

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
March 20, 2015**

The Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair James Oscarson at 12:39 p.m. on Friday, March 20, 2015, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst
Risa Lang, Committee Counsel
Nancy Weyhe, Committee Secretary
Jamie Tierney, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lisa Ruiz-Lee, Director, Department of Family Services, Clark County
Julie Ornellas, Special Services Manager, General Services Division,
Department of Public Safety

Chair Oscarson:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have two Committee bill draft requests (BDR) for introduction before Monday's deadline. The first, BDR 40-702, is requested by this Committee. This measure revises provisions governing emergency medical services. Please bear in mind that introducing this bill does not mean support or opposition to the bill; it is just an introduction. I will entertain a motion.

BDR 40-702—Revises provisions governing emergency medical services. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 425](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR 40-702.

ASSEMBLYMAN TROWBRIDGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Oscarson:

The second bill draft request is BDR 38-545 and was requested on behalf of the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission. The measure revises provisions governing the Committee for the Statewide Alert System. I will entertain a motion to introduce BDR 38-545.

BDR 38-545— Revises provisions governing the Committee for the Statewide Alert System. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 424](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BDR 38-545.

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Oscarson:

We will now begin the work session with [Assembly Bill 52](#). I will turn it over to Ms. Coulombe to read through [A.B. 52](#).

[Assembly Bill 52](#): Revises provisions governing the persons responsible for a child's welfare. (BDR 38-192)

Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Assembly Bill 52](#) clarifies that a public or private home, institution, or facility is responsible for a child's welfare if the child resides or receives child care at the home, institution, or facility. The Department of Family Services proposed the following amendments: Clarify that care received outside the home can be all day or a portion of the day; and remove the term "child" from a location where care can be received as it could be interpreted as limited to a child care facility ([Exhibit C](#)).

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
[ASSEMBLY BILL 52](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chair Oscarson:

The floor statement will be assigned to Assemblyman Gardner. Next is [Assembly Bill 158](#).

Assembly Bill 158: Authorizes certain entities to obtain and provide or administer auto-injectable epinephrine in certain circumstances. (BDR 40-66)

Kirsten Coulombe:

Assembly Bill 158 authorizes a physician, or osteopathic physician, to issue an order of auto-injectable epinephrine to an authorized entity and allows the entity to obtain such an order. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN TROWBRIDGE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 158.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Moore:

On the third bullet point where it says any person who administers pursuant to section 3 ([Exhibit D](#)), is that telling me that someone can make a mistake and not be accountable? They are not held liable?

Kirsten Coulombe:

Mr. Chair, if I could defer to Committee Counsel.

Risa Lang, Committee Counsel:

The bill already provides some immunity from liability as you can see on page 4, section 5, subsection 1. This extends it so that somebody, as long as he is not acting in a grossly negligent or reckless manner in trying to assist somebody, will be immune from liability. He would be immune for ordinary mistakes, or if he accidentally administered the drug to someone who did not need it.

Assemblyman Moore:

With that provision, I could not support this.

Assemblywoman Titus:

There is a law already in existence called the Good Samaritan law. It essentially protects individuals who are acting in the best interest of an injured person if the individual is trying to help him. If you are a good citizen you should be covered; that is the Good Samaritan law. What this bill does is require that the

one who is in charge of the epinephrine has been trained: the individual in the building, or restaurant, an athletic trainer, or whoever. It is not going to be the wanton care of somebody walking by and saying, oh give me that EpiPen, I can do that. That is not what we are doing here. We look at whether the establishment chooses to have the EpiPen, if someone in the group—such as the Girl Scout leader—chooses to obtain the prescription from a legal provider, then shows that she knows what to do with it. In that way, if she administers it but the patient did not need it at the time, it offers some protection.

Chair Oscarson:

Just a reminder for the Committee that this is enabling. It is not a must or a shall; it is a may, if they want to. We are not forcing anyone to do it.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

In regard to this bill as a whole, I understand where the proponents are coming from, and I support trying to assist people in the prehospital setting when it comes to allergic reactions. I am very supportive of that part; however, I still have significant concerns with what this bill does. I do not believe that the side effects of epinephrine were fully disclosed during the hearing on this; I think they were downplayed, and that adverse effects on someone with a cardiac-related event, stroke, or hypertensive emergency in these situations could be extremely detrimental. Those types of situations occur far more often than somebody having an acute allergic reaction.

I do not believe that the training is adequate for people to have a solid knowledge of the drug, its indications for use, and when it should not be used. While we have this new amendment that addresses some of the liability concerns, I still believe that there are significant issues that have not been addressed by either those who get certified or the businesses that are allowed to use it. This brings into question whether they are fully covered by the Good Samaritan law once they go through formalized training. I am opposed to this bill because of these reasons and others.

Chair Oscarson:

Is there any other discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN MOORE AND SPRINKLE
VOTED NO.)

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson will do the floor statement.

Chair Oscarson:

We will now introduce Assembly Bill 164.

Assembly Bill 164: Revises provisions relating to access by patients to certain investigational drugs, biological products and devices. (BDR 40-125)

Kirsten Coulombe:

Assembly Bill 164 authorizes a manufacturer to provide, or make available, an investigational drug, biological product or device to a patient diagnosed with a terminal condition if a physician prescribes or recommends such drugs, products, or devices after certain conditions are met. An investigational drug, biological product or device is defined as (1) successfully completing Phase 1 of a clinical trial; (2) has not been approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA); and (3) is currently being tested in a clinical trial approved by the FDA. [Continued to read the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

Because of the willingness of the sponsor and the sponsors of the other bill, Assembly Bill 358, Assemblyman Ohrenschall and Assemblywoman Fiore, I have asked that we delay a vote on this so we can get together and work through some of the language together. Assemblyman Ohrenschall, we appreciate your diligence in doing that, and Assemblywoman Fiore, we appreciate your diligence in combining these two bills and developing really good legislation for the state of Nevada. We will handle A.B. 164 with a work group with Assemblywoman Titus and Assemblyman Sprinkle as co-chairs. Thank you for the Committee's indulgence and again thank you to the two sponsors of those bills. It is important legislation, and we want to get it picture-perfect so other states can model what we do. We are grateful for the time and efforts of those who have come down for that, and we look forward to your input.

Now Assembly Bill 169.

Assembly Bill 169: Provides for the collection and application of graywater for a single-family residence. (BDR 40-804)

Kirsten Coulombe:

Assembly Bill 169 requires the State Board of Health to adopt regulations concerning the use of graywater systems for a single-family residence, and such regulations are effective statewide except where a district board of health has already adopted regulations for graywater systems. [Continued to read from work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 169.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Joiner:

I have a quick disclosure I want to make. As you may recall, my husband, Kyle Davis, testified on A.B. 169 in front of this Committee on behalf of a nonprofit client of his. I have checked with legal counsel, and I do not believe there is a conflict of interest under Assembly Standing Rule 23 because the bill clearly does not affect his nonprofit client any differently than any other nonprofit. However, that being said, I am making this disclosure and plan to abstain from voting on this measure out of an abundance of caution.

Chair Oscarson:

Any other discussion? [There was none.]

Assemblyman Thompson:

Just a point of clarification. On the top of the bill it says it requires a two-thirds majority vote. I know that is if it is on the floor, but in committee is it the majority?

Chair Oscarson:

Yes, that is correct.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER ABSTAINED
FROM THE VOTE.)

Assemblywoman Spiegel will do the floor statement.

Chair Oscarson:

Ms. Coulombe, please read Assembly Bill 199.

Assembly Bill 199: Makes various changes to certain advisory committees and programs relating to health care. (BDR 38-552)

Kirsten Coulombe:

Assembly Bill 199 changes the name of the Medical Care Advisory Group to the Medical Care Advisory Committee and extends membership terms from one year to two years. [Continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a motion to do pass?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 199.

ASSEMBLYMAN TROWBRIDGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Dickman will do the floor statement.

Chair Oscarson:

Ms. Coulombe, please read the description of Assembly Bill 248.

Assembly Bill 248: Revises provisions governing reporting of information by physicians to the Department of Motor Vehicles concerning patients with epilepsy. (BDR 40-930)

Kirsten Coulombe:

Assembly Bill 248 removes the requirement that a physician report all diagnosed cases of epilepsy to the State Board of Health which in turn reported such information to the Department of Motor Vehicles. [Continued to read from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).]

Chair Oscarson:

Is there a motion to amend and do pass?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 248.

ASSEMBLYMAN GARDNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblywoman Titus will do the floor statement. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 268. This revises provisions related to foster care. Ms. Ruiz-Lee will be presenting today on behalf of many people, and we are grateful to have her here and appreciate her remarks.

Assembly Bill 268: Revises provisions relating to foster care. (BDR 38-193)

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

I am here to present Assembly Bill 268 on behalf of the Interim Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. To some degree A.B. 268 is a bit of a cleanup bill from some statute modification that was made in 2013. In 2013, we modified the licensing regulations to allow for background checks of most individuals affiliated with foster care agencies and agency related homes. However, when we made this change, this did not impact individuals who regularly care for children in a regular or traditional foster home environment. The bill that comes before you provides for the statutory authority to conduct background checks on adults who are regularly found in foster homes and who have supervision authority of children.

I want to talk about who these individuals might be. You will often hear in the child welfare arena that we refer to them as non-primaries, essentially nonlicensed individuals who are closely affiliated with those who are licensed foster parents. Typically at the time of licensure, we will encourage potential foster families to identify other individuals who can serve as a backup in case they have an emergency or they need assistance or whatever the case may be. Oftentimes what you will see is a grandma or a grandpa or an aunt or an uncle who will step forward and go through the background check process so they can officially be part of that person's licensing record to allow them to be regularly and routinely in the home and to provide substitute care for the children who are placed in that home.

Historically, our practice across the state has been this and to background check these individuals. In the last couple of years, we have realized that we have had some issue with statutory authority—or an absence of it—to actually implement this practice, so we had to modify our practices to focus on a Child Abuse and Neglect (CANS) and a local background check as opposed to the formal Department of Public Safety background check. We come before you today to ask for permission or authority to be able to background check these individuals who provide supervision to children who are in the home. Doing this will allow us to develop regulation and policy around the practice, creating clear guidance as to who requires the checks and when, and to continue with some semblance of our previous practice that we believe better ensures child safety.

I would be happy to do a walk-through of the bill for you fairly quickly. If you go to the original bill draft, we do have an amendment that came in. I am going to read off the original bill draft, but I will highlight for you where that amendment lives. Essentially what this bill does, starting at section 1, is provide us the authorization to conduct an investigation of the background and personal history of someone else who is regularly found in the home and who provides supervision to the children. You will see on page 3, line 45 that permissive language starts to appear in that section.

Page 4, line 19, is where our amendment ([Exhibit I](#)) comes into play. The language that was released says not more than once every five years. We believe that language should match the language as it appears on line 15, which would be at least once every five years. We want to make sure that if we have cause to do those background checks outside of that five-year mark, we can do it, so we tried to line up that language.

As you hit section 2, line 21, of the bill, what you see are the changes to the existing statute that are procedural and allow the authorization for those background checks to occur. With that said, I am happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Assemblyman Thompson:

What would be the definition of regularly that you mentioned? Give us some examples.

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

When we made the statute modifications in 2013, we went round and round in terms of how to define regular or routine. Ultimately we came to the conclusion that the definition in that instance and in this instance will be vetted out through regulation development. The way we use or interpret it now is the grandma who provides substitute care for her daughter's children and the foster children who are in the home. We know at the time of licensing that grandma is regularly in the home and provides supervision, so we do the background checks right then and there.

A different example would be when we have workers go into the home and on the second or third visit we notice that the same individual is routinely in the home but has not identified himself as living there. At that point in time we would say, we have seen you here a couple of times and assume that you are here pretty regularly and routinely, so you might be supervising the child. That is when we intervene and say it is time to do a background check to ensure everything is clear.

Assemblyman Thompson:

With those examples, will you have the capacity to do all of those background checks if it is a huge family?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

We do have the capacity to do them. Keep in mind that we have focused on those routinely found in the home who are also providing supervision to the child. As another example, I regularly have Sunday dinner at my home and my family members come over. Does that constitute regular and routine? Sure, but they are not supervising the child solo; they are there, and I am there. It is a family gathering as opposed to needing to have a date night, which we do two times a month, and mom comes over to watch the children. We try to segregate that. One thing we want to be very cautious of with any legislation like this is that we are not here to preclude normalcy for children. They need to be able to lead normal lives even in foster care. This provides us the ability to go back through the regulatory process and decide who and when, and to have that public dialogue about what routine means.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

When you realized that you did not have the statutory authority to do the background checks you were doing, it seemed like you might have downgraded the type of checks you were doing. When you changed the background check procedure, did you find instances of people who should have had more thorough background checks, or was it fundamentally the same?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

That is a very hard question to answer because the second you make the decision to downgrade your background check to local, that is all you get, and you do not have the ability to go backwards and run the federal FBI check. Essentially, you do not know what you are potentially missing.

When I do licensing within Clark County and the Department of Family Services, I do a couple of steps when we initially license homes. The first thing I do is a local background check. If I get something that statutorily precludes someone, I save her and me the cost of fingerprinting and tell her up front that she does not meet the qualifications of the law to be a foster parent.

If they clear the local background check, we move them formally into the FBI background check. After doing that, I still lose another 20 to 30 percent of applicants through the national background check. My assumption is that it would hold true for these individuals. Keep in mind, especially in southern Nevada, we have some transiency—people who move in and out—particularly

from California. Local is local; you only get what has happened there, not what happened elsewhere.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

The children we are talking about have come from very traumatic situations. I think the information that you just gave us is very telling as to the importance of what this bill is trying to accomplish. I am glad you recognized the problem and that we are addressing it here.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

If the foster parents have a biological child who semi-routinely watches the foster child, would that child need to have a background check? Would there be a fee to the foster family to do that check?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

The way the statute reads is that anyone over the age of 18 who is residing in the home or any other adult must have a background check.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

If it was an 18-year-old biological child?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

Yes, currently that is exactly the way the law is structured. The current statute for background checks on the license holder for a foster home is the licensee has to be background checked, any employees they have who are regularly in the home have to be background checked, and then anyone who is over the age of 18 who is in that home, with the exception of children who have been involved in the foster care system themselves.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Is there a separate fee for each person?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

It depends upon the agency that you are being fingerprinted through. Oftentimes the Department of Family Services will waive those fees, and we just pay for them. Typically we charge for initial licensing, but beyond that we cover the expenses and we also cover the expenses for relatives.

Assemblyman Moore:

When you say routinely in the household, would that include the pool guy or the gardener if they are there every day?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

No, in this instance it would not. What we are looking for is the supervision of the children, so it is not going to be the gentleman who delivers pizza or the pool boy or any of those people. That is a question that we get a lot: what does that mean and how do you define it? That is why we keep it to those who are supervising the children.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

What you are saying is right now you have no authority to do this except through regulations. I thought there was a babysitting provision; if someone was going to supervise the child for more than four hours, that person needs a background check. I do not know if that is left to each individual agency to have a policy or it is somewhere in the regulations.

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

There is not an actual standard babysitting policy for the agencies. We all have variations of a babysitting policy, although they are very similar in nature. Currently we do not have the statutory authority to do a full FBI background check on those individuals. The best we can do for those individuals is to do a local background check and then a CANS check through the central registry.

Chair Oscarson:

A foster parent takes their child to a day care facility or some facility like that. Do you rely on the background check that facility has done on the individuals? Sometimes that is transient in nature, who is taking care of children in the different rooms. Are you going to assume those background checks have been done appropriately? How do you handle that?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

We require that children go to licensed day care centers. The licensing requirements for day care centers include similar background checks for their staff as we have for foster parents. As a matter of fact, I think they are lined up nearly perfectly. We rely on the license holder or the licensed day care facility to ensure that all of their employees meet their own background check requirements for that license. The routine checks by the licensing authority help to confirm that for us, but we require our children to go to licensed day care providers. If they are not, we would do a background check to ensure they were appropriate.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I imagine some of the stickiest situations might be when you place a child with a family. You are trying to keep them in the family, but members of the family may have had less involvement with law enforcement than the parents.

Often in the family tree you can find certain patterns of behavior and issues with substance abuse. What would your intent be for family members when you have a household with multiple family members and lots of people watching the children? They are trying to make it work, trying their best, and trying to keep the child with family. You run the FBI check and find that the auntie or uncle who is in the house a lot has a DUI. What do you do then? Nothing in statute says that if you find anything in the background check, you delicense the person or write the case plan so that person cannot be around the child, or cannot supervise the child. Talk to me about after the fact and how you enforce it and what type of discretion you have with that information.

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

I am going to approach your question from two perspectives: one perspective is the license holder, the other is a non-license holder who serves as a placement resource. For a license holder, this bill draft specifies that if somebody who is in the home regularly does not meet background standards, the foster parent has an obligation to not allow that person in the presence of the child. It is contained in this bill draft.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

What are those standards? Does it have to be completely clean, or not have certain offenses within a certain time frame?

Lisa Ruiz-Lee:

If you look at the bill beginning on page 2, line 12, those are the charges that exist in the law today: murder, voluntary manslaughter, mayhem, felony involving the use or threatened use of violence, assault, sexual assault. You can walk your way down the list. These are the criminal charges that would preclude somebody from being a license holder or from being allowed in the presence of a foster child. That already exists in the statute today, so from a licensing perspective, if we have a license holder who has someone in the home providing supervision for the child and he did not meet the background requirements, according to this statute we would have the authority to pull the license if they did not follow the directive and keep him from the child's presence.

On an unlicensed provider for foster care, the process is a little different. You hit the nail on the head when you said that the standards are not the same when we look to place a child with relatives because we believe children belong with family. I am not saying that we do not have standards, because we do in terms of criminal history for relatives; however, relatives are typically licensed much later on in the process. If a child comes into care on a Sunday night, we immediately look for relatives and try to place the child with that relative that

night. We do background checks before we place that child to ensure that they meet our criminal history requirements, but those requirements are not the same as the licensing requirements. There are instances where we place children—or courts order children to be placed—in the homes of relatives that cannot meet the background requirements for licensure. We are very clear up front with people that, based upon their criminal history, they do not meet the requirements for licensing. We may place the child with them, or the court may order the child to be placed with them, but they do not meet the requirements for licensure.

Chair Oscarson:

Any other questions? Seeing none, we will now ask for testimony in support of A.B. 268. Is there anyone here or in Las Vegas testifying in support? Seeing no one, is there anyone testifying in opposition to A.B. 268? Seeing no one, is there any neutral testimony on A.B. 268?

Julie Ornellas, Special Services Manager, General Services Division, Department of Public Safety:

I am here to speak to you today regarding some of the provisions in A.B. 268 as they relate to the release of criminal history record information to a person or a private entity—the foster home in particular. When state statutes are codified through the state legislative process and then approved through codification, if they contain fingerprint provisions that allow access to federal criminal history, they have to be reviewed by the FBI to ensure they meet Public Law 92.544 criteria for access.

One of the access to criminal history criteria—if it is released based on fingerprint provisions—is that it must only be released to a governmental entity and cannot be disseminated outside of that. While it has good intent, some of the provisions of this bill would need to be modified to meet Public Law 92.544. Throughout the bill it references that the person, the licensed foster home operator, or an applicant must maintain certain records of criminal history and convictions. I assume that is for some sort of audit or regulatory oversight. We are here to offer assistance with the language and delineating who would submit the fingerprints under *Nevada Revised Statutes* 424.033 for this new purpose. Currently, the statute—which was approved by the FBI—only indicates background checks for the licensure purpose and for any resident who is 18 years or older.

This bill expands those provisions ([Exhibit J](#)) and the FBI requires any amendments that change provisions or intent to go through the process and be formally approved by the FBI to ensure they meet continued access under Public Law 92.544.

Chair Oscarson:

To make sure I understand, you are offering to work with the division to make that happen so that it would be compliant with the law. Is that correct?

Julie Ornellas:

Correct.

Chair Oscarson:

Perfect. Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there any other testimony in neutral? [There was none.] Seeing no further testimony, I will close the hearing on A.B. 268. I will now open the floor to public comment, should there be any. [There was none.] Seeing no public comment, the meeting is adjourned [at 1:23 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Weyhe
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Oscarson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Health and Human Services

Date: March 20, 2015

Time of Meeting: 12:39 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 52	C	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 158	D	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 164	E	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 169	F	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 199	G	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 248	H	Kirsten Coulombe, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
A.B. 268	I	Lisa Ruiz-Lee, Department of Family Services, Clark County	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 268	J	Julie Ornellas, Department of Public Safety	Proposed Amendment