she tracked the finances of the institute and said she “could do without the oversight, but that was not the way the system worked.”

Dr. Larson added that each of the institutions had their own percentage that they received and it varied depending on whether it was a federal grant, which was a federally-negotiated amount for indirect cost recovery, or whether it was a contract or grant that was locally funded. Some of the grants received had a cap, so if the cap was 10 percent that was all that administration received. Those funds frequently went to the Grants and Contracts Office, which helped with compliance issues and did the paperwork, but the funds also went back into the system to support other kinds of research. She reiterated that the amount was quite variable depending on the source of the money.

Ms. Giunchigliani requested additional information and opined that the administrative fees could be “ridiculous,” particularly if there were redundancies in the paper tracking and the filing. She noted that the program, while it should be considered statewide, had not “made the list,” and she asked if it had made the funding list.

Dr. Larson indicated that the program was on the enhancement list approved by the Board of Regents. Ms. Giunchigliani pointed out that there were many things on that list, and commented that UNLV tended to get less in project money for statewide projects than UNR received. She requested that staff gather information regarding what was being funded project-wise so that it could be balanced to ensure that worthwhile projects were being funded statewide.

Dr. Larson said that there was a very detailed listing of the statewide programs, where they were located, what part was state-funded, what they received in additional funds. She said that every single statewide program brought in a substantial amount of its own funds, and used that base support for personnel who could then pursue grants. Ms. Giunchigliani asked that that information be provided along with the ranges for the administrative percentage.

Bobbie Gang, representing Nevada Women’s Lobby, addressed the Committee and said the Nevada Women’s Lobby (NWL) supported A.B. 172 and asked the Committee to fund the appropriation for the Women’s Research Institute of Nevada. Ms. Gang said the NWL had worked for many years with the WRIN and relied on the institute’s research and resources for the work the NWL did to educate its members and the public on women’s issues. The NWL had worked with the WRIN on the NEW Leadership project from the beginning and was proud of its success because it was an important project, especially since it was a statewide project and involved students from all over the state, including the rural communities. Ms. Gang said the NWL was also very proud that the NEW Leadership had been selected to work on a project with the national organization to develop information about the status of women in Nevada.

Heather McCutcheon, alumnus of NEW Leadership Nevada 2000, spoke in support of A.B. 172. Ms. McCutcheon said she was a current student at Truckee Meadows Community College and a long-time Nevadan—her great-great-grandparents settled Churchill County, and she had grown up “talking politics” with her grandfather around the dinner table, but her family had not believed that college was very important. She said, “I am a smart woman, there was much that I could do, and I did, and I have. I have a very

successful career in software development, it's what I've done for many years; however, I've had a great love for this community."

Ms. McCutcheon said that "politics and public service is where I want to be," but she had been unsure as to how to proceed. Two years earlier, she had chosen to leave her career and go back to school. In a political science class, she had written a paper about the way politics was viewed in America, and her political science professor, Dr. Paul Davis, pulled her aside, told her about the NEW Leadership program, and encouraged her to apply, which she had done.

Ms. McCutcheon asserted that the program was "life-changing." She stated:

It's difficult when you have passion and you don't know what to do with it, and you don't have support around you. What NEW Leadership does is brings women who have that desire at a young age, gives them a foundation and some support and encouragement and gives them direction. As a professional, I've been in leadership programs for a long time, but this program is different in that it follows you, it tracks you, and keeps you focused.

Ms. McCutcheon indicated that her involvement in NEW Leadership had led her to attend "Grassroots Lobby Days," a Republican Women's luncheon, and to work on the campaign. She said she had recently received an email about the Nevada Federation of Republican Women, which was starting a chapter in northern Nevada and was looking for young Republican women to run for office. Ms. McCutcheon noted that the information had been made available to her through the NEW Leadership program.

Ms. McCutcheon opined that "somebody who paid for my plane ticket and hosted me for six days and allowed me the opportunity to meet Sue Wagner is incredible. And any program that does that in this state is worth money."

Ms. McCutcheon added that during Grassroots Lobby Days, she had used her own car to transport people to and from the airport, and she had found her own housing because she was very conscientious about the funding situation. She said she, and others in the program, understood the importance of the program and were willing to contribute their own time and their own means to assist.

George Ross, McMullen Strategic Group, representing himself and Sam McMullen, spoke in support of A.B. 172, and said he, and Mr. McMullen, had been very impressed by the NEW Leadership program and had convinced several of their clients to contribute to the funding of the program. Mr. Ross said that the program was geographically and ethnically diverse, and even more impressive were the young women in the program. They were not the students who had been student body presidents; the young women in the program were those who had great potential and ideas and wanted to be involved, but did not know how. The young women might not even realize they had that potential, but someone recognized it and encouraged them to apply, and once in the program they were exposed to a number of women in the state of Nevada who had been successful in all walks of life, in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors, so the young women realized that they could succeed as well. They realized that "they [could] be the kind of women they wanted to be and still have this kind of life." Mr. Ross added that the young women also learned about the tools necessary to becoming involved: organizational tools, how to put together a program, how to put together an organization, how to build a movement in a neighborhood, et cetera.

Mr. Ross concluded by stating that he did not know whether the NEW Leadership program was more valuable than other items on the list of programs to fund, but he opined that, on its own, the program was very important. He added that his clients had felt the same way and had shown their support through contributions.

Mr. Marvel asked whether the proposed funding was a one-shot appropriation or would become part of a base budget and, if so, which budget it would be included in. Ms. McClain said she hoped it would become part of the base budget in a UCCSN budget.

Gwenavere Dally, a student at Western Nevada Community College, addressed the Committee and said that she had attended the NEW Leadership Nevada program in June 2004. Ms. Dally said she was present to testify on behalf of the WRIN because, while it sounded "cliché," the program had changed her life and changed the way she viewed politics and the way she viewed herself as a leader. The program had given her the tools she needed to do the things that she had always wanted to do. Ms. Dally made the following statement:

I grew up in a household without stability; I attended 18 schools, lived in three times as many homes with abuse and drug use, and I have not had the opportunities that many other women had. To be able to be invited to a program like this at no cost of my own was a profound experience. It's unbelievable because I would not have been able to do it on my own. This program not only did the things it said it was going to do, like taught me about women's history, leadership, diversity, politics, but it did so much more.

The opportunity to attend this sort of program had a serious impact on my life. Through the experiences in my life I became very shy and withdrawn, and this is something that I struggled with for many years. I never liked being shy, but I didn't know how to overcome that. While attending college, I slowly started to come out of that shell; however, the majority of my growth has been in the year since I attended NEW Leadership.

A year ago, I would not have been able to speak in front of you right now. I had the opportunity to learn with such women as UNLV President Carol Harter, Nevada Senator Dina Titus, Nevada Supreme Court Justice Miriam Shearing. All these women had a serious impact on my life. Not only did they share with me their experiences in their lives, they shared their mistakes, they showed me that it's okay to make mistakes, and they gave me the courage that was needed for me to follow my dreams and the strength to learn from my mistakes and to know that I can go on and if I make a mistake it's okay. I can learn from that and be better for it.

While I was at NEW Leadership Nevada, I was given the challenge to think of what I would do if I knew I could not fail. I took on that challenge, and now I have turned my hopes and dreams into goals and visions that I am actively pursuing. That's unbelievable for me. Since June of 2004 when I attended this program, I have had many opportunities to expand on my new leadership skills.

I spoke to students and instructors at my college campus about the program. I spoke at College Council in front of WNCC President

Carol Lucy and other department heads about this program. Dr. Lucy followed that up with a donation of \$3,000 to the program.

At Grassroots Lobby Days, I had the opportunity to sit on the Assembly Floor with Kathy McClain and Sheila Leslie and this experience opened my eyes to the way government works and changed me because I never appreciated government before.

While I was here at Grassroots Lobby Days, as I realized that the WRIN had a bill going before the Legislature and what that meant for the future of the program that had impacted my life, I took it upon myself to go to each of your offices to express to you what this program meant to me and what it means to the future of Nevada's women. That's also something I could not have done a year ago. I am here to ask you to assist in the growth of the organization that has assisted in my growth.

Ms. Giunchigliani complimented Ms. Dally on her testimony and said she was thrilled to hear that the NEW Leadership program, which involved girls from all across the state, had helped Ms. Dally. She said the program showed women that being involved did not necessarily mean they had to be politicians, they could be good "soccer moms," or they could be active in their churches and communities. She noted that gender bias in the curricula was still an issue in teaching, and often the potential of young women was not tapped. She said that NEW Leadership was "one more piece of that puzzle."

Assemblywoman Gansert acknowledged that Heather McCutcheon had assisted with her campaign. Mrs. Gansert expressed appreciation for the NEW Leadership program because it was creating future leaders.

Ms. McClain emphasized that the program was strictly nonpartisan and taught women more than politics: the women who attended heard from women lobbyists and business leaders and elected officials, such as Karen Kelly, Thalia Dondero, Barbara Vucanovich, Sue Wagner, Frankie Sue Del Papa, and so forth. Ms. McClain said she could not even mention all the great women that had helped with the program and the Women's Research Institute, but Mrs. Koivisto, Ms. Weber, Ms. Giunchigliani, and Mrs. Smith had all been involved. She encouraged the Committee to support A.B. 172.

Assemblyman Perkins thanked Ms. McClain for bringing the legislation forward. Mr. Perkins remarked that with four daughters, he had seen some of the challenges that young women faced. He saw a great deal of potential, and he knew a program like NEW Leadership would be very beneficial. He said that leadership happened on many different levels, and one did not need to be a politician or a business leader to contribute to the community.

Mr. Perkins complimented the young women who had testified because it was an intimidating situation, but they had benefited a great deal from the program, and they were good examples for other young women in the state.

Lana Buehrer, President, Community Action Board, Women's Research Institute of Nevada, was not present for the meeting but requested that her letter be included in the record ([Exhibit D](#)).

Chairman Arberry indicated that he had received a note from Senator Dina Titus that she requested be read into the record ([Exhibit E](#)):

I would like to inform you that I strongly support the Nevada Women's Research Institute at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. My intern, Annette Magnus, is a student at UNLV, and she also supports this institute. WRIN helps to find ways that we can improve the lives of women in our state through research and education. It sponsors young women leadership conferences, academic research by and on women in Nevada and the west, oral histories of women in Nevada, and lecture series by noted scholars on relevant topics. This institute is not just an asset for UNLV, it is a benefit for all Nevadans. Thank you.

As there were no further comments, Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 172 and opened the hearing on A.B. 28.

Assembly Bill 28 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes regarding administration of Rehabilitation Division of Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. (BDR 18-386)

Terry Johnson, Deputy Director, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR), introduced Martin Ramirez, Chief Financial Officer, DETR, and Michael Coleman, Administrator, Rehabilitation Division, DETR. Mr. Johnson spoke in support of A.B. 28, which had originally been introduced to align the authority within the Rehabilitation Division with the Division Administrator as opposed to the Bureau Chiefs. Throughout the bill, the Administrator is replaced with the Bureau Chiefs, making that person ultimately responsible for the operations of the agency.

Mr. Johnson indicated that he had provided an organizational chart ([Exhibit F](#)) to the Committee. The chart illustrated the alignment that would be taking place: how the agency was currently organized and how it would be organized with the passage of A.B. 28.

Mr. Johnson stated for the record that the budget presented on behalf of the Department and the Division was consistent with, and supported, the legislation. The bill would not have any additional fiscal impact with regard to the budget as presented, and would reorganize the division, clarify its status, and give the Administrator the ability to adopt regulations and exercise other authorities consistent with division heads.

Ms. Giunchigliani commented that changing the term "Chief" to "Administrator" was fairly common and the state was working to make the terminology consistent. She wondered whether there would still be a Chief for the Bureau of Disability Adjudication.

Mr. Johnson explained that there would still be a Chief of the Bureau of Disability Adjudication and that person would be answerable in the realignment to one of the Deputy Administrators. That position, unlike the other positions that were being proposed to change to Deputy Administrators, did not have the same levels of authority and responsibility as the Deputy Administrators would have.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked how many people the Bureau Chief oversaw, and Mr. Johnson replied that the Chief of the Bureau of Disability Adjudication oversaw a staff of 85. Ms. Giunchigliani asked if the Deputy Administrators oversaw larger staffs. Mr. Johnson explained that the proposed Deputy Administrators were currently Bureau Chiefs, and they did have wider

responsibilities and statewide responsibilities. As Deputy Administrators, it would accord the Division Administrator the flexibility and latitude to task them with responsibilities consistent with the Administrator's vision for the operation of the agency.

Ms. Giunchigliani inquired whether there would be salary changes commensurate with the proposed change. Mr. Johnson indicated that there would be salary changes, and those changes had been included as part of the original budget submission.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked how many positions were made unclassified. Mr. Johnson noted that, in the budget, the positions would be unclassified, but statutorily, they were currently unclassified.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked if that included the Bureau Chiefs. Mr. Johnson explained that the Chief of the Bureau of Disability Adjudication was in the classified service and would remain so. The two positions that were Bureau Chiefs and would become Deputy Administrators were unclassified in the statutes. He said that the budget submitted by DETR contemplated those positions being unclassified for the purposes of the budget as well.

Ms. Giunchigliani remarked that the Legislature might change that during budget closings in order to maintain consistency. She editorialized that the reason the unclassified positions had been made classified was to achieve parity, but that had not happened, and she was of the attitude that, as someone on the Senate side had indicated, it should be "all or nothing" for the positions, there should not be any changes at all.

Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 28 and called for a brief recess.

Assembly Bill 98: Makes appropriation to Motor Pool Division of Department of Administration for additional vehicles. (BDR S-1209)

Keith Wells, Administrator, State Motor Pool, Department of Administration, presented A.B. 98 and said the bill would provide \$1,100,603 in funding to purchase additional vehicles for agencies requesting additional vehicles. It would provide 49 vehicles in the first year of the biennium and 5 vehicles in the second year. The primary recipient of the vehicles would be the Department of Public Safety's Parole and Probation Division, and the secondary recipient would be the Department of Human Resources' Early Intervention Services, and the remainder would be provided to a few other agencies.

Chairman Arberry questioned what types of vehicles would be purchased, and Mr. Wells indicated that the agencies determined which vehicles he purchased. Chairman Arberry advised that the agencies purchase vehicles in a variety of sizes, rather than purchasing only small vehicles. Mr. Wells assured him that the Motor Pool Division had increased its fleet of larger vehicles.

Chairman Arberry noted that the request was included in The Executive Budget.

Chairman Arberry asked if there was any further testimony on A.B. 98. There being none, Chairman Arberry declared the hearing on A.B. 98 closed and opened the hearing on A.B. 36.

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)

Coleen Lawrence, Chief of Program Services, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DHCFP), Department of Human Resources (DHR), introduced Patrick Cates, Administrative Services Officer IV, DHCFP, DHR, and indicated that Mr. Cates would present the fiscal impact of A.B. 36.

Mr. Cates explained that A.B. 36 was not in the budget, and the bill sought to expand Medicaid coverage to children that had “aged out” of Medicare in the 18 to 21 age bracket. The Division had estimated a fiscal note for the bill of \$1.4 million in General Fund appropriations for the upcoming biennium, and approximately \$1.8 million in General Fund appropriations for future biennia. He said it was estimated that approximately 167 individuals would receive coverage under the bill, given the assumption that 50 percent of those eligible would not opt for the Medicaid coverage for various reasons: they would be covered by other entitlement programs or they would be employed and not meet the income requirements.

Mr. Cates indicated that the fiscal note had been completed in conjunction with the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) and the Welfare Division. Part of the fiscal impact included modification to the Nevada Operations Multi-Automated Data Systems (NOMADS), one-half of 1 FTE for the Welfare Division to manage that additional caseload, and there were also some costs for the Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth (UNITY) system at DCFS to track the new eligibility category.

Mr. Cates pointed out that the bill had an effective date of July 1, 2005, but given the time requirements to establish State plan amendments for the Medicaid program, it was estimated that the coverage group would not begin until January, which allowed for time to put the State plan amendment in place and to make the modifications to the NOMAD system in order to implement the changes.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked if there had been a request to include the funding in The Executive Budget. Mr. Cates said he was not aware of any request to include it in the budget.

Ms. Giunchigliani remarked that she had served on an interim committee which had sent a letter requesting that it be included in the budget. She asked Mr. Cates to find out if there had been a request made to the Governor’s Office and if the Governor’s Office had chosen not to recommend the appropriation. Mr. Cates said that he would look into that and provide that information to the Committee.

Ms. Lawrence interjected that as a point of clarification the Committee should note that A.B. 35 and A.B. 36 were requesting similar recommendations for aging out of foster care, but there were two different age limitations. A.B. 36 would cover individuals to the age of 21.

Ms. Giunchigliani noted that A.B. 147 had “aging out” requirements as well, and the age limitation was 23 years of age. She commented that there should be a consistent standard for “aging out” issues. Ms. Lawrence agreed that the language should be consistent.

Michael Capello, Director, Washoe County Department of Social Services, spoke in support of A.B. 36. Mr. Capello said the issues in the bill had been raised several legislative sessions earlier as the Legislative Committee on Children, Youth, and Families examined issues youth faced as they left the foster care system. In particular, many of those youth needed medical services, including mental health services, but as they turned 18 and "aged out," they lost access to those services. In some cases, there were youth who needed medication, such as psychotropic medication or general medication to maintain health, who turned 18 and were no longer in the custody of the agency that provided child welfare services, and they were no longer eligible. Mr. Capello stated that over the past few years, the need for extending the benefit was apparent, and he asked for the Committee's support in consideration of A.B. 36.

Assemblyman Marvel asked how many young people in Washoe County would qualify under the bill. Mr. Capello said there were approximately 50 to 60 youth "aging out" each year, and approximately half of those youth might participate. He remarked that the fiscal note had been difficult to complete, as it was difficult to know how many would participate and to what extent the average former foster youth would access ongoing medical care. Clearly, there were children who had medical conditions or mental health conditions, and it could be assumed that they would use the services. There were also youth that would choose not to take advantage because they did not have a pressing health need.

Mr. Capello added that he empathized with the divisions that had generated the fiscal note because it was very difficult to determine what the costs would be because so much was unknown.

Chairman Arberry stated for the record that Assemblywoman Barbara Buckley wished to express her support for A.B. 36. Ms. Buckley had been detained in another committee meeting and was not able to be present.

Chairman Arberry closed the hearing on A.B. 36 and indicated that the Committee would proceed to other business.

Assembly Bill 456: Revises provisions governing planning, design and construction of facility for vocational training for culinary skills in southern Nevada and transfer of responsibility for operation of performing arts center in certain larger counties. (BDR 20-1063)

Chairman Arberry noted that the Committee needed to take action on A.B. 456. Mark Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, explained that as the Committee had not heard the bill, the Committee could choose to pass A.B. 456 without recommendation, and then the bill could be re-referred on the Assembly Floor to another committee.

Ms. Giunchigliani explained that A.B. 456 was a request for "clean up" language in a bill that had been passed the previous session. She said that A.B. 456 clarified the language that the money for the Culinary Institute, which had already been given to the Institute by Clark County, could be repaid. The old language had stated the money was only for design and not construction, but with the language change, the Institute could pay the county back. The second component in the bill was related to the fact that the county and the cities had both adopted the regulation for the car rental tax, and the final component was a \$50 million contribution from the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation to the performing arts center. The bill clarified who would own the facility, the county did not wish to own it, and it would be owned and housed

on property in the city. The language in the bill outlined the bonding capacity and the ownership issue.

Ms. Giunchigliani pointed out that the issues in the bill were under the purview of the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs rather than the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. She emphasized that there was no fiscal impact, and the bill had been incorrectly referred to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

Chairman Arberry indicated that he would hear a motion from the Committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN MARVEL MOVED TO PASS A.B. 456 OUT OF COMMITTEE WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEALE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Mr. Hettrick and Mr. Hogan were not present for the vote.)

Chairman Arberry asked the Committee to consider the introduction of the following bill draft requests:

- BDR S-1037 - Extends date for reversion of appropriation made by 2003 Legislature for state radio systems. (A.B. 533)

ASSEMBLYMAN MARVEL MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR S-1037.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Mr. Hettrick and Mr. Hogan were not present for the vote.)

- BDR S-162 - Expands authority of Board of Regents of University of Nevada to issue revenue bonds. (A.B. 534)

ASSEMBLYMAN MARVEL MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR S-162.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEALE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Mr. Hettrick and Mr. Hogan were not present for the vote.)

- BDR S-1039 - Extends date for reversion of portion of appropriation made by 2003 Legislature for digital microwave project. (A.B. 532)

ASSEMBLYMAN SEALE MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR S-1039.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (Mr. Hettrick and Mr. Hogan were not present for the vote.)

* * * * *

In response to an earlier request from Chairman Arberry, Mr. Stevens provided a list detailing budget amendments ([Exhibit G](#)). He pointed out that the Committee would begin closing budgets, and the list would allow the Committee to be "up to date" on all the amendments before the budget closing process began.

Andrew Clinger, Deputy Director, Budget Division, addressed the Committee and explained that the items listed on [Exhibit G](#) had been discussed previously with the exception of the final item on the list. The final item, number 51, related to the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, and it was an adjustment to that budget account based on federal funding.

Mr. Clinger added that there were approximately 10 adjustments that had not yet been placed on the list; the Budget Division would be submitting those later in the day.

Ms. Giunchigliani remarked that with the 10 additional adjustments, there would be 61 change orders. She asked if item 1 was correct as there had been 3 revisions of the utility costs. Mr. Clinger said that item 10 was the correction to item 1.

Ms. Giunchigliani asked about the \$34 million in each year of the biennium on the Distributive School Account (DSA). Mr. Clinger said that issue had not yet been resolved, and he was working with the Department of Education and with LCB Fiscal staff. Ms. Giunchigliani suggested that the process be expedited because there would be a hearing on that account shortly and it would be helpful to know if there would be a \$68 million "hit" on the budget.

Mr. Clinger provided a general outline of the 10 change orders that would be added to the list:

- An adjustment for the Public Employees Retirement System for the DSA
- An adjustment to deferred maintenance with reductions based on the review of those items subsequent to submission of The Executive Budget
- An adjustment to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) waiver
- An alignment between the indigent account and human resource budgets
- An adjustment to fund Phase II of the sewage treatment facility at Southern Nevada Correctional Center, which had not been included in the Capital Improvements Program and needed to be completed in order to open that facility in August 2006
- A caseload adjustment update for the Division of Parole and Probation
- An adjustment for the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) Grant program at the Nevada Department of Corrections, which was

related to the Willing Inmates in Nevada Gaining Sobriety (WINGS) program

- An adjustment for the Public Defenders Office, which had been heard in Committee the previous week
- An adjustment for the statewide cost allocation plan
- An adjustment for the Attorney General's cost allocation plan.

Mr. Clinger indicated that those adjustments would be finalized and sent to the LCB Fiscal staff.

Chairman Arberry clarified that those adjustments were the 10 change orders. Mr. Clinger indicated that was correct and said those were the change orders that he had and would be providing by the end of the day.

Assemblywoman Leslie asked if those 10 items included the uncapping of the Nevada Check Up program. Mr. Clinger said that was on the list.

Mr. Stevens indicated that both the Senate Finance chairman and Chairman Arberry had requested that staff outline budget amendments as the Committee closed each of the budgets that would be impacted. He indicated that the LCB Fiscal staff would provide that information in the closing documents given to the Committee.

Mr. Stevens noted that the Committee and the subcommittees would begin the budget closing process the next week, and he indicated that the LCB Fiscal staff would provide an update, from the Fiscal Analysis Division's viewpoint, of the state's situation revenue-wise. He emphasized that the Fiscal Analysis Division was not responsible for developing revenue projections; the Economic Forum was responsible for the state's official revenue forecast. However, the Fiscal Analysis Division would provide an analysis of the situation.

Chairman Arberry adjourned the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Susan Cherpeski
Committee Attaché

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Morse Arberry Jr., Chairman

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Committee Name: <u>Committee on Ways and Means</u>			
Date: <u>March 29, 2005</u>		Time of Meeting: <u>8:00 a.m.</u>	
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
AB 172	B	Assemblywoman McClain	NEW Leadership folder
AB 172	C	Assemblywoman McClain	NEW Leadership pamphlet
AB 172	D	Lana Buehrer/WRIN	Email (1 page)
AB 172	E	Senator Dina Titus	Testimony (1 page)
AB 28	F	Terry Johnson/DETR	Organization Chart (1 page)
	G	Andrew Clinger/Budget Division	Change Orders (2 pages)