

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Eightieth Session
May 3, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 4:00 p.m. on Friday, May 3, 2019, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E 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 Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator David R. Parks, Vice Chair
Senator Moises Denis
Senator Yvanna D. Cancela
Senator Chris Brooks
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senatorial District No. 8
Senator Julia Ratti, Senatorial District No. 13
Senator Pat Spearman, Senatorial District No. 1

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Michael Keever, Committee Secretary
Vicki Kemp, Committee Secretary
Jennifer McEntee, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Natha Anderson, President, Washoe Education Association; Nevada State Education Association
Lea Cartwright, Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School
Diane Baker, Interim Library Director, Carson City Library
Ricky Gourrier, Academica Nevada
Susan Slykerman, Teacher/Librarian, Liberty High School; Advocate, Clark County School Librarians Association
Vikki Courtney, Clark County Education Association
Robin Carpenter, Certified Teacher Librarian, Johnston Middle School; President, Clark County School Librarians Association
Joan Dalusung, Nevada Library Association
Billie Ramos-Guerrero, Librarian, Dean Petersen Elementary School
Lindsay Anderson, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District; Association of School Superintendents
Ed Gonzales, School Organizational Team, Liliam Luhan Hickey Elementary School
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Mark Newburn, Cochair, Nevada State Council on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics; Chair, Computer Science Advisory Subcommittee
Sarah Adler, Charter School Association of Nevada; National Alliance on Mental Illness Nevada
Tyson Falk, McDonald Carano, LLP.
Ethan Cole, Filament
Bailey Bortolin, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Ross Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County, Nevada
Ryan Gustafson, Human Services Agency, Washoe County, Nevada
Holly Welburn, Policy Director, ACLU Nevada
Kendra G. Bertschy, Public Defender, Washoe County, Nevada
Ernie Adler, Sierra Sage Academy
Helen Foley, First Med
Brooke Maylath, President & Advocate, Transgender Allies Group
Jorge Sanchez, Nevada Family Alliance
Marguerite Urbina

Senate Committee on Finance
May 3, 2019
Page 3

Jesus Faz
Jose Zalarar
Carlos Jimenez
Enriquez Rivera
Carla Vallarta
Renaldo Benevitas, Clark County School District
Colyn Abron, Nevada Youth Legislature
Isabelle Rotes
Lancette VanGuilder, Nevada Dental Hygienists Association
Caryn Solie, Nevada Dental Hygienist Association
Dawna Brown, Health Director, Pyramid Lake Tribal Health Clinic, Pyramid Lake
Paiute Tribe
Wendy Madson, Executive Director, Health Communities Coalition
Marla McDade Williams, Strategy 360
Richard Dragon, President, Nevada Dental Association
Kellie McGinley, Nevada Dental Association
Dr. Michelle Farnoush
Dr. Steven Saxe, President, Nevada State Society of Oral and Maxillofacial
Surgeons
Dr. Joseph Wineman, Past President, Southern Nevada Dental Society
Cody Phinney, Deputy Administrator, Health Care Financing and Policy, Nevada
Department of Health and Human Services

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will be hearing a number of bills this afternoon, beginning with Senate Bill (S.B.) 191. I will turn the chair over to Vice Chair Parks.

SENATE BILL 191 (1st Reprint): Requires each public school in a school district to establish and maintain a school library. (BDR 34-562)

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

Senate Bill 191 requires each public school in a school district to establish and maintain a school library.

SENATOR JOYCE WOODHOUSE (Senatorial District No. 5):

I am here to present S.B. 191 which requires each public school in a school district to establish and maintain a school library that meets certain standards ([Exhibit C](#)). My colleague, Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, will outline the

provisions of the bill added in from her library bill which was S.B. 249. We took the two bills and "married" them while in the Senate Committee on Education.

SENATE BILL 249: Requires each public school to establish and maintain a school library. (BDR 34-13)

Research consistently shows that when children have access to good libraries with plenty of books and adequate staffing, they read more and they do better on reading tests. For children in poverty, libraries are often their only source of reading material. Having a collection of books is not enough to make a good library, though. Research has found that the most important element in a strong library program is a full-time certified librarian with support staff.

Librarians and teachers form an instructional team when they combine their knowledge of teaching strategies, resources and technology to meet the specific needs of each student. Librarians can help students discern the difference with well-developed instruction strategies based on critical thinking and analysis. This knowledge helps students with a wide range of crucial life skills which supports our mission to graduate students who are college and career ready.

Research is clear; school libraries and librarians propel student achievement. Senate Bill 191 ensures all public school students in Nevada have access to school libraries. The bill is straightforward. It requires each public school in a school district including certain charter schools to establish and maintain a school library. The State Board of Education must adopt regulations prescribing the minimum requirements for a school library.

After S.B. 191 was heard in the Senate Committee on Education, certain concerns were raised about those currently employed as school library assistants. We address those concerns in section 9.5 of the bill which allows a school library assistant to act as a teacher/librarian without obtaining additional credentials until July 1, 2025.

SENATOR MARILYN DONDERO LOOP (Senatorial District No. 8):

I will briefly outline the provisions combined into this bill from S.B. 249 that were not already covered. In addition to requiring each public school, including charter schools, to establish and maintain a school library, section 8 of this bill requires each public school employ a teacher/librarian with certain exceptions.

Section 9 provides exceptions to this requirement. If two schools within a district, including charter schools with the same sponsor, are unable to employ a librarian, the district superintendent may approve hiring one librarian to provide services to both schools. If a public school in any district other than Washoe County School District (WCSD) and Clark County School District (CCSD) are unable to employ a librarian, the school may apply for a waiver from the State Board of Education. In the last case, the application for a waiver must identify the reasons the school is unable to employ a librarian and explain how the school will provide library services to its students. Such applications expire on June 30th of the following odd-numbered years.

While Senator Woodhouse has already covered why school libraries are so important, I would like to briefly mention some final thoughts. Provisions of this bill are similar to S.B. No. 143 of the 2017 Session. We have brought this bill back because we truly believe in the benefits libraries have for all our kids but particularly those living in poverty. Over the last couple of decades, we have continued to experience a decline in school librarians and media specialists even as student enrollment has increased. Research indicates that public school districts have lost nearly 20 percent of full-time librarians since 2000. A 2018 *Education Week* article added that minority districts were hit the hardest by the loss of librarians.

I was a school librarian, and I reached hundreds of students by helping them and their families not only learn the love of books but some of them even to learn English. There is a critical need to support our libraries and librarians. These services are truly essential for all of our kids. Our students go through school and we prepare them to go to jobs where they will need research. We prepare them to go to college and all sorts of other things. One of the things they need to know how to do is to read and understand. I urge your support of this important legislation.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I noticed charter schools have a cutoff of 500 students. Given the fiscal notes, especially from some of the rural districts that I represent, might it be appropriate to soften that to a smaller number? Some rural schools may not have an enrollment of 200. If you are going to require that they have a full-time librarian—and I am supportive of libraries—we have to be cognizant of staffing. In Elko County, for instance, once you get outside of Elko and Spring Creek,

there probably would not be a school that has an enrollment of 200, and there would be a requirement of a full-time teacher/librarian.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

In S.B. 191, the enrollment of 500 was one of the amendments that we inserted on the Senate Committee Education side. We can look at that number. The other piece that is really important is even in urban districts there are schools that are very small such as Mount Charleston, Searchlight and Jean in CCSD. We inserted language that school districts with those very small schools can hire a librarian to take care of more than one school and they do not have to put a librarian in every single school.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The travel time is an issue. If you had a full-time librarian in Winnemucca that had to service McDermott, that librarian is going to spend four hours per day on the road.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

I am familiar with the area that you are discussing. What would likely be required is a schedule where that site would not be visited every day. Maybe Winnemucca would be the focus one day and McDermott another day as a librarian in Sandy Valley might have that school one day and Jean another. We may not require the Mount Charleston person to go to Jean, but we may require them to go to Indian Springs. They can also employ an aid until 2025 so that gives us some flexibility to transition into the bill. As a certificated teacher, with a librarian endorsement, there are multiple things that a good librarian puts into place as a certificated teacher.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

In respect to S.B. 249, did you feel the fiscal notes from those counties would be necessary with the sections that were introduced in the bill? Some of the smaller counties that I represent had fiscal notes; for example, Lyon County approximated \$200,000. A floating librarian then could be one per county that serves all of the schools?

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

That would be my vision. A school district or county may envision it differently because it may work. If I was in Clark County, it would not make sense to go from Jean to Mount Charleston for example. Those type of distances may cause

them to configure a different way to do that. Certainly in Lyon County, you can get between most of the cities: Smith Valley, Fernley and Yerington are all reachable without a full day of travel. One librarian could possibly serve three schools. There would likely be someone in Fernley because there is a higher population.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

To address the fiscal note, Dr. Mary Pierczynski will be testifying with an amendment that changes a "shall" to a "may" which will assist with the fiscal impact. The bill contains language where the superintendent can provide a waiver.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I appreciate the amendment from Dr. Pierczynski, but it appears to be mainly focused on professional development. I am still concerned about the portions coming back from S.B. 249 and how they may affect some of my smaller counties. Maybe we can make it clearer within the bill draft that the concept of a shared teacher within an area may work. For example, there may be a shared opportunity with an elementary school and a high school in the same area to ensure a trained and qualified individual is available, perhaps just not on a daily basis because it is not affordable to have one at each school.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

While I recognize that Clark County is a huge district, I will tell you that you have to be a certificated teacher to be a librarian in Clark County.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

It is my understanding that the reason for the high number on the fiscal note, particularly from the rural counties, was due to the professional development. Dr. Pierczynski will address the element that is driving up the cost of this program.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I was unaware that you already had to be a certificated teacher to be a librarian in Clark County. I know that is not how it is done in Washoe County. My experience with my children is that the district gives a certain number of allocations to a school based on their student population and then it is up to the principal to decide how to disburse those allocations based on grade levels. If a library is currently staffed with a library assistant, then they would ultimately

have to take one of those allocations and move it into the library. That means there will be some classrooms without a teacher and those kids will have to get redistributed. That could increase class sizes by 10 or 12 kids. Without an ability to increase the number of allocations, I see this in the county my kids are going to school in as taking teachers out of classroom grades and moving them into the library without accounting for that.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

I know what you are saying, but that is not necessarily the case. There are music teachers in the schools—that is a teacher teaching music. This would be a teacher that is teaching library. I do not know how they will do it in Washoe County, but there is transition time until 2025. This is without any disrespect to anyone doing this job right now, but I believe that current law provides that an aide in any room must be accompanied by a certificated teacher. If that is the case, you would have a certificated teacher in that room. In Clark County, that time is used for prep time for teachers. When I was a librarian, I would have the children for 50 minutes and the teacher would have that time to prep.

NATHA ANDERSON (President, Washoe Education Association; Nevada State Education Association):

This is an important bill for our educators, our teachers teaching second or third grade and our teacher librarians. Currently in Washoe County, we have teacher/librarians in the high school and the middle school levels, but we do not have it in the elementary school levels. Instead, we have library assistants that do an excellent job. They are truly working on finding the right books. We do have some who have their associate's degree. We are also working through some of the social media areas or other areas necessary for a library services that is not quite the same level. That is one reason why we are trying to get a school librarian in all schools.

I would like to cover a few of the policies not the funding. Our school librarians play a critical and central role in our schools. They are able to support professional development in different fashions and student achievement by providing research help and digital learning opportunities. Further, for many students the library is their "safe place."

We know spending money on our school libraries is used efficiently and effectively. It obviously increases reading scores, but there is also evidence that

it helps in math test scores. Finally, access to a school library is an equity issue. As has been stated in many studies, our poorest and most racially diverse communities have the least access to library services. By providing those elements in all of our schools, including our elementary schools, with a licensed librarian will help our students become stronger. Graduation rates and reading and math achievement were significantly higher in schools with high-quality libraries.

There are some real financial issues facing our school districts. This bill has drawn some different fiscal notes. There is some work that can be done to fix some of those things, and I am hopeful that the proposed amendment coming from the Nevada Association of School Superintendents will address many of them. Some of the fiscal notes are due to the phasing-in aspect of the bill.

We realize as educators that we do not have enough teacher librarians to be able to staff every single school. That is one reason for the transition time until 2025. It is possible to work on an alternative right to licensure program as well as other elements in conjunction with our school districts to address the issue just stated by Senator Kieckhefer. Is it taking a teacher out of a classroom to make sure there is actually a librarian? Do we have enough people that can do it? Can we also find out a way to make this work with the school budgets? That is another reason why this phasing-in transition time of 2025 is part of this bill; the current library assistants who are currently providing incredibly important services can continue to do so.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Based on the regulations that you anticipate to be promulgated by the Nevada Department of Education (NDE), do you anticipate physical infrastructure changes or significantly enhanced material procurement or other items that would have an additional cost?

MS. ANDERSON:

In Washoe County, I do not. I believe all of our schools currently do have locations for the libraries. The current specifications for our buildings coming soon based on the passage of Washoe County Ballot Question 1 have library space. There are some that have questioned what that number for materials will be. With the NDE and some of their current discussions, I hope that they will be speaking with the school districts to ask what is appropriate. I do not anticipate any problems at this time.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

We will now take testimony from those in support of S.B. 191.

LEA CARTWRIGHT (Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School):

We are Nevada's first kindergarten through eighth grade charter school which started in 1999 in Washoe County. We are in support of S.B. 191; we support the importance of library resources. They are critical to 21st-century learning and global citizenship. We appreciate the development of regulations that will help adjust the unique circumstances such as space issues that are experienced by charter schools.

DIANE BAKER (Interim Library Director, Carson City Library):

I am here in support of S.B. 191. We are fully in support of strong libraries at all levels of schools. It is great that the middle and high schools have teacher librarians in place now at many places. The strength of that being extended to the elementary school will be critical. It also helps those of us in public libraries when we work hand in hand with the school districts to be able to leverage and extend the teaching and learning opportunities for the students at the schools that can also come to the public libraries.

RICKY GOURRIER (Academica Nevada):

We have spoken to both sponsors of the bill, and we are here in full support of S.B. 191.

SUSAN SLYKERMEN (Teacher Librarian, Liberty High School; Advocate, Clark County School Librarians Association):

On behalf of the Nevada certified teacher librarians, I am speaking to you in support of S.B. 191. Education funding is an evident focus of this year's Legislative Session. School libraries and certified teacher librarians should not be exempt from that funding. My detailed testimony has been submitted ([Exhibit D](#)).

VIKKI COURTNEY (Clark County Education Association):

I am reading a statement from Theo Small ([Exhibit E](#)) who is not available in person today; he wishes to indicate his support of S.B. 191 as a teacher in CCSD and in his role as the Vice President of the Clark County Education Association.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 3, 2019
Page 11

ROBIN CARPENTER (Certified Teacher Librarian, Johnston Middle School; President, Clark County School Librarians Association):

I am here to urge you to advance S.B. 191 for the benefit of students in the State of Nevada as detailed in my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

JOAN DALUSUNG (Nevada Library Association):

I would like to voice our support for S.B. 191.

BILLIE RAMOS-GUERRERO (Librarian, Dean Petersen Elementary School):

The Dean Petersen Elementary School is one of the high poverty urban libraries that we were discussing. I am fortunate to have a supportive administration that has recently funded my library with \$20,000 in Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I funds recently to update a much-outdated library. Most of the materials were from 2003.

Librarians do much more than just reading and checking out books to students. In my library alone, I work with all grade levels and my lesson plans not only contain library standards but also English language arts (ELA) standards, social studies and science. I was recently able to hatch chickens and expose my children to the life cycle of eggs; something they would never get to experience. We have the fourth and fifth grades working on the Great American, Great Nevadan program. The other primary grades are studying the Pledge of Allegiance and important civic standards in social studies.

Everything we do is in collaboration with elementary classrooms to extend what they need to do and support one another. Any librarian is willing to have that conversation. I became a librarian after 17 years in the elementary classroom, and I spoke to my administration about how we can work together to cooperatively assist the students in learning to continue their growth. We provide access to books and materials and encouragement to read more.

We recently did a Helen Keller unit that opened interest in students to seek out information about World War II and Helen Keller biographies, taking the initiative to further learning beyond our texts. There are so many ways to extend what the students need. Many of my students would not have access to books if it was not for our library. I also work with Spread the Word Nevada, and we do a monthly engagement with parents and families to have access to books. We also have books free to them to build their own personal libraries. We have a public library that is less than half a mile away, but many of the students would

never be able to go there. Most of their reading materials come from our library. Please support S.B. 191.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

Is there anyone to speak in opposition to S.B. 191?

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County School District):

I certainly consider the bill sponsors partners in our quest for better education in the State of Nevada, but I do have to voice opposition to S.B. 191. Our fiscal note on S.B. 191 as originally drafted was \$0. However, since the reprint and with the amendment, we have submitted a new fiscal note ([Exhibit G](#)) for a future biennium given the 2025 implementation date. We still anticipate a fiscal impact to the WCSD to be about \$2.7 million in today's dollars. I do not have the inflationary figures or calculations for the phasing. The total fiscal impact is in the neighborhood of \$3 million. To Senator Kieckhefer's point, we have a concern that the State Board of Education may adopt a regulation that requires some kind of physical infrastructure changes to our buildings or purchasing additional books or computers.

That question mark and loss of local control for our elected school board is one of our substantial concerns—section 7, subsection 2. Section 8, subsection 1 is the part requiring the hiring of a teacher librarian. As you have heard, we have a certified teacher librarian in our secondary schools, but not our elementary schools. Section 8, subsection 2, and I believe this is where the amendment will come in, requires the district to provide professional development for those assistants that want to become certified teachers. It is not necessarily professional development; it is a bachelor's degree. It is not a series of coursework or a number of hours; our paraprofessionals would need to receive a bachelor's degree to become certified teacher librarians even if they were to go through an alternative route to licensure program as was mentioned. That is a major undertaking for our employees to make that change in their lives.

I want to reiterate that every school in the WCSD has a stand-alone library and someone staffing that library. As of now, those positions have not been cut. It is a really sad state of affairs when our Board of Trustees has to consider cutting services like librarians, nurses, counselors and many of the other critical services that we want to offer. We do not do that with pleasure or take it

lightly. I heard the words "unfunded mandate" earlier and that is our major concern with the legislation in its current state.

In section 9.5, the bill addresses charter schools with less than 500 students, I could compare that to WCSD where we have 18 elementary schools with less than 500 students and 5 elementary schools with less than 300. As a large district, we do have those small schools. I will continue working on the legislation with the sponsors and would like to be in support of S.B. 191. We are committed to libraries in the WCSD and some of our libraries actually double as a partnership with the county and community library where they are open to the public and not just the school community. We have no intention of reducing or minimizing those libraries, but we do want to maintain local control and avoid those unfunded mandates.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

How many positions would you need to convert or would need to become licensed positions that currently are not?

MS. ANDERSON:

We have roughly 63 elementary schools where a classified professional would have to transition to a certified position. That was the basis of our calculation of \$2.7 million on the fiscal note—the difference between those positions.

ED GONZALES (School Organizational Team, Liliam Luhan Hickey Elementary School):

The reason I am speaking in opposition to S.B. 191 is because we lose the local ability to control our placement of people. It has been mentioned that there is an allocation in the school district budget for librarians, but that is partly because we have not fully implemented the law for the reorganization. It is supposed to be that they buy back services that are being designated as what they have. There is some frustration from the secondary schools about not having that choice considering that the CCSD does not have mandated librarians in schools as long as the standard is obtained. Both the Hickey Elementary School Organizational Team (SOT) and the Southwest Career and Technical Academy SOT have voted to oppose this bill.

There is a concern from Hickey Elementary on section 6.7. We use a literacy specialist during the prep period, so their concerns have been alleviated. The concern at Southwest and other schools that did not want to be named is the

same as Senator Kieckhefer's concern that S.B. 191 will lead to bigger class sizes. Southwest is one of the best high schools in the State with reading proficiency. They are worried they are going to have to lay off a science or math teacher and increase class sizes. One principal at a middle school believes that his class sizes will increase by approximately three per class because they use mostly the prep buyouts. That is how he would deal with it. For the record, some principals are concerned about increased class sizes as a result of this bill.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

There is not anyone else to testify in opposition. We will take neutral testimony.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

Our organization is composed of all 17 superintendents. The WCSD expressed their concerns about this bill and other concerns were heard as well, especially around professional development. I am here to offer an amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) on the record to alleviate some of those concerns. Our amendment addresses section 8 subsection 2 as described on [Exhibit H](#) by changing "shall" to "may". That will leave the opportunity up to the school districts to assist with the qualifications necessary to become a teacher librarian as Ms. Lindsay Anderson previously explained.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

That concludes the neutral position. We will close the hearing on S.B. 191 and would ask that the State Charter School Authority and NDE submit updated fiscal notes.

Our second bill to be heard is S.B. 313. This bill revises provisions relating to computer literacy and computer science education.

[SENATE BILL 313 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to computer literacy and computer science education. (BDR 34-731)

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

The fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) are becoming more and more critical as a Nation to remain competitive in the global marketplace and to maintain our strength in innovation and advancement across all disciplines. My written testimony on S.B. 313 ([Exhibit I](#)) has been submitted. Note that page 4, section 7 also provides for distribution by NDE to the charter schools.

The appropriations indicated over the biennium for S.B. 313 are \$1,632,588 to carry out all of those provisions. This bill is patterned after the appropriation that we put into the bill last Session. However, the amount was reduced by 50 percent. We are trying to reach out in the times where we do not have all of the funds that we need. For the CCSD, WCSD, rural school districts and charter schools, the appropriation was reduced because we wanted to make sure we were adding in the Regional Professional Development Programs to also provide training as this is their field. They do a lot of work in math and science, and we wanted them on board. The other thing we really wanted to address was making sure that we are monitoring and evaluating the programs in the field. This is why I took the advice of someone at NDE to put \$12,500 in this bill to take care of that need. As I indicated in my testimony, there is the account for computer education and technology.

There is someone from NDE available if you would like further detail about the appropriations, as the Department was significant in determining the amounts of the bill. Otherwise, Mr. Mark Newburn will provide additional information about S.B. 313.

MARK NEWBURN (Cochair, Nevada State Council on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics; Chair, Computer Science Advisory Subcommittee):

Senate Bill 313 is the result of specific recommendations by the State STEM Council and the Computer Science Advisory based on national best practices to expand the number of kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) computer science teachers. This bill is the next in a series of STEM-related bills introduced since the Great Recession designed to create the high-skilled workforce needed by the new Nevada. Specifically, S.B. 313 is a direct follow up to S.B. No. 200 of the 79th Session introduced to expand equitable access to K-12 computer science education. These bills are in response to the recognition that all of Nevada's economic sectors are increasingly dependent on computer technology. Recent advances in artificial intelligence and automation now threaten to eliminate many traditional jobs. The original S.B. No. 200 of the 79th Session was groundbreaking and instantly became the model legislation used by the rest of the Country. The impact was immediate. From 2017 to 2018, Nevada's participation in advanced placement computer science principles grew by 127 percent. Female participation grew by 175 percent; Hispanic participation grew by 179 percent. That 2017 bill laid the groundwork of standards and requirements. Now the roadblock is a lack of trained teachers.

Senate Bill 313 expands the number of computer science teachers in 3 ways based on national best practices. It continues grant funding the school districts to help them expand their initial in-service teacher professional development in computer science. It incentivizes teachers to earn the new computer science license endorsements developed by the Computer Science Advisory Committee by reimbursing their costs for college classes needed to earn the endorsement. It also incentivizes our colleges and universities to develop the new pre-service teacher training in computer science and develop the courses needed for the new computer science teacher license endorsements. Our kids are entering a world where every job may be a computer job. A world where the jobs their parents have may no longer exist. Senate Bill 313 is the next step preparing our kids for success in that future.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

We will open the hearing for testimony in support of S.B. 313.

SARAH ADLER (Charter School Association of Nevada):

We appreciate the sponsor, the bill and the bill's future orientation toward the kind of skills our teachers need so our students can obtain those skills for durable jobs in the future. We appreciate charter schools being included in the small county category; we are eager to work with the providers of this support.

MS. ANDERSON:

I am here today to support S.B. 313, particularly because it is not an unfunded mandate. It gives us the resources that we need in the WCSD to provide our teachers with this meaningful training, so they can provide it to our students.

TYSON FALK (McDonald Carano, LLP.):

I am here today on behalf of Microsoft. We would like to applaud and support Senator Woodhouse for her continued support of computer science. We supported S.B. 200 of the 79th Session, and S.B. 313 is a good next step. Computer science is foundational. Every 21st-century child should be able to learn about algorithms, how to make an application, and how the Internet works—just like they learn about photosynthesis, the digestive system or electricity. I urge your support of S.B. 313.

MS. PIERCYNski:

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents supports S.B. 313 that Senator Woodhouse as our champion of STEM has presented. We hope that it can be funded.

ETHAN COLE (Filament):

I am here in support on behalf of Filament, a block chain startup in Washoe, to explain that the company has had trouble in the past two years getting the talent and workforce that they need. Some of the issue may be related to Senator Woodhouse's explanation about there not being enough college-level graduates; we need to start earlier with the lower level. We are very appreciative of the bill.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

There is new language in section 6, subsection 2 that all persons who are studying to become a teacher must receive appropriate education and training in computer literacy and computer science. Is it an entire unit or what does this translate to?

SENATOR WOODHOUSE:

It is part of the recommendation from the STEM Council; I will ask Mr. Newburn to answer.

MR. NEWBURN:

That would be like all other subjects where there are Nevada academic content standards as they train preservice teachers depending on the grade and the subject. They are responsible for teaching them what they need at that level and there are standards for K-12. Someone teaching a high school computer science course would be different than someone teaching fifth grade where only a basic understanding of the core concepts would be needed.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Where are those requirements currently outlined?

MR. NEWBURN:

There are Nevada academic content standards in computer science that have been approved. The NDE website on academic content standards will display expectations for the different grade levels.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Are those already incorporated into primary education courses at the university level?

MR. NEWBURN:

The goal of this bill is for NSHE to start incorporating this in your preservice teacher program. Part of the funding account is to prepare grants for them to give them the funds to do that preparation.

SENATOR DENIS:

I wanted to thank Senator Woodhouse. I had a bill that was trying to deal with young ladies falling off the cliff in middle school and not going into technology. Rather than two separate bills, it is incorporating it into this bill. Not just for young ladies, but for all students that are dropping off because they are not getting the proper technology training in the middle schools.

VICE CHAIR PARKS:

Seeing no one to speak in opposition or neutral on S.B. 313, we will close the hearing. Senator Woodhouse will resume chairing the meeting.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Next we will hear S.B. 293. Senator Julia Ratti has a proposed amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) to be discussed.

SENATE BILL 293 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to children who are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. (BDR 38-517)

SENATOR JULIA RATTI (Senatorial District No. 13):

I am here today on what is an important bill. Nevada needs to make some significant strides forward and needs to do it with a sense of urgency. For years now, Nevada has known that there are child victims of sex trafficking in our State. While the extent of the problem is difficult to identify with specificity, Nevada consistently ranks as one of the states with the greatest minor sex trafficking problems and populations. We must answer to the call that ranking creates. I want to acknowledge that our State has made great strides recently to create a plan for the scope and breadth of the problem through the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children.

To be clear, the original bill would have prohibited the ability to put any child victim of sex trafficking in juvenile detention. There were some serious concerns that without having an alternate placement already in place that could take care of the safety needs of that child, we would be putting children in jeopardy if we "flipped the switch" prior to that. My written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)) has been submitted and contains additional information. The bill does still state that we will no longer put children victims of child sexual exploitation in the juvenile justice system; but it puts the stake in the ground in 2022. The amendment gives us time and personnel to work on the planning process to build the infrastructure. In the next legislative session, we can look at authorizing the funding or policy necessary to have that infrastructure.

Bailey Bortolin represents the Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers and they are available to speak to any technical issues. We also have lined up a small number of people to testify while being respectful of the time of the Senate Finance Committee. Many others were enthusiastic about this bill, but we tried to bring forward the key folks on S.B. 293.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In the last amendment we received, what happens to these children under 18-years old if they do come into contact with law enforcement and are suspected of being involved in sex trafficking? I do not see in the bill where they are going to be taken to any type of facility. It is only a plan for the future development of these facilities.

SENATOR RATTI:

From now until 2022 when the plan is completed, it would be the same exact result as the child would have today.

BAILEY BORTOLIN (Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers):
It will be status quo right now.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

On the amendment on page 3, line 29, it states to "return the child to a parent or legal guardian or to another jurisdiction." We have been accused in the past —perhaps sometimes unfairly—of employing "Greyhound therapy" and I want to ensure that there is coordination across jurisdictions or family out of state if we are moving a child to another state.

Ms. BORTOLIN:

This is a technical issue. In child welfare, we do have a Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act compact with other states so that the child retains home state jurisdiction. The concerns specifically raised by Bridgette Duffy, who was unable to stay today but helped with the amendment, was to address what the district attorneys in Clark County have been seeing; many runaways from California are found in Clark County. The national compact jurisdiction requires that we return those girls to their home state jurisdiction. The concern was that if we could not use a secure facility as laid out in this section, for example our child congregate care, they would run away. We would call the parents and by the time the parents got to Las Vegas from California, she would have run away. It is to address that specific situation. Often girls are brought to Nevada, but Nevada is not their home and we find them in the sex trafficking situation. The intent is to reunite them with their families.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

In section 16, the provisions that take effect in 2022 address an offense of prostitution or solicitation of prostitution. Is this an instance where a girl is offering herself up for prostitution and not an underage "John" so to speak?

Ms. BORTOLIN:

I am also not a district attorney, but I believe that it is to ensure that the act did not have to be completed. Sometimes the girls are sent to solicit.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Does this exempt someone that is trying to hire or buy her?

Ms. BORTOLIN:

It would be the minor victim who is soliciting, because she has been instructed to go solicit.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will hear those who wish to testify in support of S.B. 293.

ROSS E. ARMSTRONG (Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):

We did attach a fiscal note; I would like to provide the background. As amended, there is a position still needed within the Division. We determined by looking at the class specifications that a social services chief 2 level would be

the appropriate level. The fiscal note covers that position and the standard associated expenses.

One of the things that we are seeing this Session is another bill, Assembly Bill (A.B.) 151, that sets up some new legal triggers for child welfare agencies and how they can take these type of cases, refer them and work with home states. This particular position would be there to design a thoughtful system. We do not want to keep them in a juvenile system, and it is inappropriate to just place them in the foster care system because that system has very specific goals of reunification with the person we have removed them from. Clearly, we do not want to do that in these situations. The types of treatments and therapy that are needed is much different than the regular foster child.

ASSEMBLY BILL 151: Provides for the protection of children who are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. (BDR 38-457)

We built the fiscal note with the long-term full-time position. If this Committee prefers, we could build one as a contracted position if you are approving this as a one-time expenditure to be further addressed in the next Session. It is a drop in the bucket compared to the resources of the pimps, traffickers and buyers. We thank the sponsor for concerns about the original bill and a thoughtful approach to addressing this issue.

ALEX ORTIZ (Assistant Director, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County Nevada):

I am here in support of S.B. 293 as amended. This is a very important bill and it is needed to help with these commercially sexually exploited youth in our State—helping these victims on a daily basis with proper planning to determine the best interests of these children. We will remove our fiscal note with the proposed amendment. Senate Bill 293 is very different from where it was.

RYAN GUSTAFSON (Human Services Agency, Washoe County, Nevada):

We are in support of S.B. 293. Washoe County is in full support of actively working to develop and implement a plan to actively respond to this trend and the impact that it is having on the victims. No state in this Country has really found a perfect model or solution yet for this population.

We would like Nevada to be the first in getting this right. We do not have the time to implement something prematurely and not be effective, so we appreciate the chance to intervene in a more methodical manner. Combating sex trafficking certainly takes a community to wrap around the problem and needs a variety of players from law enforcement, mental health and treatment to solve the problem. We cannot do this in isolation and are counting on all of us to make this a priority during the interim.

Washoe County had also submitted a fiscal note prior to the bill amendment on S.B. 293. Based on the new amendment language, the fiscal note can be removed.

HOLLY WELBURN (Policy Director, ACLU Nevada):

We would like to register our support for the important legislation in S.B. 293. We echo how important it is to establish this position and create the infrastructure that will allow Nevada to properly address the needs of commercially exploited children and keep them from entering the criminal juvenile justice system. That can have a long-term impact on their lives.

KENDRA G. BERTSCHY (Public Defender, Washoe County):

I am also here with John Piero with the Clark County Public Defender's Office. We should not be housing these victims in juvenile detention centers. We absolutely need to be providing them with the resources as soon as we identify them rather than them languishing in the juvenile justice system and potentially entering into the adult criminal justice system.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The solicitation of prostitution is someone who is trying to hire a prostitute. Is that correct?

MS. BERTSCHY:

In the interest of time, I can have a lengthy discussion with you offline. I believe that you are correct, but there are some nuances.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

For purposes of clarity, the way that it is written is that if a 17-year old was soliciting prostitution, then he would be exempt from arrest or criminal prosecution for doing so. I do not think that is the intent of the bill, but that is how I read it.

ERNIE ADLER (Sierra Sage Academy):

It has been represented that there are not any real programs to deal with this. There is a program that deals with this; it is the Sierra Sage Academy in Yerington, which is nationally accredited. There are dormitories, a full gymnasium, a charter school and items such as equestrian programs and softball teams for girls that have been sex trafficked. They are also expanding into Clark County with a nonresidential program for girls that have been sex trafficked. The big problem is that there are not enough slots in these programs, and we have long waiting lists for treatment. This is going to be more of a challenge in this issue rather than there not being an appropriate model. There are good treatment models right now.

As far as girls getting arrested and referred to facilities, most of the juvenile court judges are pretty up on this and will do things like reducing charges to something like disturbing the peace to prevent girls from having something on their record that reflects engagement in prostitution. That is a problem, and they are trying to deal with it as best as they can.

HELEN FOLEY (FirstMed):

FirstMed is a federally qualified health center in southern Nevada. During 2018, there were 500 sexually abused or exploited youth that came to FirstMed for services. Some of those for physical but many for mental health reasons. They were referred by the National Children's Advocacy Center or the Clark County Department of Family Services because through therapy it was discovered they had been sexually exploited. Referrals were also from the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Child and Family Services, Nevada Youth Parole Bureau and our Mobile Crisis Unit among others. Many come for services from nonprofit organizations. The problem is where do they go from there? How do we identify more children that need help?

We are just launching a program with the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada where there will be training for all of their bus drivers. They will have a stack of cards for FirstMed. I do not have all the details, but there will be posters at the bus stops and on the buses themselves to identify and hopefully treat these young men and women that are sexually exploited. This bill is a good start on what we do with them afterwards. We see that it takes funding and dedication. With all of the parties coming together and the State and their effort, it should be a good start to a really bad problem.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one to testify in opposition or neutral to the bill, we will hear closing remarks.

SENATOR RATTI:

There are many great organizations and components of the system that are doing good work on this issue as is the Nevada Coalition to Prevent the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children taskforce established by executive order that has been putting in a lot of time and energy. There are some treatment options and there are some wonderful judges that are trying to do this work. But it is the continuum of care from the moment we have contact with these young women and sometimes young men to the point where they receive the treatment that they need. Even when we have great judges that are doing good work, that child has been sitting in the juvenile justice system waiting to get into the court system. Even with the very best judges making the very best decisions so that there is not a criminal record, our position on this bill is that it is not appropriate.

While the treatment options and lack of treatment options are concerns—we need a lot more like those referenced by Mr. Adler—it is also about the critical period of time when the law enforcement officer comes into contact with victims and the number of days and the timeframe before they can actually be placed into a treatment setting that is going to work for them. We also have to address the very real challenges of protecting them from a pimp, from running away and all the other pieces that happen in that window of time. That is an area where we are all struggling.

Without good solutions in that space, we lock them in juvenile justice for their own good. I think it is a well-intentioned decision, but still not an appropriate decision. That is the urgency for the full-time position. We desire to and have been doing good work to try to change it, but if we do not have a person whose job it is to make sure this planning process moves forward then we will not meet the deadline that we have made for ourselves. By 2022, we are not going to allow that to be an option anymore. There are many things competing for your time and attention and the dollars of the State of Nevada, but it is critical that we get this one position to keep it moving and meet our deadline.

In regard to Senator Kieckhefer's question, I will verify the language with Legal Counsel as our intent for S.B. 293, for the record, is not any persons who might

be soliciting prostitution. It is to these victims who are being put under pressure to go out and find a "John". If we need to bring another modest amendment by work session, we will do so.

MS. BORTOLIN:

The stakeholders and I did have a conversation that we wanted to put on the record. Mr. Armstrong mentioned A.B. 151. If that bill passes, we will be creating a new chapter for some laws specific to child victims of sex trafficking and child welfare in juvenile justice. It would be our goal if legally possible to have section 1 fall under that new chapter as well to marry those bills in the same chapter rather than have this be in chapter 424.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 293. Our next hearing will be on S.B. 204.

SENATE BILL 204 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the mental health of pupils. (BDR 34-551)

SENATOR PAT SPEARMAN (Senatorial District No. 1):

Dear Family or whoever reads this: I am so stressed and tired. I really want to die. Like I try to do my best in school; but I can't, because I am depressed. My parents expect everything to be perfect. I have an essay due tomorrow, and I can't focus because of my anxiety and depression. I do not know why I feel like this. I feel like I am being overdramatic, but I really want to die. I just swallowed a few pills, and I do not feel good.

What you just heard was what was supposed to be the final message to Colyn Abron's parents. He happens to be my youth legislator who brought this bill to me. In his testimony before the Education Committee, he said "fortunately someone found him in time."

Senate Bill 204 requires the elementary and secondary schools of Nevada to develop and implement policies for prevention of suicide. My written testimony and the applicable fiscal notes have been submitted for the record ([Exhibit L](#)). The Public Charter School Authority has been eliminated; there is not a fiscal note with reprint 1. The NDE entered a fiscal note, but the bottom line is zero because they are going to use existing resources.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 3, 2019
Page 26

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will hear from those in support of S.B. 204.

BROOKE MAYLATH (President & Advocate, Transgender Allies Group):

I cannot say more than what Senator Spearman has gone into detail with. I could give you a litany of statistics and horror stories of what the lack of support does for transgender children and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) children as a whole.

It is clear that we need to be able to have the ability to help our kids and give them the support. We know that the kids that do have support—whether it be through schools or especially from their parents, which is not always the case—drastically reduces the likelihood of suicide. I beg you for the sake of our children for your support of S.B. 204.

Ms. ADLER (Charter School Association of Nevada; National Alliance on Mental Illness Nevada):

Senate Bill 204 is going to continue to engender the partnership that needs to exist between education and mental health, hopefully with life-saving results. Mr. Abron met with our National Alliance on Mental Illness Nevada policy taskforce. He is an amazing young man, and I am so grateful that he is alive.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Senator Spearman mentioned that the State Public Charter School Authority removed the fiscal note. Can you please put that on the record?

Ms. ADLER:

I am closely working with them; I noticed that they have resubmitted a zero dollar fiscal note for the first reprint of the bill.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will hear opposition to S.B. 204.

JORGE SANCHEZ (Nevada Family Alliance):

I am representing many families today, some are here and some unfortunately cannot make it. They have various issues with S.B. 204. Section 10 in particular deals with private schools. The amendment does not suffice. I would like to bring your attention to page 14, line 33 which requires training for teachers and pupils concerning the prevention of suicide. This part of the bill

presents a problem to private schools' autonomy to train and teach according to their core beliefs, particularly those that are parochial schools.

The language in the section leaves an open door for the State to interpret or decide what the teachers and students will be trained on. This training itself will cost private schools money. Money that the schools will have to pass on to the parents, particularly those schools that do not receive any type of government funding. This would be on top of existing fees like tuition fees, registration fees, books and uniforms. This seems a bit unnecessary given the fact that our schools are required by the State to already have a prevention plan. For this reason and others, I am in opposition to S.B. 204.

MARGUERITE URBINA:

I am here as a mother to voice my concerns on S.B. 204 which has to do with my children's lives. Although I am in favor of suicide prevention, I am against section 10 of the bill because of the requirements as stated by Mr. Sanchez. It requires the training of teachers and students and includes the phrase "include without limitation" and this worries me a lot. This phrase enables a contract writer to make claims later because of the lack of details in the contract at the time that agreement was made. This phrase will also enable the bill sponsor to force requirements on private schools that will violate my children's rights in private schools. Please read section 10 of S.B. 204 and consider my children's rights.

JESUS FAZ:

I am here foremost as a concerned parent. I believe we all know suicide is a horrible thing, and we all care and we want to help. However, S.B. 204 is not the answer nor is it a viable plan. It severely infringes upon the autonomy of private schools' beliefs. I am the parent of four and strongly believe in the private school system. My children will be negatively affected by S.B. 204 as it relates to private schools and children of faith. This bill threatens the existence and purpose of why private schools exist today. In section 10, it is not optional to incorporate a policy for private schools. The problem is that in sections 11 and 12, the State Board of Education is given power to deny or revoke a license for failure to adopt a policy that is in accordance with S.B. 204. Also, section 13 makes it possible for any person that is aggrieved to file a complaint with the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This, in turn, would again lead to the revoking or denial of a license.

Senate Bill 204 requires the training of all teachers and students on this new bill. How much money will it take to train every teacher and student? The most concerning issue to me is what kind of training does this entail? We know that a high percentage of students at high risk of suicide belong to the LGBTQ community, as scientific research confirms. The problem here is that the teachers and students of various faiths will be forced to receive training which would force them to accept and condone lifestyles contrary to their religious beliefs. Failure to do so supports the concern of autonomy in private schools, since the State would revoke or deny a license to any school not in compliance. I am completely in opposition of S.B. 204.

JOSE ZALASAR:

I am the concerned father of three kids. My concern is with section 10 of S.B. 204. I feel so sad for people committing suicide for any reason; I agree that we need a bill to prevent suicide and protect all kids in our schools. This should worry about every single student not just a single group. This section affects and destroys the autonomy and feel of private schools. As the concerned parent of 3 kids, please erase section 10.

CARLOS JIMENEZ:

I work as a mental health professional. There is no doubt that suicide is a big issue in today's society. I come across it almost every day and take it very seriously. It is an issue that we cannot ignore; I do support suicide prevention. I appreciate all of you for taking this issue into consideration, but I have an issue with section 10 of S.B. 204. It infringes on the right of private schools to operate their schools according to their beliefs. This bill clearly violates the free exercise and establishment clauses which protect religious schools rights to teach and communicate its faith.

I also have concerns on page 14 line 33 (c). Some questions arise as to who will be determining what the teachers and students will be trained on. Who will determine what the finest and appropriate instruction is? This bill is not clear enough, and I am asking you to completely remove section 10 of S.B. 204 and anything that infringes on rights of private schools.

ENRIQUEZ RIVERA:

I am a practicing therapist in Las Vegas and also a veteran. I am in opposition to S.B. 204. We can all agree that suicide is a horrible tragedy, but there is another tragedy taking place here today. The State of Nevada is infringing upon

the rights of private citizens to educate their children as they see fit while adhering to State and federal laws.

The reality is that Nevada ranks second to last in the Nation when it comes to public school education. Why is the State not allocating time and resources to address this issue instead? Why is the State pushing S.B. 204 which attempts to take the autonomy away from private schools and give it to the State?

This is unconstitutional and immoral. It is unconstitutional because private schools have the right to formulate their own curriculum, rules and regulations and arrive at their own decisions without State or federal officials mandating how they educate their children. This bill is immoral because many of these private schools are religious. Forcing them to adhere to certain guidelines that go against their religious beliefs with the threat of revoking their license is immoral and wrong. I am asking you to completely remove section 10 and anything that infringes upon the autonomy of private schools.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Is there anyone to testify in neutral?

LINDSAY ANDERSON (Washoe County School District; Association of School Superintendents):

I would like to clarify that the school district fiscal notes that were submitted will stand. They are not withdrawn as the result of any amendment. We supported the bill in the policy hearing, but need to be clear that there is a fiscal impact at the school district level.

CARLA VALLARTA:

I am in opposition to S.B. 204. I want to leave you with a quick quote from Benjamin Franklin, "Those who will give up essential liberties to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." Although I understand suicide is important, my concern is that because we are looking for safe methods, we are forgetting that as private schools we want freedoms. We want to be able to run our schools based on either our faith or other principles to keep the private school operational. Please remove section 10 and allow us to deal with our kids the way that we want to deal with them. I do not understand why they keep pushing on private schools. Leave us parents alone. We remove our kids from the district for a reason. We do not want to be bothered by government. Please vote against S.B. 204.

RENALDO BENEVITAS (Clark County School District):

I would like to reiterate everything that Ms. Anderson just stated. We have the same situation in Clark County with the fiscal note. We appreciate the important conversation, but we always have concerns when there is an unfunded mandate.

COLYN ABRON (Nevada Youth Legislature):

I am the amazing person that you have been hearing about. The number of people that came up and talked to me this week about their suicidal ideations compelled me to come here today even though I am sick. As read by Senator Spearman, I was planning on leaving this earth on February 20th when I almost committed suicide.

I was fortunate enough to have a supportive family who helped me reach out for help, and I am doing a lot better. I am not going to list statistics, but it is scientifically proven that students who receive this type of education and have these types of resources are able to do better and reach out for help. I hear many concerns addressing the issue of "let my children—let me be able to have my children." If you read section 10, it specifically states in consultation with the parents, the governing body and the school board. The parents have the option to choose the plan they want when responding to suicide.

Mental health being taught in health classes is subjective, lacking and not mandated. The World Health Organization recognizes the full spectrum of health as a complete physical, mental and social wellbeing; not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. Our current schools' lack of acknowledgement in health by not teaching mental health and the lack of resources have left so many of our students undocumented, undiagnosed and unaddressed. What are you going to do about it? You have the power right now as a legislature to vote for a bill that will save lives in Nevada. You have the power right now to make sure our students are educated about the science and the symptoms of mental health, because studies show that students who receive this education and support are more likely to seek help.

Mental health is a growing epidemic in society. I see my peers turning to alcohol, marijuana and other drugs, not for recreational purposes, but because they feel depressed and use them to feel better. That is a problem. One in five will be diagnosed with a mental health disease. We can no longer turn a deaf

ear or a blind eye. This epidemic effects every aspect of our society. We must pass S.B. 204.

Educate instead of medicate. Information is intervention. By teaching students and teachers the truth about mental health, we arm ourselves with the tools needed to promote a more healthy student and society. You can opine and feel like we are doing everything right, no matter if the suicidal ideation does not discriminate against public, charter or private schools; gay, straight, black or white. We all have these issues and studies show that 44,000 students in Nevada felt hopeless for more than 2 weeks.

ISABELLE ROTES:

I have been there in those hard times where you really thought about ending it. I do not think this policy is our only solution. I am a Christian and I was saved. That is the reason that I am here today is because Jesus Christ saved my life. I do not agree that this policy is the only solution. My solution was Jesus Christ. That worked for me. Why can we not see if that will work for other people? I know it will; it is just a matter of you deciding whether you want to give your life completely to Christ or not. In regard to this policy, I see that it is for the better—to protect everyone, to save lives. At the same time, it comes with the great cost in money, especially for private schools that are struggling to make it and keep functioning as a school. The high school that I went to was a private school; they are really struggling right now. It is a really good school. I got high grades because of that school and its programs. I feel like you are wasting resources to see if this method is going to work; we are not even sure of it. I am for suicidal prevention, but I am against section 10 of this policy.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I would like to enter into the record that shows the fiscal year 2019-2020 that shows travel expenses in \$4,900, substitute pay for \$3,000, meeting supplies of \$100, and \$8,000 for the General Fund revenue fund. Then it shows zero at the very end. The original fiscal note indicates costs, but shows that they will cover it from their General Fund. That came from the NDE.

Now I will address section 10. I wish people had spent time reading it. It does not state that "the State will do." It actually reads the governing body of a private school that provides instruction to students in Grades 7 to 12 inclusive shall in consultation... the word consultation means that you are going to talk to folks and get some type of consensus. The consultation shall include the pupils,

parents, guardians of pupils, school employees, persons who provide mental health services to pupils and organizations with expertise in the prevention of suicide and other interested persons. There is nothing in section 10 that requires them to go by something that the State does.

Each organization then decides. If the Bible saved you, put the Bible in your plan. If the Koran saved you, put the Koran in your plan. Whatever makes it work for you, you can do that. I am so sorry that someone misinformed the people who think that section 10 is a mandate for them to teach against their principles of religion. Put the Bible in there; no one says that you could not do that.

I had the opportunity a few weeks ago to meet Ms. Tammy Duckworth (former U.S. Army lieutenant colonel who has served as the junior United States Senator for Illinois since 2017). She was the Blackhawk helicopter pilot that was shot down. One of the things she talked about in her speech was that when she was laying there and could not move, she did not care if someone was black, white, straight, gay or transitioning. She was glad people were there to help her. I am a veteran, too, and the whole time I served I never asked the question if I would save the life of someone in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) community. I never asked that, but I stayed in the closet because there were people that were misinformed about who I am.

We have talked about private schools having difficulty. The irony is that some of the funding for private schools comes from public dollars—and LGBTQ people pay taxes. Like it or not, in your private school LGBTQ people are helping to fund your education.

Let me deal with the faith issue. I am of the opinion that people can have their own faith. They just cannot impose that on anyone else. I spent my life as a child wrestling with who I am; a lot of the times not feeling good about who I am. It was not just me "coming to Jesus." It was a matter of me using my faith and other resources to help me get through it. I sit here now as a proud member of the LGBTQ community and Jesus saved my soul, too. How about that? He walks with me and he talks with me. You want to talk about what we can do or cannot do because this is against our religion? Jesus' brother, James, said in the Bible "if you see your brother in need and you do not help them how dwelleth the love of God in you?" In John 3:16 "for God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever should be believe in him should

not perish—whosoever—but have everlasting life". Whosoever: those are the differently abled, those who are homeless, those who are being sex trafficked and even those in the LGBTQ community. I resist the notion that section 10 comes against anyone's religion.

I also want to put on the record that when we talk about freedom of faith, we are not just talking about Christianity. A lot of people have distorted "what the founding fathers meant" or what they did. Most of them were agnostic. Read it in history. Freedom of religion came also with freedom from religion. As Christians, Muslims, Jewish, Bahá'í, it does not matter. In section 10, whatever your religion is, if you want to consult that feel free to do so. If I were the people who came and thought that this was something that was mandated and would go against their religion, I would respectfully ask that they go back to whomever told them that is what this says.

It is unfortunate that when people came here and spoke to Senator Moises Denis, they did not stop by my office. I could have saved them the trouble of coming here and misinterpreting section 10. There is more language that we will look at that will address their concerns. I do not know what else to say if people do not understand the consultation provision. Senate Bill 204 will save lives. Research shows us that it is not just "other children" in other places, but many of the suicides that are completed are children that are in very strict religious homes, because they do not feel like they can talk to their parents. This has nothing whatsoever to do with your religion—consult the Bible. Please do not misrepresent what this bill says; it states "in consultation".

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will now open the hearing on S.B. 366.

SENATE BILL 366 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to dental therapy. (BDR 54-661)

SENATOR JULIA RATTI (Senatorial District No. 13):

I am presenting S.B. 366; I brought this bill on behalf of the Nevada Dental Hygienist Association (NDHA). The bill is to address the health of Nevadans. It very specifically focuses on the oral health of Nevadans. The bottom line is that this bill provides a mid-level provider in the oral health field. Just like we have done on the medical side where we have physician's assistants (PA) and advanced practical nurses (APRN), and there is a range of providers between

nurses and physicians. This bill creates a dental therapist that is a mid-level practitioner for oral health. We brought this bill based on concerns of my constituents that I talk to on a regular basis that explain health care continues to be one of the top concerns.

We do this very unique thing in the United States where we sometimes do not consider oral health to be the same as the rest of the body. It is excluded from traditional health care coverage. You have to have a separate plan to get your dental health care taken care of. Because of that, there are many Nevadans that are going without the essential health care that they need. I am a little baffled on how we got to this place, because the health of your mouth is very much connected to the rest of your body. In the policy committee, we spent a great deal of time going over the details.

We are talking about the health of our very low-income Nevadans. We had great presentations on what is happening in tribal areas and on reservations. We are also talking about my friends and family that do not have dental coverage with their employer; they struggle when they need access to dental care for themselves. Just like on the medical side where mid-level providers have proven to be an incredible tool for increasing access to health care, I believe that dental therapists will do the same on the oral health side.

LANCETTE VANGUILDER (Nevada Dental Hygienists Association):

I understand the discussion today is to focus on the very small fiscal impact—which is only about \$37,000 from the General Fund. Although Nevada ranks 25th in the Nation for the number of dentists per capita, Nevada still is at the bottom of the list in the U.S. for dental care and services. The vast majority of our State has been designated as dental health care professional shortage area by federal and State agencies. A recent report lists Nevada as 49th in the Nation for children's dental health. According to the DHHS, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Nevadans experience many oral diseases and conditions in greater numbers than their national counterparts and additional work is needed to reduce these disparities.

Introducing this new mid-level provider in Nevada is intended not only to increase access to care but also the affordability of dental care and services for all Nevadans no matter where they live: urban, rural, frontier and tribal areas. Dental therapists would have a master's degree level college education and be required to graduate from a dental therapy program accredited by the same

agency that accredits all dental and dental hygiene programs. My written testimony ([Exhibit M](#)) details more facts and data, education and safety information and the importance of the proposed legislation.

My written testimony, [Exhibit M](#), also includes an issue brief from the Minnesota Department of Health, Board of Dentistry and a table from the NDHA highlighting states that are in the process of creating or have implemented legislation enabling dental therapists. I would like it to go on record that current dental hygiene and dentist licensure fees in Nevada are among the highest in the U.S.

Recently, some states have passed legislation and are still in the rule-making process, while some states have not had a fiscal note attached to the legislation at all. Additional costs to the State may be offset in the long run by the reduction in dental-related emergency room visits, a healthier workforce with less time missed from work, students with less education time missed for dental appointments and overall healthier citizens in Nevada. I ask the Committee to consider that \$37,000 from the General Fund as a minimal investment and critical step in building a more robust and diverse dental care delivery system. It is important to ensuring we have various ways for people to get dental care that is accessible, safe and cost effective with an overarching goal of improving health.

SENATOR RATTI:

As a matter of clarity, the fiscal impact is \$97,000 over the biennium.

MS. VANGUILDER:

We were looking at the numbers specifically relating to the General Fund. The total is \$97,000 and \$37,000 of it would be from the General Fund.

SENATOR DENIS:

Is the remaining funding coming from fees?

SENATOR RATTI:

The fiscal note from the DHHS, Division of Health Care, Financing and Policy contains the details. Part of the fiscal note indicates that sections 56 through 68 will require \$45,000 for updating the Medicaid program. The General Fund is the match.

MARK KRMPOTIC (Senate Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

In the Medicaid budget, B/A 101-3158, most expenditures are funded on a matching basis between the General Fund and federal Title 19 of the Social Security Act funds to fund administrative and medical reimbursement expenses.

HEATH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH CARE FINANCING AND POLICY

HHS-HCF&P - HCF&P Administration — Budget Page DHHS-DHCFP-12
(Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3158

SENATOR RATTI:

I have submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit N](#)). We came in with a significantly more ambitious bill. We are deleting sections 1 through 57. The bill was highly negotiated; we have been working primarily with the NDHA and the Nevada Dental Association (NDA). We believe that we have done everything that has been asked to address the health and safety concerns that were brought forward. You will see in the testimony that there is still a difference of opinion; but even with that difference of opinion both parties are working together to make sure that it is the best policy bill possible.

The amendment contains more technical amendments to make sure we are getting it to the best bill it can be. In section 83, subsection 4, we are restoring the language of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 631.313. This basically reverses an inadvertent deletion of the authority of a dental hygienist to administer local anesthesia. There was some conversation about the administration of pain management, but this is the administration of pain management that dental hygienists already enjoy and it was never the intent to remove the existing scope of practice for anyone. That was an error that we are correcting.

In section 60.2 of the bill, we are deleting paragraph (e) of subsection 1. There was never any intent that the dental hygienist would have to have a public health endorsement to then move up that career ladder to become qualified as a dental therapist. You could still be a dental hygienist with a public health endorsement or you could move up the career ladder from a dental hygienist to

a dental therapist, but the two are not really related. It is more cleanup language to make sure the intent is on point.

We are deleting section 60.2 subsection 2, the hours of clinical practice under the supervision of a dentist because that was not intended. We had a good conversation about making sure that a new dental therapist was operating under the supervision of a dentist—in the room watching what they are doing for a period of time at the beginning of their practice. Mechanically, it was never meant to be a condition of licensure. For licensure, you go to school, complete clinical training in the school program and pass the test to receive your license. Once you are actually in a practice, in the collaborative agreement with the dentist, for the first number of hours in that collaborative agreement you can operate only under supervision. Once you meet those minimum hours and the dentist that has control in the collaborative agreement about what you can and cannot do can then allow you to work within the collaborative agreement but not always in the direct line of sight of the dentist.

To recap, the deletion of section 60.2 removes that as a condition of licensing. There is a provision that has been added that talks about that direct supervision that was important to both the dental hygienist and the dental associations. It is basically tiered so that if you were licensed as a dental therapist in another state—and as we do not have a Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) approved school, the vast majority of therapists would likely come from another state—you would need 500 hours of supervised practice. If you were a dental hygienist, and you have 5 years of practice, then you need 1,000 hours of supervision when you first start. If you have neither of those qualifications as a dental therapist from another state or a dental hygienist, then 1,500 hours are needed. That is direct supervision within line of sight with the dentist that you have entered into the collaborating agreement with. There are still some differences of opinion about the aspects of the bill and there will be speakers from both sides. I have advised that this is a finance committee and not a policy committee.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I have been on both sides of S.B. 366 since you introduced it; I have not heard it in the Human Services Committee, so I will need to ask a couple policy questions. Clearly, this is great for my rural district to bring dental care to rural and smaller communities including tribes. I do have some concerns. For instance, PAs function under inspection of their charts on a regular basis. I

would feel more comfortable if we incorporated regular supervision, such as every 30 days, by a supervising dentist's review of the records. Presently, it is 18 months, and I consider that too long.

SENATOR RATTI:

I have not heard this concern with the many conversations with stakeholders that have happened. If our subject matter experts here at the table cannot address it, we will take it back to the table. One thing I have tried to do is ensure this mid-level practitioner is not treated any differently than any other mid-level practitioner. I would want to verify the NRS language and see if it is a matter of NRS, the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) or the collaborative agreement.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

With the collaborative agreement, once you have accomplished those hours is the agreement finished?

SENATOR RATTI:

Let me be very clear. The bill in its current form does not have independent practice. All dental therapists in the State of Nevada would be working under a collaborating agreement with a dentist.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That gives me a comfort level. Now to tweak it down to where there is a review of the charts. I am concerned we may get an unscrupulous dentist that would put 30 of you to work and then be gone.

CARYN SOLIE (Nevada Dental Hygienist Association):

Senator Ratti answered part of this. The collaborative agreement between the dentist and the dental therapist would have the parameters of how frequently they review charts together and how frequently the dentist physically sees the patients. This would be up to the dentist to write the agreement. It would be something that could easily be nailed down to satisfy your concerns through the regulatory process or NAC and not necessarily codified in statute. With someone having a series of 30 therapists, there is a limit in the bill that there can be no more than 4. I have submitted written testimony as well ([Exhibit O](#)).

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

We will take testimony in support.

MS. ADLER:

We have many supporters of S.B. 366 in the room and many letters of support and forms of documentation have been submitted in your exhibits. I have spent most of my professional career in rural and tribal Nevada. The unmet need for care is enormous as explained in my written testimony ([Exhibit P](#)).

DAWNA L. BROWN (Health Director, Pyramid Lake Tribal Health Clinic, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe):

With Pyramid Lake being one of the larger tribes in Nevada, we take the responsibility of taking the lead in various areas that will benefit not only ourselves but the smaller tribes as well. One way is with the possibility of providing much needed dental care at all levels. Senate Bill 366 will go a long way to help us accomplish this as described in my written testimony ([Exhibit Q](#)).

WENDY MADSON (Executive Director, Health Communities Coalition):

We in Nevada have seen much progress around oral health services, from the passing of the Volunteer Health Care Services Act in 2013 allowing out-of-State providers to participate in humanitarian outreach events such as Remote Area Medical, school-based varnish and sealant events and oral health presentations within the schools. We are on a forward-moving path. We support S.B. 366 as explained in my written testimony ([Exhibit R](#)).

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Strategy 360):

I am here today on behalf of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony. We want to go on record in support of S.B. 366.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Seeing no one else in support, we will hear opposition to the bill.

RICHARD DRAGON (President, Nevada Dental Association):

The intent of S.B. 366 is to address a perceived need to increase dental care in our State. However, data shows Nevada already has an ample number of fully-trained dentists who can meet the need. My written testimony ([Exhibit S](#)) contains this data and I ask that you vote no.

KELLIE MCGINLEY (Nevada Dental Association):

I am a native Nevadan and a practicing pediatric dentist. The NDA asks you to oppose this bill for the reasons detailed in my written testimony ([Exhibit T](#)) .

DR. MICHELLE FARNOUSH:

I am a proud graduate of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), School of Dental Medicine. I rise in opposition to S.B. 366. Getting accepted into dental school is not for the weak hearted or unprepared. Besides the mandated classes that are academically challenging, research, preparatory courses and entrance exams are required just to apply for admission.

Over 12,000 applications are submitted per year to dental schools nationwide. The program at UNLV had more than 2,300 applications last year alone for a class size of 75 dental students. The clinics have more than 60,000 patient visits per year saving Nevada residents over \$1.6 million annually. We have unparalleled experiences in community outreach, including remote area medical, and free clinics to underserved children, veterans and domestic violence victims equating to \$3.8 million in free services to Nevadans in need every single year.

Upon graduation, the average 4-year dental school debt is \$286,000 with some upwards of \$450,000. Students and recent graduates such as myself would gladly exchange practice location for debt forgiveness. Nevada should be using its existing resources to find fiscally-responsible solutions that comprehensively address oral health while keeping our dental school graduates here in the State rather than promoting underqualified dental therapists.

There is a viable solution to increase access and support new graduates; creating a rural area assistance loan repayment program. Debt forgiveness dental programs have already proven successful in Georgia, Louisiana, and most recently in Florida. It is a replicable model that can be easily and successfully implemented here in Nevada to have an immediate and substantial impact. Incentivizing all new graduates to practice in the underserved communities would solve several problems at the same time—access to dental care in exchange for debt relief while attracting and keeping top-notch doctors serving our community here in Nevada.

The solution to increasing access to care is to physically get dentists to these locations. The UNLV School of Dental Medicine was established to support the dental needs of Nevadans. You have the ability to oppose S.B. 366 to support new students and graduates and allow Nevadans, regardless of socioeconomic status, their basic right to receive the best care possible from qualified and licensed dentists.

DR. STEVEN SAXE (President, Nevada State Society of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons):

I am a board-certified oral and maxillofacial surgeon and president of the Nevada State Society of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (NSSOMS). My education consists of 12 continuous years of university education after high school and some of my colleagues spend 14 to 15 years after high school, all for the ability to possess the critical-thinking skills to extract a diseased tooth.

Senate Bill 366 takes a step back, giving those with four years of training after high school the ability to do the same. This is wrong. Senator Spearman refers to this opposition to S.B. 366 as a turf war. That could only exist between two similarly-qualified individuals, and that is not the case. Approximately 20 years ago, I testified before this body to oppose S.B. No. 133 of the 71st Session—a bill that would have lowered the standards for obtaining a license for dentistry and allowing corporations to own a practice in Nevada. This was all in the name of providing access to rural areas and the underserved. Here we are trying to address the same issue 20 years later by further lowering the standards to deliver dentistry to Nevadans. Currently in southern Nevada, there are two dentists on every corner, and the problem is still present.

As our population grows so does our dental workforce. Many programs over the years have been initiated, including a dental school at UNLV, that have been addressing these issues for years. The issue of access to dental care exists nationwide and cannot be fixed with S.B. 366. There are numerous ways to help correct this issue.

"Senate Bill 366 and having a two-tiered system in Nevada where poor people and those with poor insurance benefits in geographic restrictions are stuck seeing someone less qualified than a doctor to address their needs will not fix the issue."

The advent of the dental therapist concept in the U.S. has not addressed servicing those with the most need as evidenced in numerous studies conducted in the Nation. Of those who live in geographic-restricted areas, the poor and underserved across the U.S., the cost to deliver dentistry over the years has only increased, including the cost of going to dental school. The same overhead and expenditures to run my dental practice will be incurred by those who become dental therapists even if they are encouraged to be promised bonuses for churning out volume.

Many misrepresentations have been made by the proponents of this bill including statistics that are over a decade old. Monumental advances in our State have occurred to address these specific populations over the years; Nevada ranks among the highest in the Nation addressing these issues. Organized dentistry has offered many solutions to address this problem. Working with legislators and local officials, we have more reasonable options than lowering the standard.

Please reach out to the NDA and the NSSOMS for reasonable alternatives for doctors to address the needs of Nevadans. Earlier, we discussed oversight of non-certified teachers as librarians. The oversight of dental therapists by a dentist is four dental therapists to one dentist. The makers of this bill present that they do not even have to be in the same building. Please vote no on S.B. 366 and stop the advent of a 2-tiered delivery model in Nevada where poor people and those with poor insurance benefits do not have the advantages of seeing well-trained doctors.

DR. JOSEPH WINEMAN (Past President, Southern Nevada Dental Society):

One of the things I would like to address is that when I went to dental school, we were exported from the schoolhouse to clinics across the city in Pittsburgh where I grew up. This is another opportunity for the UNLV School of Dental Medicine to start this very similar procedure where we take our dentist students, faculty members or volunteer dentists out to these remote locations and do real dentistry, not just screenings, fluoride and cleanings.

The State Dental Health Officer has at her disposal two dental trailers that we could use initially to start this program. All we need is some volunteer dentists to go along with the students to make it happen. It is a way for dental students to get an idea of where they would like to practice. There are some students that are my protégées that are thinking about upon graduation buying a dental van or mobile home and hitting the country circuit like other people used to do. Some of these cities that are lacking dental support have not had it for more than a century. If you think back to the old barber pole, the white and red bandages of that symbol are for the blood and bandages from the dental extractions that they would perform.

Similarly, dental therapists do not have the training now as the dentists of today. I volunteer my time to help the homeless. We do other things in our own practices as was eluded to by Dr. Dragon, and the Dental School does a lot of

work for those folks who do not have access to care. I will ask you when we talk about access to care, how many people would choose not to have dental treatment done, that have an iPhone 10x or have a brand new car. Everybody makes choices. When we talk about the expense of dental care, there are discount plans that any patient can purchase and get access to care at a lower fee. All you have to do is ask your own dentist how they handle that situation.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

As there is no one else to testify in opposition and no one for neutral testimony, Senator Ratti may make concluding remarks after Senator Denis' question.

SENATOR DENIS:

We often discuss a bill to help a certain population. Somebody mentioned that we were trying to do this 20 years ago, and we are still talking about it today. Will we get a report that shows the impact?

SENATOR RATTI:

There was some conversation with the NDA regarding doing some type of reporting or metrics. My concern with doing reporting or metrics at this point in the evolution of this process is that we are establishing a dental therapist in NRS. The \$37,000 of General Fund would allow DHHS to build the framework for somebody to be able to bill Medicaid for those services. However, we do not have a CODA-approved school in Nevada, and we will not have one any time in the near future. We are going to, at the very best, have a few that might move here from another State. It will take time to build the educational program and the career ladder. If one of the dental hygienists that you heard from today wanted to become a dental therapist, they would have to move and go to school for two to three years and then come back. In the near window, there is not going to be any opportunity to measure impact.

While I would like to say that S.B. 366 is going to solve everything tomorrow, it is not going to. It will take time to build, just like it has with PAs and APRNs. It is a process. It has to be established in NRS. The Dental Board will have the task of writing the regulations to put it into place. We will need to enable Medicaid billing, and then we will start the work of working with our educational institutions and our community providers to actually build out the rest of that career ladder process. That is why there is no current measurement in place.

SENATOR DENIS:

I did not mean the measurement to be necessarily in the bill. In general dentistry, are we tracking that type of thing?

SENATOR RATTI:

I am really impressed with some of the work that is being done in DHHS. They have established a data position and are collecting good data on many different things. There is certainly great data around Medicaid, but there is actually a new position or multiple positions working on data collection across the healthcare spectrum.

CODY PHINNEY (Deputy Administrator, Health Care Financing and Policy, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):

We do have data analytics folks that have some access, especially to our Medicaid data, so there are some limitations as to what we can track. This would be small to begin with but could get metrics from the Medicaid data.

SENATOR RATTI:

I would like to submit for the record a publication by the U.S. Health Resources and Services Administration ([Exhibit U](#)) at the national level. They track health professional shortage areas, and this is their map for dental health. Dark purple indicates where there are shortage areas. Almost all of Nevada is purple and this is very current data. Whether or not we have enough dental providers in Nevada is not in question. Almost the entire State is in a dental health shortage area—there are a couple of small white areas where we are not.

I am a little confused by some of the testimony from the opposition, and I will follow up. My confusion is around the testimony discussing a two-tiered system where poor and disadvantaged populations would be receiving a different level of care than all other populations. The reason I am confused is that we have had the request from them to limit dental therapists only to federally qualified health centers in rural areas and tribal areas, but the bill does not actually do that. It allows dental therapists to practice anywhere within their scope of practice under a collaborative agreement with a dentist and a four to one supervision ratio. They can serve wealthy clients or low-income clients.

The original version of S.B. 366 had independent practice for low-income rural federally qualified health care centers and collaborative practice everywhere else in an attempt to create an incentive to go into those higher-need areas, but that

was all taken out of the bill to meet the safety concerns that were brought forward by the opposition. As it currently stands, the bill creates the mid-level practitioner. There is no drawing the line to state that they have to go into certain settings.

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

With that, we will close the hearing on S.B. 366. We have some bill draft requests (BDRs) introductions that Mr. Krmpotic will discuss.

MR. KRMPOTIC:

We have three BDRs that require Committee introduction. The first is BDR S-1167 which makes an appropriation to the Governor's Office of Finance (GFO) for the Statewide expansion of the northern and southern Museum of Arts. This is a bill that contains appropriations contained in the Executive Budget; therefore, it is a budget implementation bill.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1167: Makes an appropriation for the statewide expansion plan for the northern and southern Museum of Arts. (Later introduced as S.B. 533.)

The second is BDR S-1168 which makes an appropriation from the General Fund to the GFO for the replacement of a Nevada State radio system. This also contains appropriations as recommended by the Governor and is a budget implementation bill.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1168: Makes an appropriation from the State General Fund to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for the Nevada Radio System replacement. (Later introduced as S.B. 534.)

Lastly, BDR 41-1200 revises provisions governing the financial support for programs for the prevention and treatment of problem gambling and it is also a budget implementation bill.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 41-1200: Revises provisions governing the financial support for programs for the prevention and treatment of problem gambling. (Later introduced as S.B. 535.)

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

I will take a motion to introduce all three budget implementation bills.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 3, 2019
Page 46

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR S-1167,
BDR S-1168 AND BDR 41-1200.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

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

Senate Committee on Finance
May 3, 2019
Page 47

CHAIR WOODHOUSE:

Our last order of business is public comment. Seeing none, the meeting is adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jennifer McEntee,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

| EXHIBIT SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|----|--|--|
| Bill | Exhibit / # of pages | | Witness / Entity | Description |
| | A | 2 | | Agenda |
| | B | 11 | | Attendance Roster |
| S.B. 191 | C | 3 | Senator Joyce Woodhouse | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 191 | D | 3 | Susan Slykerman / Liberty High School | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 191 | E | 1 | Vikki Courtney / Clark County Education Association | Statement in Support from Theo Small, Clark County Education Association |
| S.B. 191 | F | 2 | Robin Carpenter / Johnston Middle School; Clark County School Librarians Association | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 191 | G | 1 | Lindsay Anderson / Washoe County School District | Fiscal Note |
| S.B. 191 | H | 1 | Mary Pierczynski / Nevada Association of School Superintendents | Proposed Amendment |
| S.B. 313 | I | 5 | Senator Joyce Woodhouse | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 293 | J | 5 | Senator Julia Ratti | Proposed Amendment |
| S.B. 293 | K | 3 | Senator Julia Ratti | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 204 | L | 7 | Senator Pat Spearman | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | M | 11 | Lancette VanGuilder / Nevada Dental Hygienists Association | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | N | 31 | Senator Julia Ratti | Proposed Amendment |
| S.B. 366 | O | 4 | Caryn Solie | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | P | 4 | Sarah Adler | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | Q | 1 | Dawna Brown / Pyramid Lake Tribal Health Clinic | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | R | 1 | Wendy Madson / Healthy Communities Coalition | Written Testimony |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|--|
| S.B. 366 | S | 1 | Richard Dragon / Nevada Dental Association | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | T | 1 | Kellie McGinley / Nevada Dental Association | Written Testimony |
| S.B. 366 | U | 1 | Senator Julia Ratti | Health Resources & Services Administration Map |