

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
February 13, 2015**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair James Oscarson at 1:36 p.m. on Friday, February 13, 2015, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Oscarson, Chair
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblyman David M. Gardner
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Brent A. Jones
Assemblyman John Moore
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblyman Glenn E. Trowbridge

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District No. 33

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Karen Buck, Committee Secretary
Jamie Tierney, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ben Graham, Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court of Nevada
Alina Kilpatrick, Deputy Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender, Elko County
Nancy Porter, Judge, Fourth Judicial District Court
Stacey Shinn, representing the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Barry W. Lovgren, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Kevin Quint, Bureau Chief, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Dena Schmidt, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Health and Human Services
Laura E. Freed, Deputy Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Warren Whipple, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada
Joseph L. Pollock, Program Manager, Environmental Health Section, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Madge Del Sarto, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada
April Tatro-Medlin, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Dan Musgrove, Member, Southern Nevada Health District

Chair Oscarson:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 81. It revises the provisions governing programs of treatment for the abuse of alcohol or drugs.

Assembly Bill 81: Revises provisions governing programs of treatment for the abuse of alcohol or drugs. (BDR 40-488)

Ben Graham, Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court of Nevada:

Over the years, the Legislature has made efforts to put in force programs that help those who suffer from alcohol or drug addiction or both, in an effort to see that these people get treatment or get care and hopefully then will not reoffend and will get on with productive lives. One of the provisions that we have with drugs and alcohol is that the courts make various assignments for these individuals. In the more populous areas, you have a number of providers available. When we get into the more sparsely populated areas, we need to broaden that pool a little bit. That is the effort of these amendments. This bill has been out there for a while, but in the last day or two there has been an Internet exchange about potential amendments and consequences. It is important at this stage to put it on the record, but I think there may have to be some amendments a little later that clarify that nothing in this legislation anticipates or requires the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to do anything more than they are doing today. If anybody wants to stretch it to say that it does, that is certainly not the intent, and I do not think that can be read from the language.

I am asking you for the opportunity to listen. I have with me Alina Kilpatrick, the public defender from Elko, and District Court Judge Nancy Porter. They are the ones who deal with this day in and day out and have had considerable exchanges with Judge Michael Montero from Winnemucca, who also participated in putting this together. I will remain here, but I ask you to listen to them. Afterwards, there may need to be additional clean-up amendments that we would ask permission to submit for the work session.

Alina Kilpatrick, Deputy Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender, Elko County:

I would like to talk to you about Assembly Bill 81 and how this bill came about and why it is front of you. This bill came about in a meeting that the specialty courts had on a Friday morning. In that meeting we were discussing some challenges we were facing being in the rural areas and not having these brick-and-mortar facilities available to us. The diversion statutes that this bill covers, which are *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapters 453, 458, and 484C, require the specialty courts to use a facility for treatment as a treatment provider. The problem is that a facility, as defined in the statute currently, is a brick-and-mortar place. If we want to provide treatment, we have to use folks that are affiliated with these brick-and-mortar places. In places like Ely and Winnemucca, there are no brick-and-mortar treatment facilities. The rural areas

are at a real disadvantage with regard to that. That is no secret. What this bill tries to do is change the definition of "facility" and replace it with "treatment provider." It allows a treatment provider to be a person, a public or private agency, a residential treatment center, a facility for treatment for abuse of alcohol or drugs, or a voluntary organization, which is licensed or certified pursuant to NRS Chapters 641A, 641B, and 641C.

The amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) that was put in front of you today concerns "licensed or certified pursuant to NRS 641A, 641B, or 641C." I would like to explain why we have this particular amendment. When we were meeting about this bill, Judge Montero from Winnemucca pointed out that if these treatment providers were certified by the Division, that could literally mean these treatment providers would have to be Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA)-certified since the Division does not issue licenses for these treatment providers. The Division issues certifications. This is an argument regarding semantics. There is a real difference between a certification and a license. *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapters 641A, 641B, and 641C talk about the licensing boards for marriage and family therapists, for social workers, and for alcohol and drug counselors. A certification, if we were to say certified by the Division, would mean they would have to be SAPTA-certified. The whole purpose of this bill is to specifically help the rural areas. There are some awesome collateral consequences for those of you in urban areas as well, but it is to really help out the rural areas by allowing them to use local treatment providers that do not have to fill out all the paperwork, do all the applications, and go through all the certifications with SAPTA.

I am not an absolute expert on SAPTA. There are people here who work for SAPTA. What SAPTA does is give money to treatment facilities in order to provide treatment, education, and prevention. It has state money and federal money and, in order to get state and federal funds, according to the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) Chapter 458, these facilities and providers would have to be SAPTA-certified. What we are trying to do is help these specialty courts be more independent. That is what the amendment involves.

Some other collateral consequences of this bill are that it allows for voluntary organizations to be included in the definition of treatment provider. Originally, they were excluded. The reason why I included voluntary organizations when I was thinking of this bill was so that agencies such as the Salvation Army and the Reno Gospel Mission, which provide very good treatment for some folks that cannot afford it, can be included as treatment providers and help out drug courts in facilitating treatment. In addition, one of the provisions in this bill allows participants, at the judge's discretion and approval, to use similar programs in other jurisdictions to get treatment. The word "jurisdiction" is very

deliberate. I did not use "state," and the reason why I used "jurisdiction" specifically is that the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) does not fall under the purview of any state. It is under the jurisdiction of the federal government. If we brought in our divergent statutes to allow participants to engage in treatment with like providers in other jurisdictions, then veterans can utilize their VA benefits in order to help facilitate the treatment process.

Those are the major aspects of this bill. It is not designed to cost anybody any money. It is actually designed to save money, so we can be more local. We do not believe that it has absolutely any fiscal impact whatsoever.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

In regards to the SAPTA certification, what is it composed of and who is it available to? Is it offered statewide? Is it offered to nonprofits? Do you have to have certain requirements to take the class? How long is the class? Do they annually review it?

Alina Kilpatrick:

The SAPTA certification requirements that I was able to find are available and described in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) Chapter 458. It is pages and pages of small print. To answer your question thoroughly, I would have to use a lot of explaining. The issue really is not about qualifications. It is about everything that the provider would have to do, such as the application, providing proof of insurance, providing evidence of compliance with all local and state laws, having a manual that describes everyone's job descriptions, having an evacuation plan, and providing information about communicable disease issues. These are things that, of course, state and federal government want to know, but for a local provider in Elko or Winnemucca, it might not be particularly relevant.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

Can we have a follow-up? That was not the kind of answer I was hoping for. I had hoped you would have said they are trained in psychology, addiction and identification, recidivism rates, and things like that, instead of being bureaucrats about how many square feet per patient. In order to get SAPTA money, you have to have a manual and you have to have an evacuation plan, and you have to have these things rather than have qualified people that are something more than just—Well, I completed the program last week, so I am going to teach it this week—type of situation. There are drug counselors out there that would have to have master degrees to teach the programs. Maybe you do not have that in Winnemucca.

Chair Oscarson:

I agree with you 100 percent, except that in the rural areas, we struggle so desperately to have any kind of resources at all to utilize. I know that from my own community and from the communities I represent. I think this is an attempt to get some kind of a service in place for the prosecutors and the courts to be able to utilize, and that they might be able to have some services, which is better than none and having people end up back in the system. That would be my only comment. I do not mean to be critical, but it is a different animal than in the urban areas.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

I certainly agree. However, what I am trying to say is, do the Winnemucca programs, all of a sudden, become accessible in Clark County where they can have a higher level program offered to them, thereby having the unintended consequence of watering down the programs in the more urban areas? If there was a restriction that these would only be available in counties of less than 100,000, this is solved.

Alina Kilpatrick:

I think I understand your question, and your question is would there be an unintended collateral consequence of lowering the standard of care in urban areas in an effort to broaden the reach, scope and availability of treatment into rural areas? My answer to that is I do not think it is going to lower the standard of care in urban areas. The reason why is because it appears to me, just by reading the *Nevada Administrative Code*, that the SAPTA certifications are more of a bureaucratic, as opposed to a training and education type, certification. *Nevada Administrative Code* Chapters 641A, 641B, and 641C, contain all of the licensing requirements of education and training. There is actually a bill pending right now in front of the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor. It is Assembly Bill 85 to actually change some of those licensing requirements and make them more involved and require a little more. I do not think that A.B. 81 will have a negative consequence on urban areas. I actually think it will have a better consequence for urban areas because it also broadens the treatment providers to agencies that are available in urban areas, such as the Salvation Army.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

That part of the bill I enjoy and appreciate. The other side is the part that is strange.

Assemblyman Thompson:

I want to echo that, yes, it is going to help rural communities, but I see it definitely helping the urban communities because even though they are in an

urban community, it does not mean people have immediate access to the physical buildings like you talked about. Therefore, I really like the idea of helping with the overall outreach. I am hoping that someone from SAPTA will be able to let us know for sure that we are not compromising. I really want to know about the voluntary organizations. What are the requirements going to be for them, if not the same. We have the mentioned organizations in our communities but, again, the last thing we want to do is compromise level of care. I do not know if that is going to be one of your supporters that are going to come and speak, but hopefully we will have that.

Chair Oscarson:

We do have people from SAPTA here, but what I thought I would do is finish the presentation of the bill. Then I will bring them up to discuss that.

Assemblyman Jones:

It sounds like you are trying to make things easier, instead of more difficult, and get rid of the bureaucracies. As a businessman, I am so upset with the massive amounts of regulations and bureaucracy that come down on us. However, my question is somewhat similar. For example, the Salvation Army may have a 40 percent success rate while somebody with a degree might have a 15 percent success rate. Is there anything that looks at results that people have in terms of, I am a facility and what I do is come out and beat drums every day. That is not going to get somebody off drugs. Is there anything that actually statistically shows we have a 40 percent, 70 percent, 30 percent, or whatever success rate that can tie into actual results instead of the bureaucratic stuff?

Alina Kilpatrick:

The specialty courts in general are very results-oriented. The Administrative Office of the Courts publishes quite a bit about the results of the specialty courts, but in regard specifically to the facilities, I honestly do not know the answer to that question. I do not have statistics about which facility is necessarily better than the other ones. However, I would respond to that by saying people that are indigent, do not have any insurance, or are at the mercy of organizations that will provide them treatment, do not have the opportunity to really choose based upon the facilities' published success rates. Particularly in rural areas and for indigents all across the state, what we are trying to do is broaden the availability of treatment for everyone.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I do want to echo the comments that have been made as being supportive of what you are trying to do here, at least conceptually. I am going to take it to the other side, if you will. Section 22, subsection 6 of A.B. 81 says, "No person may be placed under the supervision of a treatment provider under this

section unless the treatment provider accepts the person for treatment." What exactly are those guidelines? Are these going to be internal guidelines by the provider? Is there something written somewhere that determines whether they can accept or not? I would think there would be a burden on the court system if they are trying to put people into these diversion programs and then are finding that the providers are constantly saying that they are just not going to accept them.

Alina Kilpatrick:

I understand exactly where you are coming from. I will explain a little bit about where that specific part came from. When I take a client to apply for a diversion program under any of the three statutes that are covered by this particular bill, what I do is I notify the court and the district attorney of my client's intent to do that. Then my client goes to someone to be assessed, to see if he is appropriate for treatment. The treatment provider has to say—"Yes, I will take them."—before we can go into court and say—"Your Honor, we have done this process." The reverse, not having that in place, would allow the judge to say—"Hey treatment provider, you have to take this person. I am ordering you to take this person." We definitely do not want that because treatment providers should assess who is appropriate for their specific programs based upon the guidelines, regulations, and culture of their own specific program. It is really up to the treatment provider to decide if a person is appropriate. Some treatment providers might say, "You know what? This person is not appropriate because he has severe mental health issues that need to be addressed before we can address alcohol and drug treatment. Please, Miss Kilpatrick, have your client undergo a mental health evaluation and see a psychiatrist to see if he needs to be put on medication." Then I will reevaluate if I can treat him for drugs or alcohol.

Assemblywoman Titus:

I want to clarify something that Assemblyman Trowbridge brought up and reassure him that regardless of where you go for care in the great state of Nevada, you do not have a lesser standard of care in the rural areas. There is a standard of care that we are held to, and as a rural family practice doctor, I want you to know that we are as capable as our urban brethren are. Having said that, what this bill is really doing is giving the rural courts especially, and urban courts, another avenue to place these folks and divert them from going into jails. In the rural areas, we may have fewer options than urban areas, but it allows us to keep these folks out of our jails, which are full of people with mental health issues. The diversion program is a fantastic program but, unfortunately, as good it is, there are not enough providers on all different levels, or enough programs for us to find places for these folks to go. I appreciate your comment addressing the mandating of folks that a provider

would take because all different programs have subsets of what they do best. In health care and especially in mental health care, the success rate might be 20 percent in one program and 30 percent in another program, but in the subset of a group of people with certain diagnoses, they might have a 90 percent success rate. Therefore, it is very important that they have the option to choose and make sure they get the person that they consider best suited sent to them. This bill allows yet another option for us to help these folks stay out of our overcrowded jail system and actually have some improvement in their lives.

Assemblyman Gardner:

On the bottom of page 23 and top of 24 section 30, subsection 4, paragraph(a) a couple of sentences are taken out. My concern is part of what this says is "Immediately, without entering a judgment of conviction and with the consent of the offender, suspend further proceedings and place the offender on probation for not more than 5 years." What was deleted was "upon the condition that the offender be accepted for treatment by a treatment facility"—that one I do not really see as a big issue. However, the next one I do—"that the offender complete the treatment satisfactorily and that the offender comply with any other condition ordered by the court." I was wondering why that was deleted.

Alina Kilpatrick:

Actually, that was deleted more for language purposes. I was trying to go through and clean up language to make it a little more specific. The concept of those lines that are deleted are interwoven but better written in the additions that follow because the whole purpose, and this is what you read, was regarding driving under the influence (DUI) diversion. The whole purpose is you have to complete the program successfully in order to receive diversion, which means you do not get a felony conviction on your record. I was not trying to take that provision out. I was just trying to clean up the writing. It was written in and then referenced. If we go down to line 20 of page 24, it talks about it there.

Chair Oscarson:

Ms. Lang from our Legal Division can weigh in for us if you would like her to.

Assemblyman Gardner:

Yes please.

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel:

I do think that this is correct. It was taken out and then made more specific to this particular program. It seems to be incorporated throughout this section.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

As I am working through the different sections, I think the thing I wanted to have reconciled is I see letters in support talking about the fact that this would allow for voluntary programs. When you talk about the Salvation Army, are those the type of community providers that you are talking about when you reference programs run by volunteers?

Alina Kilpatrick:

That was my intent.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

As I look through the actual language, I do not see a reference to volunteers. I clearly see the definition about who a treatment provider is and all the NAC requirements that they fall under. Where do volunteers fit into the picture?

Alina Kilpatrick:

The bill does not define volunteers, but where it came up when I was putting this together is that the original definition of facility as defined by NRS 449.00455 specifically excluded volunteers or voluntary organizations. Talk about bureaucracy blowing your mind, you are telling a person that has no money and all they want to do is get clean that they cannot go to the Salvation Army because it is free.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

You reference the definition for treatment providers. That definition does not necessarily allow for volunteers. We should be clear for the legislative record, by volunteer, you mean a licensed treatment provider that assesses no charge or fees, correct? You are not just talking about any volunteer in the community. I want to make sure, for the legislative record, that the intent is not to release folks into a community where there might be one licensed, supervising drug and alcohol provider and then a bunch of programs run by volunteers without that licensed person being there.

Alina Kilpatrick:

I completely understand your concern. The intent of this bill is to make sure that everyone who provides services to specialty court participants, according to these statutes, is licensed.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I would like to clarify section 30 of the bill for the legislative record, so that when we go back and reference this bill in ten years and are celebrating its success, the intent is clear. We are putting a lot of discretion into the treatment provider. Some of the discretion may already be status quo, but when we are

talking about a treatment provider who will supervise this person for five years, we are talking about a licensed treatment provider and not an unlicensed volunteer.

Alina Kilpatrick:

That is correct. "Mrs. Gibbons" from down the street that makes cookies and wants to talk about your alcohol problem would not qualify.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

We have gone full circle. That was exactly what I was trying to get at when I asked initially what qualifications would the people have, and you responded that they would have the SAPTA license. I then asked what requirements were there for the SAPTA license, and you said they have to have an evacuation plan, square footage, and stuff like that. I said that does not provide assurance that they have had any kind of training whatsoever. Now they have to be licensed. What kind of license are we talking about?

Alina Kilpatrick:

I apologize, Assemblyman Trowbridge. I misunderstood your question. The bill requires any treatment provider to be licensed in accordance with NRS Chapters 641A, 641B, and 641C. Chapter 641A is for marriage and family therapists, Chapter 641B is for social workers, and Chapter 641C is for alcohol and drug counselors. Each one of those chapters has different requirements for different licenses. A social worker is going to have to have a social work degree, whereas a licensed alcohol and drug counselor is going to have slightly different requirements. By way of example, a licensed alcohol and drug counselor has to have at least an associate degree or be currently in a program. As I said, there is a bill pending right now to change these licensing requirements. However, as the law stands currently, a licensed alcohol and drug counselor has to have at least an associate degree or be enrolled in an associate program specifically designed for the treatment of alcohol and drugs. These licenses are limited in some sense to their own specific areas of practice. For example, a social worker could have a broader practice spectrum than a licensed alcohol and drug counselor because a licensed clinical social worker can treat for mental illness and mental health issues, as well as alcohol and drugs, whereas a licensed alcohol and drug counselor can only treat for that. It is the SAPTA certification requirement that we are actually trying to avoid because they are different. There is a difference having a license pursuant to NRS Chapters 641A, 641B, and 641C and having certification pursuant to SAPTA. What this bill tries to do is make sure that the folks who are providing this treatment are licensed, whether they are volunteers or in a brick-and-mortar treatment facility or the counselor with his office down the block.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

That answers my question.

Nancy Porter, Judge, Fourth Judicial District Court:

Judge Michael Montero from Winnemucca could not be here today. He is in a jury trial, but he wanted me to convey to you that he supports this bill, as I do. I wanted to speak to just a few things that Ms. Kilpatrick has not covered. The specialty court that I have is the felony DUI diversion court. This court is available for people who have had their third DUI within seven years. That is it. Multiple DUI offenders beyond that cannot get into the program, and it is a onetime program. The current definition that we have of a facility means a treatment provider that has a license for an in-patient facility. That is just breaking it down to its simplest form. We do have such a facility in Elko, and they are doing a good job for us right now. However, we would like the option to be able to use some other providers, partly because it is so expensive.

The people in this felony DUI program, by statute, have to pay for all of their treatment. It is very expensive. I do not turn people away because they are making minimum wage, but it is a real struggle for them. I have spoken to other counselors in the community who have indicated that their fees would be significantly less. I want to stress again that I am very happy with the treatment provider that we have now, but expense is an issue for some of these people.

I saw some statistics the other day about the effectiveness of these DUI courts. Over the last 21 years, fatalities for DUIs have gone down. There is some indication that this can be attributed to the success of these programs. However, although I do not turn people away for inability to pay, I have been told by members of the public defender's office that some of their clients do not want to participate in this program because they know they cannot afford it. Therefore, they go to prison. There is not a lot of treatment available in prison, so they come back out still drinking or using drugs while driving, thereby endangering the community. The more people we can get into this program, the safer we make the community. By expanding the available treatment providers, we can get more people into these programs.

Ben Graham:

As indicated, there are lots of people involved in this. The entire intent here is to make sure that we have qualified providers and to protect the integrity of the system. Nothing is being requested of any other agency to engage in or to do anything or to not do anything today. It is my understanding that there are some concerns and some clean-up amendments which need to be done.

We would ask permission of the Chair to possibly bring those back at a work session later.

Chair Oscarson:

Mr. Graham, I know there are several amendments, one from your organization, as well one from Mr. Lovgren, and potentially some others at this point in time. Since I certainly want to offer those folks an opportunity to speak. If it helps your remarks any, I have asked Assemblywoman Titus to confer with all of you in a group and work the amendments and all those kinds of things out, and bring it back to the Committee for the work session. We will hopefully have it all worked out by that work session. She has graciously agreed to do that, but I still have a process we go through. Those of you who still want to speak and bring your amendments forward for the legislative record, I am happy to do that and appreciate your doing that. I would like to take any testimony in support of the bill.

Stacey Shinn, Lobbyist, representing Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) could not be here, and they wanted me to make sure that you noticed that they have written testimony submitted for the record ([Exhibit D](#)). They are also in support. Our organizations are here today in support of expanding alternatives to incarceration for individuals who pose little or no threat to our communities. At a time when we are worried about funding and supporting a state budget, we should be utilizing the most cost effective strategies. As a social worker who has worked as a treatment provider, trust me, we cost a fraction of what it costs to incarcerate individuals here in this state. Additionally, time spent in prison increases the person's likelihood of committing future crimes. Therefore, this proposal helps reduce prison reentry rates and money we are spending on our corrections budget. Assembly Bill 81 is also a positive bill when viewed through a racial equity lens because as we know, people of color are incarcerated at a disproportionate rate in Nevada and our country.

Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District No. 33:

I want to say ditto. I know there is some work to do but, as you know, in the rural areas you do not have buildings everywhere that have these facilities. There are a lot of very qualified individuals out there that could help those with drug and alcohol abuse problems. We do have a facility in Elko. A lot of times, if you are working with people that do not need to be put in a long-term facility or overnight facility, you could work with them on a day-to-day basis. I support the bill. I would like to work with Assemblywoman Titus and help with anything I can.

Chair Oscarson:

I was just going to invite you to participate in that working group. Since your folks from Elko have done such a great job with the drafting and conceptual things for this, I appreciate that. Are there any others in support of the bill? Is there anybody in opposition of the bill?

Barry W. Lovgren, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:

I am Barry Lovgren. I am a retired substance abuse treatment professional. I want to point out that there has been a lot of misconception in this room about what Substance Abuse and Prevention Treatment Agency (SAPTA) certification is about and the billing practices of the programs that SAPTA funds. I want to point out that Kevin Quint, the bureau chief for SAPTA is in this room today, and he can probably answer some questions for you and clarify some things for you. [Mr. Lovgren continued reading from written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).] Facility licensure is about health and safety. SAPTA certification is about quality assurance, by assuring that there is qualified staff to provide treatment and similar issues to make sure you get good enough treatment in a SAPTA-certified program. [He continued reading from written testimony, which included reference to proposed amendment ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

I encourage you to be a member of that working group to participate with Assemblywoman Titus and the rest of the group because your comments are well-taken.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Thank you for helping to clarify your intent with the different sections. I see what you mean because this is housed in NRS Chapter 449 and then we go in section 10 of the bill to change the setting and talk about outpatient providers. I know there is going to be a working group, but I wonder if your suggestion to make the change in section 35 is the right place to do that. Maybe that is a question for our Legal Division, or maybe that is what is going to be hashed out in the working group.

Chair Oscarson:

I think the working group will hash that out. Mr. Lovgren will make himself available to the group if there is some need to do that.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I get what you are saying about the intent, and I am sure we are probably going to hear from Kyle Devine about that as well, about the inability to have a mandate to go license or inspect something that is not a health facility.

Chair Oscarson:

Are there any more persons in support? [There were none.] Is there anybody in opposition here or in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in a neutral position? [There was no one.]

Kevin Quint, Bureau Chief, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

I did want to say that we would like to be part of that work group, and we think there are some things that we could help with the bill. We will be available. The other thing I want to mention is on some of the questions previously posed about Substance Abuse and Treatment Agency (SAPTA) and about our regulations. Actually, I would make a couple of distinctions. One is that the occupational boards represented in NRS Chapters 641A, 641B, and 641C are for individual clinicians like social workers, drug and alcohol counselors, and marriage and family therapists. SAPTA has nothing to do with that from the perspective that we do not license individual clinicians, although we do, certify detoxification technicians. What SAPTA does is certify various levels of treatment and, actually, we do not just look at the facilities or at their policies and procedures. We look at all of those things to make sure they are in line with NAC Chapter 458, which is our regulatory chapter. But also we do look at clinical issues and quality of care. We have a treatment team, which we certify and monitor on an ongoing basis each year to ensure that folks are doing certain things, but part of that has to do with quality treatment. I wanted to mention that to make sure that is very clear. We do have a large interest in quality of care and what happens in the programs. We have influence over that as well.

The other piece I want to mention about effectiveness is, although I cannot answer by program, overall treatment has been considered from national studies to be an effective modality from the perspective of people that do enter into treatment tend to use less. They have less criminal justice involvement, less social service issues and involvements, and less marital and family problems. We do know that in the aggregate, people do better in treatment. Not everyone does because we all know somebody who did not do well in treatment, so that seems to become the norm. That is actually not true. The point is, in the aggregate, there is a good outcome. I wanted to mention those two things, and I am open to any questions.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Will our changing the terminology to treatment provider jeopardize any of the funding? I know that you provide dollars for our providers; is this going to jeopardize those funds?

Kevin Quint:

No, not that I am aware of. I will say that might be more clear for this question, we fund 18 providers and that is at about 50-odd sites, some in rural Nevada and some of course in, Clark and Washoe Counties. We also certify but do not fund about 60 providers; it is a lot more than what we do fund. We do not certify an individual clinician, but we will certify a group practice that might want to be an outpatient clinic. We will certify them as that. We may certify, not the hospital itself, but the piece of a hospital that wants to have a drug and alcohol unit. Those are the kinds of things we do. However, I cannot think of any reason why this bill would prohibit us from funding people or would get in the way of that at all.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Being that we might be able to have more service providers on the scene now, is that going to potentially take away funding sources from others? I like the philosophy of the bill. However, is it going to take away from some service providers that might be doing an excellent job working in very concentrated areas?

Kevin Quint:

I do not think so. From a public health perspective, I would say that this actually affords the citizens of Nevada a greater opportunity. I am not testifying for or against the bill because I am a state employee, but I am saying that from my perspective and from a reasonable perspective, it does. To answer your question, it does provide the potential for a greater number of providers for people, not just in rural Nevada but also in Washoe and Clark Counties.

Assemblyman Jones:

I am not against diversion programs, and I love great ideas. But as a businessman, one of the things that I am very concerned about is that I know sometimes great ideas and great intentions do not result in great results. So are there statistics? What is considered success, a 20 percent success rate, an 80 percent success rate? Is there any way that we can measure if these programs are actually having the intended consequences of getting people not to recidivate with the DUIs, or not to recidivate with going back in jail, or being picked up? Is there any data that shows what is working and what is not working, instead of just having—Oh, I want to do well?

Kevin Quint:

I did reference national aggregate data. As far as Nevada goes, I am not aware of having that information, at least not at my fingertips. I would like to look into that and get back to you.

Chair Oscarson:

Perhaps that is something they can vet out in the working group. That is something I would like to see as well. I think that is good information.

Dena Schmidt, Deputy Director, Programs, Department of Health and Human Services:

While we understand the intent of the bill, we had concerns with any unintended consequences. We appreciate the Chair's opportunity to work with the work group to resolve those.

Laura E. Freed, Deputy Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

I would echo Ms. Schmidt that we appreciate very much the intent of the bill. We appreciate a draft amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) we saw from Mr. Graham earlier that I think you all may have seen on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). We thank the Chair for having Assemblywoman Titus work out the unintended consequences of the bill, as introduced, among all the parties.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there anyone else in a neutral position that would like to testify? [There was no one.] Seeing no further testimony, I will close the hearing on A.B. 81. [Submitted but not discussed letter of support from Eric Schoen ([Exhibit G](#)). I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 99. The bill makes various changes related to nonprofit camping programs for children.

Assembly Bill 99: Makes various changes relating to nonprofit camping programs for children. (BDR 40-53)

Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District No. 33:

I hope all of you got a chance to look at the pictures ([Exhibit H](#)) that were supplied on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). I am here to present Assembly Bill 99. If you look at the pictures, you will see that this is a 4-H camp and a Lions Club youth camp. This has been used for a little bit of everything for youths for many, many years. This facility was built in 1939. I guess it was opened in 1941. I have some people from Elko I would like to have come up, and they can give you more details on the camp. Right now, the camp is considered as a labor camp the way the definition is according to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). It is not a labor camp; it is a youth camp. That is all we are trying to do. It does not change sanitation, requirements on inspections, state laws, county laws, or anything. All we are trying to do is define what the definition is, and it has been used by youth for many, many years. I have Mr. Whipple with me.

Warren Whipple, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada:

My name is Warren Whipple. I am a certified public accountant in Elko, a member of the Elko Lions Club, and treasurer of Camp Lamoille. I want to give you a short history of Camp Lamoille. The camp itself really started out to be a Boy Scouts of America camp, built in 1939 and 1940. The Boy Scouts ran it for many years. During their years, they built the lodge and another building there, which were restrooms which we have now replaced. They ran it for several years and finally determined they could not do it. Another organization started out in Elko called Camp Lamoille. They ran it for several years, and then they did not run it anymore. In 1986, the Elko Lions Club was asked to take over Camp Lamoille. Elko Lions Club organized another nonprofit corporation called Camp Lamoille with the same board of directors as the Elko Lions Club. That is how we have been running it now for about 30 years. We rent the camp every weekend for family reunions, weddings, 4-H camps, church camps, and the whole works.

About 30 years ago, a couple of us got the idea that maybe we should start another district camp, which would include all Lions Clubs in the state of Nevada, for underprivileged kids, or kids whose mothers just could not afford to send them to camp. So another nonprofit corporation was started called Camp Dat-So-La-Lee with the idea that each Lions Club in Nevada, roughly 50 clubs, would send a child to the camp every year. Some Lions Clubs did not participate; many other clubs would send two. Therefore, we have always had right around 50 children attend that camp for the last 25 years. The camp is an accredited camp under a camping association. They have all kinds of activities such as using BB guns, fishing, and using bows and arrows. They would feed them three good meals a day, and again, this great camp has been going on for 25 years.

Camp Dat-So-La-Lee has its own board of trustees and a president. The president that came in two years ago, for some reason, got into the statutes, and said that Camp Dat-So-La-Lee and Camp Lamoille have to come under the children's camp statutes. I did not think it did, but he was insistent on it. He went to the Attorney General who came back and said that it was not a children's camp; it was a labor camp. The reason it was a labor camp is because Camp Dat-So-La-Lee hires counselors to work with the children, and they sleep in the A-frames with the children. They said that means if you are paying them, then you are under the labor camp statutes, and no one wanted to be in violation of a statute, of course, which is why we did not have a camp for the year 2014 after 25 years. That is when we talked to Assemblyman Ellison and asked him if he could get us exempt from that statute so that we could continue to have the camp. Hopefully that will happen so that we can have the

camp in 2015, which is at the end of June. I would ask that this bill be approved.

Assemblyman Araujo:

I assume that the intent of the bill was to address this campground specifically, but, as I read it, it looks like it would eliminate all sanitation requirements from all youth camps here in the state of Nevada who have a 501(c). I just wanted to get clarification on that.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We met with LCB; we told them the thing we wanted to focus on was strictly the language for this camp. That was our main concern. Another big thing was trying to get this done early this year because if we do not, the youths from Clark County or other children around the state will not be able to participate. That is why we tried to focus strictly on Elko, and they thought the language was wrong to begin with. That is why we ended up coming up with the language they have.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I have a couple of questions. First, in actually looking at the language, it says, "conducts a camping program for not more than 20 days each year for children...." So with your specific camp, because you had mentioned multiple weekends and multiple events, this does not happen more than 20 days a year?

Warren Whipple:

Camp Dat-So-La-Lee is a weeklong camp. They come in on Sunday, and they go out on Saturday. We have had several, and still have several, groups like 4-H or church groups, and they will usually never go over a week. At the most, all the other campers are a weekend.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

So you are looking to just exempt the one-week groups?

Warren Whipple:

No, we want to be completely exempt from the statute that we are a labor camp.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I understand that. I am not quite seeing how we get to that with this language. My second question is you specifically talked about *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 444.190, powers of the health authority, and you are saying you are going to be completely exempt from the health authority in that area, because that is how I read this.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I have met with the state, and they are here right now if you want to speak with them. They will tell you that nothing changed on the permitting, the city, or the county. Everybody still does the inspections the same as they always have. The bill changes the definition so it is not a labor camp and changes it to a youth camp. That is it. All state, federal, and county regulations are still followed the same way it has always been done since 1941.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I guess I can circle back with our Legal Division because that is not the way that I am reading it.

Risa Lang:

What it does is, by saying it is not subject to the provisions of NRS 444.130 through 444.200, it takes it out of the provisions that deal with labor camps. I think the concern that Assemblyman Sprinkle is having is over the 20 days. Is that correct?

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I actually have it with both because it sounds to me like they are conducting activities there for more than 20 days a year, which then would negate what they are trying to do here.

Risa Lang:

We need to talk about that later, but if it is more than 20 days in a year, we may need to look at revising that language somewhat to make sure that it does stay exempt.

Chair Oscarson:

Is it 20 days or can we do some language changes to 20 concurrent days, because nobody is there for any longer than that? You just put that in there so we could get some continuity there. I cannot speak for Assemblyman Sprinkle, but that would probably allay some concerns.

Assemblyman Ellison:

That is correct. If you read subsection 1, it says "Conducts a camping program for not more than...." It does not say "to exceed," but we can lower that to whatever you want. However, it is never over a week. I think they did that in case they did set up or tear down. It has never been ever, that I know of, for the years that we had 4-H and everything else up there. We have never been up there over a week.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I am certainly not trying to speak against this. I just want to make sure that the language is clear so that they can get to what they are trying to achieve with this.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

I absolutely appreciate your wanting to do this youth camp. I am very familiar with Girl Scout camp, for example. I think that all of these programs are very important for our youth, but I am still struggling with two things. First, anytime you have youth in a camp, and I do not care how many days a year you provide services, I think you should have a certain standard of sanitation. Therefore, I appreciate that you are saying no sanitation changes are going to be made. There will be county inspections and all of that? What will change? I do not understand by changing it from the definition of a labor camp to a youth camp, what provision changes. What does that get you out of? What is the hindrance right now? Is it financial? Is it staff? I am not clear on that.

Warren Whipple:

The biggest problem we had was whether it was of the children's camp statute or the labor camp statute. When you read those statutes, we have to do certain things to the facility and the sanitation. One of the big things under the labor camp statutes is we had to put screens on all of the windows on the lodge. That lodge has something like 25 big windows in it. We have to put screens on them. The lodge is over 50 years old. It is designated as a historic building along with the other building that is there. We cannot change those buildings. We can maintain them, but we cannot make any changes to them. So it just prohibits us from what we are having because we cannot meet those statutes. Again, we do not have the screens on the windows. We have Elko Sanitation come up and pick up the garbage every week. However, we cannot meet the standards that are in those statutes.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We talked to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the county, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the historical side (Nevada Historical Society), and everybody that was involved with this. They understood that this facility is maintained under the value that it is. It is 50 years old. Nobody had a problem with it. There is not a bit of problem with the sanitation needs that are up there because the restrooms are in great shape. These guys keep it 100 percent maintained. So it basically comes down to one thing. Is it a youth facility or is it not? That is the only thing it is used for.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

My last question will be, if it is a youth camp, do you fall under other provisions of NRS? Maybe that is a question for staff, because I am reading right now NRS 440.150, all through 440.170, relating to kitchen utensils and how clean the toilets are. I do not think any camp should be exempt from those standards. If we are talking about screens and construction, maybe we could narrow which sections are a problem because a lot of these look very reasonable to me. As a youth camp, do they fall under statutes?

Risa Lang:

It looks like they would come under some other provisions. Chapter 444 NRS has another subheading entitled "Children's Camps." So I believe it would come under that. It starts at NRS 444.220 if you are looking at that, and perhaps when the Division comes up, they can expand on how that would work as well.

Assemblywoman Titus:

I understand what you are trying to accomplish, but I have to agree with Assemblywoman Joiner in the way I read what you presented us. I was quite concerned as a county health officer and somebody who is involved in making sure everyone's health is protected. The sanitation requirements need to be held to a certain standard, and we want to make sure that this bill does not have unintended consequences, in that it just does what you need it to. I do not see it being limited, so I had my concerns also.

Assemblyman Trowbridge:

What we have here are two issues that became comingled. One is NRS 444.130 that addresses the facility, and this addresses the organization and exempts the organization from those requirements. Therefore, you can have a zealous health inspector go out and cite the facility. They could not cite the organization if they operate fewer than 20 days and they are nonprofit. So if that is where you are trying to go, I think that is where you have wound up. If that makes you happy, it makes me happy.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I was looking at the section on children's camps and wondering why this particular camp would not fall under the definition of children's camps and why it was in the labor camp definition. Who makes that determination? Do we know? Is it the state, or is it the county?

Assemblyman Ellison:

That is why we are here, because the definition was brought up, and the only thing we could do is go back to LCB and say this is not a labor camp; it is a

youth camp, even though there are counselors there. There are counselors with anything pertaining to youth. They thought this would be a very simple bill to go through and just change from labor to youth and that would have been the end of it. As far as sanitation and everything else goes, it is just like any other facility that is used. It is very regulated.

Joseph L. Pollock, Program Manager, Environmental Health Section, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

We are the over-zealous health inspectors that have statutory authority over labor camps. We would never have interpreted this facility as a labor camp. It simply has been operating for 25 years, and it is not a labor camp. It is a children's camp. Based on the interpretation of one individual that did some research, he found out that it does somehow qualify as a labor camp. I am not really clear why he thinks it qualifies as a labor camp. They are just simply trying to exclude it from NRS 444.130 through 444.200. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 444.220 through 444.320, the section on child camps, would still apply. There is no change in the sanitary requirements for the camp. There is no change in the regulatory authority for the camp. They are just simply trying to get it out of the labor camp section, which I think is appropriate. This is not generated by a regulator. This attempt to get it cleaned up is from an individual that has a different interpretation than the state does.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

This whole conversation has revolved around one place, and now what I am hearing is it is all coming down to the definition by one individual. Is there not some possible way that we can just sit down and try to get a redefinition, as opposed to changing a statute that right now, as written, talks about a nonprofit organization? That could be any that fall within the definition that you have written here in the statute. I do not understand why we are changing an entire statute for one facility. This seems a bit too much.

Joseph Pollock:

I had trouble wrapping my head around why we were doing this, as well. We would never have treated this as a labor camp. However, if that is what it takes to get this camp open, I do not have another answer. There is an individual that is absolutely staunchly against this camp because he considers it a labor camp, and this is the only way we can resolve it. That is why we are here. I would think that if we could deal with the individual involved and get his interpretation changed, we would not be having this discussion now. I think there is no better place to be in the summertime than Lamoille, Nevada, and I would like to see the children get out there. That is why we are here.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

We are not allowed as a Legislature to create special legislation. No legislation can be promulgated for one individual or person. However, when there have been issues like this in the past, and correct me if I am wrong, I believe that we have the ability to ask for a legal opinion. If I can give an example, for the record, during the interim when there have been issues and the legislators feel like the intent of a law is not necessarily being observed, we come together and write a letter asking for an interpretation. I am assuming that this person is not housed within the state. Is that a fair assumption? I am observing that the opinion is not coming out of your office. Is that correct?

Chair Oscarson:

If I am hearing it correctly, somebody from a state agency did not make that determination.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

It is coming from your local government is what I am guessing.

Warren Whipple:

Do you mean the interpretation we got that we were a labor camp? It came from the Attorney General for the State of Nevada. That individual went to the Attorney General and the Attorney General said, "No, you are not a child camp; you are a labor camp." That is where we got hung up. We cannot follow the labor camp statutes whatsoever.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a written decision for that?

Warren Whipple:

Yes.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We took this to Brenda Erdoes, and I know that then Assemblyman Tom Grady worked on this quite a bit. He was going to put in a bill, and then I picked it up and ran with it with Mr. Whipple. Here is one of the things that a lot of people do not understand—there are a lot of these Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camps and camps were built that were youth camps on every inch of this state. These camps, legally based on that interpretation, if you do not change it to say youth facilities when they are really youth facilities, are all subject to shut down right now, all of them. If one person out of Clark County could determine that he thinks this was a labor camp and shut the camp down, it will shut down every youth camp in the state of Nevada. That is why this correction is here to fix that.

Chair Oscarson:

With your permission Assemblyman Ellison, since there have been these questions, now this new wild card of the Attorney General has been thrown into it, and time is of the essence for determination, I would like to ask that you and the folks you engaged meet with Assemblyman Trowbridge, since he has lots of knowledge in these areas from his previous experience with Clark County. He can work together with you and, in a week or so, come back to the Committee with what you found out. You could also meet with the Legal Division to determine whether there is something else we can do, because you are right. These other camps that fall under the same auspices that this camp does could potentially not have anywhere to send these children this summer and that could be problematic. Assemblyman Trowbridge, if you would agree to do that? You seem to have a good grasp on what it is, and just meet together and see what you can find out. Maybe we can schedule around other schedules and have whoever wants to participate be on it. There are some unanswered questions, and now we have an opinion from the Office of the Attorney General. Let us see where we go with that and what we can do, if that meets your approval, Assemblyman Ellison?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Yes and Legal Division did have that letter from the Attorney General. That is why they did this the way they did. They sat down with Brenda Erdoes and legal staff to determine that this was the only way we could go. I am more than happy to, but the other problem is my colleagues have to drive five hours in one direction just to get here. I can come back and present it. However, if we do not get this out of this committee to the floor, from the Assembly to the Senate, from the Senate to the committee, from the committee back to the Senate floor, and back to Assembly, we cannot get these camps open this year.

Chair Oscarson:

That is why I suggested we videoconference so that they do not have to make that five-hour drive.

Risa Lang:

I think that when this came to us, it was discussed that this could be a clarification since some folks are interpreting that it did fall within the definition of a labor camp. Having this provision and statute, specifying that it did not fall within those provisions would just be taken out and prevent anyone from interpreting it in that way. I think it was intended to be a clarification to make sure that it was interpreted the way all of you thought was appropriate.

Chair Oscarson:

With your permission, Assemblyman Ellison, we will reschedule this for next Friday. That will give you time to figure out what you are doing but still recognize the time element. You can come back to the Committee with the additional information you have been able to ascertain and maybe some other folks that could clarify even more from the legal standpoint.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We will meet with the Legal Division right away, and then we will get that teleconferenced to Elko so the people do not have to drive all the way here.

Chair Oscarson:

Please coordinate with Assemblyman Trowbridge from the Committee to do that. Any opposition from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Titus:

At what date did you get the Attorney General's decision? Was it last year or this year?

Assemblyman Ellison:

It was two years ago.

Assemblywoman Titus:

Had you thought about getting a new opinion?

Assemblyman Ellison:

The reason we did not think we needed to was because when we talked to the Legal Division, they thought that this was the way to handle this and to do that. Therefore, that is the way we went.

Chair Oscarson:

I think that may be a viable option and they can explore that as soon as possible. Please let me know your progress, and then we will go from there, if that is all right, Assemblyman Ellison? I think that is the way to do it so we get this all vetted out and get the right folks at the table.

Assemblyman Ellison:

If the Speaker could work on this to get it ironed out and through to the other house and do whatever we have to do to get this out of here, I would appreciate it.

Chair Oscarson:

Assemblyman Hambrick, Assemblyman Ellison has a request for you, and I am sure that you are aware of the expediency of this issue. Are there people in support? Is there anyone to testify in Las Vegas or in Carson City in support?

Madge Del Sarto, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada:

I do the rental of Camp Lamoille, and I am also in the Lions Club. This all started with a disgruntled person from Las Vegas that wanted to move the camp to Las Vegas. He talked to the right people until he got what he wanted, and they came back with the labor camp because the counselors are paid. The reason it could not be a child's camp was because they did not have curriculum approved by an education district. Under the labor camp, you had to have a certain number of restrooms for so many people. You had to have sealed garbage cans. They are U.S. Forest Service buildings, so you do not make an improvement or change to any of the buildings without Forest Service approval. This was why they put it as a labor camp because they did not have a curriculum approved by a school district.

Chair Oscarson:

Thank you for that history. That clarifies even a little more and makes it a whole different ball game yet again.

Madge Del Sarto:

You had to have so many sealed garbage cans located at so many places. In all they have nine A-frames there, and they were not screened. This is a primitive camp. I just wanted to explain why they said that was a labor camp versus a child's camp. This camp is one week out of the year, and the rest of the time it is rented to a multitude of people. Would this close the camp down to everyone or just the one-week camp?

Chair Oscarson:

That is why we have a group of folks who are going to meet and talk about that. Next is someone from Las Vegas in support.

April Tatro-Medlin, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

My name is April Tatro-Medlin. Now that we know what is going on with this bill, I am in support of changing it to what the speakers wanted, the child camp. I am in support of the people who just spoke.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there anyone else in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone else in opposition from Las Vegas or Carson City? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral?

Dan Musgrove, Member, Southern Nevada Health District:

On behalf of the Southern Nevada Health District, I think the comments and questions today that came from your able Committee were some of the same concerns that we had. We just wanted to make sure that the children were in a safe environment and that all those kinds of regulations were being followed. I think that was just some of the concerns, the language, especially in the Legislative Counsel's Digest, and as Mr. Pollock pointed out, I think the statutes that are right underneath this section of law starting at NRS 444.220 that Ms. Lang referenced, put us in a much more comfortable position. However, we certainly want to work with Assemblyman Trowbridge in the group because this is an important thing for children, and we certainly do not want to stand in the way. We just want to make sure they have a safe environment.

Chair Oscarson:

Seeing no further testimony, I look forward to those results next Friday. I will close the hearing on your bill, Assemblyman Ellison, A.B. 99. Do we have any further public comment? I will open the floor to public comment from Las Vegas or from Carson City. [There was none.] We have shifted the schedule on Monday. We will have a presentation on community care medicine, which will be a bill we are hearing. We have several different presenters from across the state. Meeting is adjourned [at 3:10 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karen Buck
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Oscarson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Health and Human Services

Date: February 13, 2015

Time of Meeting: 1:36 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 81	C	Alina Kilpatrick, Office of the Public Defender, Elko County	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 81	D	Vanessa Spinazola, ACLU	Letter of Support
A.B. 81	E	Barry Lovgren, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada	Written Testimony
A.B. 81	F	Barry Lovgren, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 81	G	Eric Schoen, Human Services Network	Letter of Support
A.B. 99	H	Assemblyman Ellison	Pictures of Camps in Nevada