

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

**Seventy-Sixth Session
April 13, 2011**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair April Mastroluca at 1:15 p.m. on Wednesday, April 13, 2011, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman April Mastroluca, Chair
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Steven Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman Scott Hammond
Assemblyman Pete Livermore
Assemblyman Mark Sherwood
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel

Mitzi Nelson, Committee Secretary

Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mark B. Jackson, District Attorney, Douglas County

Michael D. Hillerby, representing Nevada State Board of Pharmacy

Michelle R. Jotz, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro; and representing Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

Kevin Schiller, Director, Department of Social Services, Washoe County

Amber Howell, Deputy Administrator, Bureau of Services for Child Care, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Alex Ortiz, representing Clark County

Chair Mastroluca:

[Roll was called.] We are going to hear Assembly Bill 349 and then have a work session. There will be a short recess between the bill and the work session. I will now turn the Chair over to Assemblywoman Pierce.

[Assemblywoman Pierce assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Pierce:

Assemblywoman Mastroluca will present A.B. 349.

Assembly Bill 349: Revises provisions relating to controlled substances.
(BDR 40-1043)

Assemblywoman April Mastroluca, Clark County Assembly District No. 29:

Assembly Bill 349 came out of a concern regarding a nationwide issue with a substance commonly called "bath salts." For those of you who are not familiar with this issue, this is a very powerful drug that started in Europe and has quickly moved to the United States. If you plot the instances of issues with this drug, you can see its usage move across the country. It is a manufactured

chemical that is sold for approximately \$20 to \$30 per package. It is a very dangerous drug that causes hallucinations and has been described as a combination of methamphetamine and cocaine, with a little PCP thrown in. Some people have done horrendous things while under the influence of this drug.

I have provided a handout ([Exhibit C](#)) that shows what some of the other states are doing to deal with this growing problem. As of March 21, 2011, nine states have taken administrative or legislative action to ban these chemicals. Part of the problem is that these "designer" chemicals are created so quickly that it is very difficult for law enforcement to keep up. The challenge with designer drugs is you do not know that the drugs exist until there are problems with their use. Even once you are aware, you must have lab verification that the product mimics a controlled substance that is already on the schedule I list in order to take action. So there is always a lag time involved.

Assembly Bill 349 will allow the State Board of Pharmacy to move more quickly to stay on top of these kinds of issues. I wanted to make sure that, in the case of substances like bath salts which are a threat to human life, the State Board has the ability to move very quickly on the issue; that they will have the ability to say, "We recognize that this is a dangerous drug and we need to put a stop to it. We need to be able to test it and prove that it is dangerous." That is what this bill does; it gives them that extra ability.

There have been some conversations and questions with other groups that are interested in the bill. There are still some things that need to be worked out. The bill is not perfect. I have an expert on this type of subject with me here today, Mark Jackson, who was highly recommended by the Office of the Attorney General. I feel confident that he is someone who is just as passionate about these issues and just as willing to find solutions as I am. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hambrick:

The State of Nevada Juvenile Justice Commission is also concerned, because this substance is sweeping across northern Nevada. Some young people are coming into the system because of this substance. I understand that when you say "fake cocaine," you can describe the mixture of chemicals. In the old days you would have called it methadone. Is there a name for the substance the State Board would be regulating?

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

When the State Board regulates these different kinds of chemicals, the chemical names are not put into statute; they are drafted as regulations. If you went to the *Nevada Administrative Code*, you could pull up 15 pages of different drug compounds that have been declared schedule I controlled substances. The State Board already has that power. This bill simply gives them the ability to move faster.

Assemblyman Hammond:

Last week, we heard a bill very similar to this one regarding synthetic marijuana, but the term "bath salts" also came up. Will this bill cover the same issues covered by that bill? Are we duplicating anything here or do they cover two different areas?

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

I am not quite sure. I have not compared the two bills.

Mark B. Jackson, District Attorney, Douglas County:

Synthetic cannabinoids are central nervous system depressants; that is a totally separate bill. The substances that are being marketed and sold as bath salts are central nervous system stimulants, which are similar to cocaine, methamphetamine, and MDMA, also known as Ecstasy. These substances are more closely associated with MDPV (3, 4-Methylenedioxypyrovalerone).

Assemblyman Carrillo:

What kind of statistics do we have for Nevada and the rest of the country that show bath salts are a problem? I have heard that these substances target youth. However, I have not seen any numbers or evidence that show how this is affecting our society as a whole.

Mark Jackson:

The substances that are being marketed as bath salts are fairly new. Last year, we saw the synthetic cannabinoids sweep across the nation. In 2010, there were only 310 cases dealing with synthetic stimulants reported to the American Association of Poison Control Centers, specifically these bath salt types of substances. Those same centers have received over 1400 reported cases in the first three months of 2011. There were nine deaths associated with the substances in 2010. Cases involving bath salts have been reported in Clark and Washoe Counties. There is a criminalist from the Washoe County Sheriff's Office crime lab, Diane Machan, here today who is truly an expert in the field.

She would be able to tell you the similarities between some of the substances listed in section 2 of the bill, Methylone, Mephedrone, MDPV, and the three cathinone derivatives.

In Douglas County we had a recent case of a mother-daughter team that was repackaging these bath salts into capsules about the size of a toothpaste cap and selling them at a local high school. You have already heard testimony regarding some of the health effects associated with these drugs. It is a concern. We do have documented cases, primarily juvenile cases, in Douglas County. I am hearing similar reports from my fellow prosecutors across the state.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

When you state that these cases are being documented, are they combined with other drugs? Prescription drug abuse in general is a concern. I met someone in Carson City whose daughter had stolen their prescription drugs. I know that is not the issue here, but there are other things that might be involved. Are we talking about cases where just bath salts were documented? Is alcohol also involved? Are they drinking coffee with these substances?

Mark Jackson:

I was one of the original members of the Governor's Working Group on Methamphetamine Use commissioned by former Governor Jim Gibbons in 2007 and chaired by Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto. We worked for four years, not only on the meth issue, but on all drug issues throughout the state. We found that we are typically talking about polysubstance abuse. We recognize that abuse of prescription medications is at epidemic levels in the state, just as methamphetamine was and still is. We found that popularity of a specific drug occurs in cycles. We also found that polysubstance abusers are going to try new types of drugs. It is very common for these individuals to use these type synthetic stimulants with other types of drugs, to mix it with alcohol, for example.

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

If I may, I would like to elaborate a bit on some of the additional information that I have. We have done some research on some of the instances where this drug has been used. In Panama City, Florida, there was an incident where several officers were called to subdue a man who tore a radar unit out of a police car with his teeth. There was another incident with a woman who attacked her mother with a machete, claiming her mother was a monster. A Mississippi man slit his face and stomach repeatedly with a skinning knife after getting high on bath salts. A 25-year-old man stabbed a priest in the face and hand after experiencing an increased sense of paranoia from his use of bath

salts. The example that shocked me the most was the report of a mother in Louisiana who was convinced that her two-year-old child was possessed and took a baseball bat to the back of the child's head, then put the child in the car, drove to the highway, and left the child.

These are very dangerous drugs that are readily available. I think that is what really shocks me. If someone is buying cocaine or meth, you picture a dirty alley where two people secretly exchange money for drugs. This drug is sold in retail locations. It is sold in convenience stores. These are very dangerous drugs that are readily accessible by anyone of any age. Thank you.

Assemblyman Anderson:

I was looking at the bill and I think it is a great idea. My question is in regard to lines 9 through 12 on page 3, which read, ". . . the Director shall consider whether the substance has been scheduled on a temporary basis under federal law" Is the intent of that passage to make sure that we are in line with federal trends? We all know goods do not exist plainly in one state versus another.

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

That is correct. Part of the problem is that, under federal law, the U.S. Department of Agriculture regulates food items. Distributors of this product are getting around regulation by clearly printing "Not for Human Consumption" on the label. They use this method to skirt federal law.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any other questions? I do not see any. Mr. Jackson, did you have a presentation?

Mark Jackson:

I think I have discussed most of the issue. There are two things I wanted to follow up on. One of them is the topic that was just brought up by Assemblywoman Mastroluca. Designer drug usage sweeping across the country is not new. Our federal government looked at this issue back in the mid-1980s. In an attempt to try to regulate and prohibit additional designer drugs from being brought into commerce, Congress passed the Controlled Substance Analogue Enforcement Act of 1986. It was aimed at stopping designer drugs by giving a federal prosecutor the ability to prosecute for these mimicking types of compounds. There were two issues pursuant to that act. First, the chemical compound in question had to have effects which were similar to a schedule I or schedule II controlled substance. Second, it had

to be a substance that was designed or intended for human consumption. They are attempting to get around that federal ban, which would criminalize these specific types of designer drugs.

Synthetic cannabinoids are plant materials designed to look like buds of marijuana that are laced with a synthetic compound which acts like a cannabinoid. The same is true of the bath salts. They are designed to look like rock cocaine, meth, or Ecstasy. They had to come up with something to use to market these substances. Actual bath salts are typically granular. The name "bath salts" means nothing; these were never intended to be used as bath salts. They are purposely labeled that way to try to do an end around the Controlled Substance Analogue Enforcement Act of 1986.

The second issue I wanted to touch upon is the scheduling of controlled substances. There are five specific tests under the Uniform Controlled Substance Act codified under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 453. The language contained within this particular bill would categorize these chemical compounds as schedule I substances: a substance which has a high potential of abuse and no accepted medical use in treatment.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Mr. Hillerby, would you like to make a statement?

Michael D. Hillerby, representing Nevada State Board of Pharmacy:

I am here for informational purposes and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Mr. Jackson struck upon something that is important. Chapter 453 of NRS gives the State Board of Pharmacy the authority and duty to schedule controlled substances. This body did that about 40 years ago, in 1971. As was stated earlier by Assemblywoman Mastroluca, there are no substances listed in statute. Controlled substances are handled through a regulatory process which involves a very specific list of tests. Schedule I drugs are those with a high potential for abuse and no accepted medical use.

The criteria used by the State Board to determine if a drug should be regulated include the actual or relative potential for abuse; scientific evidence of pharmacological effect; state of current scientific knowledge; history and current pattern of abuse, scope, duration and significance of abuse; risk to public health; and the potential of the substance to produce psychic or physiological dependence liability. We consider these criteria in working with

law enforcement, the crime labs, district attorneys and others. Schedule I drugs are not listed in statute, but there are several pages listed in state regulation. I could not begin to pronounce or recognize most of them, but I will tell you some of them: heroin, gamma-hydroxybutyric acid (also known as GHB or the date-rape drug), LSD, marijuana, mescaline, peyote, and others. The authority was specifically given to the State Board by the Legislature those decades ago so that we could react quickly.

We are also required by statute to react when the federal government changes any of its scheduling. We have to make our schedules match theirs. They list substances through the Controlled Substance Analogue Enforcement Act. As they add substances to their list, we update ours. The most recent example was mentioned at the Assembly Committee on Judiciary hearing last Saturday. A total of three bills were introduced this session that deal with regulation of synthetic marijuana. That regulation was passed by the State Board in about 90 days. We also have the ability to do that as an emergency regulation. Those regulations are now sitting in front of the Legislative Commission pending approval. Once approved, synthetic marijuana will be listed as a schedule I drug.

We appreciate that Assemblywoman Mastroluca has brought some public attention to this issue. We were already discussing this issue at the State Board, but we welcome more attention. We work closely with law enforcement. We will be considering bath salts shortly. If we are asked by law enforcement or the evidence would lead the State Board on its own to determine that a substance warranted an emergency regulation, we have that authority. We can take such concerns to the Office of the Governor immediately and ask for his signature. We get support from law enforcement, the Office of the Attorney General, district attorneys, crime labs and others. I cannot speak for what Governor Sandoval might do, but we would suspect that he would consider that request favorably if we have made the case at that level. We can move fairly quickly. Obviously, the Legislature has maintained a certain level of influence and control over the regulatory process. If it is a traditional emergency regulation, we have to come back in front of the Legislative Commission with a permanent regulation within 120 days. That authority would not be taken lightly by any state agency, and neither does the State Board, but it is something we can do if the evidence warrants. I am happy to answer questions about our process.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Thank you. Mr. Jackson, can you come back up? There is another question for you.

Assemblywoman Flores:

I understand that this bill is attempting to allow the State Board to list these as schedule I substances. What happens afterwards with distribution? Are there currently any normal uses for this product?

Mark Jackson:

I will answer the second half of the question and allow the law enforcement experts to talk about distribution and penalties involved. No, these chemicals do not have any other use that would qualify as a medical use in the United States. That is one of the criteria that the State Board has to look at to make sure that we do not list something that is approved for medicinal use. We cannot and would not do that. As these chemicals come forward, they are not approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for any medical use or treatment. Products that do have a medical use are not made schedule I illegal drugs. Schedules II through V include various kinds of painkillers and other familiar drugs in varying degrees of their potential for abuse and harm. Those are lawful but controlled substances.

Assemblywoman Flores:

At the risk of sounding simplistic, you keep referring to these substances as "bath salts." Would anyone ever buy this product with the intention of using it in their bath?

Mark Jackson:

I am not aware of a single case or any anecdotal information shared across the United States between prosecutors or law enforcement officers of a person actually using this product as a bath salt. While I have never used an actual bath salt, I would expect the desired result of use would be to feel fresh and have smooth skin after I got out of the bathtub. I am not sure how much actual bath salts cost, but I cannot imagine that they are very expensive. These products are being marketed as bath salts; but, like the synthetic cannabinoids, they are labeled with psychedelic artwork and are named "Vanilla Sky" or "Ivory Wave" or "Bliss." They are being sold for \$30 per gram. For reference, a gram is equivalent to the size of one package of Sweet'N Low sweetener. I cannot imagine anyone buying an actual bath salt product for that price.

As far as the enforcement and distribution aspect goes, once items are scheduled as controlled substances, the penalties associated with the trafficking, distribution, sales, use, or possession are already codified in NRS Chapter 453. For example, pyrovalerone, a substance chemically similar to MDPV, is currently listed as a schedule V drug. Illegal possession or use of that substance could be prosecuted as a category E felony, which carries a mandatory suspended term and probation. If the chemical compounds used in bath salts were placed on the schedule I list through one of the three regulatory processes used by the State Board, these substances would be treated the same as heroin, cocaine, or meth. Sales, distribution, and possession would fall under the same quantity-based trafficking statutes as any other schedule I controlled substance.

Assemblywoman Flores:

If that is the case, what would happen in the instance where these substances were purchased prior to being taken off the market, if those who purchased them do not know it has been made illegal? What happens to distributors that continue to sell the product after it has been made illegal?

Mark Jackson:

The Drug Enforcement Administration issued a notice of regulation on November 23 regarding the synthetic cannabinoids. When the final federal order came out earlier this year in Douglas County, I used it as an educational component to inform merchants that it was now a violation of federal law to have the substance on their shelves and that the State Board had also adopted a state regulation that was awaiting final approval from the Legislative Commission. I would do the same thing in Douglas County in connection to bath salts. I cannot speak for all of the prosecutors across the state, but part of the issue is educational. The newspapers do a pretty good job reporting on these particular bills. It has hit the newspaper in all 17 counties. I think people are knowledgeable about it. I have not heard of any issues in northern Nevada regarding any of the merchants protesting that these products will be removed from their shelves.

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

I would like to let Assemblywoman Flores know that I have passed around a sheet that contains pictures and examples that are representative of the packaging used with these bath salt products ([Exhibit D](#)).

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Thank you for making sure that we have doubled the effort on this issue. Since the act controlling these drugs was passed almost 40 years ago, has there ever been an instance where one of these substances has been removed from the list?

Michael Hillerby:

I do not know. I will find out from the State Board, the people who deal with this on a regular basis, and let you know.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

The concern would be, "The state always does this and we need these drugs." That obviously would not be the case with these substances. The bill that Assemblyman Ellison sponsored, which was heard in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary last Saturday, is basically the same bill. I just want to make sure that these two bills will be worked out together and that we will not miss anything.

Assemblywoman Mastroluca:

Yes, we definitely will. Actually, Assemblyman Hammond brought up a similar question earlier. We will definitely make sure that neither one trumps the other.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

For the record, I did not know these substances were not real bath salts either. I asked the same question on Saturday. Also, for the record, we heard on Saturday that some of the retailers who are selling these products are making \$40,000 a month from these products. There is a vested interest for this legislation not to pass. I would like to be on record as saying that I will do everything I can to make sure your bill gets through. Thank you.

Assemblyman Frierson:

I would like to point out that we are talking a lot about bath salts because that happens to be the current phenomenon. However, my reading of this bill seems to suggest that we are giving the State Board of Pharmacy the tools to make an adjustment any time there is a new drug developed that we are not aware of, so that we do not have to wait. Is that correct?

My second question deals with an issue previously mentioned. If someone currently has a closet-load of this substance because it is legal, and then the substance is made illegal, recognizing that there is no legitimate use for these products, how do we deal with that? As soon as the state has figured it out,

I imagine word will spread pretty quickly that they should dispose of the product. While I wanted to clarify that the intent of the bill is to provide the tools needed to be flexible and adapt, we also need to answer the question of how we would enforce possession of the substance during the time that people are becoming aware it has been made illegal.

Michael Hillerby:

There are a total of five bills dealing with this issue, three regarding synthetic marijuana and two dealing with fake cocaine, or bath salts. We are fairly confident that we have the tools to handle these substances already. We can do it through the regulatory process or with an emergency regulation. The concern is what we should do if there is a serious problem with one of these substances, such as death, between the time we become aware of it and the time we know we have a validated reference test in a laboratory that would allow for successful prosecution. Could we do anything to ban those substances in the meantime? If the bill changes, it might be moved in the direction of seeing if there is anything we need to do to be able to act more quickly. The existing statutory scheme has worked pretty well; we think the process works. But there is a very legitimate concern to ask if there is anything we can or should be doing in the event of a delay between awareness of the chemicals and our scientific ability to test for them and successfully prosecute.

Our experience has been that the people selling substances like Bliss, K2, and Spice—you know the names and you have seen the packaging—are not retailers like Pottery Barn, Target, and Bed Bath & Beyond. These people know exactly what they are selling and why they are selling it. Those other retailers are not selling bath salts that cost \$30 per gram and have to be kept behind the counter. There is no surprise that this stuff is illicit at best and on its way to being made illegal. I do not think it will come as a surprise to anyone who is selling it when these substances are made illegal.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will call Michelle Jotz up to testify.

Michelle R. Jotz, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro; and representing Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs:

We appreciate Assemblywoman Mastroluca bringing forth this bill. We think that we should support anything that will help ensure the safety of the community. There are a lot of people who do dangerous things. We think this will help alleviate some of the concerns with people who do illicit narcotics. We are in support of this bill. Thank you.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any questions? I do not see any. I will now call Ronald Dreher. I do not see him present. That is everyone who signed up to speak in support of the bill. Is there anyone else present who would like to speak in support of A.B. 349? Ms. Gasca has signed up in opposition.

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

I was originally going to speak a little about the mechanism of the bill as drafted, with regard to allowing the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services to order the State Board of Pharmacy to take certain actions. After a conversation with Assemblywoman Mastroluca, I understand that the intent is to move away from that. I was not present for the entire presentation of the bill, but I am heartened to hear that. From our perspective, we were not under the impression that the State Board had any problems with creating regulations of this sort. As drafted, the bill has the problem of undermining the checks and balances of the system. It takes away the meaning of the decisions that the State Board is trying to make. I am happy to see that the bill is moving in a different direction.

On a broader note, I will comment about scheduling and rescheduling drugs. These types of bills are usually heard by the Assembly Committee on Judiciary. From the American Civil Liberties Union's perspective, we think that it is important that the state take a broader approach in general in regard to the use and abuse of illicit drugs. The State of Nevada has resorted to playing catch-up for far too long. As soon as one drug is made illegal, new ones are created. From our perspective, that is not a good use of criminal justice resources, nor is it in the best interest of the health of those individuals involved. We would encourage the Committee to take the conversation in a different direction.

I would also note that if these substances were placed on the schedule I list, a metabolite level that would be considered an illegal level would need to be established. That level may turn out to be zero, but someone from the State Board could clarify that they will be responsible for setting that level. From our perspective, the levels of metabolites that are in law right now are not scientifically based. They have historically been arbitrary and proven as such. The legislative record from multiple hearings over the past 12 to 20 years has reflected that. We think it is problematic that the state is currently effectuating laws that are not scientifically based. That needs to be paid attention to when the state moves forward with this legislation.

I think it is important the Committee understands that, from a criminal justice perspective, the sections of NRS Chapter 453 listed within the bill are ones that have an astounding fiscal impact to the criminal justice system. Generally, possession of just a few grams carries a criminal penalty of one to five years. If you take a larger snapshot of the effect of this bill, you will see quite a large impact on the criminal justice system as a whole. As such, I think that is probably why the fiscal note is attached. I do not know if there is any fiscal impact to the State Board in addition. I hope you take that into consideration and also consider moving the conversation towards a more healthy direction in the future with regard to substance abuse.

Vice Chair Pierce:

Are there any questions? I do not see any. Is there anyone else who would like to speak in opposition to this bill? I do not see anyone. Is there anyone who would like to come forward and express neutrality? I do not see anyone else. We will close the hearing on A.B. 349.

[Assemblywoman Mastroluca reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Mastroluca:

The Committee needs some time to prepare for the work session. We will recess until 2:20 p.m. [The Committee recessed at 1:58 p.m. and reconvened at 2:23 p.m.]

Chair Mastroluca:

We will begin with Assembly Bill 170, which Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst, will review.

Assembly Bill 170: Establishes provisions relating to warnings about the health hazards of smoking during pregnancy. (BDR 40-884)

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

The first bill that we have on work session today is A.B. 170, which was sponsored by Assemblywoman Pierce. This bill was brought forth to ensure that people understand the consequences of smoking while pregnant. [Ms. Coulombe continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).] While there were no amendments proposed during the hearing, Assemblywoman Pierce would like to speak regarding an amendment now.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

The March of Dimes has stepped forward to donate 2000 signs measuring 8.5 by 5.5 inches to the Washoe County and Southern Nevada Health Districts for distribution to retailers. The March of Dimes has been working with the retailers to choose the appropriate font size for these signs. The font size is going to decrease a bit, but I do not have the exact size. I will have an amendment drafted that will include the agreed-upon font size. The Retail Association of Nevada (RAN) is now in the neutral position, as indicated by the nods from the back of the room. We have this issue all worked out.

Chair Mastroluca:

Could I get a stronger nod from those representing RAN? You are neutral?

[Lea Tauchen, Director, Government Affairs, Grocery and General Merchandise, Retail Association of Nevada nodded in agreement.]

Chair Mastroluca:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Livermore:

I am not going to support this bill. This is another consequence placed upon retailers who are already struggling to do everything possible to keep their doors open and business functioning. I think there are already many places and opportunities to educate pregnant women who choose to continue to smoke, from the packages of cigarettes they buy, to the physician's offices where they receive their prenatal care. I do not think it is appropriate to burden the retailer with fines of \$100 if the sign is not posted. That is why I do not plan to support the measure.

Chair Mastroluca:

Thank you for your comments, Assemblyman Livermore.

Assemblyman Brooks:

With respect to my colleague from the north, I wanted to state that I am going to support this measure. I think anything we can possibly do to help with preventive medicine and health care is appropriate, even if it comes at a small expense to a retailer. As legislators, we try to promote efficiency. However, we are definitely not going to get any more efficient with health care if we continue to treat preventable diseases after the fact—that is, the different ailments such as cancer, that result from not giving people a heads-up as to

why they should not smoke. I find it peculiar that we would rather spend thousands of dollars on the back end and complain about the budget, as opposed to a couple of hundred dollars on the front end, which will not cause that much impact to retailers. I would like to thank Assemblywoman Pierce for bringing this legislation forward.

Chair Mastroluca:

I would like to remind the Committee that we are voting on issues, not on people. This is not about any one individual person or legislator. We all have the right to our opinion and we should all remember that.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

I am thrilled that the March of Dimes is working with the retailers. I think voluntary community orientation is great. The problem I have with the bill is twofold. First, it presupposes that we do not have incredible remedies already in existence to let pregnant women know that smoking is harmful. It is sort of like the GEICO commercial that says, "What? Do you live under a rock?" We should not turn our small retailers into health police. Pregnant women can already clearly see the warning on a pack of cigarettes. It clearly says if you are smoking and you are pregnant, there could be an issue. By way of precedence, this is brutal precedent and there are existing remedies that are far more effective without hurting convenience stores and others. I cannot support the bill, but I absolutely support the March of Dimes and the voluntary efforts of anyone who chooses to post the signage.

Assemblyman Anderson:

I would like to go on the record as supporting this bill and thanking Assemblywoman Pierce for working on this. I feel that choosing "all of the above" is better policy when trying to stop bad health habits in the populace. I feel like many people could use every single warning that they can get. I think some people do not fully comprehend the result of their actions. We must look at a budget with Medicaid costs and other expenses on the back end. Anything we can do to lessen the liability on the state is a good thing. If the retailers are neutral, they do not think it will seriously impact business. I think it is a win-win.

Assemblyman Frierson:

For the record, I wanted to clarify that when we say that it will cost \$100 on the front end in the name of saving money on the tail end we are in error. It seems like it is more like 5 cents on the front end. Some restaurants already provide these signs. I saw a posting in a men's bathroom. I suppose it was an

effort to spread the word. I think creating a culture of knowledge that says this is harmful behavior is a good thing and a wise thing in the long run. The warning does not have to be just on a package of cigarettes. Many retailers are already providing the warning because they recognize it is a good practice. I support changing the culture and I do not see the harm, any way whatsoever, in requiring a piece of paper to be posted.

Assemblyman Hammond:

You said the March of Dimes was supplying 2,000 signs. A lot of these businesses are going to be given the signs and I imagine that most of them will be very courteous and post them right away. They want to help out in any way possible. But what about those retailers who do not receive a sign? Will they have to provide their own sign? Again, my concern goes back to the \$100 fine. It seems like most retailers would want to voluntarily post the information. Is the March of Dimes planning on giving a sign to every business, so they do not have to worry about it or forget to put it up?

Assemblywoman Pierce:

My information is that the signs will go to the Washoe County and Southern Nevada Health Districts. The health districts are already in contact with retailers in terms of other required signs. I think this will just be an extension of that.

Assemblyman Hammond:

Are we going to have signs that are uniform, so that when you walk into a retailer you notice it? Will those businesses in the rural areas that may not get the sign have access to identical signage?

Assemblywoman Pierce:

At this moment, the March of Dimes is working with the Washoe County and Southern Nevada Health Districts. I am hoping that they will work with the rural counties as well. The bill will stipulate what font size should be used. It will be simple enough to make a sign. If the sign is posted, I am sure that no one will be fined because they did not pick the correct font size. I am sure that everyone will understand that an effort was made.

Chair Mastroluca:

Is there any further discussion? [There was no response.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 170.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN LIVERMORE AND
SHERWOOD VOTED NO.)

Chair Mastroluca:

We will move on to Assembly Bill 286.

[Assembly Bill 286](#): Establishes the Advisory Committee on Medicaid Fraud.
(BDR S-693)

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assemblyman Crescent Hardy presented A.B. 286 to the Committee on Friday, March 25. One of the reasons he brought this bill forth was that, as a small business owner, he had experienced two cases of Medicaid fraud by employees and he wanted to do what he could to address this problem. [Ms. Coulombe continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)) regarding the proposed Advisory Committee on Medicaid Fraud.]

Chair Mastroluca:

We had a lot of discussion regarding this bill during the hearing. The conceptual amendment will include the Office of the Attorney General and I am unclear of the fiscal note on this bill.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

As I recall during testimony, both departments testified that the advisory committee could be operated within normal operating funding.

Chair Mastroluca:

I understand that, but the amendment adds the Office of the Attorney General into the mix and I have concerns about that.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Could we reach out to the bill's author?

Chair Mastroluca:

I do not want to be running up against the clock.

Assemblywoman Smith:

The amendment calls for an additional member to be appointed by the Attorney General. I did not understand the reason for adding another member appointed by that office. The amendment also adds one legislator to be appointed by the Speaker, but it is customary for there to be representation from both houses. If we are going to move this bill forward, we might want to leave the appointments from the Attorney General the same, because that office already has three. Then we can add one representative from each house, appointed by the Speaker or Majority Leader.

Also, I think there are some unanswered questions about fiscal impact. This amendment talks about utilizing reserves. I am not sure what reserves it is specifically referring to. If you would want to move this bill, we could refer it to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

Chair Mastroluca:

I think that would give the author more time to work on it.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I agree.

Chair Mastroluca:

Would that be a motion, Assemblyman Goicoechea?

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I would like to see the bill moved forward with the understanding that there is a fiscal note that must be addressed.

Chair Mastroluca:

I am hesitant to move forward without additional work done on this amendment. There should be an appointment from the Majority Leader. I do not want to move something forward that will have to be fixed after the fact. If we move this bill forward, the sponsor should have the opportunity to fix it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO REFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION ASSEMBLY BILL 286 TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Mastroluca:

We will work with Assemblyman Hardy to make sure these issues are straightened out, so that his bill can continue to move forward. We will move on to Assembly Bill 362.

[Assembly Bill 362](#): Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 38-782)

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 362, regarding out-of-school time (OST) programs, was presented on Friday, April 8, by Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz who brought forth this bill because the state should be licensing OST programs but currently lacks the resources necessary to do so. [Ms. Coulombe continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)) regarding the creation of an Interim Task Force on Out-of-School-Time Programs and proposed amendments.]

Chair Mastroluca:

This bill was recently heard. Is there any discussion? [There was none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 362.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Mastroluca:

Mr. Carrillo, would you handle the floor statement?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Sure.

Chair Mastroluca:

We will now move on to Assembly Bill 533.

Assembly Bill 533: Provides certain financial protections for residents of group homes and similar facilities. (BDR 40-673)

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 533 is one of the group home bills that the Committee sponsored on behalf of the Legislative Commission's Committee to Study Group Homes. Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick testified as Chair of the Committee that the bill was brought forth after testimony provided by public administrators, public guardians, and other individuals regarding the concern that some homes were asking residents to sign over their assets to the owner upon admission. [Ms. Coulombe continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).] Nevada Health Care Association submitted a proposed amendment to the bill after the hearing.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I would like to express some concerns regarding the proposed amendment. I understand that the amendment is attempting to clarify that the facilities would like access to a patient's financial information. In order to get patients signed up for Medicaid, you must have three months of financial statements to prove eligibility. I believe the intent of the power of attorney language is to prevent a conflict of interest. However, power of attorney gives a person complete access to and decision power over all financial information. I would be more comfortable with this amendment if it included language that specifically defined what type of information institutions had access to and if it was limited in time and scope. That would be important for me to see in order to be comfortable with this amendment.

Chair Mastroluca:

It sounds like the proposed amendment does not add anything to the bill. Is the required power of attorney inherent in the paperwork that is currently signed?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

My understanding is that facilities provide authorization forms to assist in the Medicaid process. I do not know to what extent. I think the intent of the bill is to prevent conflict of interest and this amendment changes that dynamic.

Chair Mastroluca:

Are you saying the bill currently prevents conflict of interest, without the amendment?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I am fine with the bill as it is. The amendment, which grants power of attorney to an authorized representative of an assisted living facility, nursing home, or hospital, gives me pause.

Chair Mastroluca:

Did you have any discussion on this issue with the author of the bill?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Do you mean the author of the bill or the author of the amendment?

Chair Mastroluca:

Did you speak with Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick regarding this issue?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Yes, I did and she expressed similar sentiments. My apologies, I thought you meant the author of the amendment.

Assemblyman Anderson:

In my opinion, this amendment muddies the waters. I understood the original concept of the bill. I would be more comfortable without the amendment, as well.

Chair Mastroluca:

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 533.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Mastroluca:

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, will you do the floor statement?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Yes.

Chair Mastroluca:

We are going to consider one more bill, Assembly Bill 350, that is not included in the work session document.

Assembly Bill 350: Revises provisions governing children who are placed with someone other than a parent and who are under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. (BDR 38-712)

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

If you will recall, this bill was heard on April 1, and was sponsored by Assemblywoman Mastroluca. This bill allows children in custody of the court who are 18 years of age, to request that the court retain jurisdiction over them. This jurisdiction would terminate when the child turns 21, or if other conditions listed in the bill are met. This bill pertains to children in foster care who have not yet finished high school. There appears to be different definitions within the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), which has led to problems. For example, there were about 80 children in Clark County and 30 in Washoe County who were set to terminate from the foster care program prior to graduation from high school. This bill hopes to address these issues. The bill also requires that when a child turns 17 years of age and is still in custody of the court but not likely to be returned to the custody of a parent before turning 18 years old, the child must be referred to free legal services for advice regarding the consequences of remaining under jurisdiction. The bill would also require the agency that is responsible for child welfare services to meet with the child 120 days prior to the child turning 18 years old to discuss his decision. If the child chooses to remain under jurisdiction, he must enter into a written agreement filed with the court. The bill also establishes an order of priority for placing a child in protective custody.

Former Speaker Buckley testified during the hearing and proposed amendments to the bill. I have passed out a copy of the proposed amendment to the Committee (Exhibit I), which requires an informal attempt to resolve disputes before going before the court. It would also clarify that the payment to the youth could not exceed the rate of the foster care payment. It also clarifies that the young adult must seek employment while not in school.

Chair Mastroluca:

I apologize to the Committee. I thought hard copies of the proposed amendment had been handed out. Ms. Coulombe will go through the amendment and we will get you copies.

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

Hopefully, you can review the bill text in the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). The proposed amendment would delete section 22, subsection 6, paragraph (b) from the bill. [Ms. Coulombe continued to read from the proposed amendment.]

Chair Mastroluca:

[Copies of the proposed amendment were distributed to the Committee members.] We will take a few minutes to allow the Committee to take a look at the amendment. We do have some people here who could answer questions, if necessary.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Have the amendments removed the fiscal note?

Chair Mastroluca:

I am getting a nod from Diane J. Comeaux, Administrator of the Division of Child and Family Services. [Diane J. Comeaux nodded in agreement.]

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Is this the bill where there are only 80 children taking advantage of this and the legal defense fund said that children who opt out cannot opt back into the program?

Chair Mastroluca:

Yes, that is correct. If you opt out you cannot opt back in.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Did they talk about how this program would be funded as more children opt in? We only have 80 children now, but as we add more children, obviously the funding goes . . .

Chair Mastroluca:

Right, but those children will age out. The average length that a child would remain in the program is less than 9 months. They would constantly be leaving the program.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

What is the incentive for them to not stay until they are 21 years old? If I am 18 years old and someone said, "Hey, you are going to get benefits until you are 21 years old . . ."

Chair Mastroluca:

With all due respect, if you can find a child that has been in the foster care system who wants to stay, that would be a rarity. With the number of children who are in the foster care system, the 80 children who would opt into this program represent a minute percentage. Most children just want out of the system.

Assemblyman Frierson:

I believe we heard prior testimony that far fewer children want to stay in the program than the welfare services would wish. Oftentimes, children will try to get out of the system even earlier, if possible. It is extremely rare that the children who would be responsible enough to want to stay in the system, do so, even though it would help them out in the long run. I recall that being the testimony at the hearing.

Kevin Schiller, Director, Department of Social Services, Washoe County:

I would reinforce that these kids, who are aging out of foster care, are trying to get out of the same system that may have created them being in the system. I spoke previously about how we try to manage that. We try to utilize a contractor to assist in case management, which gives them one step away from the system. We find that most children who are brought into an extended service program want to get out as fast as they can. We currently have federally funded grants that are available to allow children to stay in the program until age 21. One of two things happens. A child either makes minimal progress or he works on his educational goals and decides to move on. The alternative to that is the person who will stay in the system because he wants the vocational training offered. This instance represents a relatively small number at this point. One of our biggest targets is to increase the retention of those youth who are aging out, so that we can have better success.

Chair Mastroluca:

Does that help, Assemblyman Sherwood?

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Could I reserve my right to vote yes on the floor? This is a pretty big amendment to have thrown at us. Although I know we are not a money committee, we are talking about a lot of money.

Chair Mastroluca:

I understand, and I take responsibility that you did not get this amendment earlier.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

I would feel comfortable in reserving my right to vote yes on the floor, but I am not currently feeling inclined to vote in favor of the bill.

Chair Mastroluca:

I am confused regarding your concern with money.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

We have 80 children right now that, on average, stay in the program for nine months. The possible universe of children who could go into this program is several thousand. Is that right?

Kevin Schiller:

I guess you could potentially see an increase in the foster care population. As a child hits 18 years of age, the child will have the option to enter into the plan. We may see a slight increase of children in Washoe County entering into the program, according to my projections. However, these options are already in practice; we are currently reaching out to those youth who will be aging out beginning at 15 years of age. Therefore, I do not envision that we are going to see that a strong advocacy will increase the population of children who wish to stay in the program. To give you a sense of numbers, in Washoe County we average about 700 to 800 children in foster care who do not receive an adoption, are not able to successfully reunify with family, or become part of a guardianship who ultimately age out of the program. This is probably the most difficult population that we serve. We support the bill because of the oversight and the checks and balances that it will provide in terms of how we deliver our services to meet these children's needs. Based on current practice, my projection is that the fiscal impact will be fairly minimal.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Could we put a cap on the number of children who could be served, based upon expectations? Was this the bill with testimony of "promises not contracts," so that the volunteer folks had to disaffect the court advocates who had been following these children for a long time? Incentives work, right? An advocate with good intentions—please do not misunderstand me, I am not impugning anyone's intentions—would tell a child, "You have aged out and this is an awful system. But, now we have a much better system and you have a ton of

incentive to stay here. We are going to pay you stay here and do all these things." Listen, incentives work. The number that is presently at 80 children is going to go through the roof and we will be stuck with that, unless we put a cap on it. If you are comfortable saying, "This is the number of children in the program and we do not think it will go more than 5 percent above that number," then why do we not put that number in statute?

Kevin Schiller:

I would reinforce that the same incentives we are putting into this bill already exist. The services that support children aging out of care are not significantly different from those that are currently funded through child welfare. Projections are based upon actual outcomes, similar to how we would manage an adoption subsidy or foster care caseload. I believe the numbers of children who enter our system will maintain very closely to current levels, and those incentives already exist. Most of the youth who do not want to move forward in the system do not see the program as an incentive. Their only thought is, "I want out of the system." Remember, as this bill is written, the children who continue past 18 years of age have to enter into a voluntary plan, be involved in an educational component, and have to comply with the system requirements. As much as there may be incentives tied to it, the majority of children want to move away from the system. That is why I testified that we really try to influence them to stay.

Chair Mastroluca:

I would like to get some further information from Ms. Howell, and then there are additional questions.

**Amber Howell, Deputy Administrator, Bureau of Services for Child Care,
Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and
Human Services:**

I would like to add that when a child is between the ages of 15 and 17 years old, he receives a payment for foster care placement. There is no increase in cost when he is 17 or 18 years old, because we are already paying for him. It is not an additional payment, as if they were someone who previously did not qualify. There is no fiscal increase from that perspective. Also, our caseloads have been projected to remain flat for a number of years, because as some children stay in the system, an equal number leave the system. It has remained flat for a long period of time. That is why we did not project a fiscal increase. You are paying for them anyway, so it is not above and beyond what you are already doing. It is not a new child, with new money being spent. They are already receiving funding.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

What is new then? Why do we need this legislation? If there is nothing new and the same amount of money is being spent on the same children, why do we need this bill?

Kevin Schiller:

One of the primary components of the bill was to add court oversight into the mechanism by which these children are managed. Simply put, the court wanted oversight on these children. In Washoe County, children who wished to remain in the program entered into a voluntary agreement without court oversight. The initial intention of the bill was to add court oversight for better management and improved outcomes.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Who will the court use for oversight? Is that what is new about the bill?

Kevin Schiller:

The court oversight is new. Currently, there is no court oversight.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

Will the court oversight be provided by a private practice person, who will receive payments? We will have to pay for that. That is a new fiscal component to the bill. They will have an incentive based on caseloads. The costs will go through the roof. They get paid based on the caseload. If I got that contract, I would love it. I would say, "Hey kids, stay here until you are 21 years old." Those persons providing oversight will get paid for every child who stays in the program.

Kevin Schiller:

From the Washoe County perspective, the court will be providing the oversight. We will not have a private contractor overseeing these children. It will go through the family court, under our current caseload.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

I do not want to retry the bill, but when you drop an amendment . . .

Chair Mastroluca:

Well, you are, sir. I apologize for interrupting you, but we have had the hearing on the bill. We have other people who have questions and you are monopolizing the time.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

You wanted to clear up my concerns and when I see a three-page amendment from former Speaker Buckley, it gives me pause.

Chair Mastroluca:

I asked you to wait and let some other people ask questions.

Assemblywoman Smith:

There is a fiscal note of about \$150,000. Even without that, you would like to have the bill, so that you can better manage the program.

Kevin Schiller:

I will put on record that, while I cannot withdraw the initial fiscal note, the requirements of this bill can be absorbed into our currently allocated budget.

Assemblywoman Smith:

To clarify, even without the \$150,000, you feel the bill will benefit your program and the clients?

Kevin Schiller:

It will benefit the program and truly benefit the children.

Assemblyman Hammond:

I think Assemblyman Sherwood was getting to my question. That is, what is the difference between this and what is currently done? I remember from previous testimony that 19-year-olds were already using this program. I do not remember if the program serves youth over 19 years of age or if that was the age when the children started opting out anyway. In the amendment, I see the term "child's attorney" repeatedly. Are we assigning each child an attorney? Will they only receive an attorney if they ask for one or will someone volunteer as an attorney?

Kevin Schiller:

These children already have attorneys. In Washoe County, when these children turn 15 years old, they become the top priority as vulnerable children in our system who need legal counsel. That is already absorbed into my system, so I am not projecting any growth around that issue. These are the same attorneys who are part of my transition planning which begins when a child reaches 15 years of age.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Reading through the language of many of the items included in the proposed amendment, I think this is very good legislation. As someone who worked with this population, I know that it is really hard work to remove a child from the home because of abuse or neglect. It cannot be just a thought of abuse or neglect, there has to be an investigation. All of the children we are talking about have been taken away from their families for their own protection. The allegations have got to be pretty severe for the courts to allow interference by the government to reach into a home and protect these kids. I think this legislation goes a long way toward fostering independence in this small group of teenagers who, for some reason, can never go back to their family, never be adopted, and are aging out of care. Those children who want to participate and take advantage of services will be better, more productive citizens for it. I think these children are deserving of the opportunity we are providing them.

Assemblyman Frierson:

I am trying to reflect back on the hearing. My recollection is that a great number of the attorneys involved in this process are pro bono. As a matter of fact, I believe pro bono lawyers represent approximately 70 percent and legal aid handles about 30 percent of the cases. I do not recall any testimony provided regarding anyone being paid based on a child remaining in the program. When we talk about appointed counsel, there is a distinction between a criminal attorney, who is paid for being appointed, and legal aid attorneys, who have no structured incentive based upon the number of children they see. I want to clarify this point and make sure that I do not misunderstand it. It is my understanding that these were separate issues, and in this bill we are providing a structure to allow for the consistent operation of what is already happening outside the structure of the court.

Alex Ortiz, representing Clark County:

I would like to state for the record that our senior county management team worked with former Speaker Buckley on this amendment. I have not seen the amendment personally, but it is my understanding from our management team that the amendment addresses most, if not all, of the concerns we had with the bill.

Chair Mastroluca:

To clarify, Clark County is okay with this bill?

Alex Ortiz:

Based on my discussions with senior county management, yes.

Chair Mastroluca:

Is there additional discussion? [There was none.]

ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 350.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Mastroluca:

Is there any public comment? [There was none.] This meeting is adjourned
[at 3:20 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Mitzi Nelson
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman April Mastroluca, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Health and Human Services

Date: April 13, 2011

Time of Meeting: 1:15 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 349	C	Assemblywoman April Mastroluca	Fake Drugs Pose Real Problems
A.B. 349	D	Assemblywoman April Mastroluca	Pictures of Packaging Used for Bath Salts
A.B. 170	E	Kirsten Coulombe	Work Session Document
A.B. 286	F	Kirsten Coulombe	Work Session Document
A.B. 362	G	Kirsten Coulombe	Work Session Document
A.B. 533	H	Kirsten Coulombe	Work Session Document
A.B. 350	I	Kirsten Coulombe	Proposed Amendment from Barbara Buckley