

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 1, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Health and Human Services was called to order by Chair Joe P. Hardy at 6:33 p.m. on Wednesday, April 1, 2015, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joe P. Hardy, Chair
Senator Mark Lipparelli
Senator Joyce Woodhouse
Senator Pat Spearman

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Vice Chair (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Scott Hammond, Senatorial District No. 18

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marsheilah Lyons, Policy Analyst
Eric Robbins, Counsel
Ellen Walls, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Carrie Paldi, Creative Kids Learning Center
Theresa DeGraffenreid, St. Gall Preschool
Denise Tanata Ashby, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Amanda Haboush, Ph.D., Prevent Child Abuse Nevada, Nevada Institute for
Children's Research and Policy, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Senate Committee on Health and Human Services
April 1, 2015
Page 2

Brigid Duffy, Chief Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney, Clark County
James Smith

John T. Jones, Jr., Nevada District Attorneys' Association

Lisa Durette, M.D., Child and Adolescence Psychiatry Fellowship; Healthy
Minds

Melinda Munson

Jennifer Barowitz, Department of Family Services, Clark County

Daniel Rose

Donna Smith

Stephen Fullam

Aja Staniszewski

Misty Grimmer

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

Lynne Jasames

Ollie Hernandez

Craig Rosenstein, Rabbi, Temple Bet Emet; Fostering Southern Nevada

Sean Sullivan, Deputy Public Defender, Public Defender, Washoe County

Lee Elkins, Deputy Public Defender, Public Defender, Washoe County

Bill Hart, Alternate Public Defender, Washoe County

Steve Dahl, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

John Sasser, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada

Jill Tolles

Dale A.R. Erquiaga, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of
Education

Amber Howell, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department
of Health and Human Services

Kristen Macleod, M.D.

Kristy Oriol, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence

Chair Hardy:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 359.

SENATE BILL 359: Requires a child care facility to grant priority in admission to
certain children. (BDR 38-1014)

Senator Pat Spearman (Senatorial District No. 1):

Senate Bill 359 requires a child care facility to admit—before granting to any
other child—a child who has a parent or guardian who is currently serving active
duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or who has a parent who was

killed, went missing or was captured as a prisoner of war while serving honorably on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Military families rely on quality child care facilities as an integral part of their support network. Military members or spouses are often single parents, because the other parent was injured or killed, serving on active duty, missing in action or is a prisoner of war. Military spouses often work outside the home, or continue their education. Child care is often required by these spouses. The United States Department of Defense oversees more than 800 child-development centers on military installations worldwide. These centers are not available to all military families or to families who have lost a parent or who have honorably served this Country. This bill aims to help military families access child care by giving priority admission to child care facilities. It is a small gesture we can make to thank the brave men and women for their service and sacrifice.

Senator Lipparelli:

Is it your intent if a child care facility had a wait list, that military personnel would have priority over all others on the wait list?

Senator Spearman:

Many of the child care facilities that serve military families do prioritize the list for military members. Many times, there is no other family support when one parent is absent and the other parent is alone. When I was on active duty a family plan was required. If a military member is suddenly deployed, backup child care is necessary. This bill is intended to tell the child care facility to put the active duty military family's children or those unfortunate children whose parent has been captured or killed at the head of the waiting list.

Chair Hardy:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 359 and open the hearing on S.B. 257.

SENATE BILL 257: Revises provisions relating to child care facilities.
(BDR 38-97)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse (Senatorial District No. 5):

Senate Bill 257 relates to training requirements for employees and periodic background checks for certain employees, residents and participants of child care facilities.

Based on a 2012 report from Childcare Aware of America, 22 percent of the child care workforce does not hold a high school degree, compared to 18 percent of the general population. Slightly more than one-fifth have taken some college courses, but have not completed a degree—lower than the general population at about 27 percent. Slightly less than one-fifth have a college degree compared to 30 percent of the overall population. Research shows that training and preparation of the child care workforce has a greater impact on the quality of care than any other single-quality intervention.

Currently, individuals employed in a child care facility in Nevada, except a facility that provides care for ill children, are required to: complete 15 hours of training, annually, if the facility provides care for more than 5 children but less than 12 children; and beginning January 1, 2016, complete at least 24 hours training, annually, if the facility provides care for more than 12 children. At least 2 hours of the required training must be devoted to lifelong wellness, health and safety of children.

Senate Bill 257 requires at least 12 hours of the training devoted to the care, education and safety of children to be specific to the age group served by the child care facility and approved by regulation by the State Board of Health.

In addition, each person who is employed in a child care facility is required to complete an additional 3 hours of training in the recognition and reporting of child abuse and neglect. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)) and a proposed conceptual amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) that will bring all caregivers in child care facilities up to the same level. If the facility cares for more than 5, but less than 12 children, it will be at the same level of training as those facilities that care for 12 or more children. My belief is that whoever cares for a child must have the appropriate training. Parents and guardians need to be assured that when they leave their children at a child care facility, those caring for their children can do so to the best of their abilities. I will read from my written testimony, [Exhibit C](#), concerning the necessary hours of training.

The second major provision of S.B. 257 is a common-sense provision that increases the periods required for background checks for individuals who work with or have access to children in child care facilities.

As a part of the process of obtaining a license to operate a child care facility, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) is required to conduct a background check of certain employees, residents and participants of facilities, and to prohibit unsupervised contact with a child, pending the results of a background investigation. Currently, the Division is also required to conduct a background investigation every 5 years after the initial investigation. This measure increases that frequency to every 2 years after the initial investigation. The proposed amendment, [Exhibit D](#), will require that the individual being hired must have a cleared background check before the new employee may have direct contact with any child.

In conclusion, [S.B. 257](#) and the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit D](#), take another step forward in ensuring that children who are being cared for in a child care facility have well-trained and qualified individuals who are providing care. Every mother, father, grandparent or guardian deserves to know that their children are safe when they must leave them in the care of others.

I urge your support for [S.B. 257](#).

Chair Hardy:

Must the training occur before the employee begins employment with the child care facility? Is 24 hours of training needed every year?

Senator Woodhouse:

The bill states the training must occur within 90 days after commencing employment. There is a requirement for 24 hours of training each year, and an additional 3 hours of recognition of child abuse and neglect training, making the total amount 27 hours.

Senator Lipparelli:

Does the bill cover everyone in the child care facility from those who have direct care of the child to a secretary or janitor or other personnel?

Senator Woodhouse:

Only those having direct contact with children would be required to perform the mandates of this bill. The janitors and secretaries are not covered.

Senator Lipparelli:

Are independent contractors exempted from these requirements? I want to make sure all personnel are covered.

Senator Woodhouse:

If necessary, another amendment could address independent contractors. The intent of this bill is that any person in contact with the children providing care must have the training necessary.

Senator Lipparelli:

The employee or independent contractor could not be hired until the background check is clear, is this the intent?

Senator Woodhouse:

Yes, that is the intent.

Chair Hardy:

Does the background check process consist of fingerprinting and a check to see if the person has a criminal record?

Senator Woodhouse:

That is correct.

Senator Spearman:

Would you be amenable to a friendly amendment that states if independent contractors are coming to work at the child care facility there should be a qualified staff member with them at all times?

Senator Woodhouse:

Yes, I would be amenable to that amendment.

Carrie Paldi (Creative Kids Learning Center):

I am opposed to S.B. 257. Child care staff are required to complete 21 annual training credits per year, and the amount of credits required is going up to 24 in 2016. This requirement occurred by legislation in the last Session. Within the first 90 days of employment, all child care workers must complete training in recognizing and reporting child abuse and neglect. The current regulations require a minimum of 2 hours of this training. Often, the course is 3 hours. It is

a serious and informative class. Once taken, a person will never forget it, so it is not necessary to repeat this training.

Employees receive a full background check upon their initial hiring, and every 5 years afterwards another complete background check is performed. Each year, at the school's annual licensing report period, employees are checked against the Central Registry for the Collection of Information Concerning the Abuse and Neglect of a Child in the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Costs of background checks are expensive. Employees or child care facilities pay \$80 out of their own pocket every 5 years for a background check. They pay for tuberculosis screening and certified pulmonary resuscitation training. If the requirement is changed for background checks every 2 years, the cost will increase and this could negatively affect the employee or the child care center. Child care facilities could pass on the cost to parents or guardians.

The results of the background check take 90 days. When a person is hired, a preliminary background check is performed and a temporary card is issued. The temporary card authorizes the new employee to work for the 90-day period. Within the first 24 hours of being hired, their background check is submitted to the licensing facility for the full check against the State Child Abuse and Neglect Registry and a full background check. It takes 90 days or more for a full background check to be completed.

This bill would harm child care centers, employees and families who use them.

Senator Lipparelli:

Is the employee screened before having contact with children?

Ms. Paldi:

Yes, they are fingerprinted and a preliminary background check is done. The more extensive check is done later.

Senator Lipparelli:

What does the preliminary check entail? Is it a substantial background check?

Ms. Paldi:

It is substantial. It is rare for us to find at the end of the background check the person should not be employed. I can only remember two or three times in the last 25 years this has occurred.

Senator Lipparelli:

Is the preliminary check found as a mandate in current State regulation?

Ms. Paldi:

The temporary card is required to begin work in the child care facility. To get the card, one must be hired, and once hired, the employee must disclose convictions and crimes on a form.

Senator Lipparelli:

If the person lies about convictions and there is no prescreen check, can the person receive a temporary card without independent verification?

Ms. Paldi:

No, they must be fingerprinted and the preliminary background check is done prior to the temporary card being issued.

Senator Spearman:

Many illicit activities can happen within the subsequent 5-year background check periods. What is a compromise, in your opinion, with regard to the length of time between complete background checks?

Ms. Paldi:

The 5 years would be an issue if the annual licensing check was not performed. At the licensing annual report date for the child care facility, the employees are screened against the Child Abuse and Neglect Registry.

Senator Spearman:

Does this annual screening check for other illicit or illegal activities? I have concerns if this screening only reports on child abuse and neglect and no other nefarious activities such as drug abuse or domestic violence.

Ms. Paldi:

If a person was to get a driving under the influence conviction with children in the car, it would appear on the Registry report. The report relates to activities

having to do with child abuse and neglect only. I cannot think of one employee in the last 25 years in our nine child care centers that after 5 years could not continue to work for us because of a negative background report.

Theresa DeGraffenreid (St. Gall Preschool):

I am opposed to S.B. 257. I am the director and head teacher at St. Gall Preschool. Section 1 of this bill mandates an additional 3 hours of training on recognizing and reporting child abuse and neglect. This training should only be required of all new teachers. I am also against having the background checks occur at a more frequent interval. Guidelines in statute are currently sufficient and were addressed at the last Session, especially with regard to outside contractors. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)). This legislation is unnecessary and I ask you to vote no on S.B. 257.

Senator Spearman:

Do outside contractors receive proper background checks prior to them coming in and having contact with children?

Ms. DeGraffenreid:

Yes.

Denise Tanata Ashby (Children's Advocacy Alliance):

We are neutral concerning this bill. We support the requirement for the additional hours for child abuse and neglect training. This training is important for child care providers to have subsequent training on this matter to keep current.

Regarding the background checks occurring every 2 years, we need to balance the protection of children with the impact this process has on the facility and the employee. The cost could be passed down to the parents who use these facilities. One possibility would be to establish in statute the mandate that the employees self-report any illicit or illegal crimes. Most of the types of crimes that would disqualify an employee from working in a child care facility would be caught in the current annual review.

The proposed amendment, [Exhibit C](#), would require training for employees of child care facilities regardless if the employee is responsible for less or more than 12 children. Assembly Bill No. 109 of the 77th Session increased required educational hours for employees who cover more than 12 children, but

educational hours for those responsible to supervise less than 12 children was reduced to lessen the burden for the smaller facilities, including home-based rural facilities.

Chair Hardy:

Are all employees' background checks completed every year?

Ms. Ashby:

There is an annual child abuse and neglect screening for every employee upon the date of the facility's annual licensure.

Amanda Haboush, Ph.D. (Prevent Child Abuse Nevada, Nevada Institute for Children's Research and Policy, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

We looked at child abuse and neglect training classes available in our community. Most are 2 hours in length. There is one 3-hour class available online. There is an expensive 4-hour class online as well. We are concerned about child care employees getting training online. Our organization provides the 2-hour training and we feel it is adequate to address needs.

Chair Hardy:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 257 and open the hearing on S.B. 303.

SENATE BILL 303: Revises provisions relating to the protection of children.
(BDR 38-1036)

Senator Scott Hammond (Senatorial District No. 18):

Senate Bill 303 expands the circumstances under which a child is considered to be in need of protection and requires the courts to consider specific factors in determining the risk of injury to a child if the child is returned to, or remains in the home of his or her parents.

I will begin my presentation with a story. On September 15, 2009, a 5-week old infant, I will call "Emma," suffered nonaccidental head trauma while in the care of her parents. She sustained a skull fracture and two brain bleeds from two different abusive events. When she was 5 months old, Emma was removed from her parent's home and placed with her current foster family. Now 5 years old, Emma still lives with the same foster family she has lived with for the last 4 1/2 years.

In 2009, the plan for Emma was reunification with her biological parents upon their completion of certain requirements and a determination by the court that it would be safe for her to return home. For 3 years and 3 months, the DCFS provided assistance to the family to help ensure it would be safe for her to return home.

The child welfare court reviewed the case every 6 months to determine whether Emma would be safe and that reunification could occur. Then, in January 2013, a petition to terminate parental rights was filed. During September 2013, a trial on the petition was held, and on February 14, 2014, the district court issued its decision granting the termination of parental rights. On March 27, 2014, the biological parents filed an appeal with the Nevada Supreme Court. During the appeal process, Emma remained with her foster parents. The Supreme Court granted two requests for extensions of time for the biological parents to file their appellate brief. On January 30, 2015, almost 1 year after the termination of parental rights petition was granted, the Nevada Supreme Court overturned the district court's decision.

During the 2 years the case worked its way through the legal system, Emma was cared for, loved and cherished by the only family she has ever known. A bond was formed. This little girl became attached to her foster parents, and they to her.

At this point, Emma's case is still pending. Despite having been raised in a loving, caring home for the past 4 1/2 years, the courts may decide to return Emma to her biological parents with whom she spent a mere 5 months, and at whose hands she initially suffered.

Emma and other vulnerable children need a voice. Not the voice of the State, parents or foster parents but an independent voice that ensures the child's best interests are recognized. Emma has done nothing wrong. She was placed with a family in an environment where she has grown up surrounded by love, comfort and stability. She should not suffer the emotional and psychological drama of being taken from the only family she has known because the biological parents and the courts allowed the years to pass without definitive action.

Senate Bill 303 aims to address situations such as these and the interests of children's health, safety and well-being.

Section 1 of the bill provides that a child “is” rather than “may be” in need of protection if the child is in the care of a person under whose care has resulted in another child’s death or abuse. This section also defines abuse and neglect. It clarifies that abuse includes nonaccidental, physical or mental injury, sexual abuse or exploitation, or abandonment that is either caused or allowed by a person responsible for a child’s welfare.

Section 2 amends chapter 128 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to require a court to consider specific factors in determining the risk of serious mental or emotional injury a child faces by staying with or returning to the home of his or her parents. These factors include the length of time the child has been out of the care of his or her parents; placement options for the child; the child’s age; the developmental, cognitive and psychological needs of the child; the attachment or bond the child has formed with the substitute caregiver; and whether removing the child from the care of the substitute caregiver is likely to result in psychological harm to the child.

The last issue noted is the key. Existing language in chapter 128 of NRS provides that a primary consideration in any proceeding to terminate parental rights must be whether the best interests of the child will be served by the termination and that there must be a finding of parental fault. Adding the language in section 2 ensures that the bond, the attachment and the time a child has spent with a foster family is taken into consideration when a court determines the risk of serious emotional or mental injury to a child. In Emma's case, one can easily argue that it is not in the child's best interest to be uprooted from the only family she has known to be returned to the people with whom her only tie is blood and that the conduct of the parents to fail to address the circumstances that caused removal is detrimental to the child.

Child development experts have found that for a child to grow up as a healthy, functioning and productive member of society, a sense of permanent home and family is key. Children form bonds with the parents they know, the siblings they play with and the homes and environments in which they grow. Research shows that repeated transitions are often difficult on children and may affect brain development. This bill requires courts to not only consider factors such as age and length of time with a foster family, but also the negative repercussions of removing a child from the family he or she knows and trusts and the psychological harm that results from returning a child to parents after long-term placement in foster care.

Finally, section 4 of the bill allows a court, in determining neglect or unfitness of a parent, to consider whether a child suffered a physical injury, a near fatality or a fatality for which the parent has no reasonable explanation, and for which there is evidence that the injury would not have occurred absent abuse or neglect

I received many letters from families with stories that are similar to Emma's. The stories detail court determinations that came years after foster families brought children into their homes. Their stories tell of decisions that were not made in the best interest of the children.

This bill gives the court additional tools to determine the best interest of the child. It is my hope that S.B. 303 will allow courts to make determinations more quickly and with a sense of urgency, and with consideration of factors that have, until now, been absent from the decision making process.

I strongly urge your support of S.B. 303.

Brigid Duffy (Chief Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney, Clark County):

I would like to review a friendly amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) proposed by Clark County. I will read from [Exhibit F](#) concerning the proposed changes. We believe this bill is meant to address children that are in "out of home care" through foster care, a relative's care or fictive kin placement but not address other types of termination of parental rights which may happen in private custody actions. The amendment also defines "substitute caregiver." I will read the definition from [Exhibit F](#).

I have been working in the child-welfare field for 15 years. I believe in the reunification process for parents. I work hard to help parents get their children back. The deputies in my office also work hard to support these families. I have reunified many more families than have had parental rights terminated. This is not an anti parent bill. There comes a point in time as recognized by federal and state government, where we have exhausted opportunities to reunify the child with the parent. At 12 months, the court is required to have a permanency plan in place. If parents are unable to reunify at that time, we look at alternative placement such as adoption, guardianship or long-term relative care. At 14 months, statute requires a presumption it is in the best interest to terminate parental rights. These time frames exist in federal and state law because time matters to children. The longer we wait to make decisions for them, the more

abuse our system puts on them. When we consider termination of parental rights, we must focus on what is best for our children. We need to look at parental fault. Termination of parental-fault rights is a clear and convincing evidentiary standard. It is a high standard. When speaking of termination of parental rights there is a "civil death penalty" discussion. Our Nevada Supreme Court has labeled it as such. In subsequent cases, the court has said the State has an equal and just interest in ensuring children are free from abuse and neglect. We have an important interest on behalf of children. This bill is not saying we wish to make termination of parental rights easier or not work with parents. This bill says that when we come to the point of termination of parental rights, there is something we should consider that we currently do not have in statute. We must consider the length of time the child has been in care, the attachment of the child to the caregiver and the developmental and cognitive abilities of the child, as well as the age of the child. These are taken into account when considering the parent's failure to reunify with the child and whether it creates risk of harm. I do not support a new ground for termination of parental rights. A ground for termination of parental rights is already defined in statute. It consists of a risk of physical, emotional or mental injury to a child. We are asking for consideration of the impact on the child. The court may say they have considered that impact and can disregard it. They do not have to terminate parental rights because the child has been out of the home for 5 months and there is evidence of attachment to the substitute caregiver, but this should be considered. Children deserve this consideration. The time of a child's age from 0 months up to 5 years is important and informative.

James Smith:

I support S.B. 303. I am a foster parent in Clark County. I have adopted three children through the DCFS. I have reunified five children with their parents. I am Emma's father. Five years ago, she came into our home. Her birth parents were young and we were told they needed a mentor to help them parent the child. We worked tirelessly with the parents. They asked us questions whenever they needed. The custody process has been uncertain. Judges have come and gone. This has affected Emma's case. We have been told five times to prepare for parental unification. We have supported Emma's birthmother and father at times of personal trouble. We have four other children in our home and Emma has become an important part of their lives.

We have worked and supported the biological parents. This has been a 5-year process with Emma and for us so far. We had a 5-year review in a Clark County

courtroom a few weeks ago. She is coming to the understanding that she will spend one-third of her life in the child-protection system. I am here because of Emma and future children like her who face the red-tape problems. I have come a long way from home to be here. Emma's case is now in appeal. Every moment I have with her in my home is precious. Everyone in the child-care system has agendas, from the foster parents to the district attorneys. This legislation is an opportunity for this Committee to address the best interest of the child. Proper choices for the child need to be made. We should never see the process take 5 years again. The child should not be made to suffer this. We need to protect children and we have the ability to make a difference. It may be too late for Emma. Five years is too late, if we are honest. Unfortunately, there will be another little boy or girl who will enter into the foster care system. Hopefully, we can make a difference for them and Emma will be the last child to endure a 5-year process. We have the opportunity to protect children from having to endure this process in the future.

John T. Jones, Jr. (Nevada District Attorneys' Association):
The Nevada District Attorneys' Association supports S.B. 303.

Lisa Durette, M.D. (Child and Adolescence Psychiatry Fellowship; Healthy Minds):

I support S.B. 303. The language proposed will impact the children who are 0 months to 5 years, and those with developmental disabilities. We know from long-term research that the impact of disruptive attachments at young ages has lifelong consequences. This results in the child's psychopathology and the need for treatments. This can result in children being sent into the juvenile delinquency system. It can result in substance-use disorders. These problems result from early attachment disruptions. I work with children in foster care and observe the negative impact of prolonged legal processes on children's inability to form safe and secure bonds with caregivers. I treated a 4-year-old child whose parents did not consistently engage in the child's reunification plan. The parents would only periodically participate in the plan. The child was in a prospective adoptive home placement; however, the foster parents were reluctant to bond with the child for fear that the child would be taken away from them. The biological parents would make plans to visit this child close to court hearings, but would not show up at other times. The child was distraught because of this. Had the court been able to make decisions concerning the termination of parental rights in this case, this child would have had an opportunity to bond with caregivers more rapidly. The caregivers could have had

an ability to incorporate the child into their family. This bill considers past history and risk factors of the child. Custodial considerations can be made in an informed fashion. A past history of violence is a most predictive factor of future violence. This bill will place into language a process by which courts will make developmentally informed decisions regarding abuse cases. The courts will have the opportunity to make legal decisions with the best interest of the child in mind.

Melinda Munson:

I am a foster parent of a 2-year-old girl and a 3-year-old boy. They were removed from their home 2 years ago due to severe neglect. I want to tell you about their history, their accomplishments and their prospective future. I will read from written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)). I have offered to adopt these children, but that offer was declined. I can no longer be part of a process that protects birth parents' rights above the well-being of the children. Please pass this legislation so that our State's foster children have a chance to live successful lives. Help end the cycle of multigenerational foster care.

Jennifer Barowitz (Department of Family Services, Clark County):

I have been employed with permanency services in the Clark County Department of Family Services for 12 years and have been a supervisor for 9 years. I am also a former foster parent. I support S.B. 303. Each case in the department is individual, and should be treated as such. The common denominator is always the child. The best interest of the child must be the primary factor in successful case management and for successful achievement of permanency. I became familiar with Mr. Smith and Emma's case in 2014. I was tasked with returning Emma's brother to the birth parents. He was removed from their home at birth based on severe injuries Emma suffered. After objections, court stays and appeals, the Nevada Supreme Court ordered Emma's brother be returned to the birth parents. Regardless of the abuse that almost killed Emma, the decision was made to return the child. That was one of my most difficult days. I cannot tell you how this child is doing today. I cannot tell you he is having dinner tonight and has a place to sleep. My responsibilities to protect this child were denied. I waved goodbye to him. People told me I did not make this decision and if something happens to him, it is not because of me. That statement means nothing when my responsibility is to protect children. The child left my hands last. I cannot comprehend how the best interests of children are not taken into consideration. We are told children are resilient and adjust; they will not remember. Do you recall your family? What makes you safe

and secure in your home? You would want me to take these things into consideration if your life were to change just as this child's did. The best interest and well-being of the child must be primary concern in order for the child to live a successful life. We must protect children and do everything in our power to ensure we are considering the child's needs.

Daniel Rose:

I urge your support of S.B. 303. Currently, there is no consideration given concerning length of time a child has been out of the care of his or her parent or parents, or consideration of the developmental, cognitive and psychological needs of the child, or of the fact that removal of a child from the care of a foster home is likely to harm the child.

My wife and I have been foster parents for more than 11 years. We wanted to provide safe and healthy environments for children in need. We have adopted five children who came to our home as infants. I would like to tell you about the adoption process of our 2-year-old son. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)). We are not the only family who has found themselves in this heartbreaking situation. The main consideration should always be the best interest of the child. Blood does not make family. Family is made by love, care and commitment.

Donna Smith:

I support this legislation. My husband and I have been foster parents for 6 years in Clark County. We have two children who have been adopted through foster care and are fostering a sibling group of two children. I will read from written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)) concerning my foster care experience. Biological parents need to act quickly when young children are involved, and so do the courts. Please pass this bill.

Stephen Fullam:

I support S.B. 303. My wife and I have been foster parents in Clark County for over 3 years. We have four biological children, a son we have fostered since birth and have adopted, and a foster daughter. The foster daughter is the biological sister to our adopted son. Our foster daughter has never met her father and has met her biological mother once. Her father is in prison for felony domestic violence. He will be released this year and will be following a reunification plan when his daughter is 4 years old. She does not understand anyone else other than our family is her "family." The current law does not

consider the trauma she would suffer from being taken from our family and her biological brother. This law leads to permanency sooner for children and especially for those under 6 years old. Please give judges more leeway to decide rulings that fit individual circumstances and which are in the best interest of the child.

Aja Staniszewski:

As a pediatric behaviorist, I would like to go on record to support S.B. 303, particularly the language of section 2.

Misty Grimmer:

I am in support of this bill. The bond between the foster child to the caregiver develops quickly. I am a friend of previous testifier, Donna Smith. I have seen what she has gone through. Please support this bill.

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

We have worked to improve the child-welfare system together over the last several years. With every bill I have presented or testified on, the one thing that has driven me in the positions I have taken is based around this question—is what I am supporting or opposing in the best interest of children? When I took the position of director, I believed this department was about the best interests of children. We are called a child-welfare or child protective services organization. Our job is about child safety and finding or returning children to stable homes. We are concerned with the well-being of the child. If these are true, we often miss the mark.

What I have learned in my tenure in the child-welfare system is that our system, like many others, is calibrated to the best interest of adults. We have migrated away from the best interests of the children. This has not occurred purposely. Many of our laws were crafted when the system was not as big or contentious. The system today should focus on the best interests of the children. This bill is not an opportunity to sacrifice the quality of work we do to help make families whole, and to help return children to their parents, but an opportunity to say “children matter.” When a point is reached in a child-welfare case in which the child cannot be safely returned to the biological parent, the law should fairly represent the needs and best interests of children and not leave them in limbo. This law states children matter. We should support the concepts of this law.

Lynne Jasames:

I support S.B. 303. I am a former foster child. I take care of my relative's children to prevent them from going into foster care. When the parents wanted them back, I would not oppose it. The children I had in my care the longest are functioning better in society than the ones I returned to the biological parents. I feel that I did not act in the best interest of the ones I returned. The best interests of children matters and should be considered.

Ollie Hernandez:

I support of S.B. 303. I spent 9 years in the foster-care system. My parents' rights were terminated when I was young. I was reunited with my biological family and subsequently was put back into foster care because my parents did not want to take care of me any longer. This bill resonates with me. Foster care in the confines of a loving home is a godsend. If treated with kindness for any length of time, the foster child forms an emotional bond with the foster parent. A child can overcome the trauma he or she experienced prior to entering the system. Removing the child after he or she has established a bond is an injustice. Reunifying a child with the biological parent is always preferred, but the best interest of the child should always be considered first.

Craig Rosenstein (Rabbi, Temple Bet Emet; Fostering Southern Nevada):

I support S.B. 303. I am a past-president of the Clark County Foster/Adoptive Parent Association and am a current board member of Fostering Southern Nevada. My wife and I have fostered some 30 children over the past 12 years. We have adopted 7 of them. Senate Bill 303 addresses a critical need in the child-welfare system; that of placing the best interests of the child as paramount in the decision-making process, which courts determine whether to reunify a child with the parents or to terminate parental rights and allow the child to be eligible for adoption. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)) and will read from my testimony. This legislation takes into account that if a child is injured and if no responsibility for that injury can be proven, the court can go forward with either reunification or termination of parental rights.

Sean Sullivan (Deputy Public Defender, Public Defender, Washoe County):

We oppose S.B. 303. It is my understanding that the Special Public Defender for Clark County also opposes this legislation for similar reasons. Lee Elkins is a colleague of mine. He has a considerable amount of expertise as a former judge in New York for more than 18 years. He has presided over thousands of family rights cases.

Lee Elkins (Deputy Public Defender, Public Defender, Washoe County):

I was a judge in Brooklyn, New York, for 18 years. I have presided over thousands of child dependency and termination of parental rights cases. One of the most difficult cases I had that went to appeal was one where I fought hard to keep a young child in a foster home for adoption, rather than send the child to another jurisdiction to be with family the child did not know. Children age 0 to 5 years are in a developmentally important time of life. We want stability for these children. Tonight, we have heard about the difficulties that family court judges hear over many years.

This bill is not necessary. Senate Bill 303 proposes a new ground for termination of parental rights based on the attachment a child has to the foster parent. This raises constitutional concerns. There is a fundamental liberty interest in a connection with a child to a parent and vice versa. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly recognized this and it is superior to that in state law concerning foster parents. The Supreme Court of the United States addressed this in *Smith v. Organization of Foster Families*, 431 U.S. 816 (1977). I believe this Committee needs to look at our own State's statutes as well, for example, NRS 128.108. Many of the factors being proposed as grounds for termination already exist. Specific considerations noted in existing statute for a child who has been placed in a foster home include the love and affection, as well as emotional ties existing between the foster parent and the child and the child's own parents. Also noted in current statute is the capacity of the relative families to educate the child and to give him or her love, affection and guidance; the length of time a child has been in a stable, satisfactory foster home and the desirability of the child to continue to live in that environment. All of these factors are already written in statute.

This legislation is attempting to base termination of parental rights on the child's attachment to the foster family. It has been suggested out of frustration with the child and family services system. I will read from NRS 128.105 concerning terminating parental rights. The court must find the best interests of the child would be served by termination of parental rights. Our State's statutes indicate the child's best interest is the primary consideration for determining future care of the child. The best interest of the child alone is not grounds for termination of parental rights. There must be parental fault as a matter of constitutional law. The United States Constitution requires that parental fault be proven with clear and convincing evidence before a parent's rights may be terminated. In the parent-child relationship, it is fundamental—the termination may not be made

unless there is proof of parental wrongdoing. The U.S. Supreme Court case, *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982) states this, as does the Nevada Supreme Court. Our present statute requires evidence of the conduct of the parent is a basis for a finding under the neglect statute NRS 432B.393, or it otherwise be demonstrated the child was abandoned, the parent was unfit or the child was neglected. For example, in NRS 432B.393, if a parent has attempted or committed murder or voluntary manslaughter, the agency does not have to do anything for the parent, if the agency makes a motion to be excused. I will read further from NRS 432B.393 concerning a parent who has caused abuse or neglect of the child or another child in the family, which results in substantial bodily harm. If you look that this statute, these things are mentioned there. If the Legislature wishes to adopt this bill and amend NRS 128.108 to incorporate these things in terms of the best interest of the child, this is a valid consideration. Yes, these are important concerns and considerations for the best interest of the child but I caution this Committee against adopting this bill as law. In my opinion, if adopted, it will remove the conduct of the parent which is parental fault from the equation. We do not want to do that solely because the child-welfare system is overburdened or occasionally makes errors.

Chair Hardy:

If we establish this bill as law, will it put into effect something that already exists in statute? Are you saying the conduct of the parent is already taken into account in statute and the judge will take into consideration the well-being of the child?

Mr. Elkins:

Comparing this proposed legislation to what currently exists is like reshuffling a deck of cards. Some of the proposed legislation's language is verbatim within our current statute.

Chair Hardy:

Are you against the concept of this bill?

Mr. Elkins:

I am strongly against the idea that we would terminate parental rights based solely upon an attachment of the foster parent to the child or the child to the foster parent without a finding of parental misconduct or fault. This would be a

mistake as a matter of practice of social work, family law and constitutional law. It is not necessary. I believe it is pernicious.

Chair Hardy:

As I read the bill, it lists certain standards such as length of time and placement options, age of child, developmental, cognitive and psychological needs, whether the child has formed a positive attachment, and care of the substitute caregiver. I do not see the standard of the parental misconduct noted in this bill.

Mr. Elkins:

I would suggest that the best interest of the child matters are best reached upon an establishment of fault based on parental conduct. These are important considerations. In and of themselves, they should not form the basis of a termination of parental rights given the significance of interests. There is a presumption if a child has been in foster care for 14 months, the parent has not done enough and has engaged in token efforts to obtain the child. There is a presumption, then, that it is in the child's best interests for parental rights to be terminated. This bill is well intentioned but unnecessary and could have pernicious and unforeseen consequences.

Senator Spearman:

I am struggling to understand how this legislation bases termination of parental rights solely on the attachment of the child. There are subsections of this bill that say the opposite. If our current law allows for consideration of the attachment of the child to the foster parent, why are we having so many people coming forth saying the law does not matter or it does not matter about the child, and it all has to do with the parent's rights?

Mr. Elkins:

The factors are not limited to the bond between the child and the foster parent. Other considerations are length of time the child has been in foster care and age of the child. None of these have to do with the parent's conduct. All of these currently exist in our State's statute, NRS 128 specifically. Judges do not always do what they are charged to do. Substantively changing the law in a way that may violate fundamental principles is not the answer. The current statutes cover presumptions of the best interest of the child. Fundamental rights do not need to be undermined to achieve these purposes. Although this legislation is well-intentioned, it is not the correct way to proceed.

Senator Spearman:

We have presumptions in law, but it seems the implicit without the explicit presumption is what is causing confusion as to how to go forward or not go forward with the termination of parental rights. This legislation is not designed to supplant but to make these matters more explicit. If all of these factors are already in our laws, why are these families having these termination of parental rights problems?

Mr. Elkins:

Fundamental interests should not be undermined. The courts need resources. Agency discretion needs to be exercised more prudently in this regard. A case went to the Nevada Supreme Court and was reversed for a trial court error, which prolonged the process for the child. The court found there was an error made with respect to evidence at the trial court level. This is not a typical case. We know the value of family, including natural family, to a child. It is important to look at terminal actions of parental fault and inaction. The current statutory scheme does this. The proposed bill would eliminate this as a manner of substantive law. It properly belongs in the analysis of best interest of the child. If you wish to establish these things, they are best incorporated into NRS 128. It could be legislated to have differing standards depending on the age of the child in terms of the presumption. If young people come into foster care, for example, and after 6 months the parents have not engaged in the reunification plan, then it is grounds for termination of parental rights. This requirement exists in current State law. I urge this Committee to look at existing law.

Bill Hart (Alternate Public Defender, Washoe County):

My office is against S.B 303. I represent parents every day. Parents have their children taken away from them many times for reasons they do not understand in a system they feel is unfair. This bill changes every way we do business and dependency. It changes NRS 432B.330 in a substantial way as pointed out in written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)) from my office. I will read from [Exhibit K](#) the reasons we are opposed. Poverty and being unable to provide for your child will now be a neglectful act under this bill. There will be much more litigation as the clients I represent will not plead to neglect charges when they do not believe they have neglected their child based on poverty. When a child enters foster care, many times a bond is made between the child and the foster family. The child can be taken and placed with a stranger, who is a biological family member or parent. The cases presented here today would not necessarily benefit from the proposed legislation. As previously stated, laws already exist to

terminate parental rights. Based on presumptions of the 14 months or 20 months, which is a federal guideline our State follows, we have the ability to start parental termination proceedings. I have district attorneys ask for termination of parental rights if my clients are not following guidelines and the termination of rights can start as early as 6 months into the case if parents are absent. I do not support a knee-jerk reaction to the cases that have been discussed by foster parents in this hearing to change the standard of parental fault under NRS 128. The best interest of the child is always taken into account in a termination of parental rights actions. Reject this legislation but consider Mr. Elkins' conceptual changes he discussed previously. This legislation is unnecessary and will do more to make the termination of parental rights easier especially when the Nevada Supreme Court has termed the termination of parental rights the "civil death penalty."

Steve Dahl (Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada):

I am an attorney and I work for the Children's Attorneys Project. We represent children in these matters. We look at children's and parent's sides in each case. We ask both sides to work harder. We are interested in the welfare of our clients. We have heard compelling testimony today. This type of testimony can lead one legally astray. Bad facts can make bad law. People can overreact and do things that are not necessary. This legislation is not necessary. It will harm our clients because it will cause more litigation. It will take away the finality we seek. The best thing for my clients is for them to be put into a good foster home from the start. There are legal rights which are limiting that we cannot get around. These must be considered. There are federal laws that must be followed. If we do not follow these regulations, down the road someone will appeal and that person would win the appeal. The child would be removed from the home. I understand people who are angry because things did not turn out the way they wanted. This does not mean the system is not working in the proper manner. In the vast majority of cases, time lines are followed and things happen as they should. The district attorney's office makes the decision to terminate parental rights. Once the judge decides it is part of the case plan, it is up to the district attorney's office when and how to file the paperwork to accomplish this.

There are two reasons to terminate parental rights. One is the added emphasis to the bond with the foster family and the other is due to unexplained injuries. These two reasons make parental termination easier. This statute is not for children. Look at the factors that have been mentioned in this hearing and the

causes of any delays in placement including the efforts of parents. Missing in the list of factors are the desires of the child. If they are very young, this does not come into play, of course, but there are many children old enough to speak about what they desire. This proposed statute is made for adults to help adults. There may be more litigation concerning the length of time that is proper concerning the foster parent, the child and bonds and rights. Babies bond almost instantaneously. Federal courts will disallow this legislation. Federal rights must be considered. I am not advocating for parents or for the agency, I am advocating for children to keep a statutory system in place that will withstand federal review and will obtain a quick final dispensation for the child. Most of these cases do not get appealed to the Nevada Supreme Court. There are less than a dozen cases that have to do with termination of parental rights with the Nevada Supreme Court. Most child welfare cases follow the time line set out in statute. This bill will cause greater litigation, prolong cases and cause more harm to children.

John Sasser (Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada):

The Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit L](#)) in order to clarify definitions. Four of the proposed changes are different from the amendment by Clark County, [Exhibit F](#), but three of them are similar. I will read from the proposed amendment, [Exhibit L](#).

Ms. Ashby:

We support the intent of this bill. We believe the best interests of the child need to be taken into consideration at every phase of the case. Because of the legal issues presented by others in this hearing, we have some concerns. The proposed amendment, [Exhibit L](#), would address these concerns. Some of the concerns we heard today are not about laws that need to be changed but laws that need to be followed. There are federal and state laws in place which limit time frames for a child welfare case. The purpose of those limits is to support the best interests of children and to provide them with timely permanency. A child welfare case should not go on for 5 years. I urge this Committee to think about systemic changes that need to be made to allow our system to follow the laws that already exist. There are many problems in the child welfare system. The system has become extremely litigious and delays the process for the child, in many cases. If parents are not following their case plan, we need to terminate their parental rights sooner. Resources for these parents can be limited in certain communities. There are requirements on child welfare agencies to perform reasonable efforts to reunify the child with the parent and provide

certain services for mental health and substance abuse issues. My concern with this legislation is that it is puts a Band-Aid on a problem that is much bigger.

Senator Hammond:

I speak for the children. There has been discussion about the grounds for parental rights termination. The crux of the matter is whether we are listening to the arguments concerning what is the best interest of the child. I believe in S.B. 303. We need to allow the courts to consider the particular child welfare issues established in this bill. These considerations are not mandates but suggestions to keep the best interests of the child in mind when determining the case.

Chair Hardy:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 303 and open the hearing on S.B. 394.

SENATE BILL 394: Revises provisions relating to the protection of children.
(BDR 38-264)

Jill Tolles:

I am a member of the task force established by S.B. No. 258 of the 77th Session and was charged with researching and making recommendations to the Governor relating to the protection of children. I care deeply about the personal safety of children. I am here to present S.B. 394, which seeks to establish statewide curriculum standards and implantation procedures for the teaching of personal safety to children in our State's schools. I will read from written testimony ([Exhibit M](#)) to provide background information on this subject. The task force studied issues related to abuse and the protection of children in Nevada. School districts were surveyed to determine what programs or instruction, if any, are being used to educate children in kindergarten through Grade 12 to deal with unsafe persons, situations and strategies that may be used against them and if necessary, instruct the child as to who to go to for help. We found a good number of our school districts are using school nurses, counselors, teachers and the sheriff's department or other outside programs to teach personal safety to our children but many are not providing this instruction. This bill seeks to fill the gap so no child in our public and charter schools will be in school without knowing he or she has a right to be safe and to know where to go for help if not safe. I will read from submitted testimony, [Exhibit M](#), concerning the changes this bill will make if put into statute. I will also read

from Proposed Amendment 9947 ([Exhibit N](#)) concerning changes that would occur with S.B. 394. This bill is a crucial next step in keeping our children safe.

Dale A.R. Erquiaga (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

This bill, as amended, is in line with our standard operating procedures. At the department level, we adopt standards. Standards are simply lists of what children should know. At the local level, decisions are made concerning curriculum, textbooks and lesson plans. This bill includes a reporting mechanism back to the department, which is not unusual for programs of this type. It is in many ways aligned similarly to the work like that which is being done for English Language Learners in our State, as well as programs related to bullying. This legislation aligns with the normal responsibilities of the school district.

Amber Howell (Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

We are extremely supportive of S.B. 394. The task force worked diligently over the last biennium to bring this legislation forward. There are funding sources from the DCFS for the implementation of this program, so there is no added fiscal note. We are supportive of any programs which protect children.

Senator Spearman:

Another bill was discussed and passed today, S.B. 362, that looks for grants and outlines by the DPBH on how to teach about and prevent domestic abuse for people in our State aged 8 through 80. Is S.B. 394 similar to that bill in any way?

SENATE BILL 362: Authorizes the Director of The Department of Health and Human Services to establish a program regarding the prevention of domestic violence under certain circumstances. (BDR 18-112)

Ms. Tolles:

The spirit of this task force has been extremely collaborative and we will welcome collaborations and efforts of others in our State. We are a part of community partnerships as well with respect to these efforts.

Ms. Ashby:

The Children's Advocacy Alliance supports S.B. 394. There were sections in the proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), that were removed. We would like those addressed.

Chair Hardy:

Sections 1 through 10 were removed in [Exhibit N](#).

Ms. Howell:

The prudent parenting legislation was removed from [Exhibit N](#). Much of that legislation is a replica of federal statute. To implement those, we have to develop regulations. This was deemed unnecessary. We intend to implement all of the sections that are required by federal legislation within our regulations. All of the areas we cannot implement are being addressed in other State bills in this Session.

Kristen Macleod, M.D.:

As a board-certified pediatrician, I support S.B. 394. We are all about prevention in the field of pediatrics. There is scientific research that shows reducing trauma and injuries to children directly relates to their lifelong health. It relates to major causes of adult morbidity and mortality. The medical community supports this bill.

Kristy Oriol (Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence):

Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence supports S.B. 394. Prevention education is one of our most powerful tools in preventing abuse within families. It is something we are actively participating in throughout our State. Our network offers programs in schools to accomplish education and provides services relating to this topic. We focus on the goal of empowering children to recognize and identify unsafe situations. This legislation will work well with S.B. 362.

There has been a lack of funding for these types of programs in our State. We hope there will be an increase in demand for our services with the passage of this legislation. We look forward with sharing our programs with the Department of Education to develop curriculum and standards. We have submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit O](#)). We would like to ensure volunteers would be allowed to accompany an employee of an agency whose primary purpose is personal safety of children. The way S.B. 394 was drafted, it references

NRS 391.033, and this statute refers to licenses for teachers and education personnel. It requires the superintendent be the person responsible to forward fingerprints to the FBI. The amendment, [Exhibit O](#), slightly revises this process. Our program in Incline Village uses volunteers for their prevention program and is required by their grants to run background checks on all volunteers. This includes a federal background check as well as a background check with the State's child abuse registry. We suggest that the school district could request this information from our program and we would provide it to the school.

Senator Spearman:

Perhaps there are aspects of this language that we could incorporate into [S.B. 257](#), which we spoke about earlier.

Ms. Hernandez:

I support [S.B. 394](#), especially section 12. As a former foster child and an active member of the Foster Care Alumni Association of America, Nevada Chapter. I support the changes of section 12 of this bill. It will allow compensation to guardians ad litem for services they provide and increase their numbers. It would allow more foster youth to have legal representation for best interests in a court setting.

Ms. Jasames:

I am an active member of the Foster Care Alumni Association of America, Nevada Chapter. I support [S.B. 394](#). There have been tremendous improvements for our State's foster care youth quality of care since I aged out of the foster care system. I especially support section 12 of this legislation. There are so many others who have a vested interest in the care and well-being of children in our communities and it is important to financially acknowledge these people.

Ms. Ruiz-Lee:

I support [S.B. 394](#). I have some facts for the record. Sections 11 and 12 of this bill will revoke the requirement that guardians ad litem are not be allowed to be compensated. There are approximately 20 other states that allow compensation in child welfare proceedings. We are the only State who has put into statute that they are not to be compensated. This will allow other avenues to pursue our ability to maintain compliance with federal law. Federal law requires guardians ad litem be appointed.

Senator Spearman:

If the guardians ad litem work for the best interest of the child unique to these situations, could we appropriate the same concept for children that have not had termination of parental rights yet? I am speaking with respect to S.B. 303.

Eric Robbins (Counsel):

A guardian ad litem is used in a circumstance where the court deems someone needs representation because he or she cannot represent himself or herself. For example, if someone is not competent and in need of a guardian, one is appointed. Anytime a court deems there needs to be representation for children in a custody dispute case, for example, a guardian ad litem would be appointed to speak for the best interests of the children.

Ms. Smith:

As a foster parent, I support S.B. 394, specifically sections 11 and 12. This will give children in the foster care system a consistent, best-interest voice and allow for compensation of guardians ad litem.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Health and Human Services
April 1, 2015
Page 31

Chair Hardy:

The hearing on S.B. 394 is closed. There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Ellen Walls,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joe P. Hardy, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness or Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
S.B. 257	C	4	Senator Woodhouse	Written Testimony
S.B. 257	D	1	Senator Woodhouse	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 257	E	2	Theresa DeGraffenreid	Written Testimony
S.B. 303	F	3	Clark County	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 303	G	2	Melinda Munson	Written Testimony
S.B. 303	H	2	Daniel Rose	Written Testimony
S.B. 303	I	2	Donna Smith	Written Testimony
S.B. 303	J	2	Craig Rosenstein	Written Testimony
S.B. 303	K	3	Washoe County Alternate Public Defender- Bill Hart	Written Testimony
S.B. 303	L	4	Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 394	M	3	Jill Tolles	Written Testimony
S.B. 394	N	7	Jill Tolles	Proposed Amendment 9947
S.B. 394	O	1	Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence	Proposed Amendment