

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 2, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair Justin C. Jones at 3:42 p.m. on Thursday, May 2, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Justin C. Jones, Chair
Senator Debbie Smith, Vice Chair
Senator Tick Segerblom
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator Ben Kieckhefer

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Assembly District No. 5
Assemblyman Andy Eisen, Assembly District No. 21
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore, Assembly District No. 4
Assemblyman Jason M. Frierson, Assembly District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Todd Butterworth, Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Counsel
Jane E. Bailey, Audit Supervisor
Joyce Hinton, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michael McMahon, Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services,
Department of Health and Human Services
Laurie Squartsoff, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services

Senate Committee on Health and Human Services
May 2, 2013
Page 2

Amber J. Joiner, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Health and Human Services

Jon Sasser, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; Washoe Legal Services

Elisa P. Cafferata, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates

Marla McDade Williams, B.A., M.P.A. Deputy Administrator, Health Division,
Department of Health and Human Services

Valerie Wiener

Christina Vela, St. Jude's Ranch for Children

Ollie Hernandez

Ashley Roberson

Jennifer Silverman, Children's Attorneys Project, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

Ken Lange, Nevada Youth Care Providers

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

Lisa Ruiz-Lee, Director, Department of Family Services, Clark County

Jill Marano, Deputy Administrator, Family Programs, Division of Child and
Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Barbara deCastro, President, Nevada Youth Care Providers

Victor Tagle

Lisa Mariani, Children's Advocacy Alliance

Robert A. Conway

Phyllis Keen

Camela Busmente

Misty Vaughan Allen, M.A., State Suicide Prevention Coordinator, Department
of Health and Human Services

Jennifer Batchelder, Nevada Women's Lobby

Donna Smith, Vice President, Fostering Southern Nevada; Chair, Clark County
Department of Family Services Citizens Advisory Committee

Robert Durette, Ph.D., Healthy Minds

Frank Schnorbus

Leonard Foster

Phil Allen, Majestic Behavioral Health

Chair Jones:

We will start the hearing for Assembly Bill (A.B.) 8.

ASSEMBLY BILL 8 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes to provisions governing public welfare. (BDR 38-315)

**Michael McMahon (Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services,
Department of Health and Human Services):**

Assembly Bill 8 is a housekeeping measure that will revise *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 422 as it relates to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (DHCFP) regulations and NRS 422A as it relates to the to the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS) regulations. This bill appropriately reflects the responsibilities of each division and updates outdated language in the statutes.

The DHCFP was created from the DWSS in 1997. The initial language used to create the new chapters of the NRS that defined the role and responsibilities was general in nature. Over time, the language has become duplicative and unclear. The responsibilities of the two divisions are now fully established. This bill clarifies the responsibilities of each of the divisions and the respective NRS chapters.

I will walk you through a couple of the highlights. All references to food stamps, low-income energy assistance, the program for child care and development, state supplementary assistance, supplemental security income and temporary assistance for needy families have been removed from the DHCFP. These have been removed from the Medicaid provisions under NRS 422 and reside exclusively in the DWSS provision NRS 422A.

The language also clarifies that the DHCFP administers all of the functions of the State Plan for Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program called Nevada Check Up.

The DWSS will perform the eligibility function for both programs, and the application requirements will be removed from the DHCFP. All of the appeal processes will be included in NRS 422A under DWSS regulations.

The bill also transfers language from NRS 432 to NRS 422. This chapter directs the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to post physician fee-for-service rates of reimbursement on the Internet and submit a report to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB), Nevada Medicaid and Nevada Check Up. These rates are lower than the rates provided on the current Medicaid fee schedule.

The proposed language in NRS 422 will also permanently authorize the DHHS to contract with a common motor carrier or broker to provide non-emergency transportation to Nevada Check Up program recipients.

The revised language in NRS 422A will eliminate the State Board of Welfare and Supportive Services. This Board was established as a policy board, and then it became an advisory board. The Board is no longer necessary with the advent of block grants and standardization.

Assembly Bill 8 clearly describes the duties of DWSS and DHCFF. I have provided a side-by-side analysis for each section ([Exhibit C](#)).

Laurie Squartsoff (Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services):

We agree with the changes and thank the Committee for its support.

Amber J. Joiner (Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Health and Human Services):

We have provided two amendments. The first amendment is in section 30. We are proposing that you do not repeal NRS 422.291 because it relates to bankruptcy procedures that Nevada follows pursuant to federal requirements. The second amendment would add a section to NRS 422A clarifying the hearing procedure for applicants for Nevada Check Up. They will be handled by DWSS.

These proposed amendments were provided to you in a letter ([Exhibit D](#)).

Jon Sasser (Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; Washoe Legal Services):

The Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada and Washoe Legal Services initially had some concerns about this bill, but those have been addressed. Assembly Bill 8 does a good job of eliminating obsolete language and clarifying the responsibilities of both divisions. We support A.B. 8.

Elisa P. Cafferata (Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates):

Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates also had initial concerns. The concerns have been addressed in the side-by-side comparison, [Exhibit C](#), and we support A.B. 8.

Chair Jones:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 8 and open the hearing for A.B. 93.

ASSEMBLY BILL 93 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning investigations relating to child care facilities. (BDR 38-61)

Marla McDade Williams, B.A., M.P.A. (Deputy Administrator, Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services):

Assembly Bill 93 is sponsored on behalf of the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. This bill is a result of a LCB audit report on the oversight of child care facilities. The fifth recommendation of the report ensures employees at child care facilities have timely background checks for child abuse and neglect.

The bill amends NRS 432A.175 to specify that an applicant for a license to operate a child care facility shall notify the Health Division as soon as practicable but not later than 24 hours after hiring an employee.

There are regulation conflicts, but once we are able to move the regulations forward, the Health Division will be able to implement the amendment on July 1, 2014.

Chair Jones:

This Committee previously heard bills regarding licensing of child care facilities. Does this bill overlap or affect those bills?

Ms. McDade Williams:

No, it does not.

Senator Hardy:

How does a child care facility notify the Health Division of a new employee within 24 hours?

Ms. McDade Williams:

The current process requires the child care facility to mail the appropriate forms the Health Division. We verify the criminal background checks have been initiated, and we check the child abuse and neglect registry. We will change the mailing process to a fax process over a secured fax system.

Valerie Wiener:

I chaired the interim Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. We were allotted ten measures. This bill was important enough to bring forward to help the State comply with requirements of timely notice. The DHHS sponsored this bill to ensure it would come through this Committee. The Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice urges your support for A.B. 93 as amended with the July 1, 2014, effective date.

Chair Jones:

We will close A.B. 93 and open the hearing for A.B. 393.

ASSEMBLY BILL 393 (1st Reprint): Expands the rights of children placed in foster care. (BDR 38-919)

Assemblywoman Michele Fiore (Assembly District No. 4):

I am here to introduce A.B. 393. Christina Vela from St. Jude's Ranch for Children is the driving force behind this bill, and she will walk you through it.

Christina Vela (St. Jude's Ranch for Children):

I am here to provide information on A.B. 393 and ask that you support the protection of foster children's rights relating to their sibling relationships. Siblings have important relationships with one another that carry through an entire lifetime.

Sibling relationships are critical for children in foster care. Children in foster care often are experiencing or have been victims of abuse or neglect. When they come into foster care, they are often separated from their siblings for various reasons. When this happens, the sibling relationships will start to erode if the children do not have constant visitations with each other.

Assembly Bill No. 154 of the 76th Session amended NRS chapter 432 to create the Nevada Foster Youth Bill of Rights. Assembly Bill 393 would propose an additional set of measures to the Foster Youth Bill of Rights. This includes, to the extent that is practicable, that youth in foster care be able to celebrate holidays, birthdays and other special moments with their siblings.

Another important right that will be added to the Foster Youth Bill of Rights is that sibling visitation cannot be withheld as a form of punishment. Children in foster care often experience an array of challenging behaviors. This is a tough

time in their lives. The caregivers of these children will sometimes see sibling visitation as a privilege. This bill will not allow this right to be withheld as a form of punishment.

Assembly Bill 393 also includes visitation rights when children have different permanency plans. Some children will be adopted and a sibling will remain in foster care. An older sibling may stay and age out of foster care, while a younger child may be adopted. Older children are often not aware of the permanency goals for their younger siblings. It is painful for teenagers to find out after the fact that the younger siblings have been adopted, and their sibling visitation rights have not been protected. Nothing can be done after the adoption is closed. The sibling visitations are left to the adults who may have good intentions to keep that relationship going, but after a period, the arrangement falls apart.

Children in foster care feel abandoned and lonely in this challenging time in their lives. Losing their siblings to our system is unfair, and it is something we can prevent by these measures.

The Foster Care Bill of Rights was a message to youth and children that we value and will protect their rights. It requires the State, county, and nonprofit agencies working on behalf of children to recognize those rights must be protected. We hope you will support A.B. 393 so we can implement these additional provisions. We believe it is a child's right to have a relationship with his or her siblings, and it is not a privilege.

Ollie Hernandez:

I am here to testify on behalf of A.B. 393. This bill is important to me because I had the life experience of being separated from my siblings while in foster care. I was in foster care and aged out in Clark County.

Bonds with siblings are the closest bonds a person can have. Your siblings are your confidants and best friends. There are inside jokes you can only share with siblings. If someone is separated from a sibling, he or she has lost that connection. While in foster care, a sibling is a constant person with whom a person can share what he or she is going through. No one can understand as a sibling can understand.

When I was 12, my older sister was placed in foster care a couple of months before my younger sister and I were placed. That was very tough for us. We had grown up with our older sister. We looked up to her and shared everything. She was someone we had known our entire lives, and she was ripped away from us.

A few months later, my younger sister was placed in foster care. After the experience with my older sister, I decided to go with her. It was my basic instinct to protect my younger sister from what might be out there. I wanted to make sure she did not get hurt.

My sister and I were in foster care for a year before we received a Children's Attorneys Project (CAP) attorney and were granted the legal right to visit our older sister on a regular basis. Even with this, there were many obstacles. Many of the foster parents were not willing to provide transportation or allow the visits. Sometimes they prohibited visits as a form of punishment. This bill does not affect me, as I am an adult, but there are foster children with siblings who are not given these rights. Foster children are vulnerable and need to have their rights protected. Without this bill, foster children's rights will be pushed aside, and siblings will not be able to see one another or share life milestones. The bond between siblings will be broken.

Chair Jones:

Thank you, Ms. Hernandez, for coming here to testify. As a CAP attorney, I had the opportunity to represent children in foster care. On more than one occasion, children were separated from their siblings. On one occasion, I had the opportunity to negotiate a post-adoptive contact agreement so the siblings could remain in contact. I know this bill is important. I appreciate Assemblywoman Fiore bringing it forward. I appreciate you being here.

Ashley Roberson:

I am here to talk to you about my personal experience of going through the Nevada foster care system. I was placed in foster care with my four brothers. There were times over the years when we were separated. We were not able to spend the quality time together that other kids take for granted. We were not able to lean on each other for support during the difficult times in our lives. This loss had a great impact on my life. Kids all over Nevada continue to be impacted by not being able to see their siblings.

I am here to help you understand the importance of keeping siblings together, or at least, of being able to see each other. Assembly Bill 393 will help keep siblings together on birthdays and holidays. This bill would also make sure they are no longer kept from seeing each other as a form of punishment.

There have been times when my older brother has been in trouble, and I was not able to see him. It did not help him. It just kept us apart. If my younger brothers were to get into trouble, I would want to be there as a positive influence. I would want to help them settle the problems they may have.

As someone who has been through the foster care system, I ask that you support A.B. 393. My experience of foster care is over, but you can change the experiences of other children.

Jennifer Silverman (Children's Attorneys Project, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada):

I represent children who are victims of abuse and neglect in the foster care system. I am here to support A.B. 393.

The Children's Attorneys Project helped a group of very dynamic youth in foster care draft, endorse and ultimately pass A.B. No. 154 of the 76th Session, the Nevada foster child bill of rights. Assembly Bill 393 does a fantastic job of expanding the bill of rights in the important area of sibling rights.

The sibling relationship is vital and long lasting as you have heard in other testimony today. Unfortunately, it is often fractured and diminished in foster care. Representing children in the foster care system, I have seen many of my clients separated from their siblings. This bill will help preserve that vital relationship. I support A.B. 393.

Ken Lange (Nevada Youth Care Providers):

I could not do a better job than the youths who testified here today. This bill started as part of a process within the Nevada Youth Care Providers led by Ms. Vela. Our members have reviewed and vetted it. We appreciate Assemblywoman Fiore bringing it together in a meaningful way. We support A.B. 393 and encourage you to move it forward. I have also provided my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

Kevin Shiller (Director, Department of Social Services, Washoe County):

Washoe County Social Services supports A.B. 393. It is often difficult to place siblings together in foster homes. This bill will hold us accountable to maintain the sibling relationships. As children progress through school and become adults, sibling relationships are an indicator of success.

Lisa Ruiz-Lee (Director, Department of Family Services, Clark County):

The Department of Family Services, Clark County, supports A.B. 393. This bill is a natural expansion of the efforts and headway this Legislature has made towards recognizing the rights of children.

Jill Marano (Deputy Administrator, Family Programs, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

The Division of Child and Family Services supports A.B. 393.

Barbara deCastro (President, Nevada Youth Care Providers):

On behalf of Nevada Youth Care Providers and all of the children served by Nevada Youth Care agencies, we encourage you to pass A.B. 393. Many children cannot live with their siblings, but they have the right to see them. We see that sibling visitations make a drastic difference in the lives of the children.

Victor Tagle:

I am a foster child and support A.B. 393. When my siblings and I were sent to foster care, all we had left was each other. One of my sisters was sent somewhere else, and I have not been able to see her for a while. I know by just believing that I will get to see her again. My other sister is still with me, and as long as we stick together, nothing bad will happen.

Lisa Mariani (Children's Advocacy Alliance):

The Children's Advocacy Alliance supports A.B. 393.

Robert A. Conway:

I am with the Ironworkers Local 433 and I am a product of Nevada's foster care system. I had five brothers and sisters who were also in the system. I support A.B. 393.

Phyllis Keen:

I am a foster parent in Las Vegas. I have been a foster parent for many years and have cared for many children. I understand the importance of sibling visitations. I support A.B. 393.

Camela Busmente:

I am a foster child and the older sister of Victor Tagle. I support this bill because I want to see my sister. She has been heartbroken since she left us. Our family is falling apart since we cannot see each other.

Chair Jones:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 393 and open the hearing on A.B. 221.

ASSEMBLY BILL 221 (1st Reprint): Requires the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services to consider measures to revise the manner in which payments are reviewed and made to providers under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program. (BDR S-232)

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop (Assembly District No. 5):

In the beginning of this Session, this Committee learned about the complexities of the Medicaid program in terms of eligibility requirements, medical services, programs available to recipients and Medicaid funding. With all public service programs, it is important to ensure everything is being done to eliminate wasteful spending. It is important to investigate the opportunities to prevent the most common forms of Medicaid fraud as soon as possible.

With the potential expansion of Medicaid through the Affordable Care Act, the Medicaid program will be further stretched to handle the influx of new recipients. It is important that we prepare ourselves by examining the way the Medicaid program can enhance efforts to prevent fraudulent claims through payments to providers.

Assemblyman Andy Eisen (Assembly District No. 21):

The motivation behind A.B. 221 was to ensure the State was doing everything possible to make sure public dollars were being spent appropriately and wisely. The State already addresses issues relating to Medicaid waste, fraud and abuse. That work is done through post-payment reviews. There is a surveillance of payments made to providers. Payments that should not have been made are identified. We have an aggressive program to recover those funds.

Assembly Bill 221 takes the steps to see if there might be programs available to identify these payments before they are made.

Section 1 of the bill directs the Director of the DHHS on or before January 2014 to issue a request for information to identify the different programs available that can automatically survey claims to Medicaid prior to payment, analyze billing utilization patterns and identify specific transactions that might be subject to additional review. These programs will also prevent payments of claims for services that have been identified as potentially wasteful, fraudulent or abusive.

Subsection 5 of the bill directs the Director of DHHS to review the responses to the request for information and submit a report to the Legislative Committee on Health Care (LCHC) in the interim. The LCHC will consider the report and make any appropriate recommendations to DHHS. The recommendations will include whether or not DHHS should move forward with a request for proposal (RFP).

Senator Kieckhefer:

Is there anything preventing DHHS from requesting information without this bill? Have potential vendors tried to work with DHHS? I am not sure we need a law to tell DHHS to do this.

Assemblyman Eisen:

The idea of this bill is to design the specific process, the request for information, the report to LCHC and the recommendation from the LCHC. If we purchase a program, we need to make sure it is cost-effective. We need to make sure we are not spending more on a program than it would recover. We need to make sure we are not adding a program that may generate money but reduce the post-payment recoveries and ultimately cost the State money. It is the responsibility of the Legislature to provide that assessment, which is why we provided a specific pathway for the Director of DHHS to follow.

Senator Kieckhefer:

Would we go through this process in the interim and then come back in 2015 for legislative authorization or appropriation to spend money?

Assemblyman Eisen:

The Interim Finance Committee could authorize the funds necessary for the RFP. The DHHS does not have the expertise necessary to develop the RFP. There would be a cost associated with bringing in the appropriate expertise.

Assemblywomen Dondero Loop:

There is a fiscal note on this bill. This bill duplicates those that have been passed in Washington and Oregon. Colorado has already prevented unnecessary abuse and waste.

Senator Kieckhefer:

Do the vendors in those states receive a percentage of the money their programs save?

Assemblyman Eisen:

The request for information does not indicate that. These plans are new, and we are on the front end so there is not a lot of data. Vendors are typically paid on a percentage basis. We want to find a program that would identify and prevent wasteful and fraudulent payments. The cost for the program would come from a percentage of these savings. There would not be additional cost to the State. We will also need to ensure we are not creating a conflict with the contracts we already have for post-payment collection. We need to be very deliberate in identifying a benefit for the State.

Senator Hardy:

Do you expect the request for information will determine if programs exist that can identify Medicaid fraud and abuse before payments are made? If the programs exist, will an RFP be issued? Will there be a cost to the State for these two separate processes?

Assemblyman Eisen:

There is no fiscal note on this bill. The request for information does not require money. If the Interim Finance Committee recommends an RFP, there will be a cost.

Ms. Squartsoff:

The Division of Health Care Financing and Policy is supportive of a request for information. New ideas to save money for the Medicaid program are worth investigating.

Chair Jones:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 221 and open the hearing on A.B. 29.

ASSEMBLY BILL 29 (1st Reprint): Creates the Committee to Review Suicide Fatalities. (BDR 40-307)

Misty Vaughan Allen, M.A. (State Suicide Prevention Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services):

According to the national strategy for suicide prevention, the No. 1 strategy is to promote awareness that suicide is a preventable public health problem. We can reduce the rate of suicides if the community knows how to prevent suicide, and people understand their roles in the efforts of promoting risk awareness and protective factors.

From 1999 to 2009, Nevada had the fourth highest suicide rate in the Nation. We have the second highest rate for middle-aged men and women.

The committee created by A.B. 29 can help us determine the trends, see the risk factors, see the protective factors and know what gaps are in the system. The committee can help build the communication between agencies and disciplines that can improve how we handle someone at risk of suicide. This will affect the suicide rates.

I came today from a training class with the Nevada National Guard. There were approximately 40 middle-aged men and women there who were at high risk of suicide. There was an amazing group of people handling suicide interventions. They came for the training because they see this issue everywhere, in their families and in their communities. The Nevada National Guard leadership realizes this is important. A suicide prevention committee can help the people in the Nevada National Guard by obtaining information for a comprehensive suicide prevention strategy.

We are lacking timely information. We are working with 2010 data. A review committee could help compile new data to see the trends and risk factors emerging with our returning men and women in the military. Does traumatic brain injury have a role in suicide? Is there an impact from the overuse of pain medications? Is high-risk behavior contributing to the deaths of these men and women? We are not getting that information.

The Committee to Review Suicides is based on the successes of the Child Fatality Review Committee and the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Committee. This review will enhance the State's efforts for suicide prevention. I have been on the Child Fatality Review Committee for a long time and have seen the positive impacts of those recommendations.

Senator Kieckhefer:

Why do the data trail so badly?

Ms. Allen:

Suicide deaths are complex because the intent is not often certain. Was the self-inflicted harm accidental or intentional? There are people from Nevada dying in other states by suicide. People from other states die in Nevada. These circumstances will hamper the investigation. We do not get national data until all states have submitted the information. National data are from 2010. Our State data are more timely.

I have submitted the Suicide in Nevada Fact Sheet 2012 ([Exhibit F](#)).

Chair Jones:

A letter supporting [A.B. 29](#) has been provided by Debra B. McKean ([Exhibit G](#)).

We will close the hearing on [A.B. 29](#), and open the hearing on [A.B. 348](#).

[ASSEMBLY BILL 348 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to foster care.
(BDR 38-457)

Assemblyman Jason M. Frierson (Assembly District No. 8):

I am here to present [A.B. 348](#). I have been working in child welfare for about a year. I have become attuned to some of the issues affecting our child welfare system and foster care in particular. I sponsored A.B. No. 154 of the 76th Session, the foster child bill of rights. This opened my eyes to the dynamics of our foster care system. One issue brought to my attention was the need for quality assurance for foster and group homes. [Assembly Bill 348](#) represents an effort to address that issue and to make sure we are looking out for our foster children. We need to ensure foster parents are trained and qualified and a system is in place to maintain these standards.

We do not always think about the process of child placement. We have had growing concerns about the operations of foster care agencies and foster homes. There have been high-profile instances in some of the foster homes, some of which have led to criminal charges related to crimes against those children. The LCB regularly conducts audits, and the findings are routinely and regularly concerning. There are issues from inadequate policies and procedures to unsafe and unsanitary living conditions.

I have reached out to the Clark County Department of Family Services (CCDFS) to discuss shoring up the licensing and statutes concerning foster care agencies and foster homes. I was surprised at the volume of licenses that CCDFS maintains and issues each year. They support more than 1,300 licensed homes with nearly 4,000 approved caregivers. There are 23 specialized foster care agencies; however, 20 percent to 25 percent have closed over the last year. There is nearly \$6 million paid to those agencies and \$20 million paid to non-agency homes for the care of children. There have been 350 licensing complaints investigated per year. The CCDFS completes 200 reports on complaints regarding licensed caregivers per year.

Assembly Bill 348 will assist the child welfare agencies with setting better and stronger standards for licensing foster care agencies and homes. This would create safer and more secure homes for our communities and for our most vulnerable children. I have coordinated with Lisa Ruiz-Lee, Director of CCDFS, both in the preparation and presentation of this bill. Ms. Ruiz-Lee has spent many hours receiving feedback from other child welfare entities, juvenile justice and provider partners. She has worked to create language that works better for everyone. Before Ms. Ruiz-Lee speaks to the Committee, there will be a factual presentation regarding the LCB audit. The information from the audit will help you understand the provisions of the bill.

Jane E. Bailey (Audit Supervisor):

I am an audit supervisor with the Audit Division of the LCB. Paul Townsend, the Legislative Auditor, regrets he could not be here today to present the "Summary of Reviews of Governmental and Private Facilities for Children 2011-2012" audit ([Exhibit H](#)).

As a member of the LCB staff, I can neither oppose nor support this bill. A review of facilities where children may be placed pursuant to an order of a court is part of the Audit Division's ongoing responsibilities. During the past interim,

we issued three lengthy reports on the results of these reviews. The full reports can be found on the Audit Division's Website. I will be presenting a summary of the reviews contained in those three reports. The reviews occurred in 2011 and 2012.

On page 3 of [Exhibit H](#), we identified 60 children's facilities that meet the requirements given in NRS 218G. This includes 20 governmental and 40 private facilities. [Exhibit H](#), page 4 shows a summary of information about Nevada facilities by facility type. For each type, it shows the number of facilities, and the capacity, average population and the number of staff for each type of facility.

In addition to the youths placed in Nevada facilities, 149 youths were placed in 26 out-of-state facilities in 13 different states. A chart summarizing Nevada youths placed in out-of-state facilities for the past 3 fiscal years is shown on page 6 of [Exhibit H](#).

The results of our reviews begin on page 6 of [Exhibit H](#). The policies, procedures and processes in place at 16 of the 17 facilities reviewed provided reasonable assurance they adequately protected the health, safety and welfare of the youths and respected the civil and other rights of the youths in their care.

Beginning on page 7 of [Exhibit H](#), we included the two most serious observations in our reviews. In March 2011, we found a foster care agency that did not provide reasonable assurance for the protection of the health and safety of the youths in its care. The agency did not ensure that foster parents maintained accurate documentation of medications prescribed or administered to youths. Additionally, they did not ensure the foster homes were free of safety hazards.

The issues observed at one of the agency's higher level of care homes were so significant we contacted CCDFS which began an investigation. The six foster children in the home were moved to other homes that evening. A file for recording the use of medication contained three different medication logs for the same child for the same month. Because of the lack of other documentation, such as physician prescriptions and transcription errors, we were not able to determine if the youth was overmedicated, under-medicated or if the medication logs were incorrect.

The CCDFS subsequently conducted an additional inspection of the agency's foster homes. It required the agency take further corrective action including monitoring the homes.

A June 2012 review of a State-operated group home found a lack of adequate supervision including employee evaluations and training, which may have contributed to numerous incidents regarding inappropriate staff behavior. The incidents included inappropriate use of physical force and the lack of supervision of the children by the staff. The incidents had been reported to the CCDFS during the 2 years prior to our review. Some of the reports were not substantiated by CCDFS, and others were still being investigated at the time of our review. These reports and the subsequent investigations resulted in a facility corrective action plan in June 2012. As of October 2012, the facility reported it is continuing to work on its corrective action plan with its licensing agency.

On the bottom of page 7 of [Exhibit H](#), we have summarized some of the most common weaknesses found at the 17 facilities reviewed. All 17 facilities need to develop or update policies and procedures. Examples of these include mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect by the staff. There also needs to be a specific period to complete reviews and revise youth treatment plans.

On page 8 of [Exhibit H](#) is the information indicating that medication administration processes and procedures were needed at 16 of the 17 facilities. For example, 13 of the facilities' youth medical files did not always contain complete or clear documentation of dispensed medications. One facility had seven youth files with missing medication administration records for up to 11 months. Medication files and records did not always contain evidence of independent review at nine of the facilities.

One State facility has implemented an independent review process. The facility has assigned staff members, who are not routinely involved in administering medications, to compare medication records with physician and pharmacy orders. These staff members also verify that the records are complete. This process has contributed to the facility identifying, documenting and addressing medication errors.

On page 9 of [Exhibit H](#), we report that 14 facilities need to improve their background check policies and processes. Two facilities did not obtain

dispositions of cases against employees when background checks showed arrests with no dispositions. In one instance, facility management requested an employee provide dispositions for arrests, but there was no evidence that management received or reviewed those dispositions. This employee continued working at the facility for 2 years with a felony conviction for possession and trafficking of a controlled substance. Other issues related to background checks are listed on page 10.

On the bottom of page 10, we also report that several facilities had issues with their complaint processes; nine did not make complaint or grievance forms available for use, and six did not have locked boxes where youth could file complaints.

Appendix B, page 13 of [Exhibit H](#) contains a list of the most common or significant complaints and observation made at these 17 facilities.

Senator Hardy:

I am confused with the language in the bill and in your presentation regarding a foster home and a foster agency. I think of a foster agency as Catholic Charities, LDS Family Services or an agency that is in charge of placing the children. You discussed the agencies as if they actually had the children living there.

Ms. Bailey:

The definition we used for the purposes of our report may be slightly different from the definition used in the [A.B. 348](#). In our definition, an agency contracts with various foster homes in the community. The child welfare agency that places a child in foster care would first place the child with an agency, and the agency would then place that child in one of their contracted foster homes.

Senator Hardy:

Children are not living in an agency; they are living in one of the foster homes.

Ms. Bailey:

Correct.

Senator Hardy:

Are Catholic Charities and LDS Family Services agencies?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

Catholic Charities is considered a child-placing agency licensed under NRS 127; however, they do not contract with foster homes. They provide home studies for the purpose of adoptions and help to facilitate private adoptions. The agencies we use are different from those used by Catholic Charities or LDS Family Services.

Thank you for the opportunity to present A.B. 348. This bill is the result of work we conducted and was developed over the past few years after numerous incidents in foster homes. We also reviewed audits prepared by the LCB and CCDFS.

Looking at events in Clark County over the last several years, we saw an absence of statutory oversight for licensing foster homes. Assembly Bill 348 is an attempt to remedy that absence. This bill will help create quality care for the children.

There has been some miscommunication or misperception in Clark County about this bill. I want to make it clear that there is not language in this bill draft intended to disrupt the placements of children who are already placed in foster care. We do not intend to revoke foster parent licenses at will. The premise behind this bill was that we wanted to ensure quality care for children and placement stability. The CCDFS's intent is not to bring harm but to create better and safer foster homes for children.

Section 2 of the bill identifies an independent living foster home. This is new to regulation and statute, but it is not new to practice. This has been problematic. Over the last year, we have conducted an extensive audit of independent living facilities and programs that exist in Clark County. They provide services to child welfare youth, juvenile justice youth, runaway youth and homeless youth. We discovered there is no oversight of these programs.

We found children living in apartments who were put on welfare or food stamps. It was the end of the month, and they were out of food stamps. There were six people sharing half a loaf of bread and half a jar of peanut butter. It was the weekend before school started, and they did not have school supplies or transportation to school. These people provide services to children. They were funding the services by billing Medicaid. Statutory oversight is needed for these types of programs, and there is a need to regulate.

We have many programs within the community that have good intentions. There are entities that run homes for pregnant or parenting teens with hundreds of volunteers who come in and out those homes. We do not have criminal histories on the volunteers, and we do not know what it is that they do. This creates the perfect opportunity for unsavory people to prey on the innocence of children. We have identified the need for these agencies to be licensed and regulated. We have included that need in the language of this bill.

Section 3 of A.B. 348 identifies, for the first time in statute, a reference to juvenile court. This is important because in practice juvenile courts and juvenile justice agencies place their children in the licensed foster homes.

Sections 4 through 7 identify a structure that needs to be in place for foster care agencies. We are requiring that the agencies be businesses recognized through the Office of the Secretary of State and that they hold a valid business license. We ask that they have a governing body with multiple members. We have discovered that agencies with governing bodies will tell us if they have problems or if they are heading down a path that may lead to problems. There are more eyes and ears focused on the efforts and activities of the agency. We have better outcomes with agencies with governing bodies.

Sections 8 through 14 establish the requirements for the people who work in foster care agencies. These sections also establish the process for the orientation agencies should provide to employees. This includes training on policy and procedures. We have found the employees of some agencies are not oriented to the work of child welfare. We established requirements that would provide stability in the workforce of the agencies.

Section 9 of the bill specifies that foster care agencies can accept volunteers for the services they provide, but they cannot rely solely on those volunteers. The programs that are struggling rely entirely on volunteers. We appreciate that they are using volunteers, but we ask that they not rely only on volunteers to provide their services.

The training component of A.B. 348 is in section 10. We require foster care agencies to provide this training to their foster parents. The intent is not to use training as a punishment, but it does give us leverage for the requirements for foster parent training.

Criminal history requirements are covered in sections 11 through 13. In the Assembly, there was considerable discussion regarding background checks for persons who come into direct contact with foster children. We changed the language from any contact to direct contact. We need to know about the criminal history of employees who have contact with the children. One of the cases of child abuse in a foster agency involved the IT person. On pages 6 and 7 of the bill, there is a list of crimes that would preclude a person convicted of from working for a foster care agency.

Section 14 identifies conflicts of interest for members of the governing bodies, employees, contractors, volunteers and vendors of the agencies. We ask that a person not be licensed for foster care placement if he or she is a vendor or an employee of the foster care agency. However, we do allow the licensing authority to make these decisions on a case-by-case basis. Placement stability is of the utmost importance. We do not want to disrupt foster child placement.

Chair Jones:

Why is it a conflict of interest for a member of the governing body, employee, consultant, contractor, volunteer or vendor of a foster care agency to adopt a child who is in the custody of the agency?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

What we see happen in foster care agencies is that there are issues with subsidy negotiations. The agencies are paying foster parents a higher rate than they would be paid through subsidy negotiations. We find we run into many hurdles when trying to move children to adoption with those agencies.

Chair Jones:

It is a broad statement to say that no one who is a volunteer or a contractor with a foster care agency can adopt.

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

The language here states we can give them permission. We would like to evaluate those on a case-by-case basis.

Senator Kieckhefer:

I am looking at section 11 regarding the background check. Is there a time when a child would be at the physical location of the agency and not in a foster home?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

Yes, there is. There are agencies that have cottage style campuses. People who are regularly and routinely on the campus could come into direct contact with the children.

Senator Kieckhefer:

I do not believe it was your intent, but this language is too broad.

Senator Smith:

We have had similar discussions in the education arena about these issues. We may need to distinguish between supervised and unsupervised children.

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

Section 15 requires foster care agencies to provide an annual report to a licensing authority.

Section 16 through section 18 of the bill establishes the relationships between the agencies and their recruited and contracted homes. It is important for us to know the terms of these relationships because we are the authority that provides payment to the foster parents. We have included in this section some of the language we would like to see in the contracts. We want to see the specifications of the financial responsibilities of each party. We also want access to the contracts.

Senator Hardy:

Why are we going through 17 different agencies instead of dealing directly with you and the county?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

Most of these agencies specialize in therapeutic foster care. They provide services to higher-needs children and youth. It is a good community partnership for them to recruit and train for those homes. There are opportunities for community partners to do business better than government. One example is Child Focus. This agency specializes in sibling preservation. An organization like Child Focus could recruit foster families that want to take large sibling groups. They can provide specialized training and support for staff in those homes.

Senator Hardy:

Are we going to discourage people with all these new regulations?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

We are not discouraging people. We are encouraging them to do what they are doing now but in a better way. We have been very concerned in southern Nevada about the quality of care for children placed in some homes. We are setting standards for agencies on how they will operate and support their foster homes. We expect the best care possible for our children.

Senator Hardy:

Can a foster parent leave an agency and apply to be a foster home with you directly?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

Yes, if he or she is affiliated with an agency and does not like that agency, that parent can change. He or she can also work directly with CCDFS.

One of the components of this bill will eliminate contracts with non-compete clauses. These contracts prevent foster parents from moving from one agency to another or to CCDFS. The bottom line is placement stability. If a family has children placed in their home and feel they need the flexibility to be affiliated with another agency or CCDFS, they should have it.

Senator Hardy:

Would a person be paid more if they work with CCDFS than with a private agency?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

We do not have that information, and that is why we would like access to the contracts. We know many of the agencies pay a higher rate than we pay the foster parents. We have also had foster parents come to us and state they were not making half the amount that we pay. The money we pay is reimbursement for the cost of the care of the children, and we need to be able to assess that by reviewing the contracts.

Senator Hardy:

Do you give more per child to the agencies than you would pay foster parents?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

Yes. We pay a higher amount to the agencies than we pay our regular foster parents. Regular foster parents are paid \$22 to \$24 a day. The therapeutic foster care agencies are paid between \$38 and \$42 a day. We have built the administrative cost into the expanded rate.

Section 20 of the bill establishes the independent living homes. This section also provides the policy and procedure requirements for these homes. We identified the standards we thought were most important, but there would need to be regulations written. These homes do not fit the traditional foster home model.

Section 21 and section 22 further define the support foster care agencies should provide to their foster homes. We ask that foster care agencies help obtain medical records on children. We also ask that foster care agencies visit their foster homes at least once every 60 days. Much of this language is tied back to the LCB audit findings. We needed to make sure there is contact between the agencies and foster homes. These contacts should occur whether there are foster children currently in the home or not.

Section 22 requires foster care agencies to provide crisis intervention and assistance to foster homes and foster parents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This is important to foster families. It will help reduce psychiatric hospitalizations for children and police call outs. Foster parents do need help at times.

Section 23 addresses the physical safety of children. It describes when a foster parent can use physical restraints and when the foster parent has to provide a report to the licensing authority of an event.

Section 24 addresses placement requirements. Foster care agencies and their licensed foster homes accept placements from a variety of sources. The placements come from private sources, welfare agencies and juvenile justice services. As part of managing the licenses, we ask to be notified when making a placement that is not through the courts or us. We also ask the foster care agencies give priority to assisting with the placement of children or youths coming from the child welfare and juvenile justice services. This is important because we have put many resources into maintaining the licenses for those homes, and we have many children who need placement.

Section 26 addresses concerns regarding the amount of time we spend doing investigations on licensed homes, particularly homes attached to agencies. Forty-seven percent of the licensing and child protective services complaints we receive are about agency homes. This is significant because agency homes comprise only 20 percent of the beds that we have. When we have complaints and render findings, where we substantiate complaints or issue corrective action plans, we would like to charge the agencies a fee for the work we do on those investigations.

Section 27 forward is language cleanup. We are trying to align all the language based on all the changes we have made in statute. In section 35, subsection 5, there is language relating to the services we provide to both welfare and juvenile justice children. We are asking that the specialized agencies work with us so we can ensure the safety of all children placed in those homes.

In section 36, we updated the provision regarding criminal history.

In section 44, subsection 3, we ask for the ability to charge a reasonable fee for home studies. We have seen an increase in the number of people coming to us under the premise that they want to be foster parents and to adopt. We go through a lot of work and effort to issue home studies and licenses. They then sit in our system for years because these people did not have the intention to foster; they just wanted to adopt. They will ask us to send the home study to a private adoption agency. With this bill, they will have to reimburse some of the costs associated with the home studies. Home studies have a high value attached to them. A private adoption agency will charge from \$3,000 to \$15,000 for a home study.

Senator Hardy:

What would be the cost of the fee?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

I would suggest we take the average number of hours associated with doing the home study and multiply it by the average wage of our employees who do the home studies. This amount will still be below what the private adoption agencies charge.

Senator Hardy:

This will make it harder for a foster family to become a foster family. What is a "reasonable" cost?

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

This charge would not apply to families that want to become foster families. We want families to foster, and we will provide their home studies free.

Section 44, subsection 3, has created some controversy. We have a large number of foster parents who are licensed through us, approximately 25 percent, who have not taken any placements in the last 6 to 8 months. In the last 12 months, 12 percent of the homes have not taken placements. This relates to the adoptive issue. They are not interested in being foster parents. They want to adopt and are waiting for that perfect child. I am maintaining their licenses and sending staff out to their homes every year to do the home inspections. This gives us the ability to tell those families that we cannot support the licenses when they have little intention of taking placement of children. The intention behind this language is not to harm parents who are taking foster children. It will not harm foster parents who have been taking foster children but need a small break. The intention is to say we need foster parents, and we need adoptive parents. There is an administrative cost involved to maintain a large number of licenses for people who have no intention of fostering.

In section 50, we struck the language dealing with provisional licenses. It is a violation of federal law to issue provisional licenses.

Section 51, subsection 4, gives us the ability to charge a reasonable fee for licensing a foster care agency. We will have to determine that amount through regulations. Foster care agencies are not licensed, but they should be. We cannot license these agencies with our current staffing.

Jennifer Batchelder (Nevada Women's Lobby):

The Nevada Women's Lobby supports A.B. 348. This bill offers improved protection for foster children.

Donna Smith (Vice President, Fostering Southern Nevada; Chair, Clark County Department of Family Services Citizens Advisory Committee):

I am a licensed foster parent, and I support A.B. 348. I serve as the Vice President of Fostering Southern Nevada, which is an all-volunteer not-for-profit organization. We run recruitment and retention programs for foster parents. I also chair the Clark County Department of Family Services Citizens Advisory Committee. This is an activist committee comprised of members from every area of child welfare. We are focused on collaborating with CCDFS to improve services to children and families. One of the committee's major work plans is focused on foster parent recruitment and development. The committee believes in meaningful statutes that provide oversight and governance of all foster parents including those with foster care agencies.

This conversation is about doing right by children and youth in the foster care system. It is about ensuring the safety and well-being of the most vulnerable population in our community. It is about doing that better. As a licensed foster parent, I would be subject to these rules, and I am fine with that. The statute changes are a good first step in the right direction.

When I look into the eyes of my children, who were both adopted through the foster care system, I cannot imagine them in the care of adults who are not qualified to provide therapy, or who have them participate in an unregulated independent living program with little food and a lack of transportation. Those things are happening now. How can we leave these children and youth so unprotected? Assembly Bill 348 is about ensuring quality care for children and youth in the foster care system. It is about holding those who provide these services to the highest standards for the sake of the children.

Assembly Bill 348 will also save the taxpayers money by an anticipated decline of incidents in foster homes with this new oversight and these new regulations. Every child deserves access to high caliber resources. By voting for A.B. 348, you will ensure this will happen for children and youth in the foster care system.

Ms. Silverman:

I represent children in the foster care system, and I support A.B. 348. I support the CCDFS's effort to regulate foster care agencies for our most vulnerable children. For many reasons this bill will be good for our child clients. Assembly Bill 348 is necessary for the CCDFS to provide much needed oversight of the therapeutic foster care agencies.

I often see my clients deprived of normalcy in these agencies. Our clients are not given opportunities to be children. They are treated more as profit centers by the agencies. My clients are overserved and overprogrammed by the unregulated agencies. They are often bombarded with time-consuming services funded by Medicaid. These services may last all day long. With the ability to provide regulation and oversight, CCDFS will be equipped to ensure our clients have the appropriate services and care they deserve.

Robert Durette, Ph.D. (Healthy Minds):

Healthy Minds is a community-based mental health practice. We have a close relationship with CCDFS. We collaborate with the CCDFS Child Haven campus and pilot a program that provides psychological care for children in the foster care system.

We have seen that further training, support and oversight are needed in the foster care system to improve care for many of the children. One example is the incident discussed in the LCB Audit Division report. We have children on medication, and we do not have oversight to see if those medications are administered accurately and appropriately. Assembly Bill 348 can improve the outcomes for some of these children.

Mr. Lange:

Nevada Youth Care Providers is the organization that represents the agencies that have been under attack today. I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)) that outlines our main concerns. It is important to remember that no child was endangered, and we should not paint everybody with the same brush. Our members who care for 400 to 500 children a day are high-quality and high-integrity providers. Many of them already have substantial quality controls in place.

Senator Segerblom:

Do you have a proposed amendment?

Mr. Lange:

Our amendment would ask you to remove all of the language that relates to the licensing process. Let us work that through the regulatory process.

Senator Segerblom:

Will you please put that in writing?

Mr. Lange:

We will do that.

Frank Schnorbus:

The hardest job in the world is being a foster child. The second hardest is being their foster parent. My wife and I have been foster parents for 12 years. We have been therapeutic foster parents for 11 years. We deal with difficult children who cannot be placed in regular foster homes. We have been directly under the State and have been under two private agencies. Our State experience was so negative it was like a bad divorce. I told my wife we would not be foster parents again unless there was an agency to act as a buffer between us and the people who would not listen to what we were trying to say.

I am concerned we are putting so much into statute when it could be done through regulations. We already live in a fish bowl, and we are a regular family. We have our own children and our foster children. It is becoming not worth being a foster family as there are so many things expected from us.

If the objective is to get children into homes and not into warehouses, there needs to be a more responsive structure. This bill goes in the wrong direction and creates a more restrictive structure. Making it more difficult for foster homes will hurt children in need of foster homes.

Leonard Foster:

I am a foster parent in Clark County. We have a sibling group of six children that we are in the process of adopting. I have an issue with section 45, subsection 3 of A.B. 348. This section will remove the license from foster families that do not accept placement of foster children. What if a foster family has a situation like a death in the family and cannot accept placement for a while? Under this section, they could have their license revoked.

If the foster family has "unreasonably" or "excessively" requested the removal of children from their home, this section says the foster home license may be revoked. Who is responsible for defining unreasonable and excessive? Most foster parents are not trained therapists; they are average people trying to help children.

The CCDFS has retaliated when foster parents asked to have a child removed from their home. There are times when foster parents know a child would be

better served in a different home. With this section, the licensing authority could revoke their license.

Giving the licensing authority the ability to revoke or suspend a license for what is allowed in subsection 1 is ridiculous.

I am opposed to A.B. 348. I ask that you remove or reword section 45, subsection 3.

Phil Allen (Majestic Behavioral Health):

I am a licensed foster parent, and I have a master's degree in counseling. I have 3 years' experience as a foster parent and several years' experience as a psychological social rehabilitation provider. I work in many of the foster homes. I also have a problem with parts of section 45 of A.B. 348. This section will give CCDFS the ability to force the foster parents to take the next child in line. My experience with foster care is that placement is more successful if a foster family can find a child that is a good fit for their home. Where there is an affinity for the child, the parents have the strength to sit through the difficult tantrums, all the medication appointments and the big blowouts that happen at the therapeutic level in foster homes.

If we, as foster parents, are forced to take children who do not fit well with our families, you will see foster homes shut down fast. The quality homes where people want to make a difference will go away. There needs to be allowance and recognition for the emotional component in the placement of foster children.

I also have a problem with section 14, preventing contract employees and mental health providers from fostering at the same agencies they serve.

Ms. deCastro:

My group, Nevada Youth Care Providers, has issues with section 14. We do not know the guidelines, and that is concerning. This section has the potential to affect several dozen children in Nevada Youth Care Providers. Many foster parents serve dual roles in the agencies where they work. Loyalty to an agency and the beliefs of an agency should not be punished.

Our other concern is section 45, subsection 3. The fit between foster home and foster children has to be right. This section would not allow for matching children and could disrupt other children who are in the home.

Ms. Keen:

I am a foster parent, and I need to have a connection with a child placed in my home. My children also must have a connection. Section 45, subsection 3 needs to be revised.

When CCDFS suspends or revokes a license, how do we know that they are being reasonable or fair to the foster parents?

Senate Committee on Health and Human Services
May 2, 2013
Page 33

Chair Jones:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 348 and adjourn at 5:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joyce Hinton,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Justin C. Jones, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	9		Attendance Roster
A.B. 8	C	15	Michael McMahon	Explanation and Proposed Amendment
A.B. 8	D	1	Amber Joiner	Letter
A.B. 393	E	2	Ken Lange	Written Testimony
A.B. 29	F	4	Misty Vaughan Allen	Suicide in Nevada Fact Sheet 2012
A.B. 29	G	1	Chair Justin C. Jones	Letter from Debra B. McKean
A.B. 348	H	18	Jane Bailey	Summary of Review of Governmental and Private Facilities for Children 2011-2012
A.B. 348	I	3	Ken Lange	Written Testimony