



NEVADA LEGISLATURE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE

(*Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 219A.130*)

DRAFT MINUTES

October 20, 2022

The fifth meeting of the Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL) for the 2021–2023 Term was held on Thursday, October 20, 2022, at 2 p.m. in Room 4401, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2135, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the NYL's [meeting page](#). The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

YOUTH LEGISLATORS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Youth Legislator Samantha Lyle, Vice Chair
Youth Legislator Jackson Bentham
Youth Legislator Devika Bhatnagar
Youth Legislator Oniana Boulware
Youth Legislator Emmalee Craver
Youth Legislator Dylan Keene
Youth Legislator Grant Kington
Youth Legislator Gabrielle Macababbad
Youth Legislator Nicole Miller
Youth Legislator Zion Price
Youth Legislator Emma Thurgood
Youth Legislator Kristal Walker
Youth Legislator Lauren Wong

YOUTH LEGISLATORS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Youth Legislator Max Grinstein
Youth Legislator Madeline Krieger
Youth Legislator Dillon Moss
Youth Legislator Joseph Seddon
Youth Legislator Stella Thornton

YOUTH LEGISLATORS ABSENT:

Youth Legislator Patrick Donn Dimasin, Chair
Youth Legislator Michael Lara
Youth Legislator Evan Raugust

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT TO ADMINISTER THE NEVADA
YOUTH LEGISLATURE MEMBER PRESENT:**

Senator Valerie Wiener (Ret.), Chair

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Tina Ashdown, Research Assistant/Program Facilitator, Constituent Services Unit (CSU),
Research Division
Tarron Collins, Senior Research Policy Assistant, CSU, Research Division
Maria Aguayo, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Ali Sinone, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Destini Cooper, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Jennifer Jacobsen, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Asher Killian, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
David Nauss, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicates a summary of comments.]

AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Lyle:

I would like to call this meeting to order. Thank you for being here and welcome to this meeting of the NYL. Before we get started, I would like to ask the secretary to please call roll.

[Roll call reflected in Youth Legislators Present.]

[Vice Chair Lyle reviewed the meeting and testimony guidelines.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Lyle:

Our next agenda item is public comment. Public comment may be provided in several ways, all of which are listed on the agenda.

Before we get started with public comment, I would like to note that Nicholas Murray, Ph.D., CIC, Assistant Professor, Director of the Neuromechanics Laboratory, and Athletic Research Coordinator, School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), submitted public comment for the record prior to the meeting (Agenda Item II).

[Vice Chair Lyle reviewed public comment guidelines and called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented. After opening Agenda Item III, Vice Chair Lyle was informed a member of the public had been waiting on the phone to give public comment, so she reopened Agenda Item II—Public Comment.]

Andrew J. Feuling, Superintendent, Carson City School District:

Good afternoon. I apologize for the technical difficulty. Thank you for hearing my comments today. I applaud all of you for your interest and drive to be a youth legislator representing the great State of Nevada from every corner. I enjoyed reading the proposed bill draft requests (BDRs), and I am excited to see so many BDRs relate to something close to my heart—education and kids.

First, several of the BDRs related to staffing, curriculum, and calendar requirements would all likely have a fiscal impact, and I know we take that into consideration. To provide a bigger picture, I am also a part of the Commission on School Funding for the State of Nevada, and I wanted to make you aware that the Legislature has done several studies over the years of what it costs to adequately fund schools. *Adequately* being defined as “meeting all of the current state requirements and meeting appropriate or recommended staffing guidelines.” Currently, Nevada’s public schools require about \$4.4 billion annually to run. To be funded for adequacy, that number would need to be increased by almost \$3 billion. I say that to you not as a deterrent, but as something for all of you to keep in mind as you go back and speak with your legislators about what you want for your education and for those combatants to come.

Second, I would like to offer my support for Youth Legislator Thornton’s BDR regarding traumatic brain injuries. Not only is she an amazing Carson City student, but the

management of that issue should not just be left to sports, as it is currently written into law. Clearly there is a wider impact for our Nevada students and all students within the classrooms and the academic side, which schools clearly have an interest in.

I would like to offer my support for BDR 17.

Again, thank you for all the interests you have in the BDRs you have put forward.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you. It appears we do not have any more public comment.

AGENDA ITEM III—SELECTION OF TWO YOUTH LEGISLATOR BILL DRAFT REQUEST PROPOSALS TO BE HEARD BY THE NEVADA YOUTH LEGISLATURE AT THE NOVEMBER 15, 2022, MEETING

Vice Chair Lyle:

We will move on to the next portion of this meeting, which I know we are all excited for. This is the selection of the two BDR proposals. A list of the BDR proposals is in your meeting folder and available on the meeting page (Agenda Item III A).

At this time, I would like to ask each youth legislator to please explain your proposed BDR. After each presentation, youth legislators will have time to ask questions. We will take each of the BDR proposals in numerical order.

Youth Legislator Bentham, would you please start by explaining your BDR proposal?

Youth Legislator Jackson Bentham, Senate District 6:

Good afternoon, youth legislators. Did you know that according to the Department of Education, Nevada ranks 49th in education? In 2019, before the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) changed almost everything, more than one in three high school students had experienced persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness, which is a 40 percent increase since 2009. Education and mental health are big issues facing Nevada today. The BDR I am presenting is certainly not the only solution to both of those issues, but according to experts, it can certainly give all of us a better chance of success. Bill Draft Request 1 takes the first step, as it would mandate school start times for high school students to no earlier than 8:30 a.m. and for middle school students to no earlier than 8 a.m.

You might be asking yourself, "Is this really important? How can changing school start times do anything to improve our school performance? How can it improve mental health?" Simply put, it is science. Let me give you some background. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), as kids become teenagers and hit puberty, our circadian rhythm changes. Our circadian rhythm, or circadian cycle, is a natural internal process that regulates the sleep/wake cycle and repeats roughly every 24 hours. As you can see on the slides provided for you (Agenda Item III B), during puberty this changes by two hours later for the average teenager. With this information in mind, the AAP has declared teen sleep deprivation a public health issue, calling teens "chronically sleep deprived" and "pathologically sleepy." The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) says not getting enough sleep is associated with several health risks, including being overweight, drinking alcohol, smoking tobacco, using drugs, as well as poor academic performance.

Both the AAP and the CDC recommend children ages 13 to 18 get 8 to 10 hours of sleep every night. Most of us—73 percent of high school students and 58 percent of middle school students—get less than that. One reason for that is, as our circadian rhythm changes and we naturally get tired around 11 p.m., we are required to get up earlier and earlier to make it to school on time. The average school start time in Nevada is 7:45 a.m. In Clark County, many of the high schools start as early as 7 a.m. This is in direct contrast to what the experts say. No wonder high school students are not performing up to their full potential and feel depressed. Getting even an extra hour sleep will positively impact a student's attendance in school, improve academic performance, increase graduation rates, increase mental health, and some even suggest this could decrease car accidents, as kids will be more rested.

We, in Nevada, are not the first to introduce such a bill. In fact, BDR 1 will mimic what California has already put into law. Legislators from Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and the Virgin Islands are all considering mandating school start time changes. Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Utah encourage schools to consider students' sleep needs when setting school schedules, and Maryland encourages, but does not mandate, starting at 8 a.m. or later.

Colleagues, we have an opportunity to be a leader in our state when it comes to setting the standard for quality education. We have been in the bottom position long enough. Let us take the first step by proposing and passing BDR 1, which would mandate school start times for high school students to no earlier than 8:30 a.m. and for middle school students no earlier than 8 a.m. Let us do this, not for ourselves, but for our brothers and sisters, friends, neighbors, and for generations to come.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Bentham. We are now open to questioning. We are going to first go with Youth Legislator Moss.

Youth Legislator Moss:

Youth Legislator Bentham, while I support pushing our times back for the benefit of our students' mental health, there is a worker and bus driver shortage, especially in the Washoe County School District (WCSD) where I am from. Have you considered these concerns when drafting your BDR?

Youth Legislator Bentham:

California has given the state, parents, families, and schools three years to prepare. Bill Draft Request 1 would be making the change to school start times during School Year 2025–2026. For the operational pressure through schools, there will be some challenges, but we are giving them three years. Bus scheduling would be the biggest issue. We would be reworking how the times are, so the amount of workers . . .

Vice Chair Lyle:

That is all the time allotted for that question. Next question comes from Youth Legislator Thornton.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

I support your bill, but I have one question for you. There is some thought that this should potentially be a local decision, especially since Las Vegas and Washoe County schools are very different than Douglas and Humboldt County schools. Why should the decision be applied across the state instead of locally?

Youth Legislator Bentham:

I thought about this, and the mental health and sleep issues are not just a local district problem, they are a state and national problem. Thus, there is a need for statewide solutions and mandates. The districts will still have options. They can choose 8:45 a.m. or 9 a.m.; they just cannot start before 8:30 a.m. for high school and 8 a.m. for middle school.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next, we will go to Youth Legislator Craver.

Youth Legislator Craver:

How do we know that BDR 1 will allow for more sleep?

Youth Legislator Bentham:

In 2016, Seattle, Washington, changed its school start times to no earlier than 8:45 a.m., and when it made this change, students got a median of an additional 34 minutes of sleep at night. As a result, based on past attempts, it has worked. It was also found that the students' test scores went up an average of 4.5 percent when this change was made.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you. The next question is from Youth Legislator Miller.

Youth Legislator Miller:

Do you anticipate this leading to any challenges for students with after school jobs, bus schedules, and teachers?

Youth Legislator Bentham:

For extracurricular activities, such as sports, a mock trial, or something like that, they would take place before or after school just as they do now. This BDR simply aligns sleep schedules with teen circadian rhythm. So, rather than spending hours on social media waiting to get tired, they can get home, take care of responsibilities, and go to bed. Extracurricular activity times would at most be delayed. We are not changing the amount of hours in school, we are just simply shifting it over an hour, so after school jobs should not be affected much.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you. Seeing no more questions, thank you, Youth Legislator Bentham.

Next, we have BDR 4 submitted by Youth Legislator Craver.

Youth Legislator Emmalee Craver, Senate District 18:

Good afternoon. This week is my 18th birthday. While 18 years old is not quite as exciting as 21 years old, one very crucial thing comes with turning this age, I can vote. Come Election Day on November 8, I can vote in the general election. On Election Day, I can make a difference for my county, city, and state. Today, I can also make a difference with the help of every one of you. There has never been such an important time to change lives and, if you help vote for BDR 4, you can make that difference with me.

Bill Draft Request 4 is one of the most unique and original BDRs proposed and will be the most beneficial to the lives of the youth of Nevada who might not otherwise have this chance. While other BDR ideas focus on children quite frequently addressed, BDR 4 provides the opportunity to give a pathway to the individuals of our state who are rarely acknowledged or helped. The juvenile justice system in our state is flawed. One of the major reasons for that is there is no system in place that allows incarcerated juveniles to have a promising future after being released. Bill Draft Request 4 proposes opportunities for incarcerated youth that would make their lives exponentially better. I want everyone in attendance to understand that studies show that over 40 percent of people who do not have a direct pathway after being released from juvenile centers will end up in a state prison by the time they are 25 years old.

As mentioned at our previous meeting, the basic goal of BDR 4 is to create a program directly linking juvenile centers to community colleges around Nevada. It will improve the futures of the youth who have made mistakes and wrongdoings in their lives and wish to be better. I call it the General Educational Development (GED) Pathway Project. There are requirements, as there should be for any program, to qualify. The requirements are as follows:

1. They need to pass the GED test. This test will be funded by this program for every juvenile delinquent to give them the best opportunity to qualify.
2. They must complete a set number of community service hours per semester. I am recommending ten hours of community service.
3. They need to pass all high school courses offered to them throughout their incarceration in either the Summit View Youth Center, the Caliente Youth Center, or the Nevada Youth Training Center.

All these requirements ensure that the program would encourage children in the juvenile justice system to improve their lives and make steps towards better futures for themselves. One of the more famous poets of our time is a man named Clint Smith. He is a poet that advocates for juvenile delinquents' education and believes that it is tragic to "waste the intelligence stuck in our juvenile detention centers across our country." He has spent his life going around and helping educate these youths and believes in them. I am in support of him, and I fully stand on the belief that these incarcerated youth deserve a second chance.

Sacramento is the capital city of California and representing that district is Assembly Member Kevin McCarty. I have been in constant contact with him and his office throughout this process to get their statistics and opinions on BDR 4 as it relates to a similar bill passed in California in 2021, [Assembly Bill 417](#), which implements college courses into juvenile justice systems. While BDR 4 is different, the office of Assembly Member McCarty has seen many improvements in the well-being of incarcerated youths and their futures, including an increase of 54 percent of incarcerated juveniles who are off the streets and out of prison

compared to the previous year of released individuals. The office of Assembly Member McCarty is in full support of BDR 4 and myself and has expressed interest in coming to the next presentation, should you vote my BDR forward.

I have also been in contact with the Summit View Youth Center, located in North Las Vegas, Nevada, who believes BDR 4 is extremely beneficial and would make a big impact on these youths. The other youth centers that I want to include are Caliente Youth Center, located in Caliente, Nevada, and the Nevada Youth Training Center, located in Carson City.

Examining the state budget is very overwhelming but there are certain points of the budget I reviewed that I think we can allocate money from, the most prominent being the LCB who receives a grand total of over \$20 million per year, a substantial portion of which was not spent in the last calendar year. I propose we take \$500,000 out of this department to fund this BDR to better the lives of these Nevada youths who have earned this opportunity. This money would go to the program and would replenish it every two years, with \$85,000 going to each of the aforementioned youth centers. The \$500,000 is minor compared to a lot of the BDRs that the NYL will be going over today.

I think it is in the best interest of every Nevada youth who has ever done one wrong thing in their life and has made a mistake that they are willing to make up for, to have the opportunity to grow. The average Nevada prisoner takes about \$33,000 of taxpayers' money a year. Doing the math, it would only take 16 incarcerated youths to not end up in prison, and I think that BDR 4 would cover that and plenty more, which would make up for the money spent on this BDR every two years.

I sit before you today requesting that you help make the future of these youths better so they have a chance of becoming upstanding members of our society. They deserve the chance to succeed. As a group, the NYL has one opportunity to pass a singular bill, and this NYL bill deserves to go to people who never get a chance to improve. While every youth in Nevada deserves opportunities, the NYL's one bill should not go to groups of people that the Nevada Senate is already considering helping. This BDR would impact so many youths who never get addressed in such a positive way, and I fully believe everyone's votes should go to BDR 4. Thank you.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you. We are going to start with Youth Legislator Bentham.

Youth Legislator Bentham:

Specifically, what will the money go towards?

Youth Legislator Craver:

The money would be divided into two years, with \$250,000 allocated per year. Of that, \$85,000 would go to each of the three youth centers mentioned. This money would pay for one government worker who would work with all the individuals, the GED tests to be provided to all these individuals, and things to help them complete their community service hours or if they need extra assistance with their high school classes.

Youth Legislator Bentham:

Specifically, what type of people are delinquents? Who does this involve?

Youth Legislator Craver:

The youth centers that I included in this program only refer to people with minor crimes such as vandalism, petty theft, drug use, et cetera. No major crimes . . .

Vice Chair Lyle:

That is the end of the time allotted for questions from Youth Legislator Bentham.

Next question is from Youth Legislator Grinstein.

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

You mentioned that one of the requirements for being accepted to this program is community service. What does the community service part entail specifically and who would be in charge of deciding what qualifies as community service?

Youth Legislator Craver:

As mentioned, there would be one adviser per youth center and that person would overlook the hours and constitute what would be required. Some examples I have are volunteering to talk to other delinquents who want to be implemented into the program later, volunteering at places like soup kitchens, or other things that would help the community—pretty much anything that you can think of.

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

Is the community service section intended for people to complete who are currently in a juvenile prison?

Vice Chair Lyle:

I apologize but that is the end of the time allotted for your questions, Youth Legislator Grinstein.

Next, we have a question from Youth Legislator Miller.

Youth Legislator Miller:

How many juveniles a year do you think this program would be able to help, considering that, as you stated, there is a \$250,000 limit on funding per year?

Youth Legislator Craver:

Based on the funding, I estimated that it can help about 60 to 75 students per year across the state, which—as I mentioned in my speech—would make up for the funding that it would entail.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Lastly, we have a question from Youth Legislator Thornton.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

You mentioned that nobody would be in this program who has committed any major crimes, but you also mentioned that you have been in contact with Summit View Youth Center, which is a maximum-security facility in Las Vegas. What kind of protocol is there going to be for transporting these kids? We have a staffing shortage. Are there going to be enough staff to be able to chaperone these kids?

Youth Legislator Craver:

The people that BDR 4 entails are only for minor crimes. No large threats are going to be allowed, such as assault, murder, or things like that.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislature Craver. That is the end of this questioning period.

Next, we have BDR 5, which was submitted by Chair Dimasin. Unfortunately, Chair Dimasin could not be here today, so I will share their remarks (Agenda Item III C-1).

Good evening, my fellow youth legislators. It is with immense regret that I was not able to make this meeting, but I urge you to understand that my passion and fervor to create a future inclusive for all members of our society will still exist, even on paper. I will always remain intent on creating a State of Nevada where all young people can grow up to become responsible adults and helpful members of their respective communities. Nevada is facing a crisis in reproductive education and mental health, impacting all our communities.

According to the Sexual Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) in 2021, Nevada schools are required to establish a human sexuality course but [it] cannot be a requirement for education, meaning that students are often graduating without any sexual education in the first place. Nevada has no standard regarding instruction on abstinence, but the curriculum is required to emphasize abstinence as the only way to avoid pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections (STIs).

These guidelines are devastating for our youth, with the CDC emphasizing in 2019 that only 54 percent of students used a condom during sexual intercourse. The spread of STIs and teen pregnancy scares are more often than not the source of mental health issues for many constituents in all of our districts.

This is not the only issue. Nevada's curriculum does not follow federal or national standards set out by the CDC, is not regulated to be appropriate for a student's developmental stage, and has no requirement to even be medically accurate. There is no requirement for instruction on consent to be taught in Nevada, and there is no requirement for trained instructors to teach these classes. Even worse, however, is that Nevada's sexual education curriculum is not required to be comprehensive, generally ignoring sexual health issues relating to members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) community.

All of these grievances culminate in a systematic flaw of our sexual education system faces, which is the fact that sexual education courses are opt in instead of opt out. In the status quo, parents must sign a slip of paper for the students to take courses on sexual education. Comprehensive sexual education is a two-pronged solution for our young citizens. First, it works to help create responsible students when regarding sexual health. Secondly, it constructs a foundation for long-term mental health benefits for our students.

Bill Draft Request 5 specifically works to create a new sexual education system that acknowledges students on different identities, changes the system from opt in to opt out, and prepares students to be responsible in a modern world.

Let us start with the first point. Nevada is one of four states in the nation with an opt in system. Under an opt out system, all students would be automatically enrolled in sexual education courses. If parents want to remove their students from these courses, they must sign a slip of paper and submit it to the school. Other states like Texas, Florida, and Georgia have opt out policies and, as a result, their sexual education statistics, like condom usage rates, are consistently higher than Nevada's.

I have attached a sheet with Nevada's school health profile from SIECUS [which] highlights the true nature of how lackluster our sex education system is for our students (Agenda Item III C-2). Comprehensive sexual education guarantees that we cover all students from all demographics and promotes responsible reproductive health that does not rely on ineffective abstinence, only education. It is time for an update.

More critically, though, is the second point I mentioned earlier, Eva S. Goldfarb and Lisa D. Lieberman—both researchers with a Ph.D. in public health—examined studies over the course of three decades, finding 'evidence for the effectiveness of approaches that address a broad definition of sexual health [towards mental health],' adding that:

The impact of quality sex education that addresses [a] broad range of sexual health topics extends beyond pregnancy and STIs and can improve school success, mental health, and safety. As with all other areas of the curriculum, building an early foundation and scaffolding learning with developmentally appropriate content in teaching are key to the long-term development of knowledge, attitudes, and skills that support healthy sexuality.

Further, [suppose] students are able to avoid early pregnancy, STI's, sexual abuse and interpersonal violence, and harassment. [In that case,] while feeling safe and supported within their school environment, they are more likely to experience academic success, a foundation for future stability.

Sexual education courses do not serve only as sources of reproductive information but are also a space for students to learn about mental health, their bodies, relationships, and how to live healthier lifestyles. Sexual education courses reduce a massive origin of mental illness for our young

constituents: sexual violence. Instruction on consent, as evidenced by the aforementioned researchers, has been proven to be effective at reducing sexual assault and promoting healthy relationships.

The data does not lie to you, my fellow youth legislators. A study conducted in 2019 in the *Journal of Adolescent Health* on LGBTQ-inclusive sexual education found a 91 percent reduction in the incidence rate of mental health among LGBTQ+ students in states with comprehensive education.

It is time for us to galvanize around the issues of sexual education and mental health. It is time for us to promote a Nevada that helps people from all demographics live responsible lifestyles that are free from mental health issues. It is the Nevada Youth Legislature's time to pass pioneering legislation that creates a wave of change for all of our constituents. I urge you all to vote for BDR 5. Thank you for your consideration.

Because Youth Legislator Dimasin is not here, we are going to move to the next BDR with no questions.

Next is BDR 6 submitted by Youth Legislator Grinstein.

Youth Legislator Max Grinstein, Senate District 15:

To jog everyone's memory, BDR 6 (Agenda Item III D) proposes to create a pilot program to provide free, weekly phone calls for 1,000 Nevada children of incarcerated parents. I was inspired to propose this legislation when I had the opportunity to tour San Quentin State Prison over the border in California this summer. I noticed there were a few places that were very important to the lives of the incarcerated people with whom I spoke. For example, the cafeteria, workout yard, or chapel. Out of all those places, my impression was the one singular location they treated with the most reverence was the bank of phones in one of the housing units.

As I looked around and saw how important phone calls were to the inmates, I wondered about how those calls must be just as important for their families on the other end of the line. When I got back to Reno, I reached out to organizations for justice-impacted families to discuss prison phone costs in Nevada, and I want to share with you two of the stories from those conversations.

Sasha told me about the struggles for her incarcerated loved one to keep in contact with his mother, father, and children because of the high cost of calls. She said, "It is really hard to parent for 15 minutes at a time, especially when we have to pay per minute, plus added fees to add money."

Pamela from Las Vegas told me the following:

I am his main contact to all his children, so this has been costing me at least \$450 a month just for phone calls. With four children and only 15-minute calls, it gets very expensive when I am the only one making sure he keeps his relationship with his children. He has been away for eight years and keeping this connection with his children is very important. One of his sons has just recently forgiven him for not being around and they have been able to overcome some serious issues because of the phone calls. If this bill gets passed, it would be very helpful for his children and put less stress on me, as

I do everything possible to keep it going. I currently work two jobs just to try and maintain everything out here and make sure he has all he needs in there and, most important, access to his children.”

I will note that this is not just a “feel-good” issue. Academic research proves that improving familial communication in prison has concrete benefits for children, parents, and families as a whole. One study noted that weekly calls with incarcerated parents significantly improves family relationships, leading to, “increased warmth, closeness, and loyalty between incarcerated parents and their children.” Yet another study, and I will tell you there is a lot of them on this subject, noted that frequent contact with family members while incarcerated serves to reduce recidivism rates post incarceration. That means that by putting in a little bit of effort on the issue of prison phone justice, our state can ultimately save money and decrease crime in the long run. That is why I have proposed this legislation.

Bill Draft Request 6 would create a pilot program for one year for 1,000 children to receive free, weekly 30-minute phone calls with their incarcerated parents in Nevada prisons. After the pilot program elapses, the director of the Department of Corrections would be instructed to issue a report to the Legislature. The Legislature could use the findings of this report to determine if it wanted to make the pilot program permanent.

Now that we have gotten some of that stuff out of the way, let me answer two important questions about this bill. First, how will it be funded? One notable aspect about BDR 6 is that it will not have a fiscal impact on Nevada taxpayers. Instead, the Department of Corrections would be instructed to seek out all relevant private and public grants and gifts to cover associated costs. Private organizations like Arnold Ventures, for example, offer grants to state governments to implement criminal justice reform programs, which could include prison phone justice. The federal government also offers a slew of grants administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the U.S. Department of Justice. These grants distribute funding allocated by the Second Chance Act ([H.R. 1593](#) of the 110th Congress), which sought to assist justice-impacted families and there is significant precedent for our state, having received more than a million dollars of Second Chance Act funding in the past, suggesting that we could do it again.

The second question I want to answer is why you should support this bill. For liberal youth legislators, this bill addresses your concerns about equity and accountability in our state criminal justice system. By this view, whatever you want to say about the life decisions that landed someone in prison, punishment should just be doled out to that person and not to their innocent children who have done nothing wrong and who face the financial burden simply to talk to their parents. If you are conservative, this bill speaks to core conservative values around strengthening the family unit. Whatever you want to say about the life decisions that landed someone in prison, strengthening the family ties between parent and child can only have positive impacts on them and on society as a whole, as research has suggested. In our state, children are being punished for having a parent in prison, but it does not have to be that way.

Please join me in supporting BDR 6, which would help to create a fair, more equitable, and more affordable criminal justice system for Nevada children who have done nothing wrong.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislature Grinstein. Youth legislators, please remember to keep questions as short and concise as possible. We will start with Youth Legislator Craver.

Youth Legislator Craver:

How would you decide which youths would be a part of the program over other deserving youths?

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

As BDR 6 outlines, the Department of Corrections would be instructed to make that determination. It already has a Family Services Division and that employee would be instructed to determine that because I feel the Department would be the best to administer this application.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next question is from Youth Legislator Kingston.

Youth Legislator Kingston:

I think there is a safety concern with this. Are there any safeguards in place to make sure that inmates are actually talking to their children?

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

That is a really important point you bring up. One thing I will note is that BDR 6 outlines that: (1) a parent would need to apply for their child, so most of the safety problem is resolved; and (2) if a parent on the outside felt that it was not safe for their child to speak to their incarcerated parent, then there would not be a pathway for the state to give them free calls because they would not apply in the first place.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next, we will go to Youth legislator Moss.

Youth Legislator Moss:

Similar to BDR 4, regarding the pilot program and the children, what is the application process like for these families and children? What qualifications must a child have to be chosen as one of the 1,000 children?

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

I will answer the second part of your question first. To qualify for the program, you would need to be a minor child, under the age of 18, with at least one parent incarcerated in a facility operated by the Department of Corrections. Then, the Department is instructed to advertise this program through ads in visitation rooms and notices on their website, after which parents could apply for their children to be involved in this program. Ultimately, it is up to the discretion of the Department of Corrections to initially select the 1,000 children.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next, we have a question from Youth Legislator Thornton.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

How would the prisons be able to regulate these phone calls? How would they know that the children are actually on the line?

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

There are already robust security measures in place regarding prison phone calls. The state currently has a contract with a company called Securus Technologies, LLC, which provides phone service to prisons. Securus has the technological capacity to monitor these calls and to assure that the people who they are speaking to are their children, as does the Department of Corrections.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

Current law already says that prisoners are allowed to maintain contact with the child of a parent and that the director of the prisons must allow the prisoner to use videoconference equipment to talk to their child. Why is this BDR still necessary?

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

While current law says that they must be allowed to do it, there is no precedent for them being able to do it for free, and because of how expensive these calls are, as the two stories I mentioned before demonstrate, for many families it is not possible.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Grinstein. That is the end of your questioning period.

Next is BDR 11, which is my proposal. I would like to hand the meeting over to Youth Legislator Seddon for the duration of my presentation and the question-and-answer period.

Youth Legislator Seddon:

Thank you, Vice Chair Lyle. When you are ready, please proceed.

Youth Legislator Samantha Lyle, Senate District 7:

Our home state of Nevada ranks 51st for youth mental health (Agenda Item III E); however, I want to solve this problem with everyone here today by ensuring that students in Nevada have access to critical mental health resources that do not currently exist in our status quo. In my town hall, I was made further aware of the impacts of the mental health crisis on my peers. I had almost every single member in attendance bring up the lack of resources in our school system and the fact that they did not even know that my school had a school psychologist or even other social workers, and this feeling is hardly unique to just my school. Mental Health America released *The State of Mental Health in America* report in 2019, and Nevada youth had the highest percentage of youth coping with severe major depression at 12.7 percent. The national average is 8.7 percent. The root of this problem really lies in the lack of resources that are available to us at school.

The ratio in Clark County School District (CCSD) for school psychologists to students is 1:1,866, and in WCSD, it is 1:2,000. I plan to change this and mandate 1 school psychologist for every 1,000 students in each school district.

I want to discuss specifically why I picked school psychologists and I want to go through the fiscal impact and the mental impact. Why have I decided to focus on school psychologists? Katherine Lee, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in Residence of the Counselor Education, School Psychology, and Human Services at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), explains why. She says there is a common misperception that school guidance counselors and school psychologists offer the same service, but that is wrong as one is trained for academic guidance and the other is professionally trained to identify and address health needs. School psychologists are currently covering two, sometimes three, different schools at a time and they are spread evenly. We have seen this as Katherine Dockweiler, Ed.D., a school psychologist, explains that the two days a week she is assigned to a school, she has very little to no time for preventative measures for other struggling students, meaning that she is no longer able to take on new students because she is only able to go to a school two days a week.

Let me talk about the fiscal impact, which I know is going to be a big concern for a lot of us. First, I want to address that we cannot put a price tag on our constituents' mental health. This is difficult to fully quantify because salaries for school psychologists vary, so I am going to give you the numbers. I calculated this with the average salary of \$76,000 of a Las Vegas school psychologist. In CCSD, we have 185 school psychologists. With the 315,000 students in CCSD—keep in mind we are one of the biggest school districts—we need around 130 more school psychologists to meet this mandated ratio. In WCSD, there are around 32 school psychologists. With the 64,000 students in WCSD, we would need around another 32 school psychologists. How much does this cost? Together, these salaries would cost around \$12 million, which would come out of our education budget, as this would be a payroll issue. I am not going to just leave this piece of legislation to CCSD and WCSD, it is going to be expanded to every school district; however, numbers in smaller school districts are difficult to find.

Remember, there is no price tag to mental health and the better achievement that it inevitably brings. It has already been shown that depression is linked to lower grade point averages (GPA) and behavioral issues that we are currently seeing, as we are continuously afraid to go to school. It is high time we end the mental health crisis.

Youth Legislator Seddon:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Lyle. Are there any youth legislators with questions? We will start with Youth Legislator Craver.

Youth Legislator Craver:

The next BDR we will go over also relates to mental health. How do you think BDR 11 stands out in comparison to that one?

Youth Legislator Lyle:

Bill Draft Request 11 stands out in comparison because it specifically focuses on school psychologists, whereas BDR 12 contains other social workers and people who might be able to help with mental health. As I have already stated, UNLV professors have shown that school psychologists are more equipped to deal with mental health issues.

Youth Legislator Seddon:

Next, we will go to Youth Legislator Miller.

Youth Legislator Miller:

Do you believe that if the number of counselors within the school system was increased and they were provided adequate training to deal with mental health issues, they would be able to have a similar effect as school psychologists?

Youth Legislator Lyle:

I would argue that it would be better than the current status quo, but school psychologists go to school to get years of training. I believe that the small amount of training that CCSD might be able to supply would pale in comparison to the years that school psychologists go through to get a psychology degree.

Youth Legislator Seddon:

Youth Legislator Grinstein, you may now ask your question.

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

I was wondering how you landed on the ratio of 1 school psychologist to every 1,000 pupils.

Youth Legislator Lyle:

The actual national recommendation for the ratio of school psychologists to pupils varies from 1:250 to 1:500. However, because CCSD is a very large school district and we have such a big deficit, I did not want to make the giant drop from 1:2,000 to 1:500. Therefore, I arrived at 1 school psychologist for every 1,000 pupils as a happy medium.

Youth Legislator Seddon:

Youth Legislator Thornton, you may now ask your question.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

Are you aware of the 2020 Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils in Nevada?

Youth Legislator Lyle:

I have seen some of the grants and other funding to increase mental health, but I believe that a lot of those initiatives were input after the pandemic and those do not specifically address increasing the school psychologist ratio, if I am correct.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

This does increase the school psychology ratio. It was a bill passed during the last session that is exactly what you are talking about, but with a different ratio. It feels like BDR 11 might go against what the legislators have already been working on for the last couple of sessions, so how does BDR 11 work with that?

Youth Legislator Lyle:

I am not familiar with the bill that you are mentioning, but as you said, the two ratios are different.

Youth Legislator Seddon:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Lyle, for your presentation and all youth legislators for your questions.

I will now return the meeting to Vice Chair Lyle.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Seddon. We are going to move on to BDR 12, which was submitted by Youth Legislator Miller.

Youth Legislator Nicole Miller, Senate District 20:

Good afternoon, everyone. I am here speaking today because Nevada's youth face a dire crisis in youth mental health. Nevada has been ranked 51st in youth mental health consistently and consecutively since 2015. We are not 51st without a reason. As you can see in the flyer (Agenda Item III F), CCSD public schools have approximately 1 counselor for every 2,200 students. As a matter of fact, this one counselor—who is supposed to act as an adviser for the 2,200 students—often only deals with schedule changes and course concerns. Their primary job is not mental health assistance, nor are they always adequately trained to provide appropriate guidance for students with mental health issues and illnesses.

It has become increasingly evident that mental health is not a priority of the public school system right now. Today, I come here asking you to make it a priority of the NYL. The recommended ratio is 1 trained school counselor or psychologist for every 500 to 700 students. Nevada has one counselor for four times the recommended number of students. Many students struggle with mental health conditions that lead to time away from school, increased juveniles in the prison system, and overall acting out inside and outside of the classroom setting. Approximately 18 percent of Nevada's youth struggles with depressive episodes. In 2020, 71 percent of youths in Nevada who experienced major depressive episodes never received treatment. We need a better solution; the issue is not going to resolve itself.

I am not here asking for an immediate shift to the recommended national amount of school psychologists and counselors. I know the tremendous fiscal impact that such a quick shift could make. What I am asking is that we require the State Board of Education to establish a binding minimum number of counselors in the public school system. The reason why I have not given you a specific student to counselor ratio is because every school is different. Although all schools do need an increase in the number of mental health professionals, the number is not always uniform across the board. It depends on the severity of the mental health crisis in the area and the overall level of mental health-related problems within the school system.

This takes me to the second element of my ask. Around 70 percent of juvenile inmates arrested each year have a mental health disorder. It is clear that there is a correlation between the lack of mental health assistance within the school system and the number of juveniles entering the system due to mental health illnesses. Let us be the voice that puts an end to this vicious pipeline. Eighty percent of people who are incarcerated as minors will return to the system as adults at some point in their life. The lack of access to youth mental health care has lifelong detrimental effects for many Nevadans. We need restorative justice programs for students within the school system. Punishment does not help a student grow within, nor does it support that student's needs. Students acting out is a cry for help that

they currently have minimal, if not zero, access to help. Let students seeking help get the help they need before ending up in an incredibly difficult system to escape. They need mental health counselors as part of their plan of action before steps towards expulsion or imprisonment are taken.

Nevada's teen suicide rate is 5.4 per 100,000 above the national average. It is an incredibly unsettling statistic that has troubled me over the past few weeks while I prepared to speak to you all about BDR 12. We have frequently been up in the top ten states with the highest suicide rate, and I cannot help but wonder if some student stories might have ended differently if they had the ability to go to someone and ask for help. When I say someone, I do not mean a teacher. Teachers are not mental health professionals adequately trained to deal with severe mental health disorders, nor do they have the time in their schedule to do so. I mean a trained mental health professional who could have set up a plan for these students to get back on track and feel less mentally drained and done with life.

Today I ask you to please vote to help resolve the youth mental health crisis in Nevada by voting for BDR 12, on behalf of: (1) those who the school system has failed; (2) those who have asked but were not heard; (3) every person in my town hall meeting who had never met their school counselor; (4) the 18 percent of Nevada's youth who struggle with major depressive episodes; (5) the youth who are in the juvenile system at this very moment because they did not receive the proper help they needed to restore themselves; and (6) those who can no longer ask and who we are too late to help. I know the financial impact of hiring so many counselors is steep and educating them properly also has financial costs but the amount of life that it can change is dramatic. It gives students access to the help they need to allow them to better their lives. Do not allow Nevada to be 51st in youth mental health for yet another year. Thank you.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislature Miller. Any youth legislators with questions?

We will start with Youth Legislator Walker.

Youth Legislator Walker:

Would our current counselors and public schools have to go through additional training so they can better handle mental health cases?

Youth Legislator Miller:

Yes. The reason why I included this clause is because, right now, counselors are sort of academic counselors within the school system; there are not enough mental health counselors. While it would be great if we could afford school psychologists, I am trying to allow this to happen without having such a dramatic financial impact. Therefore, that training will include how to deal with students with anxiety, depression, and teen suicide. It would be a restorative justice program.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next, we will go to Youth Legislator Bentham.

Youth Legislator Bentham:

How does BDR 12 stand out or differ from BDR 11?

Youth Legislator Miller:

I think the major difference is that BDR 12 also has a program for referral to a counselor before ending up in the juvenile justice system. As I mentioned, 80 percent of people who are incarcerated as minors are going to return to the system as adults. Bill Draft Request 12 deals with restorative justice as well and gives them the mental health training before the youths end up in that difficult-to-escape system.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Youth Legislator Krieger, you may now ask your question.

Youth Legislator Krieger:

You mentioned allowing schools to set their own student-to-counselor ratios. While I think this is a wonderful idea, how will we address concerns with schools that might have less funding and may disregard the goals of this BDR?

Youth Legislator Miller:

I think that it is necessary to establish a minimum. The minimum ratio of counselors to students might not be as low as 1:1,000; it might be 1:1,500. That way schools can ease into it, and if they need more, the State Board of Education is able to allot more counselors to that school to meet the students' needs, as not every school needs the same amount. It differs based off areas and other components.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next, we will go to Youth Legislator Grinstein.

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

I know there is a national shortage of psychologists and counselors, which is part of the reason why we have this problem. How would school districts go about implementing the hiring component of this BDR?

Youth Legislator Miller:

I think a large component to this is the training that the counselor would receive because I know school psychologists are extremely rare to find in Nevada right now; however, we can take newly certified counselors and provide them that additional training within the school system. That way they can provide a maximum impact even though there is a large staffing shortage at this point.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislature Miller.

Finally, we have BDR 17, which was submitted by Youth Legislator Thornton.

Youth Legislator Stella Thornton, Senate District 16:

The last time that I spoke to you, I did not know if the need for BDR 17 was apparent enough. I tried my best and I put it all out there. Then, I saw that you do understand the importance of the health and well-being of every student in our state.

I have a couple more statistics I would like to share with you that I was not able to mention last time. Unfortunately, Mark Halstead, M.D., of the AAP says that:

... school officials often fail to recognize the need for academic or environmental adjustments. Appropriate guidance and recommendations from the pediatrician may ease the transition back to the school environment and facilitate the recovery of the child or adolescent.

There are many symptoms and many factors that correlate with mental health symptoms that you may have after a concussion or a traumatic brain injury (TBI), but it does not take away from the fact that approximately one in five individuals experience mental health symptoms after a concussion or TBI, and that is published in a study from the National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. While these statistics are crucial to understanding concussions and TBIs, they do not show the days where you sit alone in a blacked-out room not able to talk because your own voice is too loud to hear in your ears. These statistics do not show the thoughts you have when you are alone.

Bill Draft Request 17 proposes more than just the accommodations; it includes pathways for students and student athletes to get the help that they need and be able to go to school and not spend every minute of the recovery process fighting for their rights to heal. Your head is the most important part of you. It is where you create your persona, feel, laugh, think, and where the dendrites, neurons, and synapses fire so that you can laugh, play, talk, and walk. Now, imagine all of that being taken away. This is why we need return-to-learn (RTL) and return-to-play (RTP) plans codified in Nevada state law.

As you heard earlier in public comment, the Neuromechanics Laboratory of UNR is a big supporter of BDR 17. The Carson City School District supports BDR 17 as well. I am in talks with CCSD; I have a meeting with them next week. As you know, CCSD is the fifth largest school district in the country, and they are about to become supporters of BDR 17. Washoe County School District is already implementing new programs. The Nevada Interscholastic Activities Association (NIAA) is creating new RTP and RTL policies at the prompting of the Neuromechanics Laboratory and myself.

I am excited to push BDR 17 forward, and I am proud to be able to help every single student in the state by hopefully bringing it into law, all without a fiscal impact. As heard earlier by Superintendent Feuling, there is not a lot of money right now for many other educational bills; however, BDR 17 does not have a fiscal impact and it creates so much good for every single student and student athlete in the state. I am grateful to have each and one of you by my side if you decide to vote for this BDR. Thank you.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Any youth legislators with questions? We will start with Youth Legislator Price.

Youth Legislator Price:

I want to provide a little personal anecdote. This summer, a peer of mine was recently diagnosed with cancer, more specifically leukemia. He has had trouble returning to school, as he is in honors and advanced placement classes, which are very demanding. Does BDR 17 exclude these students? I believe the verbiage used in BDR 17 puts a lot of emphasis on sports injuries. Why not include other health conditions?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

As a personal anecdote from me, I am still concussed. I have post-concussion syndrome and second impact syndrome. I have found that it is hard for people to provide accommodations to people in school whose symptoms cannot outwardly be seen. Whether you are able to see some of the symptoms of cancer, this is a place where there is a huge hole for which there needs to be accommodations. The concussions and TBIs are called "the invisible injury" because you cannot see anything that is going on with these students. Bill Draft Request 17 is not about student athletes . . .

Vice Chair Lyle:

I apologize. That is all the time allotted to that question.

Next question is from Youth Legislator Kington.

Youth Legislator Kington:

It is my understanding that a 504 Plan already exists, and it requires schools to accommodate for disabilities that make it more difficult to learn, which concussions fall under. How does BDR 17 add to that and what does it change? Also, how many youths does this affect?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

Bill Draft Request 17 lists Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as one of the possible things that you can have as an accommodation. Bill Draft Request 17 is a lot more about making sure that there is a list of accommodations and a step-by-step procedure. A 504 Plan does not include a step-by-step procedure. I did not know I was able to have a 504 Plan in school until three months into my concussion, and getting that 504 Plan took another two months. None of the school counselors or the people that I was talking to understood how to get this federal document, and we do not have another law in Nevada to help with that situation.

Regarding your second question, each year, more than 330,000 children are affected.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Next, we will go to Youth Legislator Moss.

Youth Legislator Moss:

Since I am not a student athlete and I have not incurred any injury thus far in my high school life, can you define briefly what RTL policies are?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

Absolutely! You can get a concussion from not being a student athlete. Bill Draft Request 17 is to make sure that we understand that student athletes are students first. The BDR is also for students not participating in any sports; you can get a concussion from whiplash or from being in a car accident. The RTL policy will help create steps for going back to school and provide potential accommodations in those steps so that you do not have to fight every single day of your recovery for the accommodations that you need to be able to go back to school.

Youth Legislator Moss:

Are there any financial provisions to BDR 17?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

There is no fiscal impact to BDR 17. Every plan is already made out.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Youth Legislator Craver, you may ask your question.

Youth Legislator Craver:

I am in contact with Senator Scott Hammond—I talk to him once or twice every other week or so—and he mentioned that they are already taking steps towards this idea, and it might get passed in the Nevada Senate. Why would we use our one NYL bill on a BDR that may be passed in the Senate?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

This is not being passed by the Nevada Senate. The RTP plan was passed with a lot of loopholes in 2011; this adds on an RTL. Whereas there are only 13 states who have done this, Nevada would be able to pioneer this change without a fiscal impact. I would not propose a BDR with a fiscal impact, especially during this upcoming session.

Youth Legislator Craver:

I did not say that there is one passed, I said they are working on passing a bill like this in one of the next two or three upcoming sessions.

Youth Legislator Thornton:

Well, I am making sure that it gets passed this session, not in the next couple of sessions.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Our last question is going to go to Youth Legislator Grinstein.

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

Bill Draft Request 17 tackles learning problems that occur after somebody gets a concussion. How does BDR 17 address the core problem of student athletes getting concussions in the first place?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

There are a lot of different provisions, such as only being able to practice head-to-head once a week in football and things like that. Bill Draft Request 17 is specifically for after concussions because there are so many ways to get a concussion. Concussions do not just happen to student athletes. They can happen from being in a car crash or falling off a roof. That is why this BDR is not just about student athletes. It addresses and helps with those accommodations for every single student in Nevada, of which, 6 percent can get concussions every year.

Youth Legislator Grinstein:

Would the NIAA be required to create a framework for students who got concussions for reasons other than sports or just for sports?

Youth Legislator Thornton:

Absolutely not, only for sports. The NIAA is not the only part of this. The school districts would be creating plans as well.

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Youth Legislator Thornton, and thanks again to all the youth legislators for those presentations and for your questions.

Now that we have heard the BDR ideas, I would like to give our members a quick three-minute recess to privately review and consider the information that has been presented. I would also like to remind the members that we adhere to the Open Meeting Law, so we cannot discuss the BDR proposals during the break. Youth legislators, please take this time to consider the BDR proposals you have heard today. After the recess, I will ask the secretary to call roll to determine the BDR proposals that will receive hearings at the NYL meeting on November 15, 2022.

At this time, we will take a three-minute recess.

[Recess.]

Ms. Ashdown:

It appears we are having some technical difficulties so I am going to call the roll.

Youth Legislator Bentham—BDR 1
Youth Legislator Bhatnagar—BDR 4
Youth Legislator Boulware—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Craver—BDR 4
Youth Legislator Grinstein—BDR 6
Youth Legislator Keene—BDR 4
Youth Legislator Kington—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Krieger—BDR 5
Youth Legislator Lyle—BDR 11
Youth Legislator Macababba—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Miller—BDR 12
Youth Legislator Moss—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Price—BDR 5
Youth Legislator Seddon—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Thornton—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Thurgood—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Walker—BDR 17
Youth Legislator Wong—BDR 17

Vice Chair Lyle:

Thank you, Ms. Ashdown. The two BDRs that will be considered at our next meeting are BDR 4 and BDR 17. Congratulations.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PUBLIC COMMENT

Vice Chair Lyle:

I will now open the second period of public comment. The same rules mentioned during the first period of public comment apply. Please try to avoid repeating testimony if someone has already made your point. Each person will be asked to limit testimony to three minutes.

[Vice Chair Lyle called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.]

Vice Chair Lyle:

We are now ready to adjourn. After this meeting, we will move on to our training session for today. Do any youth legislators have any final thoughts or comments before adjourning?

Seeing none, this concludes our business for today. This meeting is now adjourned.

AGENDA ITEM V—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the NYL, the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Destini Cooper
Research Policy Assistant

Maria Aguayo
Research Policy Assistant

Tina Ashdown
Research Assistant/Program Facilitator

APPROVED BY:

Youth Legislator Patrick Donn Dimasin, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II	Nicholas Murray, Ph.D., CIC, Assistant Professor, Director of the Neuromechanics Laboratory, Athletic Research Coordinator, School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno	Public testimony
Agenda Item III A	Legal Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	List of bill draft request proposals
Agenda Item III B	Youth Legislator Jackson Bentham, Nevada Youth Legislature (NYL)	Adobe PDF presentation
Agenda Item III C-1	Youth Legislator Patrick Donn Dimasin, Chair, NYL	Written comments
Agenda Item III C-2	Youth Legislator Patrick Donn Dimasin, Chair, NYL	Informational handout
Agenda Item III D	Youth Legislator Max Grinstein, NYL	Informational handout
Agenda Item III E	Youth Legislator Samantha Lyle, Vice Chair, NYL	Informational handout
Agenda Item III F	Youth Legislator Nicole Miller, NYL	Informational handout

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.