

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
February 19, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair Justin C. Jones at 3:34 p.m. on Tuesday, February 19, 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

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Marsheilah D. Lyons, Policy Analyst  
Risa Lang, Counsel  
Jackie Cheney, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Christopher Roller, American Heart Association  
Michelle Gorelow, M.A.Ed., Director of Program Services, March of Dimes, Nevada Chapter  
Dana Lunde, Director, Maternal and Neonatal Services, Sunrise Children's Hospital; March of Dimes  
Julie Downs  
Lawrence P. Matheis, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association  
James L. Wadhams, Nevada Hospital Association  
Valerie Wiener, Chair, Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice  
Denise Tanata Ashby, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance  
Ken Lange, Nevada Youth Care Providers

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

Marlene Lockard, Nevada Women's Lobby

John T. Jones, Jr., Chief Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney, Clark County, Nevada District Attorneys Association

Brigid Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County

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

Alex Ortiz, Principal Financial Analyst, Department of Finance, Clark County

**Chair Jones:**

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 92.

**SENATE BILL 92**: Makes certain changes related to the health of infants.  
(BDR 40-529)

**Christopher Roller (American Heart Association):**

The American Heart Association (AHA) supports S.B. 92. If passed, it would ensure every newborn in Nevada is screened for critical congenital heart disease (CCHD) using pulse oximetry. I will read my prepared testimony ([Exhibit C](#)), and I have included some supporting documentation ([Exhibit D](#) and [Exhibit E](#)).

**Michelle Gorelow, M.A.Ed. (Director of Program Services, March of Dimes, Nevada Chapter):**

I support S.B. 92. Newborn screening is a public health program designed for early identification of disorders shortly after birth that are not evident and can affect infants' long-term health. I will read from my prepared testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

**Senator Hardy:**

There is concern about false negatives or false positives that could lead to follow-up treatment. Could you address that concern?

**Mr. Roller:**

Research indicates the false positive rate is very low. If there was any detection that led to a follow-up, those follow-up decisions would be made by the parents and physicians.

**Senator Hardy:**

What are the statistics of incorrect results?

**Mr. Roller:**

I do not have it in front of me, but my recollection is 0.17 percent.

**Senator Hardy:**

What percent is that in Nevada?

**Ms. Gorelow:**

There are approximately 38,000 babies born a year in Nevada.

**Senator Hardy:**

Is that 1 out of 10,000?

**Ms. Gorelow:**

The study I saw had a range of 0.12 to 0.7 percent for the false positives. Seventy percent of CCHD would be detected through pulse oximetry.

**Dana Lunde (Director, Maternal and Neonatal Services, Sunrise Children's Hospital; March of Dimes):**

Congenital heart disease occurs in 8 out of every 1,000 live births with approximately one-quarter of these infants having CCHD. I will read my prepared testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

**Senator Hardy:**

How many echocardiograms did you do for the positive pulse oximeter results?

**Ms. Lunde:**

We are in the process of getting the program up and running. We anticipate four or five echocardiograms.

**Senator Hardy:**

Are you anticipating four to five being positive or negative?

**Ms. Lunde:**

We are anticipating four or five echocardiograms being done with half being positive.

**Senator Hardy:**

Then your percentages will be more than four children.

**Ms. Lunde:**

Correct. Sunrise Children's Hospital is the only cardiac center in the State that takes CCHD babies. We may see an influx because of the population we serve.

**Senator Hardy:**

Do you prescreen the babies for CCHD before they are born?

**Ms. Lunde:**

No. We deal with a high-risk population. We are the regional referral center. We have a high number of high-risk pregnancies and mothers without prenatal care who come to us.

**Chair Jones:**

What would the cost be if a baby was not tested and later returned to the emergency room?

**Ms. Lunde:**

I cannot give you an exact figure. Usually the babies come by ambulance and require resuscitation. They then could need cardiac surgery. In that case, the cost could be in the millions of dollars.

**Chair Jones:**

Has Sunrise Children's Hospital made the calculation that economically it makes sense to run an inexpensive test to offset the possible costs if children return?

**Ms. Lunde:**

That is correct.

**Senator Hardy:**

Realistically, these children will need cardiac surgery no matter when it is detected. Is that correct?

**Ms. Lunde:**

That is correct.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

What is the average stay in the hospital for a newborn baby?

**Ms. Lunde:**

Usually 24 to 48 hours.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Are any released before 24 hours?

**Mr. Lunde:**

It is very minimal.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Is the echocardiogram the first test you do after the three pulse oximeter tests show a positive? Are there any other diseases caused by low oxygenation that can be revealed through less costly testing first?

**Ms. Lunde:**

There is not an automatic echocardiogram for a positive finding. We would report to the physician and look at the patient's history. Other tests, such as blood or chest X-rays, would be performed. It brings awareness of possible problems and prompts further diagnostic testing.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Are the insurance carriers billed for this service, or is it absorbed into the screening procedures you provide?

**Ms. Lunde:**

It is wrapped into our current routine nursing care. As this is a new procedure nationwide, I cannot say how it will be billed in the future.

**Julie Downs:**

I have a 5-year-old daughter. My experience has been in pharmaceutical sales and most recently selling medical devices to cardiac catheterization labs in hospitals. My daughter was born with congenital heart disease that was not detected until she was 2 years old. She had no symptoms. The pediatrician checking her for a cold said there was something he did not like and administered a pulse oximetry test. She was hospitalized, and a small heart defect was detected. She had a cardiac catheterization and wound up on life

support. Her defect had never been seen before, and we were told she needed a transplant. She had surgery in May, and her future is still unknown. The pulse oximetry was the key factor in detecting her condition. I urge you to pass this bill.

**Chair Jones:**

For the record, could you identify other groups that are supporting this bill?

**Ms. Lunde:**

They include the American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Cardiology, St. Rose Dominican Hospitals, St. Mary's Hospital, Sunrise Children's Hospital, National Newborn Screening and Global Resource Center, and other pulse oximetry advocates.

**Lawrence P. Matheis (Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association):**

We reviewed the clinical evidence regarding this new procedure and feel it is viable. A cost-benefit analysis needs to be done to add a new screening test. The screen is meant to find something that is relatively rare and indicates that follow-up is necessary and a problem does not go untreated. We support this bill.

**James L. Wadhams (Nevada Hospital Association):**

We support this bill. It is a concept being performed in most of our facilities. I would like to have an opportunity to work with the sponsors and this Committee on some drafting issues to clarify and improve the bill.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Is this a billable service in most of your facilities?

**Mr. Wadhams:**

Yes, it is.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Do you know the cost?

**Mr. Wadhams:**

No, I do not.

**Chair Jones:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 92.

I would like to present a proclamation to Mr. Roller and Ms. Gorelow in recognition of Congenital Heart Defect Awareness Week ([Exhibit H](#)).

We have former State Senator Valerie Wiener in Las Vegas to present S.B. 97, S.B. 98 and S.B. 99. I will open the hearing on S.B. 97.

**SENATE BILL 97**: Revises provisions relating to hearings concerning children who are removed from their homes. (BDR 38-69)

**Valerie Wiener (Chair, Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice):**

I am pleased to be here as a retired Senator. Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 of the 76th Session directed the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study concerning the laws of the State governing the protection of children to be done in consultation with those who are affected by or participate in some way in the system. I was chair of the interim Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice.

Denise Tanata Ashby, Executive Director of Children's Advocacy Alliance, facilitated our meetings. She consolidated information from six different working groups that represented different interests to help ensure we have statutes that address the needs in a concise and equitable way. Our laws need to be more consistent with federal laws, and we need to ensure practices in the child welfare system correspond with regulations and statute. We want to promote the goal of family preservation and reunification. In our final report, we adopted 14 recommendations. Eight are included in the three bills before you.

One concern was regarding the address of record when a child is removed from a home. Our recommendation is that the address on record will be where the child was at the time of removal, not the address where the child was placed after removal.

Section 2, subsection 1 increases the amount of time allowed for the adjudicatory hearing petition alleging a child is in need of protection from 30 to 60 days.

Section 3, subsection 8 and subsection 10, strengthens the language by changing the word "opportunity" to the word "right" to be heard at the hearing.

Section 4 addresses permanent placement options for children.

**Denise Tanata Ashby (Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance):**

The Children's Advocacy Alliance is a private nonprofit organization whose mission is to serve as an independent voice for children and families in Nevada in the areas of children's safety, children's health and school readiness.

In response to S.C.R. No. 5 of the 76th Session, we created a work group comprised of State representatives from welfare agencies, attorneys, private providers, courts, academia and community advocates. I am speaking today on behalf of the work group. Additional information is in my written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).

Senate Bill 97, section 1, clarifies the address on record of a child in need of protection. This is the primary residence at the time of removal, not the address of the foster home or other protective custody placement.

Section 2 amends the time frame of when an adjudicatory hearing must be held from 30 to 60 days. Upon further consideration, the work group is respectfully requesting to remove this amendment, retaining the 30-day time frame. Extending the time frame may have the unintended consequence of delaying permanency for children. Current practice does allow for extensions when needed.

Sections 3 and 4 incorporate several provisions bringing Nevada into compliance with federal laws. Section 3 states parents, adoptive parents, siblings, relatives and foster parents have a right, not just an opportunity, to be heard at hearings. Section 4 outlines additional considerations the court must make in reviewing any plan for the permanent placement of a child, including placement out of state.

**Ken Lange (Nevada Youth Care Providers):**

We represent the specialized foster care community as well as mental health service providers to youth. We support section 1 and section 3 of S.B. 97. We strongly oppose section 2. We support the work group's recommendations.



**Chair Jones:**

To be clear, are you strongly opposed to the change to 60 days?

**Mr. Lange:**

That is correct.

**Senator Hardy:**

Was there any discussion to use the word "or," such as 30 or 60 days? Can you do the work in 30 days?

**Mr. Lange:**

I did not attend many meetings, so I cannot address that question.

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

We did discuss inserting the word "or." The discussions regarding the time frame were predicated by court congestion and trying to expedite procedures. We could potentially be delaying permanency for children if we extended the time.

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

We support S.B. 97. This bill contains requested changes to ensure compliance with federal Title IV-E requirements. Title IV-E is the section of the Social Security Act that governs activities with which state and local child welfare agencies must comply in order to receive federal funding. Audits are performed every 3 years by the Administration of Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, to ensure compliance. Nevada's last review in 2011 found deficiencies, and we were placed on a corrective action plan. The areas out of compliance were related to current statute issues. Failure to implement required changes could put the State's federal funding in jeopardy.

Senate Bill 97 address two of the concerns: first, the right for caregivers to be heard as opposed to the opportunity; second, regarding the need for increased specificity of what must be in a court order.

**Marlene Lockard (Nevada Women's Lobby):**

We agree the change from 30 to 60 days is too long a time frame for parents and relatives to go through proceedings.

**Chair Jones:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 97. Senator Wiener will introduce S.B. 98.

**SENATE BILL 98**: Revises provisions governing certain reasonable efforts made by an agency which provides child welfare services to preserve and reunify the family of a child. (BDR 38-68)

**Ms. Wiener:**

This bill changes requirements about reasonable efforts to preserve and reunite families in the best interest of the child. This measure was drafted to be in compliance with federal law.

Section 1, subsection 3 clarifies language regarding reasonable efforts. Section 1, subsection 4 requires diligence and care regarding cultural appropriateness, accessibility and availability of services. Section 1, subsection 5 refers to other requirements related to the health and safety of the child and placement issues. Section 1, subsection 7 provides additional court requirements regarding agencies.

One of the considerations when creating state statute is equitability, as each case is unique and each child is important.

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

This bill incorporates more of the recommendations made by the work group related to reasonable efforts made by child welfare agencies to preserve and reunify the family. Efforts to reunify a child and family are reasonable when the services and resources offered to the family are culturally appropriate, available and accessible within the specified time frame. These reasonable efforts can be waived when certain aggravating circumstances exist, such as subjecting the child to abandonment, torture, chronic or sexual abuse.

The original recommendation included a provision which would add a prior conviction for sexual abuse against the child or a sibling of the child to the list of circumstances in which a waiver may be granted. This provision was left out of the bill and the interim committee respectfully requests this provision be added back in to ensure compliance with federal law, [Exhibit I](#).

There was some disagreement among the members regarding section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (a), subparagraph (1). The amendment would narrow

this provision to allow waivers only when the parent or primary caretaker committed or aided or abetted in the commission of, or attempted, conspired or solicited to commit murder or voluntary manslaughter of another child. The law does not require a conviction related to a child, but allows for waivers for any conviction of murder or voluntary manslaughter.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Right now an exclusion could be made if parent or primary caretaker had been convicted of one of these crimes regardless of who it was. The way I read the bill now is that you could only have a waiver if you killed one of your other children. Is that correct?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

That is correct.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Is there a proposed amendment?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

The work group as a whole is not requesting any revisions.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

We have an amendment from the Nevada District Attorneys Association regarding that section. Is that correct?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

Yes.

In section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (d), the amendment would remove the section that permits waivers if the child or a sibling was previously removed and adjudicated abused or neglected ([Exhibit J](#)). Federal law allows waivers for aggravating circumstances, such as chronic abuse. However, Nevada is one of only nine states that permit waivers for any previous removal or adjudication.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

I read the bill to say that an exemption could be made not just for a previous case of abuse, but for a previous case where a child was removed, returned and removed again for abuse. Is that accurate?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

That is accurate. For clarification, there are different types of abuse. For example, if a child was removed from a home for parental substance abuse and was later returned to the home, possibly 5 to 10 years later, there could be a subsequent removal for something completely unrelated, such as medical neglect. The argument is whether it is appropriate to waive reasonable efforts in those cases.

**Senator Kieckhefer:**

Is the waiver of reasonable efforts left to the discretion of the judge?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

Some of the language in this bill makes it very clear that the court makes the determination on a case-by-case basis of whether or not a waiver of reasonable efforts would be appropriate.

If the committee decides to leave in section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (d), there would still be enough oversight to ensure these cases were looked at individually.

Another item of disagreement among the work group, after the recommendations were submitted, was the possibility of including an addition of an aggravating circumstance related to continual failure to protect a child from sexual abuse perpetrated by someone other than the parent. This could be another parent, stepparent, or boyfriend or girlfriend of the parent, [Exhibit I](#). Specific questions on this potential addition should be directed to the district attorney's office.

**Chair Jones:**

Could you explain what culturally appropriate services mean?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

The agency would take into consideration the cultural background of the family, such as the language spoken in the home and other cultural norms.

Additional information is in my written testimony, [Exhibit I](#).

**Mr. Lange:**

The language in section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (a) subparagraph (1) should be left alone. The indication of murder or voluntary manslaughter should be sufficient to trigger a waiver.

We support the language in section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (d) of the aforementioned section. We know some of the parents we deal with may backslide and may need more opportunity. We would not like to see a waiver triggered for something that could be relatively minor.

We also support the recommendation to include sexual abuse perpetrated by someone other than the parent.

**John T. Jones, Jr. (Chief Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney, Clark County, Nevada District Attorneys Association):**

I oppose S.B. 98. Brigid Duffy will be testifying on our amendments. She has broad experience in child welfare and juvenile matters.

**Brigid Duffy (Chief Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County):**

I have seen the good and bad of foster care, from successful outcomes to children being returned to their homes and murdered by their own parents. I have seen thousands of children go through this system. I was not a part of the subcommittee, but I was able to attend one meeting as a private citizen.

I would like to address Chair Jones' question regarding what is culturally appropriate. There is a lot of legislative intent in this area. It could mean it was culturally appropriate to use implements to torture or beat your children; or certain types of touching between children and parents was culturally acceptable. I would ask you to discuss what culturally appropriate actually means before it is used in courts, where parents could say an action is all right because it was culturally appropriate.

In regard to amending the circumstances in which an agency is not required to make reasonable efforts and defining specific aggravating circumstances, the District Attorneys Association and the Clark County Department of Family Services (DFS) do not support the premise that the subcommittee's recommendations align Nevada statutes more closely with federal law. Title IV-E of the Social Security Act specifically left it up to each individual state to define

an aggravated circumstance. Federal law states that state legislative processes will produce decisions based on public debate, consideration and broad input from all interested and relevant parties. Providing federal guidance beyond what is included in this statute is inconsistent with the intent of the statute to provide states with the maximum flexibility.

We also disagree with restricting murder and voluntary manslaughter only to that of another child of a parent. It is absurd to think about a parent who can murder somebody else's child. Furthermore, if it is the intent of the subcommittee to be more closely aligned with the federal intent of federal statutes, I urge the statute be amended to include a reference to a commentary section of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997. It says, in circumstances where a criminal proceeding is pending or conviction is under appeal, the court that hears a child welfare dependency case shall determine whether it is reasonable to attempt to reunify the child with his or her parent. The court shall consider, without limitation, the developmental needs of the child and the length of time associated with the completion of the criminal proceeding or appeals process.

Many states have different definitions of aggravating circumstances prior to removal that reach the same outcome without specifically saying a prior removal and an adjudication. Several states define an aggravated circumstance as excessive use of drugs or alcohol rendering a parent incapable of caring for the child. Other states use a mentally ill or deficient parent as criteria.

A prior removal and an adjudication of a child means the child was taken from a home and a court found that child was abused and neglected. A child can be removed and returned home the next day and never have a court proceeding. Our statute says an adjudication, which means the case went to trial or the parent pleaded no contest. Services are provided and reviewed by the courts every 6 months. Families usually receive services for over a year in an effort to return the child home. Then we talk about removing that child again. The State is saying that tool needs to be in place so the child is not cycling in and out of foster care.

**Senator Hardy:**

Could you clarify when the child should be in a foster home if parents are dragging out criminal charges?

**Ms. Duffy:**

It depends on the criminal charge. In the case of murder of another child or sexual abuse, the child will be placed in a foster home. In the case of a parent being arrested for robbery or drug-related charges, the DFS will be providing services to that family during the time criminal charges are pending.

**Senator Hardy:**

I am confused about the term permanent placement that is reviewed every 6 months by the court. Why are we reviewing a permanent placement?

**Ms. Duffy:**

Under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 432B, every child who is removed and placed in foster care has to have a court review of the child's case every 6 months until that child has a permanent home. That could be reunification, a guardian or an adoption.

When I speak about children languishing in foster care, I am talking about parents sitting in a county lockup facility awaiting trial. The court should have the discretion, based upon the developmental age of the child and, even though there is not yet a conviction, to make a decision based on the best interest of the child. Once the court finds an aggravating circumstance exists, the DFS must move to an alternative permanency plan within 30 days. If in the first 60 days of a child's removal the court finds that an aggravating circumstance exists, the court has 30 days to say the DFS is not providing reasonable efforts to this parent and then move directly towards adoption. It expedites the child's stay in foster care.

**Senator Hardy:**

You do not want them to languish in foster care. You want a definitive action to happen that gives them a permanent placement. Is that correct?

**Ms. Duffy:**

That is correct.

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

An adjudication is specific to some type of a removal related to abuse or neglect of a child. We could have nine investigations on someone dealing with substance abuse. We have the discretion as to whether to take the person to court or to petition or adjudicate him or her. When we do make the

determination to petition and we have a request for a waiver, our decision will be based on the child's best interest. Removing the language from section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (d) ties our hands from trying to move forward for permanency for the child. We have to provide significant proof when we ask for a waiver.

**Ms. Marano:**

The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services, supports most of S.B. 98. Senate Bill 98 meets the remainder of the Title IV-E requirements and ensures Nevada's compliance with our corrective action plan based on the reasonable-effort requirements added by this bill. The specific reasonable-effort requirements have to do with items the court must consider when making a reasonable-effort determination and what items must be contained in the court order. We support the inclusion of these elements in the bill.

However, S.B. 98 is not currently in compliance with our other federal mandate, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974 (CAPTA). To be in compliance with CAPTA, an additional waiver of efforts in sexual abuse cases is needed. Welfare agencies receive funds from CAPTA to assist in prevention methods, assessments, investigations, prosecution, training and treatment activities related to child abuse and neglect. We support the amendment requested by Ms. Tanata Ashby.

The DCFS is not in favor of removing the option from statute to waive reasonable efforts when a child who was previously removed from the home due to abuse or neglect was returned to the home and then was removed again. Federal law has granted states the flexibility to determine when to waive reasonable efforts for their state. If we delete the flexibility from the statute, we are taking away the ability of the court and child welfare agencies to examine and consider the facts of each case.

The additions Clark County has proposed in its amendments are supported by DCFS.

**Chair Jones:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 98 and open the hearing on S.B. 99.



**SENATE BILL 99**: Provides for the protection of children in the child welfare system from identity theft. (BDR 38-65)

**Ms. Wiener:**

Senate Bill 99 deals with identity theft. Section 1 requires an agency that provides child welfare services periodically to examine the child's credit report, if it exists. The agency is required to report any potential identity theft instances to the Attorney General. The Attorney General has the authorization to investigate reports and prosecute persons who might be responsible for identity theft.

Ms. Tanata Ashby will address some concerns that have arisen since this legislation was drafted.

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

Children and youths in the child welfare system are particularly vulnerable to identity theft crimes, both from their family members and strangers. A great number of individuals have access to the personal information of these young people, which puts foster children at higher risk of identity theft victimization. If the identity theft has not been detected, it can pose challenges for young people when they are trying to be approved for housing, securing credit or a loan, and being accepted to college.

Under federal law, an agency that provides child welfare services must run a credit check for all foster youths when they reach the age of 16 and every year thereafter while in care. The requested amendment to section 1, subsections 1 and 2 would parallel the federal law.

No other amendments are requested. Additional information is available in my written testimony, [Exhibit I](#).

**Senator Hardy:**

How do you deal with issues regarding social security numbers?

**Ms. Tanata Ashby:**

I will ask Ms. Marano to answer that question.

**Ms. Marano:**

That question points out of the reasons we are asking to limit the number of children on which we are doing reviews and our process. Different credit reporting agencies have different requirements. One of the credit reporting agencies, TransUnion, allows us to batch information. We can submit multiple requests at one time and receive a batch report back. This streamlined process limits the number of people having access to the portal and information on the child. Some of the other credit reporting agencies do not have that technology.

**Mr. Schiller:**

Washoe County supports the bill. I would like to remove the fiscal note originally attached to the bill. The proposed amendments address that fiscal issue.

**Alex Ortiz (Principal Financial Analyst, Department of Finance, Clark County):**

We had submitted a fiscal note which we now wish to remove based on the proposed amendments. Clark County supports the bill.

**Chair Jones:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 99.

**Chair Jones:**

I will introduce Bill Draft Request (BDR) 38-66.

**BILL DRAFT REQUEST 38-66:** Revises various provisions concerning investigations of reports of abuse or neglect of a child. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 176](#).)

SENATOR KIECKHEFER MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 38-66.

SENATOR SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

Senate Committee on Health and Human Services  
February 19, 2013  
Page 19

**Chair Jones:**

The Senate Committee on Health and Human Services is adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lynn Berry,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Justin C. Jones, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>		<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
S.B. 92	C	2	Christopher Roller	Written Testimony
S.B. 92	D	2	Christopher Roller	Support documentation
S.B. 92	E	1	Christopher Roller	Written Testimony of Melanie Baldwin
S.B. 92	F	4	Michelle Gorelow	Written Testimony
S.B. 92	G	2	Dana Lunde	Written Testimony
	H	1	Senator Justin C .Jones	Proclamation
S.B. 97, S.B. 98, S.B. 99	I	5	Denise Tanata Ashby	Written Testimony
S.B. 98	J	2	Denise Tanata Ashby	Support documentation