



NEVADA LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON CHILD WELFARE AND
JUVENILE JUSTICE
(Nevada Revised Statutes 218E.705)

SUMMARY MINUTES AND ACTION REPORT

The fourth meeting of the Nevada Legislature's Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice was held on May 9, 2012, at 9 a.m. in Room 4412 in the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. A copy of this set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report," including the "Meeting Notice and Agenda" ([Exhibit A](#)) and other substantive exhibits, is available on the Nevada Legislature's website at <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/interim/76th2011/committee/>. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's (LCB's) Publications Office (e-mail: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair
Assemblyman Jason M. Frierson, Vice Chair
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen
Assemblyman John Hambrick

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Greg Brower
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Kelly S. Gregory, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division
Risa B. Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Stephanie Travis, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Rex Goodman, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Division
Karen Hoppe, Program Analyst, Fiscal Division
Lisa Gardner, Senior Research Secretary, Research Division

OPENING REMARKS

- Chair Wiener welcomed the Committee members, presenters, and the public to the fourth and final meeting of the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- April Tatro-Medlin, private citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, thanked the Committee members for their commitment and service to the children of Nevada. She opined that psychotropic drugs are dangerous for children and should not be administered to those under State care. Ms. Tatro-Medlin urged the Committee to view a documentary, titled “The Drugging of our Children,” for additional insight into the effects of psychotropic drugs on our nation’s youth.
- Chair Wiener thanked Ms. Tatro-Medlin for her testimony. She suggested that Ms. Tatro-Medlin also provide her input to the Legislative Committee on Health and Human Services.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON APRIL 4, 2012, IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2012, MEETING HELD IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED. SENATOR KIHUEN AND ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.

PRESENTATION CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STATEWIDE COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

- The Honorable James W. Hardesty, Associate Justice, Nevada Supreme Court, announced that the next two meetings for the Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform (CSJJR) will be held on May 24 and June 26, 2012. He then gave a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation regarding the goals and objectives of the Commission ([Exhibit B](#)).

Associate Justice Hardesty stated that the CSJJR is focusing on two key areas of Nevada’s juvenile justice system: (1) deep end commitments; and (2) data collection methods. He explained that the Commission has been examining best practices that are emerging nationwide by studying systems that have demonstrated improved outcomes for children. Associate Justice Hardesty stressed that the Supreme Court supports major systemic shifts in the State’s juvenile justice system; however, it maintains a neutral position on budgetary issues.

He then provided information regarding systemic changes made to juvenile justice systems in other states. He mentioned the Missouri Model, and recommended the members of the Committee watch the ABC Primetime: Crime series “Missouri’s Different Approach to Juvenile Justice,” to gain insights into transformational juvenile justice reform. He also brought the Committee’s attention to California and Texas legislation, which catalyzed systemic shifts in their juvenile justice systems. California Senate Bill 81, adopted in 2007, shifted the custody, parole, and probation responsibilities of non-serious, non-violent offenders from the state-level to the county-level, and created block grants for counties. Texas Senate Bill 103, adopted in 2007, instituted commitment alternatives for chronic misdemeanor offenders, funded community-based services and made other policy and operational changes. He added that subsequent Texas legislation led to the complete organizational change of that state’s juvenile justice system.

Associate Justice Hardesty proceeded to offer statistics regarding the number of youth serving sentences in adult prisons in Nevada. He also provided data regarding the number of youth detained in State juvenile corrections facilities, including the Nevada Youth Training Center and Caliente Youth Center.

Continuing, Associate Justice Hardesty shared information regarding prior legislative actions in Nevada that have resulted in the loss of funding for county-run juvenile justice programs. He pointed out that the State has eliminated community correction block grants and detention reimbursement fees and reduced specialized room and board payments to counties. Associate Justice Hardesty remarked that these fiscal limitations reduced the ability of counties to provide services for youthful offenders.

He stated that the CSJJR has come to the following conclusions about juvenile justice systems: (1) regional models are preferable to centralized State facilities; (2) juvenile crime rates are dropping nationwide due to greater supervision at the local level; (3) State commitments should be limited to juveniles who have committed serious and violent felonies; (4) factors that reduce delinquent behaviors include connections with the labor force and other people; (5) collaborative efforts between states and counties can result in effective funding formulas; and (6) data collection systems need to be standardized.

Associate Justice Hardesty also discussed deficiencies in Nevada’s juvenile justice system, which include: (1) a lack of mental health services in rural and urban counties; (2) extensive out-of-state placements for mental health and substance abuse services; (3) minimal availability of early intervention and diversion programs; (4) the prominence of “crossover children,” which are youths involved with both the juvenile justice system and the child welfare system; (5) the absence of a consistent statewide data collection system; (6) fragmentation and institutional barriers within the juvenile justice system; (7) excessive referrals from school districts for minor offenses,

including truancy; (8) oversight issues; (9) a lack of community-based programming; (10) funding limitations; and (11) undefined responsibilities for states and counties.

Continuing with his remarks, Associate Justice Hardesty offered recommendations for improving the juvenile justice system, which included the following:

1. Provide in-state mental health services for children;
2. Increase and improve front-end services for children, which would require adjustments with Medicaid reimbursements;
3. Mandate training for judges, district attorneys, public defenders, and those employed by juvenile justice departments;
4. Create a non-advisory juvenile justice committee, which would have regulatory and fiscal authority, to develop and enforce policies, such as improving communication within the system;
5. Mandate communication between schools and the juvenile justice system, removing legal barriers to enable both parties to receive information about children engaging in problematic behaviors;
6. Create an improved data collection system;
7. Shift away from the Reform Model, which focuses on deep end commitments;
8. Shift toward regionally located facilities with small residential placements;
9. Remove institutional barriers to improve relationships between departments and agencies;
10. Establish day and evening centers;
11. Explore options for repurposing and utilizing existing infrastructure and facilities;
12. Establish family resource centers at the regional level; and
13. Realign and adjust State funding to allow changes to be made within the system.

Associate Justice Hardesty reiterated that the purpose and motive of the Supreme Court is to improve the system, not to acquire or distribute funds. He then remarked that the CSJJR intends to collaborate with Mike Willden, Director, Nevada's Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), to assess fiscal realignments of State and county resources that would allow for systematic reform.

Continuing, Associate Justice Hardesty commented on additional areas to be explored by the CSJJR and the Nevada Legislature, which include: (1) excluding truancy from juvenile court jurisdiction and eliminating or narrowing "disturbance at school" as a criminal charge; (2) revising definitions to ascertain that "camps" are not "detention facilities," in order to increase Medicaid coverage for children and facilities; (3) expanding provisions set forth in Senate Bill 112, adopted during the 2011 Session, pertaining to records that may be reviewed by a juvenile court; (4) re-introducing provisions from Senate Bill 26, which failed in the 2011 Session, to establish an improved method of collecting reimbursement from parents of youthful offenders; (5) re-introducing provisions from Senate Bill. 86, which failed in the 2009 Session, pertaining to Title IV-E of the Social Security Act-Federal Payments for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance; (6) revising statutes, including: NRS 62E.710, to allow only children convicted of felony or gross

misdeemeanor to be placed in a facility for detention; NRS 62E.520, to increase the age in which a child can be placed in a correctional facility; NRS 62B.390, to increase the age in which a child can be certified as an adult in criminal proceedings; and NRS 62B.330, 62E.100, 62E.280 and 62E.290, all of which pertain to juvenile competency laws.

Associate Justice Hardesty concluded his testimony by outlining desired outcomes with juvenile justice reform, which include: (1) law abiding behavior; (2) reduced length of stay for juveniles in detention facilities; (3) early intervention programming; (4) improved quality of life for families and children; and (5) reduced numbers of children entering the juvenile justice system.

- The Honorable Nancy M. Saitta, Associate Justice, Nevada Supreme Court, reiterated the need for a paradigm shift in Nevada's juvenile justice system. She added that those currently working in the juvenile justice system are operating to the best of their abilities in a flawed system in need of reform. Associate Justice Saitta also commented that systemic change at the State level is possible during times of economic challenge, and she pointed out that other states have instituted major reforms under comparable fiscal circumstances.
- Chair Wiener stated that she has an allocation of bill draft requests (BDRs) at her disposal as Chair of the Senate Committee on Judiciary, and would consider some of the ideas provided by Justice Saitta and Justice Hardesty for possible BDRs.

Discussion ensued among Senator Brower, Associate Justice Hardesty, and Associate Justice Saitta regarding out-of-state placements. Associate Justice Hardesty explained that youths are sent out of State for mental health services, because Nevada does not have a facility in which to place them. He added that out-of-state placements are costly for the State and have negative impacts on youth and their families. Associate Justice Saitta noted that Nevada is compromised in its ability to evaluate, diagnose, and treat youth with mental health conditions, which results in the escalation of symptoms that can lead to out-of-state placements.

Senator Brower requested additional information regarding communication issues between agencies and potential statutory improvements. Associate Justice Saitta commented that she would discuss communication issues during her presentation of the Court Improvement Program (CIP), which will include suggestions for statutory adjustments. Associate Justice Hardesty stated that some of Nevada's laws impede communication between agencies due to issues of confidentiality. He concluded his remarks by offering to furnish the Committee with relevant statutes upon request.

- Senator Brower commented on the issue of certification and stated that petitioning for certification is necessary in some instances.

- Associate Justice Hardesty noted that when the State bars a pardon or probation for an offense committed by a child, it is costly for the State and obstructs the ability to rehabilitate the offender.

OVERVIEW OF NEVADA'S COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

- Associate Justice Nancy M. Saitta, previously identified, gave a presentation regarding the Nevada CIP ([Exhibit C](#)). Her testimony included information on the program's origins, funding, focus, and improvement in the dependency court system.

Associate Justice Saitta commented on the importance of open dialogue between parties acting on behalf of children in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. She noted that the Supreme Court intends to submit a BDR for the 2013 Session that would change the way schools, courts, probation officers, and child welfare workers communicate with one another.

Associate Justice Saitta recognized the efforts of Katherine Malzahn-Bass, CIP Program Coordinator, CIP for the Protection & Permanency of Dependent Children, Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court, for elevating the CIP's strategic plan to a distinguished level. She pointed out that the program's strategic plan for 2012 is being utilized as a national model.

Associate Justice Saitta noted that the Supreme Court is involved with efforts to revise Chapter 432B of NRS, to align State law with federal requirements.

- Chair Wiener pointed out that a variety of recommendations pertaining to Chapter 432B of NRS, including statutory alignments to federal law, have been submitted by other stakeholders for consideration during the Work Session.
- Chair Wiener asked that all members be marked present.

PRESENTATION CONCERNING DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT IN NEVADA'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

- Lorne Malkiewich, Chief Operating Officer, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), introduced Cheri Ely, Program Manager, Juvenile and Family Law Department, NCJFCJ.
- Ms. Ely provided background information about the NCJFCJ and gave a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit D](#)) about disproportionate minority contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system from a national perspective. Her testimony included information on pertinent federal legislation and resources, as well as suggested policies and programs for addressing the issue at the state level.
- Steve McBride, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), DHHS gave a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit E](#)) that

included information regarding the Relative Rate Index and DMC Data compiled between 2009 and 2011, which revealed heightened levels of DMC in Nevada. He pointed out that the statistics highlighted in red have been identified by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) as areas warranting further investigation. Mr. McBride noted that the data compiled for the “Transferred to Adult” category does not include direct file cases.

- Pauline Salla, Social Services Chief I, DCFS, DHHS, provided an overview of statistics listed on the Statewide DMC Data Three Year Comparison 2009-2011 ([Exhibit E](#)). She brought the Committee’s attention to data compiled for minority contact with Nevada’s juvenile justice system between 2009 and 2011. Ms. Salla pointed out the lack of statistics for some ethnicities in 2011 due to a problem that occurred at the county level. She added that the error has been identified and corrected. Ms. Salla noted the ‘Secure Detention’ category refers to county-run juvenile detention centers, and the ‘Secure Confinement’ category refers to state-run correctional care. She concluded her testimony with a summary of statewide activities aimed at reducing DMC in Nevada.
- Fritz Reese, Director, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County, provided information about DMC in the Clark County juvenile justice system ([Exhibit F](#)). He reported on the existence of DMC in the County, identified contributing factors, and shared community-based strategies to reduce its prevalence.

Mr. Reese discussed statistics collected on youth in contact with the juvenile justice system and stated that an over-representation of youth of color is evident in: (1) referrals; (2) bookings; (3) cases filed; (4) cases adjudicated; (5) cases resulting in probation placement; (6) cases resulting in placement at Spring Mountain Youth Camp; and (7) cases resulting in State correctional care.

Mr. Reese pointed out a correlation between social disengagement and contact with the juvenile justice system. He commented that youth of color are overrepresented in truancy rates, dropout rates, and teen pregnancy rates. Mr. Reese referred to truancy as the “gateway charge,” because it is the most prevalent referral in the County.

Continuing, he shared information about committees established through the Department of Juvenile Services to address social issues at the community level, which include: (1) a low-risk committee that developed a diversion court to address the needs of youth who pose a low-risk to society; (2) a high-risk committee to assist youth who are transitioning back into the community after being detained in County or State facilities; and (3) an education committee to increase graduation rates by re-engaging youths in school programs through the Positive Youth Development initiative. Mr. Reese added that the committees are working in collaboration to reduce DMC in the Clark County juvenile justice system.

Concluding, Mr. Reese listed the following recommendations to reduce DMC in Clark County: (1) foster collaborations; (2) organize and implement workgroups that aim to reduce the disproportionate percentage of minority youth referred to and served by the system; (3) develop and implement evidence-based delinquency prevention programs that are culturally competent; (4) address the needs of both the community and the youth; and (5) foster positive relationships with families and local law enforcement, juvenile justice, educators and other entities serving youth in our community and our State. He added that removing truancy referrals would reduce minority contact with the system.

Discussion ensued between Chair Wiener and Mr. Reese regarding programs designed to increase graduation rates in southern Nevada. Mr. Reese commented that he is the Chair of Ready for Life Southern Nevada, which strives to increase graduation rates. He shared that the organization re-engages youth who have dropped out of school, and maintains engagement for youth who are at-risk to leave the system prematurely. Mr. Reese noted that the organization is planning a Nevada State Summit at UNLV, with a tentative date set for November, to discuss ways to improve graduation rates in Nevada. He added that invitations will be sent to Committee Members when additional details become available. Chair Wiener commended Mr. Reese for his efforts to increase graduation rates Nevada.

Additional discussion transpired among Chair Wiener, Assemblyman Hambrick, and Mr. Reese regarding the potential for removing truancy as a referring charge into the juvenile justice system. Mr. Hambrick voiced his concern that eliminating the referral might affect the ability of law enforcement to identify and track individuals who may commit offenses as adults. Mr. Reese articulated the importance of youth engagement in the educational system. He elaborated that 85 percent of individuals who fail to complete a high school education by the age of 24 end up in the adult criminal system. Mr. Reese reiterated that keeping youth engaged in school can reduce DMC in Nevada.

- Chair Wiener conveyed that proposed statutory changes discussed would allow for improved communication with law enforcement regarding at-risk youth.
- Carey Stewart, Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Second Judicial District Court of Nevada, Washoe County, reported on the link between school failure and contact with the juvenile justice system. He noted that a Washoe County School District study revealed an association between school suspension rates and low graduation rates. Mr. Stewart elaborated that youth with zero suspensions in Washoe County have a 70 percent chance of graduating from high school compared to those with three or more suspensions who have only a 13 percent chance of graduating. He pointed out that youth on probation in Washoe County have an average of seven suspensions on their school records.

Mr. Stewart also shared data compiled on youth detained in State Correctional care in Washoe County on November 4, 2012. He said that of the 35 individuals examined,

71 percent (25 individuals) were youth of color. Mr. Stewart added that all of the individuals were missing 50 percent of their high school credits.

He provided a document that contained additional statistics for youth in contact with Washoe County Juvenile Services in 2011 ([Exhibit G](#)).

- Chair Wiener voiced her concern with the truancy, suspension, and low-graduation rates in Nevada.

PRESENTATION CONCERNING PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS RISK FACTORS FOR YOUTH

Food Safety

- Paula Berkley, Representative, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, provided testimony to the Committee regarding food insecurity ([Exhibit H](#)) in Nevada, which included the following topics:
 1. Facts on children and food insecurity;
 2. Food Bank of Northern Nevada school-based programs;
 3. Food Bank of Northern Nevada SNAP applications submitted by year; and
 4. Bridges out of poverty.

Responding to a query from Vice Chair Frierson, Ms. Berkley explained that Nevada ranks at the bottom of the nation for providing free and reduced meals to children who qualify for the assistance. She added that Nevada falls behind Guam, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia in this ranking.

Discussion ensued between Senator Brower and Ms. Berkley regarding eligibility criteria and the availability of free and reduced meals in Nevada's schools. Ms. Berkley pointed out a large gap exists between the number of children who qualify for the federally subsidized free and reduced school meals and the number of children served by the program. She noted that a variety of factors interfere with access to the full range of nutrition programs.

- Chair Wiener stressed the importance of offering adequate nutrition to Nevada's schoolchildren, noting that behaviors and cognition can deteriorate due to hunger.
- Jodi Tyson, M.P.H., Research and Public Policy Manager, Three Square Food Bank, provided testimony regarding food insecurity in southern Nevada and outreach programs offered by her organization, which include: (1) the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP); (2) food banks; and (3) other programs, including Backpacks for Kids, Kids Cafe, and the Summer Program.

Continuing, Ms. Tyson brought attention to three maps: (1) Food Insecurity by Zip Code 2010; Food Insecurity by Zip Code 2011; and (2) Foreclosures 2011-1 Per X Housing Units ([Exhibit I](#)). She pointed out that high unemployment rates and mortgage foreclosure rates indicate food insecurity in specific zip codes. Ms. Tyson emphasized that the data reflects economic challenges, which have increased food insecurity across Clark County in recent years. She added that she could provide the Committee with other statistics upon request.

Ms. Tyson concluded her testimony by urging the Nevada Legislature to examine policies to bring additional federal funds to Nevada during the 2013 Legislative Session. She stated that SNAP outreach efforts and school meal programs could be expanded with increased funding allocations.

- Chair Wiener requested information from Ms. Tyson regarding the fruit-gleaning program in Clark County. Ms. Tyson explained that the Las Vegas Valley Community Food Council has identified neighborhood fruit gleaning, or harvesting, as a means of increasing food security for low-income seniors in southern Nevada.
- Vice Chair Frierson requested additional statistics related to [Exhibit I](#) and also commended the Three Square Food Bank for the service it provides to the community.
- Ms. Tyson announced a Legislative Day on May 14, 2012, hosted by the Three Square Food Bank and that a weekend dedicated to volunteer fruit gleaning in Las Vegas has been scheduled for July 21 and July 22.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Yvette Williams, Chair, Clark County Democratic Black Caucus (CCDBC), thanked Chair Wiener for her service to the community and provided testimony that included two recommendations for the Committee's consideration: (1) establish a Commission on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice to address issues of DMC in Nevada; and (2) add provisions within NRS 125C.050 to establish certain procedural requirements to protect the rights of parents, grandparents, and other interested parties during child removal proceedings ([Exhibit J](#)).
- Chair Wiener commented that the recommendations might be considered by the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice during the 2013-2014 Interim, or by the 2013 Nevada Legislature, should a member be interested in submitting a personal or Committee BDR on those topics.

WORK SESSION—DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATING TO:

- Domestic Sex Trafficking of Minors, Child Prostitution, and Prosecution of Persons Accused of Pandering and Soliciting Children
- Crimes Against Children
- Incarceration and Prosecution of Juveniles
- Juveniles Certified as Adults
- Criminal Acts Committed by Juveniles
- Use of Restraints on Juveniles
- Laws Governing the Protection of Children
- Child Abuse and Neglect
- Bullying, Cyber-Bullying, Harassment and Intimidation, and School Discipline
- Child Support Enforcement
- Disproportionate Minority Contact in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems
- Children's Mental Health

Chair Wiener provided an overview of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit K](#)) and thanked Kelly S. Gregory, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB and Risa B. Lang, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division, LCB, for their work in preparing the recommendations for the Committee's review. She asked staff to discuss each of the recommendations individually, beginning with recommendations for legislation to be forwarded to the 2013 Nevada Legislature.

Child Care Facility Background Checks

Recommendation No. 1—Draft a bill to require child care facilities to notify the Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), when a child care facility hires a new employee, has a new resident who is over the age of 18 years, or has a new participant in an outdoor youth program who is over the age of 18 years; to ensure background checks are completed on all employees, residents, and outdoor youth program participants within the current statutory time frame outlined in NRS 432A.170. A copy of NRS 432A.170 is provided behind **Tab A** ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Marla McDade Williams, B.A., M.P.A.,
Deputy Administrator, Health Division, DHHS)*

- Kelly S. Gregory provided background information regarding the recommendation, and referred to Legislative Audit LA 12-06, titled "Department of Health and Human Services Oversight of Child Care Facilities 2011," which was provided to the Committee at its January 18, 2012, meeting. She pointed out that a key finding of

the audit is statutory oversight pertaining to notification requirements of childcare facilities.

- Chair Wiener requested additional information about Recommendation No. 1 from Marla McDade Williams, Deputy Administrator, Health Division, DHHS.
- Ms. Williams specified that the proposed changes in Recommendation No. 1 pertain to subsection 5 of NRS 432A.170.
- Chair Wiener remarked that the intent of the recommendation is to create effective, thorough and standardized procedures for conducting background checks in childcare facilities.

General discussion ensued regarding the procedure involved to review and incorporate the 39 recommendations into the Committee's allocation of ten BDRs. Chair Wiener pointed out that many of the recommendations can be consolidated into one BDR. She added that other actions could be taken, in lieu of a BDR, such as writing letters to the Chairs of Senate and Assembly standing committees.

Ms. Lang confirmed that multiple recommendations can be combined into one BDR, as long as they comply with the "single-subject rule," pursuant to NRS 295.009.

Responding to Vice Chair Frierson, Ms. Williams confirmed that Recommendation No. 1 calls for childcare facilities to send employment notifications to DHHS in a timely manner, and background checks will continue to be performed by that agency.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE
RECOMMENDATION NO. 1. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY
ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

***Domestic Sex Trafficking of Minors, Child Prostitution, and the Prosecution of Persons
Accused of Pandering and Soliciting Children***

Recommendation No. 2—Draft a bill to provide a definition of "sexually exploited child" in Chapter 62A ("General Provisions" related to juvenile justice) of NRS. A sexually exploited child, under this proposal, would be defined as a child under the age of 18 years who is engaged or attempting to engage in prostitution. Suggested language is provided behind **Tab B** in [Exhibit K](#).

*(Recommended by Susan Roske, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division,
Clark County Public Defender's Office)*

If Recommendation No. 2 is adopted, the following recommendations may also be considered:

Recommendation No. 2(a)—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to a child in need of supervision (NRS 62B.320) to include a sexually exploited child.

Recommendation No. 2(b)—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the release of a child alleged to be in need of supervision (NRS 62C.050) to include an exception for a sexually exploited child.

Recommendation No. 2(c)—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the initial admonition and referral of a child in need of supervision (NRS 62E.410) to include an exception for a sexually exploited child so that such a child is not subject to the initial admonition of the court.

- Chair Wiener noted that Catherine Cortez Masto, Attorney General, has established a workgroup to address statutes pertaining to the sexual exploitation of children, and will submit an omnibus measure containing related provisions to the Nevada Legislature during the 2013 Session.
- Ms. Gregory provided an overview of Recommendation Nos. 2, 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c). She clarified that Recommendation Nos. 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) will be considered only upon the approval of Recommendation No. 2.

Responding to a query from Senator Brower, Teresa Lowry, Assistant District Attorney, Family Support, Juvenile and Child Welfare Divisions, Clark County District Attorney's Office, confirmed that the District Attorney's Office is in agreement with all of the recommendations listed in this category.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 2, INCLUDING RECOMMENDATION NOS. 2(A), 2(B) AND 2(C). THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 3—Draft a bill to establish the crime of sex trafficking of a minor similar to statutes involving involuntary servitude, but without any requirement of proof of forced labor or services. The new crime must identify children who are commercially sexually exploited as sex trafficking victims. Additional information and the statutes referenced in this recommendation are provided behind **Tab B** ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Teresa Lowry, Assistant District Attorney,
Family Support, Juvenile and Child Welfare Divisions,
Clark County District Attorney's Office)*

If Recommendation No. 3 is adopted, the following recommendations may also be considered:

Recommendation No. 3(a)—Draft a bill to revise the definition of “victim” for purposes of determining eligibility for aid to certain victims of crime (NRS 217.070) to make victims of sex trafficking of a minor eligible for such aid.

Recommendation No. 3(b)—Draft a bill to include victims of sex trafficking of a minor in existing rape shield provisions (NRS 50.090).

Recommendation No. 3(c)—Draft a bill to provide the same statute of limitations for victims of sex trafficking of a minor, as is provided for victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse, and to provide for the same removal of the statute of limitation or extension as provided for those crimes pursuant to NRS 171.083 and 171.095.

- Ms. Lowry informed the Committee that the Attorney General’s workgroup is in support of Recommendation No. 3, including Recommendation Nos. 3(a), 3(b), and 3(c).

Discussion ensued among Vice Chair Frierson, Senator Brower, and Ms. Roske regarding the definition of a minor as it pertains to “age of consent.” Vice Chair Frierson stated that complexities exist in regard to minors who are between the ages of 16 and 18, including those who are emancipated. He added that there was controversy surrounding this issue during the 2011 Session, which suggests that concerns may arise with this proposed legislation. Ms. Roske commented that the Attorney General’s workgroup is attempting to mirror federal law, which states that children under the age of 18 who are being sexually exploited are victims of human trafficking. She also said that federal statute does not require proof of force or coercion for prosecution to occur. Senator Brower pointed out that the issue of age determinations can be worked out during future reviews of the proposed legislation.

There was a discussion among Chair Wiener, Assemblyman Hambrick, and Ms. Lang regarding the need for a BDR to address the management of funds for victims of sex trafficking. Ms. Lang explained that the aid is already established in the statutes so there is no need for a BDR.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE
RECOMMENDATION NO. 3, INCLUDING NOS. 3(A), 3(B) AND 3(C).
THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON
AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Crimes Against Children

Recommendation No. 4—Draft a bill to prohibit a person from willfully capturing and transmitting the image of a violent crime committed in this State by or against a child under the age of 18 years using an electronic communication device or other device with the intent to encourage, further, or promote such a crime.

(Recommended by Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair, Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice)

- Chair Wiener offered to use a Senate Committee on Judiciary BDR for Recommendation No. 4.
- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 4.

Placing Graffiti On or Otherwise Defacing Property

Recommendation No. 5—Draft a bill to add any property, symbol, structure, or sign listed with the Nevada State Register of Historic Places or the National Register of Historic Places to the definition of “Protected site” in NRS 206.330. Additional information and a copy of the statute are provided behind **Tab C** ([Exhibit K](#)).

(Recommended by Scott Black, Detective, Gang Crimes Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department)

- Ms. Gregory pointed out that the Committee heard a presentation on this topic at its February 22, 2012, meeting.
- Detective Black explained that the intent of this recommendation is to expand language in the statutes to include all historic landmarks in the State. He noted that graffiti vandalism is on the rise, which necessitates providing greater protection.

Discussion ensued between Chair Wiener and Detective Black regarding restitution for graffiti damage incurred in unprotected locations. Detective Black explained that recourse involves the small claims court system, which is generally under-utilized by the public. Chair Wiener suggested that Las Vegas Metro could initiate a public information campaign regarding the recoupment of losses through the small claims court system.

- Chair Wiener offered to use a Senate Committee on Judiciary BDR with this recommendation.
- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 5.

Incarceration and Prosecution of Juveniles

Recommendation No. 6—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to conditions and limitations on detaining a child in certain facilities (NRS 62C.030) to allow juveniles who are transferred to adult court for criminal proceedings to petition the court for temporary placement in a juvenile detention facility pending the outcome of the proceedings.

(Recommended by Susan Roske, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division, Clark County Public Defender's Office, and Esther Brown, Founder and Executive Director, The Embracing Project)

- Chair Wiener pointed out that Recommendation Nos. 6 through 15 all fall into the same subject area and could be combined into one BDR.
- Ms. Roske explained that current statute allows for children who are direct filed into the adult system to petition the courts for temporary housing in juvenile facilities. She commented that children transferred to the adult system through certification hearings are not allowed to engage in the same process.
- Senator Wiener requested clarification regarding the discretionary aspect of the recommended provision.
- Ms. Roske explained that a change in statute would allow a youthful offender to submit a petition and the decision to grant temporary housing would be made by a judge.

There was a general discussion regarding the disparity in statute for individuals committing higher-level crimes and those committing lower-level crimes. Ms. Roske and Ms. Lowry concurred that those committing lower-level offenses do not have the same opportunity to petition the courts for juvenile housing as those committing higher level offenses.

- Assemblyman Hambrick voiced concern with allowing juveniles charged with serious sexual assault offenses to be housed with other juveniles. He suggested that individuals charged with serious sexual assault offenses be barred from the right to petition the court for such placement.
- Chair Wiener emphasized that the provision would not automatically grant permission for an individual to be housed at a juvenile facility, reiterating that the decision would remain with a judge.

Discussion ensued among Senator Brower, Ms. Lang, and Vice Chair Frierson regarding current statute and the suggested revision. Ms. Lang pointed out that recommended language for subsection 4 of 62C.030 is documented in “Proposed Legislation For 2013” under Tab D of the Work Session Document ([Exhibit K](#)). Vice Chair Frierson noted that those charged with murder and attempted murder are currently allowed to petition the court for temporary housing in juvenile facilities, and the revision would extend this right to those charged with other crimes.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 6. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 7—Draft a bill to require any child under the age of 18 years who is sentenced as an adult to a term of imprisonment for committing a crime to serve the term in a juvenile detention facility until the child reaches the age of 18 years, unless dangerous to another juvenile. Additional information is provided behind **Tab D** ([Exhibit K](#))

*(Recommended by Esther Brown, Founder and Executive Director,
The Embracing Project)*

- Ms. Gregory brought the Committee’s attention to a memorandum written by Ms. Brown to Chair Wiener regarding recommended legislative changes to address challenges of housing juveniles in adult criminal justice facilities. See Tab D in [Exhibit K](#).

Responding to Senator Brower’s request for information from Ms. Roske and Ms. Lowry regarding the recommendation, Ms. Roske stated that adult prisons are dangerous environments for children. She referred to the *New York Times* article, located behind Tab D in [Exhibit K](#), dated April 8, 2012, titled “Children Can Never Be Safe in Adult Prisons.”

Discussion ensued between Vice Chair Frierson and Ms. Lowry regarding the necessary resources to meet this requirement. Ms. Lowry pointed out that fiscal limitations have reduced housing in the juvenile justice system, and suggested that resources be thoroughly evaluated prior to adopting a change in statute. Vice Chair Frierson agreed that there needs to be adequate funding for juvenile housing prior to passing a policy mandate during the 2013 Legislative Session.

There was discussion between Chair Wiener and Ms. Roske regarding the segregation of youthful offenders in the adult prison system. Ms. Roske noted that Nevada’s Department of Corrections has a special unit at its Indian Springs facility for youthful offenders.

- Senator Brower pointed out that regardless of where a youthful offender is placed, there will be a fiscal impact.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION :**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 7. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 8—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to direct filing of charges against a juvenile for criminal proceedings as an adult (NRS 62B.330) so that direct filing may

only occur if the crime charged is murder or attempted murder and the child is at least 16 years of age. Suggested language is provided behind **Tab D** ([Exhibit K](#)).

(Recommended by Susan Roske, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division, Clark County Public Defender's Office, and Esther Brown, Founder and Executive Director, The Embracing Project)

- Ms. Roske explained that under current law, children as young as eight years old are automatically charged as adults for murder, attempted murder, and certain other crimes, including the use of a firearm by an individual charged with a previous felony-level offense. She commented that the intent of the proposal is to remove the requirement that a child, under the age of 16, be direct filed into the adult system for the above mentioned charges. Ms. Roske pointed out that judges would be allowed to use discretion in transferring such cases into the adult system through certification proceedings. She added that youthful offenders, aged 16 and older, would continue to be direct filed for charges of murder or attempted murder and all other charges would be referred to the juvenile system.
- Ms. Lowry stated that the Clark County District Attorney's Office opposes this recommendation. She explained that only the most serious offenses are included in direct file cases, and they are typically committed by older children. Ms. Lowry suggested that if the recommendation should move forward as a BDR, then alternative tools and sentencing options should be explored for the prosecution of serious offenders who are under the age of 16. She elaborated that discussions could involve secured juvenile facilities, determinate sentencing, and blended sentencing.

A general discussion ensued regarding blended sentencing options.

- Vice Chair Frierson surmised that the greatest area of concern with this measure pertains to the suggested removal of subsection 3(b) of NRS 62B.330, which involves sexual assault, or attempted sexual assault, of an individual aged 16 years or older who has previously been adjudicated delinquent of a felony. He asked Ms. Roske about the possibility of modifying her recommendation to allow for these provisions to be maintained within statute. Ms. Roske indicated that she would modify the proposal, as long as a provision to establish a minimum age for the automatic direct filing of juveniles charged with murder and attempted murder is maintained.

Responding to a query from Chair Wiener, Ms. Roske explained that subsection 1 of NRS 194.010 exempts children under the age of eight from punishment for a crime. She restated that the proposal would establish a minimum age in which a child is direct filed into the adult system for charges of murder and attempted murder, and cases involving children under the age of 16 could be transferred into the adult system through the certification process.

- Senator Brower voiced his concerns with capping the age at 16. He stated that serious crimes are sometimes committed by offenders who are under that age.

- Chair Wiener reiterated that capping the age in which a youthful offender is automatically tried as an adult does not preclude a judge from certifying a younger child as an adult.

In response to Chair Wiener, Ms. Lowry explained that the Clark County District Attorney's Office maintains a database of vital statistics on its certification cases, including: age of offender, offense(s), history, gender, and race. She added that statute requires law enforcement and district attorneys to prove that youthful offenders, between the ages of 8 and 14, understand the wrongfulness of their actions.

- Chair Wiener commented that 15-year-old offenders seem to fall within a grey area.
- Ms. Roske reiterated that under current law, certain youthful offenders who are eight years or older are directly placed into the adult system without recourse.

Responding to Senator Brower's request for clarification regarding petitions and jurisdictions involved with the certification process, Ms. Roske explained that petitions to transfer cases to the adult system are submitted by district attorneys to juvenile court jurisdictions.

- Vice Chair Frierson advised preserving subsection 3(b) of NRS 62B.330 and referenced the document titled "Proposed Legislation for 2013" behind Tab D in [Exhibit K](#).
- Senator Brower concurred with Vice Chair Frierson's suggestion and maintained his opposition to capping at age 16 for direct file cases. He stated that he might support a BDR that would lower the cap to age 14.

There was a general discussion regarding the Committee's recommendation for capping the age of a juvenile offender. Chair Wiener asked the other Committee members if they would prefer to lower the age cap to 14. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson stated that she had no objection to capping the age at 16, for the purpose of developing a BDR.

- Chair Wiener then asked the Committee members for their opinions regarding an amendment to retain subsection 3(b) of NRS 62B.330.
- **ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 8 AND TO REINSTATE LANGUAGE IN SUBSECTION 3(B) OF NRS 62B.330. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON.**

In response to Senator Brower's request for clarification with the modified proposal, Ms. Lang explained that the measure would ban the direct filing of charges against children under the age of 16 except in the case of murder, attempted murder, sexual assault, or attempted sexual assault. She specified that the proposal would delete language under

subsections 3(c) and 3(d) of NRS 62B.330 and retain language under subsection 3(b) of NRS 62B.330.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

THE RECOMMENDATION AS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK
AND SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON PASSED. SENATOR
BROWER VOTED NO.

Recommendation No. 9—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to direct filing of charges against a juvenile for criminal proceedings as an adult (subsection 3(f) of NRS 62B.330) to remove the provision requiring a juvenile who was previously convicted of a criminal offense as an adult to be treated as an adult if charged with another offense in the future. Additional information is provided behind Tab D ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU] of Nevada)*

- Ms. Gregory pointed out that relevant statutes for each recommendation are provided in the Work Session Document ([Exhibit K](#)). She added that Ms. Gasca was not present to discuss Recommendation No. 9.
- Ms. Lang explained that the recommendation pertains to a direct file provision in statute, which states that once a child is direct filed and convicted for any offense in the adult system, all subsequent offenses committed by that child are automatically handled in the adult system. She added that this is known as the “once an adult, always an adult” provision.

There was discussion among Senator Brower, Ms. Roske, and Ms. Lowry regarding the proposal. Ms. Roske explained that this statute is absolute for all cases prosecuted in the adult system, even when a charge is plea-bargained down to a misdemeanor offense. Senator Brower stated that he agrees with the current statute and sees no reason to change it. Ms. Lowry indicated that the Clark County District Attorney’s Office has concerns with this recommendation. She remarked that juveniles are only introduced into the adult system in extreme and violent cases, and added that sending a youthful offender back into the juvenile system can be problematic with resources, corrections, and accountability.

Vice Chair Frierson asked how often a felony offense, committed by a juvenile being prosecuted in the adult system, is reduced to a misdemeanor offense. Ms. Lowry stated that she can provide this information from the database at the Clark County District Attorney’s Office, upon request.

- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 9.

Recommendation No. 10—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to discretionary certification of a juvenile for criminal proceedings as an adult (NRS 62B.390) to: (a) increase the age of a juvenile for purposes of determining when a court may exercise the discretion whether to certify the juvenile for adult criminal proceedings from 14 years to 16 years (subsection 1(a) of NRS 62B.390); and (b) eliminate presumptive certification (subsection 2 and subsection 3 of NRS 62B.390). Additional information is provided behind **Tab D** ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Esther Brown, Founder and Executive Director,
The Embracing Project)*

- Ms. Gregory noted that Ms. Brown was not present to discuss the recommendation.
- Chair Wiener requested information regarding the current statute and the recommended changes from Ms. Roske and Ms. Lowry.
- Ms. Roske explained the process in current statute, which allows for a district attorney to petition a juvenile court to have a case transferred into the adult system if the offender is over the age of 14 and charged with a felony. She added that a judge may use discretion in granting certification. Ms. Roske stated that presumptive language in current statute removes the discretionary aspect with petitions filed for children who are 16 or older. Rather, it presumes that petitions filed for those children are automatically approved. Ms. Roske pointed out that the recommendation would remove the term, ‘presumption,’ in order to allow for discretionary certifications and would raise the minimum age in which a child can be certified as an adult, from 14 to 16.
- Ms. Lowry stated that the Clark County District Attorney’s Office is opposed to removing presumptive language in statute and also disagrees with raising the minimum age in which a child can be certified as an adult. She pointed out that violent offenses are committed by children under the age of 16, and the protection of the public must be considered with correctional actions. She added that an extensive review of an offender’s background is conducted prior to a determination, in both discretionary and presumptive certification hearings.
- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 10.

Recommendation No. 11—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to a child who is charged as an adult for the commission of a crime to:

- (a) Allow the court to remand the case back to juvenile court if the charge for which the child was transferred for adult proceedings is dismissed or otherwise dropped;

*(Recommended by Esther Brown, Founder and Executive Director,
The Embracing Project)*

- OR -

- (b) Allow the case to be remanded back to juvenile court when the judge deems that to be appropriate.

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

- Ms. Gregory mentioned that only one of these recommendations can be approved for a Committee BDR.

There was a general discussion regarding the intent of, and necessity for, Recommendation No. 11(a) and Recommendation 11(b).

- The Committee took no action on Recommendation Nos. 11(a) and 11(b).

Recommendation No. 12—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to a child who escapes or attempts to escape from a facility for detention of juveniles (NRS 62B.400) to: (a) increase from 14 years to 16 years the minimum age at which a child may be charged as an adult under this statute; and (b) make the decision discretionary, rather than mandatory, whether to charge the juvenile as an adult for any other related offenses. Additional information is provided behind Tab D ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Esther Brown, Founder and Executive Director,
The Embracing Project)*

Discussion ensued regarding secured facilities and the certification process for children who escape or attempt to escape from a detention facility.

- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 12.

Recommendation No. 13—Draft a bill to make certain juvenile offenders who are sentenced to terms of imprisonment as an adult eligible for parole after a certain number of years. Suggested language is included behind Tab D ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Susan Roske, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division,
Clark County Public Defender's Office)*

- Ms. Gregory noted that information was presented on this topic at the Committee's April 4, 2012, meeting.
- Ms. Roske explained that the proposal would allow certain offenders to petition for parole at the age of 25. She explained that the recommendation pertains to offenders who committed their crimes when they were juveniles, and who have received minimum sentences of ten years. She added that this is a discretionary provision.
- Ms. Lowry stated that the Clark County District Attorney's Office would like to participate in further discussions regarding this topic, should a BDR be approved. She noted several concerns surrounding the proposed language, including the types of

offenses that might fit the criteria for parole and consideration of the interests and expectations of victims.

- Responding to a query from Vice Chair Frierson, Ms. Roske explained that victims would have a right to express their opinions at parole hearings.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 13. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED. SENATOR BROWER VOTED NO. SENATOR KIHUEN WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE.

Recommendation No. 14—Draft a bill to provide that restraints such as handcuffs, waist belts, and leg irons may not be used on a juvenile during a court proceeding unless certain requirements are met. Suggested language is included behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Susan Roske, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division,
Clark County Public Defender's Office)*

- Ms. Roske discussed the restraints used on children in detention during their court proceedings. She added that this includes children as young as eight years old. Ms. Roske suggested that restraints only be applied when necessary.
- Ms. Lowry voiced her concerns about children being shackled. She suggested that representatives from the juvenile justice systems in Nevada be included in additional discussions, should the recommendation move forward as a BDR.
- Senator Brower asked about the prevalence of shackling techniques used with juveniles in Nevada.
- Ms. Lowry explained that this issue would be more appropriately addressed by the Nevada Juvenile Justice Commission.
- Senator Brower suggested that a BDR may not be necessary, as other strategies can be utilized to move discussions forward.
- Chair Wiener noted that the Committee could send a letter to the Nevada Juvenile Justice Commission. She indicated that she would be willing to submit a Senate Committee on Judiciary BDR, upon request by the Commission.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO DRAFT A LETTER TO THE CHAIRS OF THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES ON JUDICIARY URGING THE STUDY OF THE INDISCRIMINATE USE OF PHYSICAL RESTRAINTS ON JUVENILES DURING COURT PROCEEDINGS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 15—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to acts which constitute domestic violence (NRS 33.018) to provide that violence by a juvenile toward a sibling or parent is not an act that constitutes domestic violence. Suggested language is included behind Tab D ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Susan Roske, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Juvenile Division,
Clark County Public Defender's Office)*

- Ms. Roske opined that the charge of “domestic battery” is overly utilized in the court system, and is not always warranted. She pointed out examples of cases where violence in the home does not constitute domestic violence.
- Ms. Lowry indicated that her office is opposed to the recommendation, as there are instances where domestic battery is an appropriate charge for violence committed in the home by a juvenile. She added that barring the ability to charge a juvenile with “domestic battery” is overly restrictive.
- Assemblyman Hambrick voiced concern to changes in subsection 1(d) of NRS 33.018, which pertains to sexual violence.
- Paula Berkley, previously identified, spoke on behalf of the Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence. She stated that the organization would be willing to participate in any additional discussions on this topic if the Committee approves the recommendation.
- Vice Chair Frierson articulated that some juvenile cases may warrant a domestic violence charge, which necessitates discretionary language in statute.
- Chair Wiener offered to explore the possibility of submitting a BDR through the Senate Committee on Judiciary.
- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 15.

Laws Governing the Protection of Children

Recommendation No. 16—Draft a bill to require child welfare agencies to establish procedures to protect children and youth in the child welfare system from identity theft. Additional information is included behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

- Chair Wiener commented that information pertaining to Recommendation Nos. 16 through 29 was presented in previous meetings during the 2011-2012 Interim.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 16. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 17—Draft a bill to streamline and clarify the process and authority to substantiate abuse and neglect allegations. Additional information is included behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

- Ms. Gregory pointed out that testimony for this recommendation was provided to the Committee at its April 4, 2012, meeting.
- Lisa Ruiz-Lee, Interim Director, Clark County Department of Family Services, explained that the recommendation would align court and agency procedures for substantiations of abuse and neglect.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 17. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 18—Draft a bill to require that all child welfare advisory groups or committees, formed pursuant to law, include parent representatives unless prohibited or limited. Additional information is included behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

Responding to query from Vice Chair Frierson, Denise Tanata Ashby, J.D., Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance, clarified that the focus of the recommendation is to increase participation of natural parents with child welfare advisory groups and committees.

She added that ‘parent representatives’ might include representatives from parent advocacy organizations.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION :**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 18. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 19—Draft a bill to require that all agency improvement plans be made available to the public and posted on the Internet (NRS 432B.216). Additional information is included behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 19. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 20—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to action taken by an agency upon receipt of report of possible abuse or neglect (NRS 432B.260) to allow referrals for differential response when the child is under the age of 5 years. Additional information is included behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Jill Marano, Acting Deputy Administrator, Child Welfare Services,
Division of Child and Family Services [DCFS], DHHS)*

- Chair Wiener noted that previous testimony demonstrated that early intervention is correlated with positive outcomes for young children. She added that differential response referrals for children under the age of five are currently prohibited, and a change in statute would reach more children through discretionary language.

- The Committee **TOOK THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 20. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 21—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the placement of a child in protective custody (NRS 432B.390) to require one of the following parties to obtain a warrant prior to placement: (a) an agent or an officer of a law enforcement agency; (b) an officer of the local juvenile probation department or the local department of juvenile services; or (c) a designee of an agency that provides child welfare service. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Kevin Schiller, Director, Washoe County
Department of Social Services)*

- Ms. Gregory pointed out that Mr. Schiller provided testimony about this recommendation at the Committee’s April 4, 2012, meeting. She added that a memorandum from Mr. Schiller, which contains suggested language, is located behind Tab E in [Exhibit K](#).
- Chair Wiener requested information from Jill Marano, Acting Deputy Administrator, Child Welfare Services, DCFS, DHHS.
- Ms. Marano remarked that the BDR proposed in Recommendation No. 21 would add further clarification in the law pertaining to child removals.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE
RECOMMENDATION NO. 21. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE
CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 22—Draft a bill to define “reasonable efforts” in Chapter 432B (“Protection of Children From Abuse and Neglect”) of NRS. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

Recommendation No. 23—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the preservation and reunification of a family and child (NRS 432B.393) to require a court to make case-specific judicial determinations regarding reasonable efforts. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Jill Marano, Acting Deputy Administrator,
Child Welfare Services, DCFS, DHHS)*

Recommendation No. 24—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the preservation and reunification of a family and child (subsection 3 of NRS 432B.393) to more closely align with the federal statutes, which allow for a waiver of reasonable efforts in certain circumstances and clearly state that the courts determine whether the child welfare agencies are required to make reasonable efforts to preserve and reunify a family and child. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

- Ms. Gregory pointed out that Recommendation Nos. 22, 23, and 24 all pertain to Chapter 432B of NRS.

- Ms. Ashby provided a brief overview of Recommendation No. 22, which attempts to clarify the meaning of ‘reasonable efforts’ in Nevada statute. She shared the intent of Recommendation No. 24, which would provide for court determinations in cases involving waivers of reasonable efforts. Ms. Ashby added that the adoption of Recommendation No. 24 would help bring Nevada into alignment with federal requirements.
- General discussion ensued regarding federal requirements in cases involving child abuse.
- Ms. Marano stated that provisions relating to sex abuse and reasonable efforts are covered in Recommendation No. 23.
- Vice Chair Frierson voiced his concern about defining ‘reasonable efforts’ in a way that would be overly restrictive in statute. He explained that language that narrowly defines the term might exclude factors that warrant consideration in certain instances.
- Chair Wiener clarified that the intent of Recommendation Nos. 23 and 24 is to align State statutes with federal requirements.
- **ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 22, RECOMMENDATION NO. 23, AND RECOMMENDATION NO. 24.**

Prior to a vote, there was a discussion between Chair Wiener and Vice Chair Frierson regarding Recommendation No. 22. Vice Chair Frierson stated that he is not opposed to moving the recommendation forward as a BDR; however, considerable dialogue may be necessary to draft appropriate language for the measure.

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

THE MOTION AS STATED BY ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK WAS
SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 25—Draft a bill to revise statutes related to child death review teams to consolidate the two State-level teams (NRS 432B.408 and 432B.409) into one State-level team and to specifically allow for the use of de-identified, aggregate data for purposes of research or prevention (NRS 432B.407 and 432B.4095). Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws
Governing the Protection of Children)*

- Ms. Gregory commented that this topic was discussed at the Committee’s April 4, 2012, meeting.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 25. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 26—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the execution and contents of a petition alleging that a child is in need of protection (subsection 4(b) of NRS 432B.510) to provide that the residence of a child refers to the address where the child resided before being taken into protective custody. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws Governing the Protection of Children)

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION :**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 26. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR BROWER AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 27—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the adjudicatory hearing on a petition alleging that a child is in need of protection (NRS 432B.530) to increase the time allowed for the hearing from 30 days to 60 days. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

(Recommended by the Working Group on the Revision of Laws Governing the Protection of Children)

- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 27. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 28—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the annual and semiannual review by a court of placement of a child (NRS 432B.580 and 432B.590) to revise language requiring that foster parents, preadoptive parents, and biological parents have the right to be heard in court proceedings to match language included in federal law. Additional information is located behind Tab E ([Exhibit K](#)).

(Recommended by Jill Marano, Acting Deputy Administrator, Child Welfare Services, DCFS, DHHS)

- Ms. Gregory noted that this recommendation would bring the State into compliance with federal law.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

VICE CHAIR FRIERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 28. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR KIHUEN AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 29—Draft a bill to amend statutes related to the annual hearing on the disposition of a case of a child in need of protection (NRS 432B.590) to require the court to make determinations regarding out-of-state placement and transition services.

*(Recommended by Jill Marano, Acting Deputy Administrator,
Child Welfare Services, DCFS, DHHS)*

- Ms. Gregory stated that this recommendation was discussed by Ms. Marano at the Committee's April 4, 2012, meeting.
- Ms. Marano briefly explained the recommendation, which requires documentation to be submitted at annual hearings to attest that out-of-state placements and transitional services have been considered for older children. She added that adoption of this recommendation would help bring the State into compliance with federal law.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION :**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 29. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No. 30—Revise certain definitions concerning child abuse and neglect. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Devon Brooks, private citizen, Clark County
Democratic Black Caucus, Las Vegas)*

- Ms. Lang provided background information regarding the recommendation and explained that it was offered at the Committee's January 18, 2012, meeting. She added that suggested language has not been submitted to the Committee for this recommendation.
- Assemblyman Hambrick suggested that the Committee take no action on this recommendation. He pointed out that Mr. Brooks was not present to provide additional information about the proposal.
- The Committee took no action on the Recommendation No. 30.

Recommendation No. 31—Revise certain definitions concerning bullying, cyber-bullying, harassment, and intimidation. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Carey Stewart, Director,
Department of Juvenile Services,
Washoe County)*

- Ms. Gregory noted that the topics of bullying, cyber-bullying, harassment, and intimidation were discussed at the Committee's February 22, 2012, meeting. She added that there were concerns with definitions involving: (1) the location where certain crimes are committed; (2) the frequency of occurrences, for purposes of reporting; and (3) the definition of "highly offensive" to the average person.
- Mr. Stewart explained that confusion exists in law enforcement regarding bullying and cyber-bullying, as two definitions of harassment exist in statute; one in NRS 200.571, the other in NRS 388.125. He remarked that Chapter 388 of NRS limits school district police departments from responding to incidents of bullying and cyber-bullying that occur off school grounds. He suggested that this language be broadened to include cyber-bullying incidents that occur at any location in a community.

Continuing, Mr. Stewart suggested replacing the phrase, "one time or repeated over time," with "any," in the definition of bullying, to assist school police in responding to negative behavior or actions.

- Chair Wiener commented that Senate Bill 276 (Chapter 376, *Statutes of Nevada* 2011) included a single incident as falling within the definition of bullying for purposes of reporting. She added that she was a primary sponsor of Senate Bill 163 (Chapter 188, *Statutes of Nevada* 2009), which addressed cyber-bullying and also defined bullying in Nevada statute for the first time. Chair Wiener stated that statutory definitions for harassment and intimidation were integrated into the definition of bullying, which may have contributed to some of the confusion. She pointed out that the Legislative Committee on Education is also addressing the issue of bullying.
- Mr. Stewart noted that statutory revisions are needed to provide greater clarity regarding jurisdictional boundaries for municipal and school district police departments.

Responding to a query from Chair Wiener, Mr. Stewart conveyed that there is a grey area pertaining to jurisdictional authority, which causes some incidents to "fall through the cracks."

- Vice Chair Frierson voiced concern with the potential breadth of the suggested revisions. He conveyed that not every incident necessitates a response from school district police.
- Chair Wiener expressed her concerns about bullying and cyber-bullying and indicated that jurisdictional boundaries need to be more clearly defined. She stated that she would be willing to discuss the issue further and may consider the recommendation for a possible Senate Committee on Judiciary BDR.

- The Committee took no action on Recommendation No. 31.

Recommendation No. 32—Adopt the recommendations contained in the *Nevada Operations of Multi-Automated Data Systems (NOMADS)—Child Support Enforcement Application Assessment Project Assessment Project NOMADS CSE System Maintenance Plan & Modernization Roadmap*, dated October 6, 2011, as prepared by Policy Studies, Inc. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Teresa Lowry, Assistant District Attorney,
Family Support, Juvenile and Child Welfare Divisions,
Clark County District Attorney's Office)*

- Ms. Gregory pointed out that this proposal was shared at the January 18, 2012, meeting. She added that the NOMADS Report Executive Summary is located behind Tab F in [Exhibit K](#), and the full report is available as an exhibit in the Committee meeting minutes from January.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION :**

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION NO. 32. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 33—Adopt the recommendations contained in the Protected Innocence Initiative's Analysis and Recommendations for Nevada, as prepared by Shared Hope International. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Teresa Lowry, Assistant District Attorney,
Family Support, Juvenile and Child Welfare Divisions,
Clark County District Attorney's Office)*

- Ms. Gregory noted this proposal was discussed at the Committee's January 18, 2012, meeting, and shared that the first few pages of the report are located behind Tab F in [Exhibit K](#). She added that the full report is available as an exhibit in the Committee meeting minutes.
- Chair Wiener reminded the Committee that alternate actions may be taken in lieu of a BDR. She returned the Committee's attention to the omnibus bill being developed by Catherine Cortez Masto, Nevada Attorney General, regarding the sex trafficking of minors. Chair Wiener pointed out that the Committee could send a letter to the Attorney General to request that the bill include provisions from the Shared Hope International report.
- Assemblyman Hambrick suggested that the Committee approve a BDR with this recommendation, unless there is certainty that the omnibus measure will include recommendations from the Shared Hope International report.

- Chair Wiener shared her reservation about developing a Committee BDR with this proposal. She pointed out that while the report was shared at a previous meeting, the Committee has not discussed the recommendations. Chair Wiener articulated that the document is meritorious, but contains a substantial volume of information that requires more thorough evaluation. Chair Wiener asked Ms. Lowry for her opinion regarding a sending a letter to the Attorney General, in lieu a BDR.
- Ms. Lowry was of the opinion that sending a Committee letter to the Attorney General would be beneficial in promoting the concepts outlined in the Report.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO DRAFT A LETTER TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL URGING THE EXAMINATION AND UTILIZATION OF THE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE PROTECTED INNOCENCE INITIATIVE'S ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEVADA, AS PREPARED BY SHARED HOPE INTERNATIONAL, IN ANY POTENTIAL LEGISLATION REQUESTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ADDRESS SEX TRAFFICKING OF MINORS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recommendation No. 34—Create a remediation plan, with concern for causes of disproportionality, to include: (a) legislative oversight; (b) policy recommendations; and (c) evidence-based practices, to be utilized by police departments, school officials, service providers, and others interacting with affected populations. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

Recommendation No. 35—Create a pilot program to ensure adequate case management for youth with severe emotional disturbances involved with out-of-community placements. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

Recommendation No. 36—Adopt Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support as a part of standards addressing the behavioral health care needs of children and develop data systems to track school climate programs and discipline. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

Recommendation No. 37—Require the tracking of point of entry statistics for youth interacting with the juvenile justice system, including status offenses. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

Recommendation No. 38—Consider recommendations that will ensure that instances of expulsion related to “immoral conduct” and bullying are not illegally infringing on the First Amendment rights of students. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

Recommendation No. 39—Create a more comprehensive approach to addressing issues related to school discipline by identifying school-based trends as an inappropriate entrée into the juvenile justice system and create policies that will prevent students from improper introduction into the juvenile justice system through the school to prison pipeline. Additional information is included behind Tab F ([Exhibit K](#)).

*(Recommended by Rebecca S. Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director,
ACLU of Nevada)*

- Chair Wiener remarked that Recommendation Nos. 34 through 39 were submitted by Rebecca S. Gasca, former Legislative and Policy Director, ACLU of Nevada, and have not been discussed before the Committee. She added that neither Ms. Gasca nor a representative from the ACLU were present to testify on the recommendations.
- Assemblyman Hambrick suggested that Recommendation Nos. 34 through 39 be referred to the appropriate Senate and Assembly Standing Committees.
- The Committee **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING ACTION:**

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO DRAFT A LETTER TO THE CHAIRS OF THE APPROPRIATE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEES AND INCLUDE A STATEMENT IN THE COMMITTEE’S BULLETIN URGING FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE ISSUES SET FORTH IN RECOMMENDATION NOS. 34 THROUGH 39. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FRIERSON AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

- Vice Chair Frierson returned the Committee's attention to Recommendation No. 3(b), which pertains to victims of sex trafficking and existing rape shield provisions. He announced that he intends to submit a personal BDR with this recommendation as well.
- Chair Wiener commented that both a Committee BDR and a personal BDR may be submitted on the same topic.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Lisa Ruiz-Lee, previously identified, spoke on behalf of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) for Clark County Department of Family Services (DFS), and provided the Committee with a copy of the DFS CAC Strategic Action Plan ([Exhibit L](#)).
- Chair Wiener expressed her appreciation for the dedication and commitment of those serving on the CAC. She also thanked the public, Committee members, and staff for their contributions in assisting the children of Nevada through the legislative process.
- Various members of the Committee praised Chair Wiener for her strong leadership skills and her service on the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Gardner
Senior Research Secretary

Kelly S. Gregory
Senior Research Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair

Date: _____

LIST OF EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the “Meeting Notice and Agenda,” provided by Kelly S. Gregory, Senior Research Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

[Exhibit B](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation dated May 9, 2012, titled “Commission on Statewide Juvenile Justice Reform,” submitted by Associate Justices Nancy M. Saitta and James W. Hardesty.

[Exhibit C](#) is the written testimony of The Honorable Nancy M. Saitta, Associate Justice, Nevada Supreme Court, dated May 9, 2012, titled “Presentation of Nevada Court Improvement Program to the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice.”

[Exhibit D](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation titled “Disproportionate Minority Contact in the Juvenile Justice System,” provided by Cheri Ely, Program Manager, Juvenile and Family Law Department, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit E](#) is a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation titled “Statewide DMC Data Three Year Comparison 2009-2011,” submitted by Steve McBride, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and Pauline Salla, Social Services Chief I, DCFS, DHHS.

[Exhibit F](#) is a document dated April 16, 2012, titled “County Judicial District DMC Yearly DMC Reports,” submitted by Fritz Reese, Director, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Clark County.

[Exhibit G](#) is a document containing information from Washoe County’s SB 232 Report to the State for 2011, provided by Carey Stewart, Director, Department of Juvenile Services, Second Judicial District Court of Nevada, Washoe County.

[Exhibit H](#) is a packet of information provided by Paula Berkley, Representative, Food Bank of Northern Nevada, which includes the following documents:

- Facts on Children and Food Insecurity;
- Food Bank of Northern Nevada School-based Programs;
- Food Bank of Northern Nevada SNAP Applications Submitted by Year;
- Bridges out of Poverty;
- Food Insecurity In the State of Nevada;
- State of Nevada Poverty and Hunger Data by County; and

- Report: Schools key to fighting America's obesity.

Exhibit I is three maps submitted by Jodi Tyson, M.P.H., Research and Public Policy Manager, Three Square Food Bank, regarding:

- Food Insecurity by Zip Code 2010 (2009 Data);
- Food Insecurity by Zip Code 2011 (2010 Data); and
- Foreclosures 2011-1 Per X Housing Units (2010 Data).

Exhibit J is a letter dated May 9, 2012, to Senator Valerie Wiener, Committee Chair from Yvette Williams, Caucus Chair, Clark County Democratic Black Caucus, Las Vegas.

Exhibit K is the "Work Session Document," dated May 9, 2012, provided by Kelly S. Gregory, Senior Research Analyst, Research Division, LCB.

Exhibit L is a letter from the Citizen's Advisory Committee for Clark County Department of Family Services and a table titled "DFS CAC Action Plan 2012," provided by Lisa Ruiz-Lee, Interim Director, Clark County Department of Family Services.

This set of "Summary Minutes and Action Report" is supplied as an informational service. Exhibits in electronic format may not be complete. Copies of the complete exhibits, other materials distributed at the meeting, and the audio record are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. You may contact the Library online at www.leg.state.nv.us/lcb/research/library/feedbackmail.cfm or telephone: 775/684-6827.