

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
February 27, 2013**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 1:40 p.m. on Wednesday, February 27, 2013, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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 nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. 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 Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan
Assemblyman Andy Eisen
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan
Assemblyman Andrew Martin
Assemblyman James Oscarson
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce
Assemblyman Michael Sprinkle

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Steven Brooks (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman David Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24

Minutes ID: 370



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirsten Bugenig, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Janel Davis, Committee Secretary
Macy Young, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lesley Pittman, representing United Way of Southern Nevada
Denise Tanata Ashby, J.D., Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Sam Lieberman, representing Easter Seals of Southern Nevada
Michael J. Willden, Director, Department of Health and Human Services
Marla McDade Williams, Deputy Administrator, Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services

Chair Dondero Loop:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were stated.] I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 79. I would like to welcome Assemblyman Bobzien.

Assembly Bill 79: Revises provisions relating to early childhood education programs. (BDR 38-199)

Assemblyman David Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24:

During the 2012 Interim, it was my privilege to serve as Chairman of the Legislative Committee on Education. I am here today to present A.B. 79, a bill that came out of that Committee and its work. This measure establishes the Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) and places it in the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Currently, the Council exists as a creation under executive order. I thank the Governor for his support of this effort. It will sunset on July 31, 2013.

I would like to open my testimony by providing the Committee with background information on this measure and then highlight the key provisions. Assembly Bill No. 546 of the 76th Session was approved in 2011 and required the two traditionally separate learning systems, early childhood care and education, be more closely coordinated and better aligned to promote an effective system to prepare children for kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) learning. Among other things, the measure required additional training in pre-kindergarten content standards for those working in early childhood care. However, the measure was ultimately vetoed by the Governor for concerns other than what is found in this bill. During the recent interim, the Legislative

Committee on Education heard several presentations from representatives of the Nevada ECAC regarding possible modifications to the previous legislation that would minimize concerns for small businesses. In addition, the Legislative Committee on Education explored initiatives in other states to better coordinate services and education to children in the 0- to 4-year old age range. Based upon testimony heard, the Legislative Committee on Education offers A.B. 79 as a vital step in building a coordinated system of early childhood care and education.

Assembly Bill 79 requires the Director of DHHS to establish the ECAC within the Department. The membership of the Council will include a representative of Nevada's Department of Education (DOE) and representatives of nonprofit entities from both the northern and southern regions of the state. These and other members will be appointed by the Director of DHHS. The Council may accept gifts and grants to assist in meeting its duties, which will include, among other things: working closely with the Nevada DOE and the State Board of Education to strengthen state-level coordination and collaboration among early childhood programs; and conducting periodic statewide need assessments of the quality and availability of services for children in early childhood. Following their assessments, a variety of recommendations will be developed relating to: increasing the overall participation of early childhood programs; increasing family engagement; improving core elements of Nevada's early childhood system; creating professional development for early childhood teachers; establishing statewide standards; and defining school readiness based upon national indicators across all developmental domains.

The Council's duties also include assessing the capacity of Nevada's higher education institutions to develop teachers in the field of early childhood education, reporting their progress to the Legislative Committee on Education during the 2014 Interim and to the Legislature during the 2015 Session.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that A.B. 79 is an important first step in building a coordinated system of early childhood care and education for Nevada. I acknowledge that governance of education has always been tricky. We had a lot of discussion on that issue last session. Early childhood education is the one area that oftentimes gets left behind because the regulations of the facilities rests with the DHHS from a health and safety standpoint; the education piece of it is what I think needs to have more focus and collaboration.

We often hear from the private providers a very real concern that regulation and interaction with government not be duplicative. It is incumbent upon us to find ways to make sure that the system is coordinated and everyone is working together. While there are other entities out there that have a focus on early

childhood education, the value of this Council in particular is that it is exclusively focused. I think the Council is a valuable player in the overall field. I am open to discussions on how this bill may be improved, but I think that the Council and the duties that are laid out are very important and something that this Legislature should support.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Hambrick:

It will be a full-time requirement to meet some of the standards and goals of this bill. Is this a doable task?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Absolutely. Thank you for recognizing how big a task this is. It was pleasantly surprising to hear about all the progress that was made by the Council thus far. Hopefully we will hear some reports from the activities they have done. This is not going to be something that will be accomplished in totality in one interim, but we need to be making steps. We have already begun the process and I am confident that this will "bear fruit."

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Do you envision a second edition of this Council during the next interim or next session? What are your long-term aspirations on this bill?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

My hope is that this is an organization that will do its work and be able to put itself out of business at some point. We have made tremendous progress on the governance issue of incorporating the "P" in the P-16 Advisory Council. The early childhood education response is to movements such as Common Core State Standards and increased focus on data and data sharing to prepare students for kindergarten. I see tremendous progress being capable in the coming years. I take this as a session-by-session approach at this time. Maybe we do have to go one more round, but maybe it will wrap up by the time my term has ended.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

It looks like this bill spells out three specific positions for the Council and the others with the Director of the DHHS. Are three positions going to be enough? Do you foresee more people being appointed to this Council?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

The key is collaboration with the DHHS and the Department of Education. Even though there is a community of statewide providers and advocates in early childhood education, we felt it was important to have both north and south involved. As the Director sees fit, I will leave the option of adding other members open-ended. There may be opportunities for additional people to be there. I do not know if it is so much that there are not enough people to do the work as much as it is making sure that we have enough people representing everyone in the system working together to effect change.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any additional questions? [There were none.] I will now ask to hear testimony in support of A.B. 79.

Lesley Pittman, representing United Way of Southern Nevada:

The United Way of Southern Nevada has a board member who is also a member of the Education Impact Council who serves on the ECAC. It is in that nature that I am here in great support of A.B. 79. We have worked very closely with the people on the ECAC to guide their efforts in terms of improving better understanding of our early childhood education system in Nevada and ways in which we might improve the quality and access to early childhood care. I appreciate your willingness to consider this legislation and appreciate Assemblyman Bobzien heading the legislation during the interim.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to speak in support of the bill?

Denise Tanata Ashby, J.D., Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

The Children's Advocacy Alliance works closely with the ECAC. We are very much in support of A.B. 79.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Is there any opposition to A.B. 79? [There was none.] Is there anyone in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 79. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 109.

Assembly Bill 109: Revises the qualifications and training required for certain persons who operate or are employed by a child care facility. (BDR 38-271)

Assemblyman David Bobzien, Washoe County Assembly District No. 24:

It is important that we have good public policy in place for those who work directly with our children in child care facilities. This bill ensures that such people have the proper background and training in order to provide the best care possible. I will walk through the sections of the bill.

Section 1 of A.B. 109 prescribes the requirements for directors of a child care facility. The director must be at least 21 years old, have a background in early childhood education; have an associate's degree, high school diploma, or credential, along with a number of verifiable hours of experience in a child care facility; and have at least 1,000 verifiable hours in business administration. In addition, the director of a child care facility is required to apply to The Nevada Registry when initially licensed and upon annual renewal. I would like to note the directors approved by the Health Division before the effective date of this bill can obtain a waiver to bypass the requirements up until January 1, 2016.

Section 2 of the bill increases the number of required hours of training beginning in January 2014 from 15 to 18 hours for the first year to 21 hours the second year, and 24 hours each year after January 2016. I would like to point out this is legislation that has been developed in consultation with a number of people in the early childhood education advocacy community. I want to thank United Way of Southern Nevada and the Children's Cabinet for bringing together a series of meetings and providers during the interim. I do not want to present what their opinion of this bill is; I want to present this as a bill that came out of that directly and has full support. The issues discussed led us to bring this bill to this Committee.

Essentially, this comes down to a desire to increase the professionalization of child care providers. As I have tracked my legislative career and the things I am interested in, this bill is not something that is going to directly affect my children because if it were to pass it would follow their experience with child care. My own personal interest in this issue is, of course, because I have twin four-year old boys who are in an early childhood facility. The people who work in their facility are very professional and the standards are in place. It is a great asset to have access where we live. I want to make sure that more centers understand how important professional development is. Ultimately, this is a bill about the youngest of our constituents.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hickey:

Last session when the Governor vetoed A.B. No. 546 of the 76th Session, you mentioned that you had more discussions with the business community. You certainly know that one of his concerns in the veto message was the high bar that the bill set for certain businesses with respect to the new requirements. Could you touch on the definition of child care? It seems to me that there is already preschool and glorified babysitting. Would these same requirements of academic backgrounds be in place for someone who has a small daycare?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I think it may be better to hear from the DHHS as to what the applicability is. They can give us a little background on their licensing process. As for the potential barriers to small businesses and the sensitivity of trying to balance these requirements for professionalization—to be blunt—this is a scaled-back version of what it is. We have spent a lot of time looking at the policy of other states when it comes to the requirements for training and professional development. They vary greatly, but you would not be surprised to hear that Nevada is far down the list in terms of what we require. This is a significantly scaled-back set of goals for professional development. I am confident that this is more palatable. We have sought the opinion of the Governor's office on this legislation and have yet to hear any input.

Assemblyman Hickey:

There was a concern raised by our former colleague, Senator McGuinness, who anecdotally knew someone that thought about the additional education requirements. It is sometimes more challenging for those in the rural areas who cannot do this online or have to take time off work. Has that been taken into consideration?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I believe so. We will hear from United Way of Southern Nevada about some of the programs they offer. Obviously it is a Clark County focus, but there are a lot of opportunities out there for professional development. This fits into a larger conversation about improving education across the board. As you know, there has been great progress made by this Legislature in terms of the adoption of Common Core State Standards and teacher and professional evaluations in the K-12 system. We are certainly not going to bring those same standards to this environment yet. This is a modest first step in bringing that focus and intention to this area of the education system.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Fortunately, Nevada has many avenues of learning environments available today. You do not necessarily need to be there in person; we have many virtual

and online classes to increase our awareness and effectiveness as teachers. I see nurses in the audience and I know online classes are available in a lot of venues; not just in child care or education. If we do not need the professional development, we may not develop it; and if we do not have it, we cannot need it. It is always a piece we need to think about looking forward in making ourselves more effective no matter what field we are in.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

Under section 1 of the bill, when looking at the different levels of education required by the licensee, it seems this is taking into account somebody that has been in the business for a while. It seems to me this does a good job in allowing somebody to meet the requirements if they are just getting started in the business. Am I reading that correctly?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Yes, that is the intention. There are a number of combinations of what the requirements would be. It is sensitive to those people who may be coming out of schooling and do not necessarily have a lot of hours versus those who have clearly been in the business for a long time and know what they are doing. We want to set a bar.

Assemblyman Martin:

Can you clarify section 1, subsection 2 about the business and education requirements? What are the current requirements?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

You may have stumped me. I will find the answer to your question.

Assemblyman Eisen:

What facilities would and would not fall under this bill? I want to make sure that there are no provisions in this bill that would change the definition of child care facility that already exists in statute, which explicitly excludes a parent, neighbor, or relative who provides temporary care. We are not talking about that kind of private setting; we are talking about a business that is paid to provide this care. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

There is no change in what is considered to be; however, I would leave it to the DHHS to provide a full picture of what we are talking about.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

There is no more important duty than taking care of your children and making sure they are safe in an environment that is conducive for learning. I am curious

about the language in the bill. Is this language that you have modeled from other places? Is it a national standard? How did you come up with the specific language for the education section?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

After a lot of discussion, it has been our goal to find a balance for what we would require in Nevada. Some states are far more stringent than what we find in Nevada. It is a balance of trying to make some steps to join that world, but at the same time, not set too high of a bar out of the gate. You will see other states get far more specific as to the content of what the hours need to be, the number or volume being much higher; there is no magic middle ground. There are some national standards that we will hear about. This is a balance of conversations through the interim with providers about what the current practices are, what is prevalent, and what is achievable. You will probably hear that this is too much or it is not enough.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I see in your language that you have also given a significant period of time for some of those levels of education and service to be accomplished. Could you elaborate on those?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Those time frames are set with the intention of giving people and operators time to get ready. You will also hear about the resources available and the network of opportunities that stand ready to assist in making sure that these can be achieved. We certainly did not want to drop these requirements on people without giving them time to scale up. We have kids to teach and centers to run in the interim. I feel these are generous in giving people time to comply.

I would like to personally thank the Chair for her help on this bill. She has gone to all meetings and I value your input.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any additional questions? [There were none.] Is there any testimony in support of A.B. 109?

Lesley Pittman, representing United Way of Southern Nevada:

I think it might be helpful for Denise Tanata Ashby, who worked very closely with many of the provider and stakeholder groups, to talk through the rationale and the case behind A.B. 109. Can I defer to her?

Chair Dondero Loop:

Yes.

Denise Tanata Ashby, J.D., Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

You should have before you my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)) and some additional resources from the Nevada Registry ([Exhibit D](#)).

A wealth of research supports that when children's needs are met during the critical years of development, the benefits are lifelong. Nearly 80 percent of the physical growth of the brain occurs in the first five years of life. We know that providing children with the right start will lead to less intervention and remediation in later grades, ultimately resulting in increased rates of graduation and success in adulthood. [Read from prepared testimony [Exhibit C](#).]

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hickey:

I appreciate your testimony. You answered some of my previous questions about the challenges in rural communities. It was nice to hear about the opportunities available to people. One of the themes this session is about the importance of early childhood education. I am still stuck on the question about the difference between early childhood learning environments and day care and babysitting. What is the definition of child care? Is there a distinction between child care and early learning opportunities? What about the working single parent who can barely afford the child care for her toddler who may, over time, see a significant increase if these education requirements and further regulations are moved down earlier? I am wondering if this is something we need to consider.

Denise Tanata Ashby:

I will attempt to answer your questions as I think they exist. One is the definition of a child care facility and that is currently defined in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 432A.024, which is included in my testimony.

In regard to your question on home-based providers, these provisions would apply to them if they are caring for five or more children and receiving compensation. This would not apply to a parent or relative or a family friend who is caring for a couple of children. These would apply to all of the current child care facility licensees under current statute. All of those providers are currently required to meet the 15 annual training hours.

More and more we are understanding the importance of early childhood education as building a foundation for lifelong learning. In my opinion, I would

like to see the terms changed in statute from "child care" to "early childhood education," which is what we are trying to accomplish in this bill. The intent of what we are trying to do with both of these bills is to change the mentality from child care to fully develop that child's ability to enter school prepared and able to succeed later in life.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Some parents may not be thinking that the facility they are bringing their child to is necessarily for the sake of early childhood education. They may be compensating for that. By requiring certain things of them, it may not always be what parents—or the customer wants—but it seems our intention is to know what they need regardless. I am not saying that these are based on bad intentions, but I am wondering how far and how young we are reaching if you keep going in this direction.

Chair Dondero Loop:

I will comment as a person who has a minor in early childhood education. You are absolutely right. These are customers, this is a business, and we need to give the best possible product and service that we can to the youngest citizens we have. This is a goal we are not reaching. We are not giving those children what they deserve. My children went to day care. Had I not had the ability to put my children in a very effective situation such as day care, I would not have been able to teach everyone else's children during the day. I appreciate your question and concern, but I think this is a very important subject.

Are there any additional questions or comments?

Assemblyman Eisen:

It sounds like the scope of this bill is a definition of the educational requirements for the licensee. I did not see anything in this bill that defines the content of the program for attendees at a child care facility. Is the scope of this bill exclusively about the requirements for the licensee?

Denise Tanata Ashby:

The educational requirements that are included in section 1, subsection 1, would be applicable to licensees and directors, or directors of child care centers, currently defined in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 432A.080 and NAC 432A.300. It does not address what type of curriculum those providers need to use in teaching the children they serve. This is strictly ensuring that whoever the individual is that oversees the administration in running an early childhood education center has the appropriate educational background and experience to do that job effectively.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I appreciate where this bill is going and the spirit of professionalizing childhood development. The current education levels for people who work in child care facilities read that 67 percent have only a high school education. Could you walk through the expectations in terms of compliance? To me, it would state that in year one almost everyone is going to be out of compliance and almost everyone is going to need a lot of training very quickly. Can you talk about the feasibility of how this plays out?

Denise Tanata Ashby:

The section regarding educational requirements and preservice requirements only applies to directors of facilities. Subsection 2 of A.B. 109 is related to annual training requirements for employees of a child care facility. We are not changing the requirements for teachers coming into a facility; we are trying to get them to have more training on an annual basis. A lot of that has to do with the fact that the teachers coming in do not have the level of education related to early childhood education.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Do we have statistics or information about where the directors are right now in the status quo? Are 100 percent of the directors going to end up below what the standards might be? I am trying to get a better idea of the scope of the requirements and how it plays out when we enact this bill.

Denise Tanata Ashby:

I do not have those exact numbers in front of me. I anticipate it is not a huge number. If there is not someone else here today that could answer that question, then I will get that information for you.

Assemblyman Hogan:

Incidentally, we have yet to hear testimony on the nature of previous objections from the vetoed bill; it would be helpful to know what the objections were. Do we feel that the primary elements of the previous bill were adequately preserved, or did we have to give up a lot of the advances that were intended to be set out in that bill in order to come up with some kind of a compromise that was thought to be passable in this Legislature? Are we missing a lot of the "guts" of the better bill that was vetoed?

Denise Tanata Ashby:

A lot of consideration went into the language of this bill. When we were discussing the early childhood community, there was a lot of revisiting the previous bill in looking at some of that language. To some extent, it is a compromise, but I think there is a general consensus in the early childhood

community that the requirements included in this bill are much more workable and are an improvement from our current standards. We recognize the fact that sometimes we need to take smaller steps to start moving forward. I believe we feel that is what this bill does.

Lesley Pittman:

I wanted to add a few comments. The United Way of Southern Nevada worked during the interim to bring together the public and private early childhood education stakeholders in Nevada around the areas of concern that we heard on A.B. No. 546 of the 76th Session. That is why you see a bifurcation of bills. The noncontroversial pieces reside in A.B. 79, while the controversial aspects of the training requirements in A.B. No. 546 of the 76th Session reside in A.B. 109. We stopped to address the objections we heard from the owners and operators of some of the privately run early childhood facilities by doing a number of things. First, we clearly identify approved childhood training programs that exist in Nevada and what their associated costs are. You can see this in the matrix provided by The Nevada Registry ([Exhibit D](#)). We also want to make sure that we are identifying accessibility of these training programs for the private operators. The idea is to phase in over a three-year period the requirement for an additional nine hours of training each year for those who work at the facilities. We believe we have made significant strides in trying to meet the objections and concerns. From our perspective, these are small steps, but they are meaningful.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

I am a parent of two daughters in college and a grandson who attends children's learning and will soon be put in Challenger where he will be able to read at age three and a half. My concern with this bill is it hinders small businesses getting started. There are three parts to my concern. The number one concern is the overregulation being implemented at a government level. The second concern is parental choice. The third point I want to make is that our Madam Speaker of the Assembly is the Speaker of this house with a General Education Development (GED) diploma. I think we sometimes forget that education is a choice.

Lesley Pittman:

In this legislation, we are trying to reach a balance so as to not impact the access issues. It comes to a fundamental belief on the part of the folks at United Way of Southern Nevada and a number of groups that are engaged in early childhood education in our state. We believe it is in the state's best interest to help ensure that all children in Nevada, regardless of their parents' financial situation, have the same access to quality child care and early childhood education in whichever licensed child care facility they attend. This

way all the children are in the same position when they enter into K-12 and are better prepared for elementary school. That is the belief behind the push for better standardization around quality and training for early childhood educators.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

The intention is great, but I think overregulation and disregarding parental choice is not okay.

Chair Dondero Loop:

I do not think that we are regulating parental choice, because parents have many choices concerning what they do with their children. Those people who choose to put their children in day care or early childhood learning facilities need to have the most effective providers.

Are there any additional questions or comments? [There were none.]
Mr. Lieberman, did you have any comments?

Sam Lieberman, representing Eastern Seals of Southern Nevada:

Yes, thank you. Eastern Seals of Southern Nevada has a child development center that has been around for 20 years. We have been involved with child development for 80 years on a national level. Our current training requirements are 20 hours. We clearly support this bill and the additional training hours required for all childhood development staff.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Is there any additional support for A.B. 109? [There was none.] Is there anyone in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in a neutral position? [There was no one.]

Mr. Willden, I know you did not sign in to speak, but I think we need some clarification for Assemblyman Hickey.

Assemblyman Hickey:

I think you understand the entirety of my question. I am wondering about the definition of child care facility in statute.

Michael J. Willden, Director, Department of Health and Human Services:

I think the question was in regard to which licensing category this bill applies to. The child care facilities in the licensing category are five or more children. This bill would not apply to individuals who care for less than five children. The standards for the licensee or director in section 1 apply to the five or greater facility. The training for all employees also applies to the five or greater child care facilities.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

Generally speaking, the five children and above facilities are people who are in business to provide child care. Is that accurate?

Michael Willden:

That is an accurate statement.

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I think basic educational components or basic standards for knowledge of what you are doing and how you are doing would behoove a business provided there was not excessive cost involved. My concern is not for the directors because I think a lot of them already have those educational requirements. My concern is for the people who are employees at the facility. The daycare that my six grandchildren participate in and my children participated in many years ago already do a lot of these things. Essentially, you learn colors, the food groups, and the alphabet. Those are the basic education things we are talking about in these conversations; not putting an encyclopedia in a child's face and expecting them to memorize it. Those are my thoughts. I just want to be clear that these are people who are in the business of providing day care for children.

Michael Willden:

Assemblyman Bobzien and I had a conversation earlier about the complicated factors between these two bills. We will continue to work on these complications with the DHHS and the Governor's office. We will have more conversations about the licensing requirements in A.B. 109. We also need to look at the impact on small businesses. In regard to A.B. 79, the DHHS absolutely supports having the highest standards possible within our childhood care facilities. There are some process questions we need to work through. If you have looked into the statutes, there are at least four councils or committees that I can think of who advise on child care. One of our questions is where everything should properly fit. Marla McDade Williams oversees the regulatory portion of child care licensing which has an advisory council.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Child care has come a long way in the last 35 years, especially since mothers returned to work and there are so many single parents. Things have changed, and I think that is why we continue to transition in Nevada while making it the best it can be.

Marla McDade Williams, Deputy Administrator, Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services:

I wanted to remind the Committee that the Health Division licenses all child care facilities except for those in Washoe County. Washoe County has more

stringent requirements for the number of children a facility can have before they are required to be licensed. I think this is something we need to be aware of as we work through this.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any additional comments? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 109. Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 2:51 p.m.].

[A letter from United Way of Southern Nevada ([Exhibit E](#)), a list of board members from United Way of Southern Nevada ([Exhibit F](#)), a summary submitted by Denise Tanata Ashby ([Exhibit G](#)), and the veto message from the Governor ([Exhibit H](#)) were all submitted for this meeting and are provided on NELIS.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janel Davis
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Health and Human Services

Date: February 27, 2013

Time of Meeting: 1:40 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 109	C	Denise Tanata Ashby	Testimony
A.B. 109	D	The Nevada Registry	Matrix
A.B. 109	E	United Way of Southern Nevada	Letter
A.B. 109	F	United Way of Southern Nevada	List of Board of Directors
A.B. 109	G	Denise Tanata Ashby	Summary
A.B. 109	H	Governor Brian Sandoval	Veto Message