

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Health and Human Services Committee February 10, 2021

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: [RECORDER MALFUNCTION] the 14th Legislative District in Sarpy County and I serve as Chair of the HHS committee. I'd like to invite the members of the committee to introduce themselves starting on my right with Senator Day.

DAY: Jen Day. I represent Legislative District 49, which is northwestern Sarpy County.

MURMAN: Hello, I'm Senator Dave Murman from District 38, and I represent seven counties to the south, west, and east of Kearney and Hastings.

WALZ: Hi, my name is Lynne Walz and I represent Legislative District 15, which is all of Dodge County.

M. CAVANAUGH: Machaela Cavanaugh, District 6, west-central Omaha, Douglas County.

B. HANSEN: Ben Hansen, District 16, Washington, Burt, and Cuming Counties.

ARCH: Also assisting the committee is one of our legal counsels, Paul Henderson; our committee clerk, Geri Williams; and our committee pages, Sophie and Jordon. A few notes about our policies and procedures. First, please turn off or silence your cell phones. This morning, we will be hearing three bills, I believe, three bills, and we'll be taking them in the order listed on the agenda outside the room. The hearing on each bill will begin with the introducer's opening statement. After the opening statement, we will hear from supporters of the bill and then from those in opposition, followed by those speaking in a neutral capacity. The introducer of the bill will then be given the opportunity to make closing statements if they wish to do so. For those of you who are planning to testify, you will find green testifier sheets on the table near the entrance of the hearing room. Please fill one out and hand it to one of the pages when you come up to testify. This will help us keep an accurate record of the hearing. We use a light system for testifying. Each testifier will have five minutes to testify. When you begin, the light will be green. When the light turns yellow, that means you have one minute left. When the light turns red, it is time to end your testimony and we will ask you to wrap up your final thoughts. When you come up to testify,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Health and Human Services Committee February 10, 2021

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

please begin by stating your name clearly into the microphone and then please spell both your first and last name. If you are not testifying at the microphone, but want to go on record as having a position on a bill being heard today, please see the new public hearing protocols on the HHS Committee's Web page on NebraskaLegislature.gov. Additionally, there is a white sign-in sheet at the entrance where you may leave your name and position on the bills before us today. Due to social distancing requirements, seating in the hearing room is limited. We ask that you only enter the hearing room when it is necessary for you to attend the bill hearing in progress. The agenda posted outside the door will be updated after each hearing to identify which bill is currently being heard. The committee will pause between each bill to allow time for the public to move in and out of the hearing room. We request that you wear a face covering while in the hearing room. Testifiers may remove their face covering during testimony to assist committee members and Transcribers in clearly hearing and understanding the testimony. Pages will sanitize the front table and chair between testifiers. This committee has a strict no props policy. With that, we will begin today's hearing with LB485 and welcome Senator DeBoer. Welcome.

DeBOER: Thank you. Good morning, Chairperson Arch and members of the HHS Committee. My name is Wendy DeBoer, W-e-n-d-y D-e-B-o-e-r, and I represent Legislative District 10, which includes Bennington and parts of northwest Omaha. Today, I'm introducing LB485, which would expand eligibility for the childcare subsidy program. But LB485 is not just a bill about childcare. It's a bill about workforce development. Investing in childcare is an investment in our workforce. When workers don't have access to quality, affordable childcare, they are often forced to take time off the job, scale back to part-time work, or drop out of the workforce altogether. If this last year has taught us anything, it's that childcare is a vital part of our economy. LB485 supports our workforce in two ways. First, it increases the eligibility level at which a family may qualify for childcare assistance from 130 percent of federal poverty level to 185 percent of federal poverty level. For a family of two, like a single parent and their child, 130 percent of federal poverty level is a yearly income of \$22,412, or \$18,068 per month. This change would extend initial eligibility for the program to a family of two, making \$31,894 a year. The current initial eligibility levels prevent many low-income families from accessing-- accessing much needed assistance that

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

enables them to stay engaged in the workforce. LB485 returns initial eligibility for the childcare subsidy program to 185 percent of federal pov-- federal poverty level, the level at which our state provided childcare assistance to workers in the early 2000s. As a result of budget cuts, the state significantly reduced eligibility and still has not regained the ground from those cuts. All of our surrounding states have higher initial and eligi-- higher initial eligibility levels for assistance. Both Kansas and Colorado's initial eligibility is 185 FPL, as this proposes. And South Dakota and Wisconsin's initial eligibility levels are even higher. By increasing eligibility for this program, we can support families who are working their way toward greater financial security while also supporting employers by ensuring a more dependable workforce. The second change LB485 makes to the childcare subsidy program is to expand the income limit for transitional childcare support. Currently, if a worker meets the initial eligibility threshold for the program, they can increase their earnings slightly before they are no longer eligible for assistance. LB485 increases that top income threshold or the income at which a family would lose assistance from 185 of federal poverty level to 200 percent FPL or three-- or \$34,480 per year for a family of two. This change will support workers as they advance in their career and lessen the cliff effect in the childcare assistance program. The cliff effect occurs when families lose assistance before they're able to bear the full cost of childcare on their own. This transitional assistance will allow workers the flexibility to accept promotions or transition into careers that provide more opportunity for growth without fear of losing their benefits instead of turning down raises or working fewer hours to keep their income below the threshold. By raising the income level at which families transition off the program, families will be better able to advance in their careers and afford childcare on their own. There will be a cost associated with these workforce investments, and LB485 prioritizes the use of existing federal funds in both the Child Care Development Block Grant and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF rainy day funds. The TANF rainy day funds have been provided by the federal government to help low-income families with children achieve economic self-sufficiency. For many years, the program has underspent the budgeted spending and spent below the annual federal block grant amount, resulting in a carryover balance growing each year, also referred to as the TANF rainy day fund. In-- in June of 2014, the State Auditor, who I think is was then State Auditor Foley, now our

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

Lieutenant Governor, cited \$55.9 million in available reserves in this TANF rainy day fund. In September of 2019, that balance had grown to over \$79 million. And in November of this year, DHHS provided a TANF funding update to my office that showed the rainy day fund has grown to over \$90 million. LB485 provides an opportunity to invest these funds in the success of low-income families and our workforce. Childcare costs can easily outweigh the paychecks offered by low-wage work. No parent should have to choose between advancing in their career and caring for their children. Investing in our childcare system is a workforce investment strategy that supports Nebraska families as they work their way to financial stability. Therefore, I encourage you to support LB485 and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

ARCH: Are there any questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thanks for being here, Senator DeBoer. I'm just looking at the fiscal note and I'm sure the department will speak to this, but I was curious if they told you. It says that they have already committed all of the TANF funds available.

DeBOER: I don't know the answer to that exactly. I think that they have ideas for them, but I'm not sure. I think that was a couple of years they had said that-- ago they said that. And maybe now they're saying it again. But it seems like they keep saying that and the fund keeps growing. So I'm not entirely sure. And you'll probably have to ask those questions--

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

DeBOER: --of them.

M. CAVANAUGH: Because \$90 million to suddenly have a plan, I'll be interested to hear what it is.

DeBOER: Yeah. I mean, I'm not trying to-- I'm just curious myself.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? This-- I do have one question.

DeBOER: Yeah.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: And this may again not be for you, but somebody else may be able to answer the question. As I recall, a couple of years ago, we-- we did expand the, I say the transition, that transition. And I-- and I-- I don't recall the percentages of FPL that we're currently operating under today.

DeBOER: So we're currently at 130 percent is the initial eligibility. And 185, I believe is the--

ARCH: Is the transition.

DeBOER: --the transition out eligibility. And you did do something a couple of years ago. I think you may have--

ARCH: I introduced the bill.

DeBOER: --introduced the bill, but.

ARCH: I should remember the percentages.

DeBOER: But I can't remember all of the specifics of that. There was some other strange piece of that that had to happen that year that was--

ARCH: Yeah, it was to bring us in compliance with federal.

DeBOER: That's what I thought, yeah.

ARCH: Yeah. All right. Seeing no other questions, thank you very much. First proponent. Good morning.

ADAM FESER: Good morning. Chairman Arch, members of the Health and Human Services Committee, I'll actually start by addressing your question there. Just to clarify, while it's fresh in my mind, had it in testimony for LB677, I'm bring it up now. So in 2019, the Legislature took a step forward in addressing the cliff effect when LB341, which you originally introduced, was amended into LB460 and passed. So that bill removed the 24-month limit on transitional childcare, and it bumped the income limit within an eligibility period to 85 percent, the state median income. So the eligibility period, like you couldn't be booted off for exceeding income within the eligibility period unless you're 85 percent SMI. So that brought us into compliance with a few things. The top end on this bill and LB677

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

addresses how long the eligibility limit for that transitional
childcare by bumping it. So that did help the cliff effect. This is a
different step that also would help it.

ARCH: Thank you.

ADAM FESER: My name is Adam Feser, A-d-a-m F-e-s-e-r. I'm a policy
advisor representing First Five Nebraska. We're an early childhood
policy organization promoting quality care and learning experiences
for Nebraska's youngest children. I am grateful for the opportunity to
speak in support of LB485 and to thank Senator DeBoer for introducing
this bill. Research suggests that access to childcare subsidy results
in a range of long-term benefits for children and their families. We
believe LB485 has the potential to benefit our state, communities,
families, and children on multiple levels. The childcare subsidy
allows more children to have access to safe, reliable, early learning
environments they need for healthy cognitive, social, emotional, and
physical development. It allows hardworking parents to earn more and
create greater financial stability for their families by offsetting
some of the heavy cost of childcare. Lastly, it enables more parents
to participate fully and productively in the workforce so desperately
needed by our state's employers, especially in the wake of COVID-19.
Our ability to address these needs determines where our communities,
families, and children can thrive. Leveraging our pool of unused TANF
funds presents an opportunity for us to do just that. LB485 will allow
more children to benefit from childcare through the subsidy. But we
must also ensure that the subsidy makes it possible for early
childhood professionals to cover the actual cost of delivering high
quality care. We do want to applaud the Nebraska Department of Health
and Human Services for their willingness to examine a hybrid approach
for setting subsidy reimbursement rates to account for the costs of
providing high-quality care for services beyond the standard market
rate for childcare. Access to reliable quality care can improve the
lives of children and families in need immediately and in the long
term. It also points toward a more robust workforce and prosperous
economy. Currently, Nebraska has some of the most restrictive
eligibility criteria for childcare assistance in the entire country,
especially compared to our neighboring states. We have the opportunity
to change that. We hope you advance LB485 to General File. With that,
I will email out my testimony since we're not bringing in hard copies
after the fact. And if anyone has any questions, I will do my best to
answer them.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony. Next proponent for LB485. Welcome.

JP LAUTERBACH: Good morning. Good morning, Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is JP Lauterbach, J-P L-a-u-t-e-r-b-a-c-h. I'm the COO of the YMCA here in Lincoln, Nebraska. And I'm speaking today on behalf of the Nebraska State Alliance of YMCAs in support of LB485. And we thank Senator DeBoer for introducing the bill and again want to register the strong support of the Ys in the state. LB485 would move initial eligibility from 130 percent of the federal poverty level to 185 FPL and eligibility for transitional childcare assistance from 185 to 200 FPL. The Y is a leading nonprofit committed to strengthening communities through youth development, healthy living, and social responsibility. We've been a presence in Nebraska for over 150 years. And through the work of the Ys in 14 YMCAs across the state, we provide programs and services in over 300 Nebraska communities. The Y has been a leader in the childcare field for over four decades and we are vested in the well-being of our state's children from their first steps as a toddler to them crossing the stage at graduation. Over 50 percent of our Y members and program participants are under the age of 18. They participate in youth sports, camping, childcare, before and after school programs, after school enrichment, teen outreach and leadership programs designed to help keep kids safe and engaged and encouraged to discover who they are. Both LB485 and LB68 are critical bills that will address the needs of hardworking, low-income families to access affordable childcare. Imagine, if you will, a single parent or even a couple working full time, making between \$9 and \$12 an hour, trying to afford quality childcare for their two children so they're safe and learning throughout the day while also trying to afford a safe place to take them home to at night. Thankfully, in 2018, Congress nearly doubled the funding every-- in every state to provide subsidized childcare through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. LB485 will help implement the significant federal investment by expanding eligibility for families to access care and update reimbursement rates for childcare providers, which will provide much needed stability to ensure greater access. The bill is a solution for a tremendous unmet need. For every child receiving childcare subsidy, five more children have been on the waiting list. High-quality childcare programs can help lift that child out of poverty by providing early education at the most critical time in their development. The right start that

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

includes early learning enrichment and fostering social and emotional well-being ensures their academic readiness for kindergarten and early investment that will fuel brighter futures. All parents, regardless of income, deserve to know with confidence that while they're at work each day, their children are safe and thriving in a quality childcare program. Subsidized childcare can also play a role in lifting a hardworking family out of poverty by helping them keep on working during the children's early years and provide the ability to make ends meet at the end of the month. The YMCAs in our state are committed to doing our part so that more children can reach their potential and more families can thrive. I thank you for your time and respectfully ask for your support of LB485. Thank you, Senator DeBoer, for introducing the bill and thank you to the committee for your time. And if you have any questions of the YMCA at this point, I'll do my best.

ARCH: Are there any questions from the committee? Seeing none, thank you very much. Thanks for your testimony. Next proponent for LB485. Welcome.

LESLIE ANDERSEN: Would you like me to take my mask off?

ARCH: Your choice, your choice.

LESLIE ANDERSEN: OK. Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Leslie Andersen, L-e-s-l-i-e A-n-d-e-r-s-e-n. I'm CEO of the Bank of Bennington. And I'm here today on behalf of the Greater Omaha Chamber of Commerce and the Nebraska Chamber in support of LB485. LB485 presents an important policy change for Nebraska as it considers how it wants to invest in childcare and what impact that has on our workforce. The changes proposed in LB485 would increase the income levels eligible for initial childcare assistance. This change gives working families more financial breathing room to work, find a job, pursue education, and afford living expenses. It reduces the cliff effect at low-wage thresholds and makes Nebraska's childcare assistance program more competitive with surrounding states. Childcare programs open opportunities for families to improve their financial situations with two incomes. Research also shows that the availability of childcare increases workplace productivity and local economic activity. Additionally, childcare options are among the top considerations for families looking to relocate to Nebraska communities. Greater financial stability among Nebraskans also increases economic activity and

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

reduces the need for state assistance. That is why the Chambers of Commerce recognize this as a critical workforce need and are working to help unemployed or underemployed Nebraskans move into higher wage jobs and greater financial security. It's also why we're supporting LB485. Sometimes career advancement, getting that new job with the higher-- with higher pay puts family income above eligibility requirements for public benefit programs. As a result of losing that assistance, the family can actually become financially worse off, a benefits cliff, or no better off, a benefits plateau. Benefits cliffs and plateaus are financial barriers to economic mobility. While a new job could provide much greater long-term income, the immediate shortfall may make it too risky to pursue higher paying work. Losing access to public benefits that help with expenses such as medical insurance or childcare can become a financial disincentive to upward movement from lower wage jobs. The Greater Omaha Chamber of Commerce and the Nebraska Chamber of Commerce are proud to support LB485 and would encourage the committee to advance the bill from committee. I'd be happy to take any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions?

LESLIE ANDERSEN: Thank you.

ARCH: Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony. Next proponent for LB485.

KEN SMITH: Good morning, Chairperson Arch, members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Ken Smith. That's spelled K-e-n S-m-i-t-h, and I'm the director of the economic justice program at Nebraska Appleseed. Nebraska Appleseed is a nonprofit organization that fights for justice and opportunity for all Nebraskans. I'm here today testifying in support of LB485. Simply put, LB485 would implement a policy change that is long overdue by increasing access to childcare for thousands of Nebraskans experiencing poverty. In Nebraska, the childcare subsidy program is intended to provide temporary assistance to low-income families by helping to cover their costs of childcare on a sliding scale. The program helps parents have a safe place for their children while they find work, maintain employment, or gain the education and skills needed to get a job. For too long, Nebraska has taken an overly restrictive approach to eligibility for the childcare subsidy program. The current initial eligibility limit, as you've heard, is 130 percent of FPL, meaning

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

that the childcare subsidy is not available to many low-income households that could benefit from it. As you have-- as you have also heard, in 2002, the eligibility for this program was cut from 185 percent FPL to 130 percent, or 120 percent FPL, and then later raised by 10 percent, back up to 130 percent. So in other words, more than 15 years later, we are still below 2002 program levels. And as you've heard, Nebraska lags behind many of our surrounding states in eligibility. I think, and Senator DeBoer touched on this in her opening, but to get a sense of how restrictive the current eligibility threshold is, it's helpful to consider the levels of income involved. We can hear things like 130 or 185 percent of federal poverty, but what-- what does that mean? The current eligibility limit of 130 percent FPL excludes families of three whose annual household income exceeds about \$28,000. So currently, if you're a single parent with two kids and you make \$29,000 per year, you're not eligible for childcare assistance. LB485 would change that so that families of three making up to approximately \$40,000 per year can be eligible. Suppose there are two working parents with two young children. That family of four is currently ineligible for childcare assistance if the parents combined incomes exceed \$34,000 per year. So again, we think LB485 is just a long overdue increase in access to childcare assistance for families who need it. You've also heard today about the cliff effect. The cliff effect is still prevalent in our childcare program, meaning that when a family's income increases modestly, it can push that household over eligibility limits for childcare assistance. By extending back end eligibility of up to 200 percent FPL when a family renews, this bill would help encourage work by allowing families to earn more income and retain their childcare support. As again, as I said, it's a slide-- kind of this program works on a sliding scale. So as a family's income increases, so does their share of costs for childcare. I think I also just want to touch on the funding mechanism for this bill. The bill was written intentionally to first pull down, pull in our funds from our Child Care Development Block Grant and-- and then specifies that any remaining funds could be drawn from TANF with General Funds to take-- to take effect after that if needed. I think that was intentionally done because Child Care Development Block Grant funds, unlike TANF, do not roll over if the state doesn't use them. And so it is incumbent upon us to use all of those funds before turning to another source. TANF funds, if we don't use all of those funds, I think as we've heard today, we do, you know, those funds are placed in reserve, the so-called rainy day fund. And I

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

think it's-- it's-- it's worth noting that we've heard for the past several years that Nebraska has a plan for those rainy day funds and that they're already-- they're already accounted for. You can't dip into them. We have a plan. But as far as we can tell, I've been at Appleseed since 2015, we've only had plans since 2015. And yet every time we look at that reserve fund, that rainy day fund, that pot of now \$90 million in federal funds that are specifically intended to help children and families in poverty, the fund just grows. I think this Legislature has the ability, and this is reflected in the fiscal note, to direct the department to spend those funds in the best way for Nebraskans. And we would submit that this bill brought by Senator DeBoer is that-- is the way to do that for-- for all of the reasons that I've stated and the reasons previous test-- testifiers have-- have stated as well. In sum, we think LB485 would go far to ensure more families in Nebraska can find a job, keep their work, or take a pay raise. This is not only good policy for the welfare of our families, but also the health of Nebraska's economy. I'm out of time. Be happy to answer any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

KEN SMITH: Thank you.

ARCH: Next proponent for LB485. Seeing none, oh, I'm sorry. Welcome.

QUENTIN BROWN: Well, thanks. Good morning, Chairman Arch and members of the committee. My name is Quentin Brown. I'm executive director of Educare of Lincoln. My name is Q-u-e-n-t-i-n B-r-o-w-n. Educare of Lincoln is a quality early childhood education program where we establish a high-quality, one stop community learning center for at-risk children and families, implementing specialized learning environments which develop children academically and socially, empowering them to become productive members of society through research and evidence-based practices. Today, we serve all 165 children and families with high-quality supports and employ over 55 dedicated teachers and other professionals. In addition to providing academic, social, and emotional learning opportunities for children, part of our mandate is to ensure that we are working with our families to ensure they have the supports that they need to provide a healthy and safe home environment. A challenge that we face as we work with families through any number of crises and on the path to a better

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

place financially is that we oftentimes arrive at a point where they no longer qualify for childcare subsidy but don't yet earn enough through employment to sustain what we might define as an adequate household. Extending childcare subsidy eligibility to families whose income is less than 185 percent, and in some cases we've heard 200 percent, of the federal poverty level will allow more families to remain on subsidy longer and avoiding or at least reducing the potential for childcare cliff effect. Our request of you today and look moving forward is to look favorably upon LB485, as it will create, extend, and sustain more opportunities for our families and our workforce. Thank you. And as everyone else, I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

ARCH: Thank you. Any questions? Senator Walz.

WALZ: Thank you. Thanks for coming today.

QUENTIN BROWN: Thank you, ma'am.

WALZ: I'm just curious. I haven't had kids for a while. I'm just curious. Can you--

QUENTIN BROWN: We have a bunch of them.

WALZ: Can you just give me an average monthly cost of day care for one child?

QUENTIN BROWN: Oh, you're looking at approximately \$1,500 to \$2,000.

WALZ: OK.

QUENTIN BROWN: Yeah, right, yeah, I mean, and there are some statistics and some of my colleagues behind me may be better versed in this, but that will reference that childcare in some cases costs more than universities. And I think just hearing that, whether you even know what the numbers are, just understanding that, I mean, brings it into perspective.

WALZ: Um-hum.

QUENTIN BROWN: This is the most critical stage of development for our children and in a lot of cases, one of the greatest benefits that we can provide to our working families. So it's you know, [INAUDIBLE]

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

WALZ: So currently, and I'm just trying to get this straight,
currently you're eligible if you don't make over the 130 percent, is
that, or \$28,000 for assistance.

QUENTIN BROWN: Yes.

WALZ: And \$28,000 divided by 12 comes to about \$2,333.

QUENTIN BROWN: You're doing the math, not me so I'm going--

WALZ: OK, well--

QUENTIN BROWN: --to say it's right. Yep. Yeah.

WALZ: So.

QUENTIN BROWN: Yeah.

WALZ: I mean I'm just--

QUENTIN BROWN: I know, I know. It's mind blowing, right?

WALZ: Leaves them about \$33 of their childcare for rent and food and
gas and-- am I doing that right?

QUENTIN BROWN: We are dealing with families that are in it and I can't
speak for all centers and organizations and programs, but we are
dealing with families that are in a very high risk and high poverty
and they need every opportunity and support and benefit that they can
receive to lift them out of that. And oftentimes we, from the outside
looking in, we think that the work that we're doing is only for the
children because that's who we're spending most of our time with. But
the work that I do and my colleagues do is not only for the child, but
it's for the entire family. And it is a workforce issue. It is a
childcare issue. It is a support issue. It's a-- it's an economic--
it's-- it's a responsibility that we all bear to get right, in my
opinion.

WALZ: Thank you.

QUENTIN BROWN: You're welcome. Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Do you know what the, well, you probably do know, what is the monthly reimbursement for a child that's on a childcare subsidy? How much does Educare receive in a reimbursement?

QUENTIN BROWN: I have people at my school that can answer that question, but I cannot.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK? Is it \$1,500?

QUENTIN BROWN: I--

M. CAVANAUGH: [INAUDIBLE] do you think?

QUENTIN BROWN: I can follow up with you on that.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

QUENTIN BROWN: I can share with you and anyone else that wants to know, but I can't answer that right now--

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

QUENTIN BROWN: --and feel confident in my response.

M. CAVANAUGH: That's fine. I was just curious if it was even-- you were even able to break even or do you have to have other funding?

QUENTIN BROWN: Oh, well, if that's your question.

M. CAVANAUGH: Yes.

QUENTIN BROWN: No, we're not breaking even from-- from that, no. I can definitely answer that.

M. CAVANAUGH: And so you have to seek other funding?

QUENTIN BROWN: Correct. We're-- we're a blended funding strategy, various funding streams to make up that difference. So.

M. CAVANAUGH: And most childcares are, even the ones that don't have subsidy children.

QUENTIN BROWN: Right.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

QUENTIN BROWN: Right.

M. CAVANAUGH: I am-- I do have children in childcare and it costs more than what I make here. So every day that I'm here is costing me more than what my pay is. So I appreciate the work that you're doing. Thank you.

QUENTIN BROWN: Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Hansen.

B. HANSEN: All right. Since you're answering questions, I feel remiss if I don't ask something.

QUENTIN BROWN: Oh, well, let's do it.

B. HANSEN: Why do you think childcare is so high?

QUENTIN BROWN: It's-- it is the most critical stage of development. I think, you know, I tell people oftentimes if a university or a high school rightfully builds a multimillion dollar facility, no one bats an eye. It's to be expected. But if someone says we're going to build a multimillion dollar facility for zero to five-year-olds say, wait a minute, they're only babies. Why do you spend that kind of money? But 85, at least 85 percent of brain development happens before the age of eight and the majority of it happens before the age of five. So it is expensive because the people we are employing to do this work are people that not only want to hold and care for babies, we want people that-- that like playing with babies and holding them and smelling them, which they do. But these are people that care about the true development and future lives of these kids. Because if we don't get it right at zero to five, we're going to spend a lot more money on the back end trying to correct what we missed zero to five. So it is so expensive because this-- this is the most critical stage of development. This is the point where you have to get the work right. We don't get another chance. Their brains are sponges soaking up absolutely everything that you do. Everywhere that you look, they're watching where you look to understand what you're referring to and what you're calling that podium there and making connections. The neurons are always firing. And I won't get into all the science, but this is where it happens. This-- this is it.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

B. HANSEN: In your opinion,--

QUENTIN BROWN: Um-hum.

B. HANSEN: --do you think government can sometimes be a hindrance or a cost because of excess rules and regulations in childcare, or is it pretty much null and void? You know, not so much--

QUENTIN BROWN: I think--

B. HANSEN: --an issue?

QUENTIN BROWN: In my opinion, I think in any instance, I think any authority or any external force can be a hindrance or not. It just depends on what the particular cases that we're referring to. So, I mean, in some cases, government can be a huge support and in some cases it could be a hindrance. It just all depends.

B. HANSEN: I've heard that from other childcare centers because I'm always curious about that because I don't know. I'm not familiar with, to some extent, I'm not familiar with the industry.

QUENTIN BROWN: Yeah, most people.

B. HANSEN: About the extra people they have to hire to figure out accounting, the extra people they have to hire to deal with rules and-- and procedures that the government requires of facilities instead of letting them actually just do their job. And so sometimes that creates like an excess cost and then they have to push on to the parent for the-- for the cost of the childcare. So that's what I was wondering. I--

QUENTIN BROWN: It--

B. HANSEN: --was just trying to get your opinion because I appreciate you being here and talking with us, too, so.

QUENTIN BROWN: No, I appreciate being here. And again, it just-- it just depends. It all depends.

B. HANSEN: Makes sense, thank you.

QUENTIN BROWN: Yeah. Thank you.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your
testimony.

QUENTIN BROWN: Thank you.

***KATIE ZULKOSKI:** Chairperson Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Katie Zulkoski, and I am here on behalf of the Women's Fund of Omaha in support of LB485, to increase access to affordable child care for working families in Nebraska. We can meet the workforce needs of our businesses, support full participation in the economy, and increase the financial freedom of families and communities by investing in affordable child care. To grow our economy, our child care system should be a top priority for policymakers, and the workforce investments in LB485 can be supported with available federal funding. Affordable, dependable child care is a workforce issue. Nebraska parents, especially mothers, are highly employed - nearly 80% of Nebraska children have a mother in the workforce. Most working parents, but especially those working in low-wage jobs, struggle to afford the high cost of child care, and women make up much of the low-wage workforce in our state (69.9%). When workers don't have access to quality, affordable child care, they are often forced to take time off the job, scale back to part time, or drop out of the workforce altogether. In Nebraska, where we are one of the leading states in the number of parents in the workforce, child care is an engine that drives our economy. Our state's policy choice to maintain low levels of income eligibility for child care assistance is a significant missed opportunity to support worker engagement in the workforce. Under the current child care assistance program, a working single mother with one child must make less than \$1,868 per month (or \$22,412 annually) to become eligible for the program at 130% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This equates to an hourly wage of \$10.78/hour for full-time, year round work - although, we know that the reality of low-wage work is rarely a dependable 40 hours a week, 52 weeks out of the year. By increasing the initial eligibility to 185% FPL, we can make affordable child care more accessible to workers who desperately need the assistance. A working single mother with one child would be able to make up to \$2,658 in gross monthly income (or \$31,894 annually) to be eligible for child care assistance. Additionally, LB485 is critical to help parents work their way off of assistance - lessening the disincentive to turn down promotions or refuse additional hours out of fear of losing child care assistance, also known as the "cliff effect." By increasing the income level at

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

which working parents will transition off of the program, we can increase the likelihood that a working parent can afford the full cost of child care on their own by the time they lose assistance. Currently, a working single mother with one child will lose child care assistance (after the initial 12-month continuous eligibility period) if their gross monthly income exceeds \$2,658 (or \$31,894 annually). At this level of income, this working mother would be responsible for a monthly \$186 fee to their child care provider, and the child care assistance program would cover the remainder of the cost. If a currently eligible working single mother would take a 25 cent per hour raise at work - earning roughly \$40 more per month - that mother would lose access to child care assistance and go from paying \$186/month for child care to the full monthly cost without assistance, which is a little less than \$1,000 on average. Under these circumstances, it doesn't make financial sense to take the raise or work more hours because it makes a family worse off financially. LB485 seeks to ensure that, when families transition off of assistance, they are better able to afford the cost of child care on their own. By comparison, Nebraska places much less of a priority on affordable child care for low-income working families than most states - including our surrounding states and our Blueprint Nebraska peer states. All of our surrounding states have higher initial and exit eligibility levels for assistance. Among our Blueprint Nebraska peer states, Nebraska has the lowest initial eligibility level and also the lowest income level at which workers lose assistance or fall off the eligibility "cliff." Many states are setting their exit eligibility at the maximum level allowed by federal law - 85% State Median Income (SMI) - to fully address the "cliff." This is true for our Blueprint Nebraska peer states of Iowa, Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Additionally, all other Blueprint peer and surrounding states have higher initial eligibility, as well - Kansas and Wisconsin are at 185% FPL, North Dakota at 218% FPL, and South Dakota at 209% FPL. It is important to note that LB485 is an investment in small businesses. Many child care providers in communities across the state are also small businesses. Increasing access to child care assistance will provide an enhanced and stable revenue stream to child care businesses who already operate on razor-thin margins and are struggling financially during this pandemic. Child care costs can easily outweigh the paychecks offered by low-wage work. Coupled with Nebraska's low eligibility levels for child care assistance, this creates a perverse incentive for workers on the margin of economic stability to turn down promotions and work

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

less hours, as such increase in pay would eliminate their eligibility for assistance before they can afford the full cost of child care on their own. Having the ability to earn additional income without losing crucial child care assistance makes it possible for women to advance in their jobs and work their way off of assistance. Please support the economic stability of women and girls by advancing LB485.

***SPIKE EICKHOLT:** Thank you Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Spike Eickholt and I am the registered lobbyist for the ACLU of Nebraska. The ACLU offers its full support of LB485 and we would like to thank Senator DeBoer for introducing this legislation. While childcare has always been essential to our economy and vital to workforce participation of parents, the pandemic has made that reality all the more apparent. Ensuring that more families have access to quality childcare will benefit all Nebraskans, but particularly benefit women and people of color who are more likely to be forced to exit the labor market to assume childcare responsibilities. Ensuring that families can afford childcare will aid in pandemic recovery efforts. We know that the pandemic has resulted in dramatic job losses and this is especially true for women. For example, nationally, 860,000 women dropped out of the labor force during September 2020. Measures like LB485 will allow those with caregiving responsibilities, disproportionately women and people of color, to afford care for their children so they are able to reenter the labor force if they so choose. For these reasons, the ACLU of Nebraska offers its support of LB485 and we urge the committee to advance the bill to General File. Thank you.

***BRUCE BOHRER:** Chairman Arch and Members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Bruce Bohrer, I am the registered lobbyist for the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on behalf of the Lincoln Chamber in support of LB485, which seeks to expand eligibility for the Child Care Subsidy program to families whose income is less than 185% of the federal poverty level, and to address the child care "cliff effect" by allowing families to qualify for transitional child care assistance if their income is less than 200% of the federal poverty level. The Lincoln Chamber supports LB485 because we see workforce development efforts as multi-faceted. Efforts run the gamut; including in-house talent attraction efforts at businesses, collaborative industry efforts, and community efforts and policies that give companies more options to engage in talent retention/recruitment. Our efforts also

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

must prioritize support for families in need who struggle with childcare expenses while advancing in the workforce. The Lincoln Chamber has understood for a long time that our community values also attract and retain talent. Lincoln - and we know this is true of our entire state - is a community that values work, values families and values striving for improvement. The Lincoln business community shares these values. We understand that efforts at workforce development also should include support for individuals and their efforts to learn new skills and gain new knowledge, thereby advancing in their careers. The Lincoln Chamber recognizes that our childcare subsidy program is not competitive with support provided by most surrounding states, and we view LB485 as part of a broader effort for workforce development. The Lincoln Chamber is proud to join the many other business-related groups who support LB485. We appreciate and thank Senator DeBoer for introducing LB485 and urge you to advance this worthy proposal to the full Legislature for debate. Thank you for your consideration.

***JULIE ERICKSON:** Thank you Chairman Arch and Members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Julie Erickson and I am representing Voices for Children in Nebraska in support of LB485. Nebraska families are working and working hard. Nebraska has always had both low unemployment and high rates of parental employment. In 2019, 76% of Nebraska kids under the age of 6 had all available parents in the workforce, meaning that they are likely to require child care. Prior to 2002, Nebraska set initial eligibility for child care assistance at 185% of the federal poverty level, currently just over \$48,000 per year for a family of four. In 2002 during a budget shortfall, then-Governor Johanns line-item vetoed a portion of funding for child care assistance and implemented regulatory changes that reduced initial eligibility to 120% of the federal poverty level. At the time, it is my understanding that promises were made to restore the cuts once the state was in a stronger financial position. In the nearly 20 years since that time, initial eligibility has only increased slightly to 130% of the federal poverty level through legislative action in 2013. Over this same time period, child care costs for families have continued to grow as has our knowledge about the importance of child care in providing a quality foundation in a child's earliest years that is critical to future success. LB485 is an investment in our workforce and an investment in the next generation of Nebraskans. It restores the broken promise to Nebraska's kids and families that has kept thousands of families living closer to the

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

poverty line and prevented parents from meaningful employment. We urge
the committee to advance LB485. Thank you.

***TIM HRUZA:** Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services
Committee, my name is Tim Hruza (T-I-M-H-R-D-Z-A) and I am here
representing the Children and Families Coalition of Nebraska (CAFCON).
CAFCON is a non-profit association comprised of 10 of the state's
largest providers of children and family services. We serve Nebraskans
in all 93 counties, providing everything from foster care and adoption
assistance to mental and behavioral health services. I am expressing
our support for LB485. I thank Senator DeBoer for introducing this
legislation. LB485 expands the eligibility for the Child Care Subsidy
program from 130% of the federal poverty level to 185%. It also
addresses the cliff effect by allowing families to qualify for
transitional childcare assistance for those families earning less than
200% of the federal poverty level. CAFCON supports this bill as it
will increase access to childcare in Nebraska and help both families
and providers. Thank you for your consideration. We respectfully
request advance the bill to General File.

ARCH: Other proponents for LB485. Seeing none, are there any opponents
for LB485? Good morning.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Good morning. Good morning, Chairperson Arch and
members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is
Stephanie Beasley S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e B-e-a-s-l-e-y, and I serve as the
director of the Division of Children and Family Services within the
Department of Health and Human Services. I'm here to testify in
opposition of LB485, which would increase the income eligibility limit
for childcare subsidy from 130 percent of the FPL, federal poverty
limit, to 185 percent of the FPL and increase the eligibility limit
for childcare subsidy at redetermination from 180-- 185 percent to 200
percent FPL. LB485 would also authorize the use of funds from the
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, program and state
General Funds to offset expenses incurred with this change. Raising
the income limit to qualify for childcare subsidy to 185 percent FPL
and raising the income limit redetermination for childcare subsidy to
200 percent FPL would require significant state dollars to implement
and sustain. TANF funny-- TANF funding referenced in this bill is
insufficient, leaving state dollars to cover the cost. DHHS has been
responsive to the impact of COVID-19 on our childcare providers and
working families who rely on childcare subsidy assistance. Diligently

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

working through this pandemic with internal and external partners, DHHS strives to ensure childcare is available for families. It is imperative that parents can continue working. It is also imperative that childcare providers supported through funding opportunities-- are supported through funding opportunities to offset the cost of low attendance and increased operational expenses. The testimony and handout provided for LB677 summarizes actions DHHS took initially and supports created using CARES dollars. And I'm sorry when we flipped the order of the hearings, there's a handout that is coming with LB677 so. For example, Executive Order number 20-18 allowed childcare providers to bill unlimited absentee days for children and give parents flexibility to choose an in-home childcare provider. Additionally, stabilization funds and incentive to re-open funds were made available to childcare providers using Child Care and Development Fund CARES dollars. DHHS anticipates that increasing the income eligibility limit and redetermination income limit would increase the number of households eligible for childcare subsidy by approximately 5,400 and the number of children eligible for childcare subsidy by approximately 10,800. Please see Figure 1 at the end of this testimony for further details. Serving the proposed number of children eligible for subsidy at 185 percent FPL would require the addition of 19 new social service workers and 2 social service supervisors. The addition of approximately 10,800 eligible children would result in an estimated annual subsidy fiscal impact of nearly \$30 million, \$29,725,714 in fiscal year '21-22 and almost \$40 million in fiscal-- fiscal year '22-23. Those already enrolled in the program would remain eligible unless they age out or have income that exceeds the allowable limits. DHHS currently obligates all CCDF and allowable TANF funding to maintain current childcare infrastructure. As our handout illustrates, all funding to support LB485 or any increases in the childcare subsidy program would come solely from state General Funds. There's also a technical issue regarding the language on page 2, line 18-26. There are several references to implementing this subsection. To the extent that it is a reference to 68-1206(1), that subsection encompasses all social services administered by the department, not just childcare. This language would mandate the use only of childcare and development funds, TANF funds, and General Funds for every program administered. The Department of Health and Human Services adamantly believes that quality childcare plays a crucial role in children's development while providing that vital assistance to support families. However, DHHS is unable to support legislation that will cost millions of state dollars

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

for implementation. We respectfully request the committee not advance
this legislation. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today and
I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

ARCH: Thank you. I'm sure we have questions. Senator Day.

DAY: Thank you, Chairman Arch. I just have a question about the fiscal
note in reference to what Senator Cavanaugh had asked earlier. It
says, Through years of underspending in allocation, the rainy day
carryover funding, the balance on September 30, 2020, was over \$92
million. And the department's fiscal note indicates that TANF funds
are currently obligated for the future biennial. Can you help me
understand--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Absolutely. Thank you, Senator.

DAY: --where that is going?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So we began programs in 2020 and we have begun new
programs in 2021 too. And so the programs that were-- that we started
where expenditures began in 2020 were supportive services and work
supports for child welfare families, home visiting programs, SNAP
employment and training, emergency assistance, NJAC [PHONETIC]
program. In 2021, what is beginning is St.. Monica's Women are Sacred
program and there's another program. These are-- these are residential
treatment facilities for substance use disorders where the child can
live with the parent, live with the mom. And then we have other
initiatives starting like Fatherhood Initiative, pregnancy program and
then a community response program, which is for at-- for families who
are at risk to coming into the child welfare system. So while we have
really focused on building some programs in 2020, obviously the
pandemic, did-- those home visiting programs didn't get off the ground
as well as we had hoped that, you know, people didn't want someone
coming into their homes, etcetera. But those programs have been
designed and we have the subawards that have been allocated and we
really expect to see expenditures rise in this-- this coming year.

DAY: OK. And that would account for all of that \$92 million.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: No. So, no. What we have is we have a plan for
the-- all the way through fiscal year '25, where we're adding programs
each year. And the programs that have been added really are focused on

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

crisis needs for families, ultimately focused on well-being for kids and families in the community to keep them out of the, deeper into the system and needing more formal interventions. And so we do have programs that are designed and ultimately that, in fact, if we-- if we would continue to-- if the amount that we're allocating would happen every year and those spends would happen, fiscal years '24 and '25 we actually would have to maybe pull back on the programs a little bit because it would spend down that rainy day fund.

DAY: OK. Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Walz.

WALZ: Thank you. Thanks for being here today. I appreciate it. In your statement, you said that there could be an approximate 10,800 eligible children. How many eligible families don't apply?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: You know, I don't know the answer. If you look at the grid at the bottom of my testimony, so I think I'm going to answer a different question. So this is who-- this is based on census data, the number of children who we believe at these various FPL levels would be eligible. We actually have families who are eligible, who have actually been authorized but don't actually bill. So they aren't utilizing that childcare assistance. And so I don't know that I would have the number for you to say how many would actually utilize the service, because we know it's a smaller portion. I think we were about 12,000 are authorized right now. Let me do this. I actually have it. Let me see. This last year, we had actually 20,000 children authorized, but only 12-- 12, 5, 12,500 children who actually billed. And so I don't know that I can determine for you the specific numbers.

WALZ: Yeah. So that's almost a little more than half that are actually taking it--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Who are--

WALZ: --using 20,000.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes.

WALZ: So would it be fair to say that, you know, you would see a similar case with the new 10,800 eligibility kids that are eligible? I mean, not all the kids are going to--

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Not all of them will be billed time.

WALZ: --not all will take this, right. OK. All right. Thank you for
clarifying that.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Good morning. Since Senator Day asked about
the TANF funds and the plan and I've heard a couple of things, but I
didn't hear \$90 million worth of a plan. And so this committee has
asked previously of previous people in your position for the plan. And
as we heard from Mr. Smith from Appleseed, we have been asking for
what is the plan. So my first question to you is, can you please
provide us with the detailed plan as follow-up to this hearing? I
think we all would very much like to know how it is that \$90 million
are being spent without the Legislature's input. I think that's really
critical because that is part of our job. My question about your
testimony is you said DHHS is unable to support legislation that will
cost millions of state dollars for implementation. So this is where we
always come in this back and forth is that the department comes and
testifies in opposition to something and it's because of the cost. But
it is not actually your job to worry about the cost. It is our job to
worry about the cost. It is our job to appropriate the funds for you
to do your job. So if that is your opposition, then that shouldn't be
your opposition. So are you opposed to more children having access to
this program?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: The way that this legislation is written--

M. CAVANAUGH: Are you opposed to more children having access to the
program is my question, not anything about how this is written.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I think the program is a great program. I think
childcare is in a very, very important thing for-- and one of the
testifiers prior to me really talked about just the importance of that
age in the development of children.

M. CAVANAUGH: So instead of coming in opposition because of the cost,
why not come and work with us and work with Senator DeBoer on
implementing this program as fully as we possibly can to impact the
lives of as many children as possible?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So we are certainly happy to sit down with Senator DeBoer and talk through questions that we might have or what some of our concerns are.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. I mean, the concern seems to be the cost. And-- and it also--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Absolutely.

M. CAVANAUGH: --my concern as a legislator is that the department has come in and told us that you are spending \$90 million without our input. I see an RFP for this Fatherhood program for \$2 million that seems to completely disregard all of the legislation that we as a body have been putting forward. It's talking about marriage, which I don't know what the state has a responsibility to get involved in people's marriages, financial stability while allowing parents to work and put their child in a safe and secure childcare. It seems like the path towards financial stability and you're doing these programs without any input from us. But then you're coming in, in opposition to childcare programs. You're coming in opposition to maternal health programs. You're coming in opposition to SNAP programs. I'm just really confused as to what the department is doing and why the department thinks that they have the authority to spend this money without our insights.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So our decisions to fund these programs have really been based on data and what we're seeing around kids coming into the deeper end of the system. So the Fatherhood program really is focused on, you know, really equipping fathers for-- for economic financial employment, really supporting that, their ability to parent and care for vulnerable kids. Ultimately, what we are hoping to do is to look at what are the issues that are facing families in Nebraska today.

M. CAVANAUGH: The first-- the first program goal is to sustain marriages.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Part of the Responsible Fatherhood and Healthy Marriage Initiative is definitely to build a family, healthy family structure, yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: That is, I mean, that is actually very galling that the state would put forward a program to sustain marriages in a Fatherhood

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

program. Families look all shapes and sizes, and you've decided to dedicate resources to a specific type of family, a nuclear family, in a cisgender, traditional role and-- and at the expense of putting children into safe childcare. We could take that money and put it towards this instead.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So that.

M. CAVANAUGH: And the results would be much more tangible than sustaining marriages.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So, Senator, I have quite a bit of experience with Fatherhood Initiatives and really the design of a Fatherhood Initiative and the focus of a Fatherhood Initiative is really to support family. And family comes in all shapes and sizes.

M. CAVANAUGH: It does. And there are great fatherhood programs in this state run by nonprofits.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: And there are-- and that's the solicitation for the services, the RFP. We did solicit bids and some of those very programs bid on that.

M. CAVANAUGH: And the pregnancy bids that you serviced, were those from healthcare organizations? Was there a healthcare requirement?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So those--

M. CAVANAUGH: Was there evidence-based practices?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So those bids are out right now.

M. CAVANAUGH: And-- but is there a requirement for them to be evidence-based and healthcare related?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I can look at the details of the RFA.

M. CAVANAUGH: I'm pretty certain that they are not. I'm just-- I'm really concerned. I'm concerned by your opposition. I'm concerned by \$90 million being basically a slush fund for the Department of Health and Human Services. I'm concerned that you're starting programs without any input or insights from this committee or this legislative body. I'm concerned that you continue to come in opposition to

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

programs that various senators have introduced to support families and children. And at the same time, you're making plans without discussing them with us. And this continues to put us in a really bad position as a state. The Department of Health and Human Services should not have this slush fund. You should not be working in isolation.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: And I can say that I do not believe we are working in isolation. When we look at the data [INAUDIBLE]

M. CAVANAUGH: Does anyone on this committee know what your plan is for that \$90 million?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I do not know that they do.

M. CAVANAUGH: Have you communicated it to any person on this committee?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I have not.

M. CAVANAUGH: Then I would say you are working in isolation. Thank you.

ARCH: Any other questions? I do have one. It was-- it was testified earlier that in 2018 Congress doubled the funding for childcare-- for the Child Care Block Grant. Is that-- did-- did Nebraska experience that, a doubling of funding?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: No. In 2018, we did get, and this is a rough number, but approximately \$12 million. Based on legislation and requirements that came in 2014, I think it was 2014, where they were, I referenced it as a mandate federally that we didn't have dollars that followed, those came in 2018 and we have had \$12 million each year. But there's no guarantee that that \$12 million will continue. But it was intended to support states in implementing what they had passed in '14 for us to do.

ARCH: Which is then what we implemented in LB677 I believe was what it was. No, I'm sorry, LB341, LB341. So at any rate, OK, so-- so I-- I have had the privilege of being in some of those discussions of the plan for the TANF rainy day fund. Why do they call it a rainy day fund?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I'm not sure why it's called the rainy day fund.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: It sounds like it's going to rain at some point. But-- but I-- I've been, with your predecessor, I was in some of those meetings and-- and it was confusing. It was confusing as to what the plan is for the expenditure of those dollars and-- and the best way to do that. So I think it would be beneficial to to have some input and some-- and some discussion on that-- on that plan for the rainy day fund. And-- and if-- and-- and for the maybe a little more clarity on the-- on the block grant as well, exactly how that's-- that's being expended as well. And that would help us in understanding LB485 as well so.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Wonderful. Thank you, Senator.

ARCH: Right. Well, seeing no other questions, thank you very much for your testimony.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Thank you.

ARCH: Are there other opponents for LB485? Seeing none, is there anyone that would like to testify in a neutral capacity? Seeing none, Senator DeBoer, you're welcome to close. And while you're coming up, I will-- I will say that we have received six letters as proponents and one letter as an opponent. And as far as written testimony received this morning, proponents, all proponents: Women's Fund of Omaha, ACLU of Nebraska, Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, Voices for Children, and Children and Family Coalition of Nebraska. And you're welcome to close.

DeBOER: Thank you very much, Senator Arch. So first, I'll say that the department did have a meeting with me yesterday, but unfortunately, I was in a bill that I was presenting that went over the lunch hour and I was unable to attend that meeting. So there was a little bit there where I apologize for that and I will meet with them in the future. I just was introducing a bill and couldn't when we had our meeting set. The technical correction on page 2 I will-- I will certainly do something about that or I can help you with that. I intend to work with the department. I think we can-- can work on finding something because I think this is such an important issue in our state for our workforce, for our parents, for all of our families. But I-- I will say I do share a bit of a concern if we have \$90 million that are going to be spent without going through the appropriations process. So, you know, I have a little bit of a concern there. So I'll look

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

into that, you know, and see what's going on with that. So see what I can come up with, happy to work with the committee if they have concerns and just work forward on this bill.

ARCH: Thank you. Any final questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. This will close the hearing for LB485 and we will open the hearing for LB677, Senator Linehan. Welcome.

LINEHAN: Good morning, Chairman Arch and Health and Human Services Committee. I think you just had this hearing. There's-- I slipped up here with this bill. What I was trying to do is I am-- I understand. I got six grandchildren. I understand daycare is critically important. One of my concerns when we do these kinds of bills is it's based on your income and you have a lot of young families whose income looks significant, but their actual money that they have to spend because of high student loan costs is significantly less than what their income taxes say. So when I asked to look into this, what I had asked for is if we could take into consideration what student loan costs were when we figure out who should get subsidized, because you could have-- you could have a teacher who's married to a nurse who both of them have \$100,000, well, maybe not 100, \$50,000 apiece in student loans. And if you look at their salaries, they wouldn't qualify for anything. But if you took out their student loans, they would be well within qualifying. So that's one thing I would just ask the committee if you're going to do anything on this to look at. The other thing that has happened since I worked with this, and I, I'm sure some of you have the same situation happening in your families, because of the CARES Act, I think the first CARES Act went to families, it was \$1,200 per adult, \$500 per child. So that was last fall, late fall. Then in 1st of January, at least in my family, everybody, and not all of them, some of them are above \$75,000, but most of mine got \$600 per person in a family. And now the way I understand by looking at the papers and the Biden administration and the Congress are talking about \$300 for each child, each family and a tax credit, and they're even talking about prorating it ahead of time starting in June. That seems to me like it's on its way. And I actually think that kind of help the families, a tax credit, refundable tax credit. So it's like the earned income tax credit. Even if you don't owe any income taxes, you're going to get \$300 for every child in the household up to I think it starts tabling off at pretty significant income levels. And I think those programs are probably better than subsidies for daycare. You

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

actually get the money in the parents' hands so the parents can make
the decision so.

ARCH: OK. Are there questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

LINEHAN: Thank you.

ARCH: Are you going to stay to close?

LINEHAN: We'll see.

ARCH: OK, OK.

LINEHAN: I'd like to.

ARCH: First proponent for LB677. Seeing none, are there any opponents?

ADAM FESER: I was a proponent. I thought someone else was going.

ARCH: I'm sorry.

ADAM FESER: I'm a proponent.

ARCH: A proponent.

ADAM FESER: I thought someone else was ahead of me. I apologize.

ARCH: OK, please.

ADAM FESER: Hi, my name is Adam Feser, A-d-a-m F-e-s-e-r, and I'm a
policy advisor representing First Five Nebraska. I feel like we went
over a lot of what this bill would do with bumping from 185 to 200
percent federal poverty level. We just want to come in in support of
it, because regardless of what happens LB485, this would still be a
good thing. We do support moving the upper level of subsidy
eligibility to 200 percent federal poverty level. I feel like we went
into cliff effect a good deal on the last-- the last hearing. This is
still the cliff effect portion of that bill. We still support it. I
don't want to spend time going over all the same things. So I was
going to say I support it and see if you had any additional questions
about LB677.

***KATIE ZULKOSKI:** Chairperson Arch and members of the Health and Human
Services Committee, my name is Katie Zulkoski, and I am testifying on

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

behalf of the Women's Fund of Omaha in support of LB677, to allow low-income families to work their way to financial stability by increasing income eligibility for child care assistance. We can meet the workforce needs of our businesses, support full participation in the economy, and increase the financial freedom of families and communities by investing in affordable child care. Nebraska parents, especially mothers, are highly employed - nearly 80% of Nebraska children have a mother in the workforce. Most working parents, but especially those working in low-wage jobs, struggle to afford the high cost of child care, and women make up much of the low-wage workforce in our state (69.9%). LB677 is critical to help low-income mothers work their way to financial stability - lessening the disincentive to turn down promotions or refuse additional hours out of fear of losing child care assistance, also known as the "cliff effect." In Nebraska, women represent almost half of the full-time workers in the state, and 79.6% of children in our state have mothers in the labor force. According to a Gallup report entitled "Women in America: Work and Life Well-Lived," the number one factor that has the greatest influence on a woman's decision to stay in the workforce or leave is children. When asked about the most influential factor keeping mothers out of the workforce, 46% of women responded with the high cost of child care (27% cited cost of child care as a major reason, 19% as a minor reason. By increasing the income level at which working parents will transition off of child care assistance, we can increase the likelihood that a working parent can accept a raise or work more hours without losing their much-needed child care support. Currently, a working single mother with one child will lose child care assistance (after the initial 12-month continuous eligibility period) if their gross monthly income exceeds \$2,658 (or \$31,894 annually). At this level of income, this working mother would be responsible for a monthly \$186 fee to their child care provider, and the child care assistance program would cover the remainder of the cost. If a currently eligible working single mother would take a 25 cent per hour raise at work - earning roughly \$40 more per month - that mother would lose access to child care assistance and go from paying \$186/month for child care to the full monthly cost without assistance, which is a little less than \$1,000 on average. Under these circumstances, it doesn't make financial sense to take the raise or work more hours because it makes a family worse off financially. LB677 seeks to ensure that when families transition off of assistance, they are better able to afford the cost of child care on their own. Having the ability to accept

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

promotions and income increases without losing child care assistance makes it possible for women to work their way off of assistance. Please support the economic stability of families by increasing transitional eligibility for child care.

***BRUCE BOHRER:** Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Bruce Bohrer. I am a registered lobbyist for the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on behalf of the Lincoln Chamber in support of LB677, which seeks to address the child care "cliff effect" by allowing families to qualify for transitional child care assistance if their income is less than 200% of the federal poverty level. The Lincoln Chamber supports LB677 because we seek workforce development efforts as multi-faceted. Efforts run the gamut; including in-house talent attraction efforts at businesses, collaborative industry efforts, and community efforts and policies that give companies more options to engage in talent retention/recruitment. Our efforts also must prioritize support for families in need who struggle with childcare expenses while advancing in the workforce. The Lincoln Chamber has understood for a long time that our community values also attract and retain talent. Lincoln - and we know this is true of our entire state - is a community that values work, values families and values striving for improvement. The Lincoln business community shares these values. We understand that efforts at workforce development also should include support for individuals and their efforts to learn new skills and gain new knowledge, thereby advancing in their careers. The Lincoln Chamber views LB677 as part of the broader effort for workforce development. The Lincoln Chamber is proud to join the many other business-related groups who support LB677. We appreciate and thank Senator Linehan for introducing LB677 and urge you to advance this worthy proposal to the full Legislature for debate. Thank you for your consideration.

***JULIE ERICKSON:** Thank you Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Julie Erickson and I am representing Voices for Children in Nebraska in support of LB677. LB677 increases eligibility for transitional child care, or child care provided to those who are already participating in the child care subsidy program. This helps ensure a more gradual transition to affording the full cost of child care without assistance. The Legislature has made several improvements to ongoing eligibility for child care assistance in recent years and LB677 takes it a step

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

further by increasing ongoing eligibility to 200% of the federal poverty line, currently around \$52,000 annually for a family of four. Increasing ongoing eligibility for child care ensures that working parents can seek higher paying jobs while still being able to afford the high cost of care. We urge the committee to advance LB677. Thank you.

ARCH: Any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. Other proponents for LB677? Seeing none, is there anyone that would like to testify in opposition to LB677?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Good morning, Chairperson Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Stephanie Beasley, S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e B-e-a-s-l-e-y, and I serve as the director for the Division of Children and Family Services within the Department of Health and Human Services. I'm here to testify in opposition of-- to LB677, which would increase the eligibility limit for transitional childcare assistance care assistance from 185 percent of the federal poverty level to 200 percent FPL. Legislation passed in 2019 provided for expansion of transitional childcare through the Child Care Development Fund. The 2019 legislation removed the 24-month time limitation on transitional childcare assistance and presently allows families to gradually increase their income during their 12-month eligibility period as long as their income does not exceed 85 percent of the state median income. DHHS has worked through this pandemic internally and with external partners to be responsive to the impact of the pandemic on childcare providers and working families who rely on childcare subsidy agreement or assistance. The handout provided alongside this testimony also summarizes actions DHHS has taken to support working families. For example, as a growing number of schools decided to offer remote learning, DHHS allowed childcare providers to bill for the subsidy while assisting children with remote learning. This created the opportunity for children to be assisted in remote learning while parents were able to continue working. DHHS anticipates that increasing the redetermination income limit would increase the number of households remaining eligible for childcare subsidy by approximately 856, and the number of children eligible for childcare subsidy by approximately 1,703. The addition of 1,703 eligible children would result in an estimated subsidy cost impacts of an additional \$3,967,560 in fiscal year '21-22 and \$5,290,080 in fiscal year '22-23. LB677 would increase income limits for families of eligibility redetermination, allowing families with higher income to

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

remain eligible for childcare subsidy. However, in doing so, it would require Nebraska to invest additional state General Funds for the childcare subsidy program to implement and sustain this change. Due to the significant fiscal impact, DHHS opposes moving this legislation forward. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thanks for being here again. First, I'll just say same concerns as last time on the opposition, just for the record. We don't have to have that conversation twice. The CARES Act dollars, is that what this attachment is?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Could you maybe walk us through this a little bit more detail?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Certainly. And I think what-- so the very first thing, Senator, also I did confirm for the last question that you had, that the TANF plan has been provided to the Legislative Fiscal Office so-- but we will make sure that it finds its way to all of you. So-- so that if you-- if you look at this first grid right here, it sort of outlines in March of 2020 additional childcare hours and units were added. Then it goes into what was added in 2020 or in April of 2020 around in-home childcare was an alternative to transitional childcare; subsidy was able to claim up to the amount of hours authorized if the child was not in attendance. So again, you get into this, you know, absent days were not capped at that point. And so they were able to bill that. And then in July, CARES Act dollars were made available for childcare providers. And we were at about \$20 million for the CARES Act dollars. And you'll see the grid on the top of the second page that really outlines how those were allocated and are being expended. And then again in August, several schools continued remote learning when they resumed. And so we notified providers that they could bill childcare subsidy during that time if they were assisting children with remote learning. So when you get into the CARES relief package, so those-- that early part, as soon as the pandemic hit, these were early reliefs that we worked to provide. Governor gave executive order that allowed us to do some of these pieces and then we get into the CARES relief package. And so if you flip to the second half of the

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

second page, there's a grid that tells you how those were obligated, how those have been expended, and what has-- what remains to date. And so there were some like stabilization grant funds. We had providers who had had difficulty. Obviously, they had lost revenue. They had difficulty keeping their doors open or even on the-- on number three, they had to close, but intended to reopen, but they needed some more support to do so. So these were ideas that were put together by a collaborative that said this is what we're hearing. This is what we see the biggest needs are. We partnered with NCFE and a couple others. And this-- this was really what was designed and proposed. And so these are the CARES dollars thus far that we were given in July.

M. CAVANAUGH: So the unspent dollars, some of these seem like they might not, just based on how long we've been in the pandemic, like the number three, we've spent \$60,000, but we have \$940,000. So if-- if those dollars continue to maintain at that-- at that rate, is there a plan to reabsorb them into one of these other categories?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: To redistribute, we could do that, absolutely.

M. CAVANAUGH: So this \$20 million will be spent in one of these categories.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes and we have a period of time to spend this. It's--

M. CAVANAUGH: And what-- how long-- forgive me, I know we had until December and then it was extended. So how long do we have to spend these dollars?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I can get the answer for you on that. I think it's three years, but I will-- I'll verify.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Murman.

MURMAN: Thank you, Senator Arch, and thank you, Ms. Beasley, for coming in and testifying. I think statistics show that overwhelmingly children do better if they're at home with their father and mother, two parents, do better in school, do better in society, and do better, have less behavioral health problems. So I applaud you for your support of families. Do you agree with what I just said?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I think that data would show that-- that having too
involved parents, right, is certainly a win for kids. Yes.

MURMAN: And on your previous-- the testimony on the previous bill, I
think you testified that there was, I'm not sure if it's families or
children, 20,000 eligible and I think 12,000 took the funding or
received the funding.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes, who are-- Yes, yes, Senator.

MURMAN: Would it be more fair if the families or the children that
didn't receive the funding also received funding because their one or
two parents, probably most likely two parents, stay home and take care
of their, their own kids? Would that be more fair if they also
received funding?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yeah, so, Senator, thanks for that question. It's
been a question that we've-- we've discussed at CFS. We really don't
know. They're authorized, they're eligible to receive childcare
subsidy. What we don't know is why they aren't doing it. And so is it
that they're utilizing family, they have made arrangements within
their family to, you know, one parent covers a different time, but but
ultimately, we're not sure why they're not utilizing. The fiscal
notes, etcetera, that we put together are based on those who are
utilizing the childcare subsidy, not those who are authorized. And so
but-- but certainly they're eligible, but we don't know why they are
not using it.

MURMAN: OK, thank you very much.

ARCH: Thank you. Other questions? I have one. On the last page of your
handout here, you talk about relief package II. It appears as though
the state will receive another \$60 million that can be used and it
identifies the five bullets below, Funds may be used for these, these
various things. And you are-- you are to provide a plan.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes.

ARCH: Of how these funds will be spent within 60 days of enactment. So
is that 60 days from December 27 when the bill was passed? What-- but
you didn't receive notice, official notice until February 3 so you
didn't know the amount of money. Do you-- do you have a 60-day clock
running right now from December 27?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I'm not sure what the due date is, but I can confirm that. But I know the team is working on a plan. We had estimates that we believed we might receive, and so they have been working on how that-- how that could be expended. But we don't-- we didn't have guidance.

ARCH: We didn't have the exact number.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: And we didn't have federal guidance on exactly what could be expended upon.

ARCH: But this-- but this is a one-time-- this-- this is a one-time grant.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes.

ARCH: That-- and it says here the funds must be obligated by 9-30 of 2023. So you've got a couple of years. You've got a couple of years to spend the dollars, but there'll be \$60 million there to spend in some type of childcare support.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes.

ARCH: Correct?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes, Senator.

ARCH: Well, I would-- I would say that when you, when you finalize that spending plan, that would be-- that would be another plan that we would-- we really appreciate seeing so we-- so we know what the-- what the department intends to do with that \$60 million. And-- and if, yeah. That-- that would be-- that would be helpful.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Certainly, Senator. Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Thank you, Senator.

ARCH: Any other opponents for LB677? Seeing none, are there-- is there anyone that would like testify in a neutral capacity? Seeing none, written testimony received this morning from-- as proponents: Women's

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

Fund of Omaha, Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, and Voices for Children. And-- if I can find my piece of paper. OK, I just had it. Lost my piece of paper. Geri, do you have another-- do you have-- you have another one on letters in support/opposition for LB677? Did we receive anything? Sorry, I misplaced that piece of paper. Find it after the hearing. Thank you. Yes, four proponents for LB677 letters of support, no opponents, and no neutral. Senator Linehan has waived-- has waived close on LB677. So this will close the hearing for this bill. We will now open the hearing for LB68. And Senator Day, you are welcome to open.

DAY: Good morning, Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Jen Day, that's J-e-n D-a-y, and I represent Legislative District 49, which covers northwestern Sarpy County, including the areas of Gretna, southern Millard, and western Papillion and La Vista. I'm excited to be back in person today and here this morning to introduce LB68. This legislation makes permanent an executive order made by Governor Ricketts that changed the state's childcare subsidy program from one based on the attendance of the-- of the child to one based on the enrollment of the child in the program. This was done to stabilize Nebraska's childcare system in the un-- during the unprecedented uncertainty that providers were facing, with some losing as many as 40 percent of their enrollees overnight. In April when the executive order was implemented, Governor Ricketts stated that these changes would help ensure continued access to high-quality childcare, provide new job opportunities, and support local communities by making sure Nebraska has a strong childcare network throughout the state. He's been proven correct. It's important to note that this policy has been successful and served its intended purpose, with 59 percent of Nebraska childcare providers reporting that they had used this temporary rule change. Simply put, this policy is strengthening our childcare system by stabilizing payments to providers and providing access to care for working parents. I have a fact sheet here if I could get a page. Thank you. This change was seamlessly implemented in part because it mirrors common billing practice in nonsubsidized childcare. The majority of childcare businesses bill families based on enrollment rather than by the days that their child attends. Our state childcare regulations make it difficult for providers to hold spots open for children that may only be in attendance 16 of the 22 business days a month, while-- while all of the providers' fixed costs, such as staffing and facility expenses,

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

remain the same, whether the child is in attendance that day or not. Some providers do attempt to navigate this. However, many providers operate within tight margins and cannot balance this patchwork of reimbursement against their limited attendance slots and fixed costs. This issue resulted in many of our state's childcare providers declining to serve families participating in the childcare subsidy program. Having our state childcare subsidy structured in a way that disincentivizes participation of providers undermines the main objective of the program, which is to make it easier for parents to find and maintain childcare so that they can continue employment. In addition to the benefits for parents and children, this change is important for providers as well, and would come at a critical time in the health of Nebraska's childcare system. In the Buffett Early Childhood Institute's 2020 Early Care and Education Provider Survey conducted in August, nearly half of all respondents reported that they were at serious risk of permanent closure due to the pandemic. Our childcare system has been hit especially hard by COVID, and this kind of economic fallout will take time to repair. Our providers will need stability while the workforce economy recovers after the COVID-19 emergency. I recognize that the fiscal note on this bill-- on this bill may cause initial concerns for some of you. But I would ask you to consider the strong likelihood of more available federal funds to support the increase in LB68. In the current version of the next round of COVID relief legislation that just passed the first round vote in the Senate, there's a \$15 billion increase in the Child Care and Development Block Grant. Additionally, the Republican stimulus proposal contains an even larger increase in the Child Care Development Block Grant at \$20 billion. Federal aid for the childcare industry has strong bipartisan support and is likely to be implemented in the upcoming relief legislation, regardless of compromise on part of Democrats or Republicans. To put the aforementioned 15 and 20 billion in perspective, the first round of CARES Act funding only included \$3.5 billion in Child Care Development Block Grant increases. So it's reasonable to-- reasonable to expect that our state will be looking at significant flexibility in funding in this area, and it's likely we won't have to dip into General Funds for this bill. It's also worth mentioning that since September 2019, the state Department of Health and Human Services has allowed a child in the program to miss up to five days a month while still being reimbursed. We think this is a good regulatory step and applaud this move. But this also gives us reason to believe that looking at the full 12-month cycle in

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

the fiscal note that covers the period before and after this change might have led to a higher cost projection. That being said, we as a Legislature have had long stretches where we've underfunded our childcare system in the past and there were already strains in the system before COVID. Lastly, it would also serve us well to think about these funds in the broader context of economic concerns. In August, the University of Nebraska Bureau of Business Research found that a lack of affordable childcare for parents had significant effects on productivity, resulting in losses and increased costs for businesses that stem from parents having to call in sick, reduce hours, or quit jobs. Statewide, this reduced income by \$639 million, which resulted in a direct net decrease in state taxes of \$21.1 million. This program could be compounded as we-- as we reopen, as according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 32 percent of employers have seen employees leave the workforce because of childcare and health concerns. In this context of a potential statewide crisis, in the event that we let childcare providers fail, I consider a \$26 million fiscal note much easier to digest. The best part of LB68 is we already have evidence that it's working well and providing an essential lifeline to providers and parents. Let's take this opportunity to solidify this new stability in our state's childcare system and move LB68 forward. And with that, I will answer any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions for Senator Day? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thank you, Senator Day. I have to admit that even though I've worked in childcare and I have children in childcare, it took this pandemic for me to know that we weren't doing the reimbursement based on registration, but based on attendance, which how do you run a business like that? You-- you own a gym.

DAY: Right, right.

M. CAVANAUGH: You have monthly fees, right?

DAY: Right.

M. CAVANAUGH: So if somebody comes once or comes 30 times.

DAY: Would they still pay the same amount?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

DAY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: That's how you--

DAY: It would be impossible to.

M. CAVANAUGH: Run a business.

DAY: --have any kind of projections for income when it's based on-- if
it were to be based on a daily payment versus a monthly type payment.
And I don't know how some childcare providers do that. Again, I didn't
know this until the pandemic either. And I also used to work in
childcare. So I see it as very problematic--

M. CAVANAUGH: So--

DAY: --that this is how we pay providers.

M. CAVANAUGH: --some of the numbers that you talked about. You said
that this results in \$639 million annually in wages that we're missing
or could you--

DAY: Correct.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

DAY: Yeah.

M. CAVANAUGH: And so that's \$21.1 million annually--

DAY: In--

M. CAVANAUGH: --Income tax.

DAY: Correct. Lost.

M. CAVANAUGH: Lost for the state.

DAY: Correct.

M. CAVANAUGH: And so assumedly that also would include sales tax,
because if \$639 million are not being made in income,--

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

DAY: Then they're not spending--

M. CAVANAUGH: --you're not spending.

DAY: --the money.

M. CAVANAUGH: And then additionally,--

DAY: Right.

M. CAVANAUGH: --if you're not making that income, you're likely
receiving other social benefits, such as SNAP.

DAY: Right.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. So just interesting. Just the \$21 million alone is
almost the same as the fiscal note.

DAY: It would pay essentially.

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

DAY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, thank you.

DAY: Yeah. Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. First
proponent for LB68.

ADAM FESER: Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services
Committee, my name is Adam Feser, A-d-a-m F-e-s-e-r, policy adviser
representing First Five Nebraska. I'm grateful to have the opportunity
to speak in support of LB68 and to thank Senator Jen Day for
introducing this bill. We believe LB68 would be a positive development
for childcare providers and children at risk in Nebraska. As you know,
childcare marketplace offers relatively little financial security for
early childhood professionals who own and operate their own programs.
For these businesses to thrive, they need reliable sources of revenue.
Typically, providers bill families for enrollment rather than
attendance. As a father of three little guys, I can tell you that's
definitely a fact. So you pay for the slot regardless of whether or
not your child's there. You go on a trip or whatever it may be, maybe

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

a child is sick, you're still paying for your slot. So this creates a consistent revenue stream that enables childcare owners to pay staff, rent, mortgage, utilities and then any other business expenses they have. However, for providers who care for children through the childcare subsidy, those children that are most at risk of falling behind before kindergarten, they're only able to bill subsidy for the hours the children are in attendance. And I should also mention that, I think Senator Day mentioned it. But the new regs will allow for billing for-- for up to five absence days after this executive order expires after the emergency declaration, definitely a step in the right direction. But that means providers who accept the subsidy can experience considerable uncertainty in their cash flow when subsidy-eligible-- eligible children are absent or family schedules change. As a result, many providers are disinclined to accept subsidy or they may limit the number of slots that they have for subsidy children. That creates a greater burden for the families to try to find it, but also reduces the amount of quality providers willing to accept it. If you have the ability to have a waitlist with all private pay families, what's your incentive to accept subsidy when it's greater administrative burden and also more uncertain? So we did have some letters that were submitted. I wanted to highlight some of the language from one from Adrienne Agulla, who owns Hamilton Heights Child Development Centers. She wasn't able to testify today, but I thought she did a really nice job of laying some of this out. So our centers are for profit and operate at extremely thin profit margins, under 10 percent, even the best of times. Our break even point is roughly 80 percent utilization. So that means there is the percentage of capacity before they get full payment. So if they have-- if you have 80 percent of your capacity at full-time slot payment, then you're-- they're breaking even. Because utilization is so critical, private pay families must commit to pay their weekly tuition regardless of attendance. The current model of only reimbursing subsidy providers for attendance makes it risky for providers to enroll children who use it. Their enrollment occupies a full spot of capacity, while often not returning a full slot of tuition. This presents variability in the business model that is unsustainable at thin profit margins. So that was from a letter. You have the letters that I just really wanted to highlight that because I thought she did a really nice job of provider's perspective how it matters. So LB68 would address this concern and make it financially safer for childcare businesses to accept childcare subsidy. I also wanted to thank

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

Governor Pete Ricketts and Child Development Fund team for their various efforts to minimize childcare closures in the pandemic. And you've heard about a lot of these things today, particularly Executive Order number 20-18, which enacted this very policy we're talking about. There's also provider grant support for PPE, things like that. LB68 offers the opportunity to continue this insightful policy and enhance our early childhood infrastructure overall. Access to quality care in the early years has positive lasting impacts, particularly for children at risk. LB68 removes a barrier to quality providers accepting the subsidy and supports those who already do. We hope you will advance LB68 to General File. With that, I'll open myself up to any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. I have a really important question. Did your new colleague inform you that you were testifying in front of the best committee in the Legislature?

ADAM FESER: I, I think not not to be a kiss up or anything, but I already agreed. I already knew all that with all my experience in here. But, yeah, we were extremely pleased to have former Chairwoman Howard on our staff. And she brings a ton of experience and knowledge that-- more than I'll be able to accumulate in decades I'm sure, so we are pleased with that. Thank you.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you for your testimony.

ARCH: I do have a question.

ADAM FESER: Sure.

ARCH: You mentioned that the new regs will pay for five absent days. These are regs. These are proposed regs that are in process?

ADAM FESER: They have been approved, I believe. But they-- they've been approved. But that won't go into effect until after the executive order is no longer operative, which would be 30 days after the emergency declaration is lifted.

ARCH: So then roughly 23 days of day care in a month. I mean, assuming a five-day, a five-day schedule could vary. But a five-day schedule,

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

roughly 23 days. So 5 out of 23 days could be absent. And so then--
then it would be paid then at that.

ADAM FESER: And I think so one-- one other-- one difference in here
would be say the amount of hours you're in childcare for a day might
be not absent, but it might not be the full amount you were hoping
for. So that would be one difference. Another difference would be
there's an administrative burden to having to track hours. And so for
some providers that have a lot of subsidy children, that means trying
to have a staff person to do it because it's a lot to track. But I
also-- I think that might be a worthwhile question to ask. If they're
already planning to allow for billing up to five absences, that seems
like the note might be larger than it would have to be if they're
already planning on that. But that-- you could-- that would be
something, I guess, for the department.

ARCH: OK. All right. Thank you. Next proponent, please. Welcome.

NICK BROTZEL: Thanks. Chairman Arch and members of the Health and
Human Services Committee, my name is Nick Brotzel, that's N-i-c-k

ARCH: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

NICK BROTZEL: Sorry, we'll try this.

ARCH: OK.

NICK BROTZEL: My name is Nick Brotzel, that's N-i-c-k B-r-o-t-z-e-l.
And I'm here on behalf of the Children's Respite Care Center, or CRCC,
here to testify in support of LB68. And I want to thank Senator Day
for offering this bill and for her strong leadership and advocacy on
behalf of Nebraska children and early childhood educators. A bit just
briefly about CRCC. We provide comprehensive educational, nursing, and
therapeutic care for children with special needs through behavioral
health day and weekend programs. The children we serve have among the
most medically complex care needs in the region, needs which cannot be
met in traditional care settings. We are in many cases the only option
for many of the families we serve. Upwards of 30 percent of our daily
day program census, or approximately 200 children, is comprised of
clients served by the Nebraska childcare subsidy program. Now, as you
can imagine, the COVID-19 pandemic has had an outsized impact on the
families we serve, given the medical fragility of the children in our

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

care. Now, by way of reference, our census in May 2019, this is a daily census, number 196 clients. Our census in May 2020 numbered 96. While our census has stabilized since the early days of the pandemic, our monthly enrollment numbers remain down by over 20 percent when compared to the previous year, and we are not alone. As the members of this committee are all too well aware, the early childhood care industry in Nebraska is in crisis. According to numbers released in June of last year, the state of Nebraska has realized a 24 percent decrease in the number of children being served by childcare subsidies. As we've heard from Senator Day and the testifier before me, the economic impact of these childcare closures cannot be overstated. A lack of affordable childcare options means that Nebraska wage earners are leaving the workforce. And keep in mind, as I know you all do, Nebraska is home to among the highest percentage of dual wage earners in the nation. And even those families who have up to now successfully juggled full time employment, in-home learning, and childcare will be forced to make difficult decisions as they are asked to return to traditional work settings in the coming days and months. Make no mistake, our state cannot effectively reopen and our state's economy will not fully recover without the help of a robust childcare system. LB68 more closely aligns Nebraska to childcare subsidy billing practices in states across our region especially, and we think this is really critical, as it relates to children with chronic health conditions. I ask that you please vote to move LB68 out of committee and on to the full body for debate. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today, and I'm happy to try to address any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: I just feel like I have to ask this testifier some questions. First of all, how was drop-off this morning?

NICK BROTZEL: It was good. Yeah, thanks.

M. CAVANAUGH: Any fits?

NICK BROTZEL: No. Everyone was great. They knew we both had to be here today.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, that's good. I'm glad. I know so much about this because of most of what you said today and because I've heard from

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

your work and I've seen firsthand how this has impacted the population
that you serve. So thanks for being here.

NICK BROTZEL: Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your
testimony. Next proponent for LB68. Welcome back.

QUENTIN BROWN: Hi. Thanks for having me back. Quentin Brown,
Q-u-e-n-t-i-n B-r-o-w-n, still with Educare Lincoln. And as I shared
earlier, Educare is a quality early childcare. Oh, actually, thank you
again for having me back and Chairperson and committee. But as I said
earlier, Educare Lincoln is a quality early childcare education
program, serving over 165 children and their families with
high-quality supports. And we employ over 55 dedicated teachers and
other professionals. We are able to sustain our work thanks to
generous funders, supporters, partners, and various funding streams
like childcare subsidy, all of which depend on organizations like ours
to enroll as many children and families as we can and support them on
the way to lifelong success. And I am more than confident saying that
despite a challenging year, we have all demonstrated our ability to
step up to that challenge. What we cannot afford is for funding
sources to unintentionally burden us financially for children who are
physically absent due to any number of credible short-term factors.
And I certainly get it. For some, the argument may be if customers and
clients aren't there, why are they paying? And I can hear that
question in the atmosphere, so to speak. But the fact is, for our team
of professionals, they are not just doing this work because they have
to. It's because they care. So whether it's reaching out to understand
why a child is absent for a day or a few days, sending home a care
package or learning activity or a number of other contacts that we
routinely make, our team is still working on behalf of that child or
children, even when they are not physically present. I appreciate the
executive order by Governor Ricketts in April of 2020, which allowed
for enrollment-based reimbursement on a temporary basis. It without
question sustained a number of organizations like ours during the
critical work of supporting our local workforce. As similar to my
prior testimony, I ask that you look favorably-- favorably upon LB68,
as it will extend the benefits of the recent executive order allowing
Educare and many other organizations to continue doing the work that
we all now realize we depend so heavily on. Thank you.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions? Seeing none, thank you very
much--

QUENTIN BROWN: Thank you all.

ARCH: --for your testimony. Next proponent for LB68. Welcome.

AMARA MADSEN: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Arch and members of
the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Amara Madsen,
that's A-m-a-r-a M-a-d-s-e-n, and I'm a service director at CEDARS
Youth Services, a child welfare organization that works to ensure that
all kids have a safe environment where they can grow and thrive.
CEDARS is in strong support of LB68, and we'd like to thank Senator
Day for introducing this legislation. Within our vast array of
services for children and families. CEDARS operates three programs
here in Lincoln that are eligible to receive payment through the
childcare subsidy program. These include our early childhood
development center on North 27th Street and the Community Learning
Centers at both Clinton and Hartley elementary schools. All three of
these programs are state licensed and nationally accredited programs
that provide early and ongoing developmental opportunities in an
inclusive environment to help provide a foundation for lifelong
learning and success. Last year, CEDARS served 139 children in these
three early childhood and school-age childcare programs; 63 percent or
a total of 87 children served in the last year received childcare
subsidy. As such, our agency is impacted by the changes proposed in
LB68 and believes that they are a positive and important step toward
improving access to quality care and education for children in
low-income families. As you've heard, the proposal in LB68 would make
permanent a change that has been in place during the current COVID
emergency. And our center and the families we've been able to continue
serving have experienced the benefits of this change firsthand.
Whether or not a child is attending our childcare center that day, we
have held a spot for that child and have invested in the
infrastructure to provide that child a first-class education and
quality care. If a child comes to our facility through a private pay
family, we rely on that family paying per day their child is enrolled,
not per day their child attends. And that same policy only makes sense
for kids receiving childcare assistance. A model in which providers
are only reimbursed when a child attends care creates a significant
disincentive for providers to serve families receiving state subsidy
due to the financial loss sustained when a child is absent. We see a

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

correlation between children from low-income families and increased absenteeism. Many of our childcare assistance families work in jobs that do not have a set or consistent schedule and can result in irregular childcare needs. Prior to the COVID pandemic, there was an average absentee rate of 14 percent for children receiving state subsidy who were served in our early childhood development center. That was a net loss of \$35,000 per year for this one program. The absentee rate in our community learning centers, school-age childcare programs is even greater. This financial impact has resulted in CEDARS needing to downsize and even close childcare programs in recent years. For many providers, it often means limiting the number of slots available to low-income families on childcare subsidy. By permanently moving to a pay per enrollment rather than a pay per attendance model, CEDARS would be able to continue our participation in this important program. In short, LB68 alleviates a primary barrier to providing high-quality childcare for low-income families. Thank you for your consideration of this bill.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony. Next proponent for LB68.

JP LAUTERBACH: Take this off this time. I struggled with it a little bit last time so. Well, good morning again, Senator Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. Again, I'm JP Lauterbach, and that's J-P L-a-u-t-e-r-b-a-c-h. And once again, I'm the COO of the YMCA here in Lincoln, Nebraska. On behalf today of the state of Nebraska Alliance YMCAs, I'm here to speak to you about the importance of LB68. And we also thank Senator Day for introducing the bill, and we are here to register our support. LB68 would allow childcare providers who accept the subsidy to account for student enrollment rather than attendance, which helps with staffing stability and would solidify our childcare infrastructure across-- across crosswise all over the state. I'll repeat quickly some earlier testimony given for LB485 about the Y. We are a leading nonprofit committed to strengthening communities through youth development, healthy living, and social responsibility. We have been a presence in Nebraska for over 150 years; and through the work of 14 Y systems across the state, we provide programs and services in over 300 Nebraska communities. The Y has been a leader in the childcare field for over four decades. And we are vested in the well-being of our state's children, from their first steps as a toddler to crossing the stage of graduation. Over 50 percent of our members and program participants are under the age of

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

18. They participate in youth sports, camping, childcare, before- and after-school programs, after-school enrichment, teen outreach, and teen leadership programs designed to keep kids safe and-- keep kids and children safe, engaged and encouraged to discover who they are. LB68 is incredibly helpful as we staff our childcare areas and plan for the needs of our children and families. As has been mentioned, during the pandemic we have been able to utilize the provisions that LB68 is now seeking to make permanent. The ability for childcare providers to account for child enrollment rather than actual attendance will help stabilize our childcare infrastructure throughout the state. And the small change has helped with employment in the childcare field and to keep many providers afloat through the pandemic. This change will also help working families and youth in the sense that our facilities will be fully staffed and stable with consistent employee expertise in the childcare field. Without this change, there is just more day-to-day uncertainty on attendance and how to staff appropriately for that. The Y is committed to doing our part so more children can reach their potential and more families can thrive. Once again, thank you for your time and ask for your support of LB68. Thanks again, Senator Day, and to the committee for your time. And I'll try to do my best to answer any questions.

***CHRIS JONES:** Dear Chairperson Arch and Members of the Health and Human Services Committee: My name is Chris Jones and I am the Community Impact & Strategic Initiatives Director with the Nebraska Children's Home Society- a statewide licensed and accredited child-placing and child-caring nonprofit agency with offices in six communities across the state of Nebraska. On behalf of Nebraska Children's Home Society (NCHS), we respectfully ask for your support of LB68. Nebraska Children's Home Society (NCHS) has 127 years of experience in putting put children's needs first through an array of services designed to build strong, supportive families and nurture children. Our core services include adoption, foster care, and family support. While our organization provides services across the state of Nebraska, almost 57% of families served are from the greater Omaha metropolitan area, predominantly in North and South Omaha. We serve children, parents and caregivers from single teen mothers to grandparents raising grandchildren. The overwhelming majority of families served by NCHS live below 200% of the federal poverty level. The Early Childhood Education Center, located at our historic Children & Family Center at 3549 Fontanelle Boulevard in North Omaha, is a

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

pre-kindergarten readiness program for young children from birth to five years of age. We began providing early childhood education at this site in 2011 and are proud to participate in the Child Care Subsidy Program to ensure all children have access to quality early childhood education. Because the Child Care Subsidy Program reimburses based on attendance rather than enrollment, our organization subsidizes the 23.3% gap in funding, or \$2,500 per child per month. The temporary Executive Order #20-18 that allows providers to be reimbursed based on enrollment has allowed us to cover overhead costs. Despite infrequent or the occasional absence by some children, the teachers are still required to report as scheduled since staffing is arranged according to teacher-child ratios. Children are enrolled in programming according to ratios to ensure safe and quality care and education. For children who are not enrolled in the Child Care Subsidy Program, the billing for care is according to weekly enrollment. This ensures appropriate funding for staffing and operations. The pandemic showed us the important and essential role childcare and early childhood education providers are for working caregivers everywhere. LB68 would improve the funding for these essential providers in our communities. Quality early childhood education prepares children to thrive intellectually, socially and emotionally, not only in kindergarten and elementary school but also in the years beyond. Its impact is lasting, and its positive effects are undeniable. Thank you Senator Day for bringing this important bill. We support LB68 and ask that you do as well. I welcome additional conversations with you and your staff.

***TIM HRUZA:** Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Tim Hruza (T-I-M-H-R-U-Z-A) and I am here representing the Children and Families Coalition of Nebraska (CAFCON). CAFCON is a non-profit association comprised of 10 of the state's largest providers of children and family services. We serve Nebraskans in all 93 counties, providing everything from foster care and adoption assistance to mental and behavioral health services. I am expressing our support for LB68. I thank Senator Day for introducing this legislation. LB68 changes the reimbursement for services provided by the Child Care Subsidy program to pay providers based on enrollment rather than attendance. This codifies the practice put in place by Governor Ricketts in his executive order in April 2020 due to the pandemic. We are supportive of this legislation as it will help both

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

families and providers of childcare. Thank you for your consideration.
We respectfully request the committee advance LB68 to General File.

***JULIE ERICKSON:** Thank you Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Julie Erickson and I am representing Voices for Children in Nebraska in support of LB68. For parents, access to safe, affordable and reliable child care is critical to being able to work. For families with lower incomes, the challenges in access to child care are numerous ranging from cost to availability. Quality providers are essential both to ensuring parents can work and laying the groundwork that ultimately helps young people be successful in school. For too long, we have undervalued the essential work of child care providers and it is long past time to enact policies that support them. In addition to supporting providers, LB68 is also an investment in strengthening the foundations of an industry that has been hit hard by the pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic has been devastating for child care providers who were always operating under thin margins. As of October of last year, 63 licensed child cares in Nebraska had closed permanently and another 224 were still closed temporarily and uncertain about reopening. This means that nearly 10 percent of the state's licensed child care centers and in-home providers were closed due to the pandemic. As we work toward rebuilding our economy, parents need child care and child care centers need providers. For most working parents, when you pay for child care you are required to pay for the slot regardless of whether or not your child attends all scheduled days. This ensures that child care providers have predictable revenue and child care centers can provide adequate staffing. For too long, we have paid providers participating in the child care subsidy program differently, not paying at all for absences for many years and more recently paying for a limited number of absences. This practice was suspended in April via an executive order from Governor Ricketts and has been critical for providers in weathering the impact of the pandemic. The different payment structures are part of creating a stratified market that discourages providers from participating in the child care subsidy program and creates greater financial instability for those who do. We should be working toward eliminating barriers to participation in this program for providers by ensuring that they are paid adequately for their essential service. LB68 is an investment that will be pay dividends for children and the economy and we urge the committee to advance this bill. Thank you.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Next proponent for LB68. Seeing none, are there any opponents of LB68?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Good morning again,--

ARCH: Welcome back.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Chairperson Arch and members of the Health and Human-- do you want me to wait until she--

ARCH: No, please.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: OK. Good morning, Chairperson Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Stephanie Beasley, S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e B-e-a-s-l-e-y, and I serve as the director for the Division of Children and Family Services within Department of Health and Human Services. I'm here to testify in opposition to LB68, which would require the department to amend the state plan for services to pay childcare providers based on a child's enrollment rather than on a child's actual attendance. It is anticipated that changing attendance to enrollment, as proposed in LB68, would result in an estimated annual state-funded fiscal impact of over \$26 million in fiscal year 2021 to '22 and each year forward. At the start of the pandemic, DHHS began seeing the impact of COVID-19 on childcare providers. In March and April of 2020, at peak closures, approximately 18 percent of licensed childcare providers reported temporary closure during the pandemic. As a result, DHHS has worked internally and with external partners to be responsive to the impacts the pandemic has had on childcare providers and working families who rely on childcare subsidy assistance. The handouts provided summarize both actions DHHS took at the start of the pandemic, as well as additional supports created using CARES Act dollars. For example, Executive Order number 20-18 was issued on April 15, 2020, allowing licensed childcare providers to bill DHHS for unlimited absences related to the pandemic. This allowance is still in effect and will end 30 days after the Gov-- after Governor Rick-- Ricketts lifts Nebraska's COVID-19 state of emergency. In September of 2020 new regulations were promulgated in Title 392 of the Nebraska Administrative Code regarding the childcare subsidy program. These regulations allow childcare providers, both licensed and license exempt, to bill up to five absentee days per child per month, not to exceed the weekly authorized amount.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

Currently, DHHS determines the number-- determines the hours per week a child is eligible for childcare and creates an authorization that reflects that determination. DHHS believes that supporting childcare providers is vitally important. The handouts provided demonstrate DHHS's response and commitment to support providers and families with our CARES Act funding and newly available Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation-- Appropriations Act funding. Given the \$26 million of state dollars needed for implementation, DHHS opposes LB68. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So the \$26 million is for FY '21-22. We're currently in the state of emergency. Are you anticipating that that is going to end soon?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: The state of emergency?

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah, the declaration that allows us to be under the executive order.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So it will end 30 days after the executive order ends.

M. CAVANAUGH: Right, but the-- your fiscal notice for the-- the biennium, and so that would assume that the state, we're no longer in the state of emergency with the executive order.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I believe that is with-- with-- with that assumption removed, yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, so I guess I'm-- I'm asking, are we anticipating that the Governor is going to end this state of emergency?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I do not know that.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, so there's a potential that there would be no fiscal note for this biennium if the state of emergency continues.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So ask the question, so if--

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: So if the state of emergency and the executive order
continue for the biennium, then this fiscal note won't exist. This is
for--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: The ex-- the expense still exists for the-- for the
billing, the enrollment days. Billing the expense still exists. Now we
do have a lower number of kids utilizing childcare right now, so we're
covering that expense.

M. CAVANAUGH: So the issue is--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I'm not sure. I'm sorry, Senator. I'm not sure.

M. CAVANAUGH: Sorry. I guess we get back to the same issue again, that
we're-- we just don't want to pay for more kids in childcare?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: It's the fiscal impact that is the issue.

M. CAVANAUGH: But not putting more children in childcare because the
bill--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Childcare is--

M. CAVANAUGH: --the bill seeks to put more children in childcare and
to basically stabilize childcares that provide services to low-income
families.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: The bill seeks to allow billing for enrollment
versus absent days and right now we have, based on our regulations
last fall-- or I guess two-- a fall ago, we implemented regulations
that said that you can bill for five absent days.

M. CAVANAUGH: Right.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: So this--

M. CAVANAUGH: So I guess why are we doing that if we oppose-- if you
oppose this bill? Because this bill is just continuing to do what
you're already doing.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Well, it opens the door further.

M. CAVANAUGH: Right. But--

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Right.

M. CAVANAUGH: --what you're doing right now is working, right?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: During the pandemic?

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: I mean, we just heard a bunch of testimony it's working.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yes. Yes. At the peak of the pandemic, about 18 percent of providers were closing, and so this was a way for us to really sustain their income so that they were able to pay their staff and do all the things that they needed to do.

M. CAVANAUGH: So we've seen a few bills this session. Chairman Arch brought a bill on telehealth that has sought to codify into statute changes that we made as a result of the pandemic because we recognize that they were filling a need. And it sounds like this is filling a need and it's successful, so I-- I-- and it's something that DHHS did on their own. So I'm very-- I-- I'm confused why the DHHS wouldn't support this moving forward, because it's filling a need and it's working, so it's purely cost.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: One of these issues is significant cost, yes. During the pan--

M. CAVANAUGH: What is the other issue?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Well, during the pandemic, we really lifted that because we wanted to ensure-- kids were being kept home for three weeks, four weeks, etcetera-- that they were able to bill. So ultimately, with the five days for-- I-- I understand what you're saying is that it is a solution that has worked during the pandemic. I think the five days was an addition that we added on in the fall, just recognizing that this was a need for people to be able to sustain so that people weren't taking their kids to the provider who were sick because they were worried about, you know, losing their slot, etcetera.

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: But it is a significant impact fiscally.

M. CAVANAUGH: So just, I'm sorry, one more question. The fiscal note says due to system limitations DHHS is unable to identify if the provider is billing based on enrollment rather than attendance. So that to me says that you would actually have to create more infrastructure to go back to the way you were before, because if you can't tell-- so this seems like less of an administrative burden, in addition to serving more families and stabilizing childcare.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I can find out what the system limitations are. I think it's-- it's how that they're billing that we have-- we're unable to go and-- and right now look and see is this a-- that you have billing for absentee or you're billing for those who are--

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: --attending.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch, and thank you, Director Beasley, for being here. I want to be sure that I'm-- I'm trying to understand this-- this difference with the five days that came into play this fall that does seem to me to be a step in the right direction that helps with that. Is-- is that change taken into consideration in the creation of the fiscal note that's in front of us?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: I can verify for you, Senator.

WILLIAMS: Yeah, I-- I'm wondering if we're missing something in that; to look at that total cost, that would be helpful for me. Thank you.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Our costs have varied throughout this, and I can have that broken down. So implementation, so from April of '19 to March of 2020-- these are the 12 months prior to COVID-- our cost per child was 5-- about \$513, then during COVID it jumped quite a bit. And then it-- it has come back down. We're-- we're having a hard time really pinpointing why it's coming back down, because there are so many funds available right now. But I can find out very specifically

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

for you, does this fiscal note include-- does it separate out the five
days?

WILLIAMS: Yeah. Thank you.

ARCH: I would like to have a follow-up question. I was thinking along
the same lines as Senator Williams here because as-- as I just ran a
quick-- and just help me if I'm thinking correctly on this. If I just
ran a quick calculation that if-- there's a weekly authorized amount
per child per family. I don't know exactly how it's done, but DHHS
is-- according to your testimony, determines the hours per week a
child is eligible. So just for sake of-- of illustration, if a child
is eligible for full-time care 5 days a week, full-- full-time,
eligible for that, and assuming 4 days, 4.3 weeks, approximately 23
days, and 5 days then a child doesn't have to be present for the-- for
the provider to be paid. Eighteen out of 23, I ran a calculation. It's
about 78 percent. So a provider-- or I should say the child only needs
to be present 78 percent of that-- of those days for the provider to
be paid full-- in full. If-- if-- if I'm understanding this new
regulation, and-- and I think that's what we-- you know, that-- that's
really what we're struggling with here is that-- is there-- is there--
is the state responding to the issue of absent versus-- versus the
bill that that specifies you're going to be paid on enrollment. This--
this seems to be a pretty significant step towards that-- that
payment. So am I understanding that? Am I understanding that correctly
in this new regulation?

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: For the 78 percent, yes.

ARCH: Well, 18 out of 23 days, if they're able to be absent 5 days,
assuming s full time, and if they're even-- and if they are eligible
for less days than-- than full-time, still 5 days, so it actually--
the percentage would even-- you know, it-- it would even be more
significant. So at any rate, I'll-- I'll look into the regulation
itself and-- and try to better understand that. But I guess along with
Senator Williams' question that it is-- it is-- is that-- is-- is that
really taking care of a lot of this issue? That's-- that's really my
question, so--

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Yeah. And I can make sure that we get the
regulations to you and--

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Yeah, well, I'd appreciate that.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: [INAUDIBLE] the program description.

ARCH: Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your testimony today.

STEPHANIE BEASLEY: Thank you, Senator.

ARCH: Is there anyone else that would like to testify in opposition to LB68? Is there anyone that would like to testify in a neutral capacity to LB68? Seeing none, Senator Day, you're welcome to close. And as you come up, we had letters of support from nine individuals, associations and we had one in opposition. And written testimony received this morning on LB68 we had three proponents from Nebraska Children's Home Society, the Children and Family Coalition of Nebraska, and Voices for Children. Senator Day, you're welcome to close.

DAY: Thank you, Chairman Arch. So I think we obviously have several questions about the fiscal note, specifically as it relates to the five-day allowance. LB68 can't be both unnecessary because the extra five days are already being paid for and also extremely costly. So I think we need to get answers on that. And so I come at this obviously from a parent's perspective, but also as a business owner perspective. This bill is just about stability for providers and for what are a lot of small businesses in Nebraska that are childcare providers. We as a state already have a shortage of providers that will serve families who use the childcare subsidy. And the main reason for that shortage is because of the instability in the payments that they receive. It's-- it's virtually impossible to run a small business and maintain staff and facility when you are not sure how much you're going to be bringing in every month. So that's mainly what this bill is about. And then also, I just wanted to mention to Senator Murman's question earlier about families. And, you know, is it-- is it better for children to be at home with two parents? And I think that we all know that, yes, that's the ideal situation. But, you know, we don't live in Utopia and there's various different types of families that exist. Mine in particular, I-- I-- I was a single mom at one time and the childcare subsidy was very important to me. And I think the decision to be a single mom is one of the reasons that I'm sitting here in front of you today with the ability to introduce this bill. So I think we have to make sure that we're supporting all different types of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Health and Human Services Committee February 10, 2021

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

families in Nebraska and all different types of parents in-- in
success in their lives. And also it's always about the kids and making
sure that they have the care that they deserve at home and otherwise.
So I'm happy to answer any other questions you have.

ARCH: Any further questions for Senator Day? Seeing none, thank you
very much.

DAY: Thank you.

ARCH: This will close the hearing on LB68 and the hearings for the
morning. And we will be back at 1:30 to hear bills this afternoon.
Thank you.

[BREAK]

ARCH: Good afternoon. Welcome to the Health and Human Services
Committee. My name is John Arch. I represent the 14th Legislative
District in Sarpy County and I serve as Chair of the HHS Committee.
I'd like to invite the members of the committee to introduce
themselves starting on my right with Senator Day.

DAY: Jen Day. I represent Legislative District 49, which is
northwestern Sarpy County.

WILLIAMS: Matt Williams from Gothenburg, Legislative District 36,
Dawson, Custer, and the north portion of Buffalo Counties.

ARCH: I'm sure we'll have other members joining us shortly. Also,
assist-- assisting the committee is one of our legal counsels, T.J.
O'Neil; our committee clerk, Geri Williams; and our committee pages,
Kate and Rebecca. A few notes about our policies and procedures.
First, please turn off or silence your cell phones. This afternoon, we
will be hearing four bills and we'll be taking them in the order
listed on the agenda outside the room. The hearing on each bill will
begin with the introducer's opening statement. After the opening
statement, we will hear from supporters of the bill, then from those
in opposition, followed by those speaking in a neutral capacity. The
introducer of the bill will then be given the opportunity to make
closing statements if they wish to do so. For those of you who are
planning to testify, you will find green testifier sheets on the table
near the entrance of the hearing room. Please fill-- fill one out,
hand it to one of the pages when you come up to testify. This will

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

help us keep an accurate record of the hearing. We use a light system for testifying. Each testifier will have five minutes to testify. When you begin, the light will be green. When the light turns yellow, that means you have one minute left. When the light turns red, it is time to end your testimony and we will ask you to wrap up your final thoughts. When you come up to testify, please begin by stating your name clearly into the microphone and then please spell both your first and last name. If you are not testifying at the microphone but want to go on record as having a position on a bill being heard today, please see the new public hearing protocols on the HHS Committee's website at NebraskaLegislature.gov. Additionally, there is a white sign-in sheet at the entrance where you may leave your name and position on the bills before us today. Due to social distancing requirements, seating in the hearing room is limited. We ask that you only enter the hearing room when it is necessary for you to attend the bill hearing in progress. The agenda posted outside the door will be updated after each hearing to identify which bill is correct-- is currently being heard. The committee will pause between each bill to allow time for the public to move in and out of the hearing room. We request that you wear a face covering while in the hearing room. Testifiers may remove their face covering during testimony to assist committee members and Transcribers in clearly hearing and understanding the testimony. Pages will sanitize the front table, chair-- and chair between testifiers. This committee has a strict no props policy. And with that, we will begin today's-- this afternoon's hearing with LB86 and welcome, Senator Bostelman.

BOSTELMAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Bruce Bostelman. I spell that B-r-u-c-e B-o-s-t-e-l-m-a-n, and I represent Legislative District 23. I'm here today to introduce LB86, which requires the registration of each credential holder who is a prescriber or dispenser of prescription drugs, with some exemptions, into the prescription drug monitoring program by October 1, 2021. The exemptions include credential holders who do not prescribe or dispense drugs: veterinarians, active-duty members of the armed forces who do not prescribe in Nebraska, retired credential holders, credential holders who are researchers and do not treat patients, credential holders who are faculty members of a college or university who do not treat patients, and finally, any other credential holders who do not treat patients. The purpose of this bill is to prepare Nebraska's

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

prescribers and dispensers or federal law set to take effect on October 1, 2021. In 2018, H.R. 6, or the SUPPORT Act, was passed into law; and Section 1944 of that act requires each covered provider to check the prescription history of a covered individual being treated in a qualified prescription drug monitoring program. Section 3990 of the SUPPORT Act provide perpetual federal funding for states to upgrade and continue to operate their PDMPs as long as two conditions were met: (1) the state has implemented a PDMP; (2) a state has implemented penalties for the unauthorized use and disclosure found in the PDMP. With these two conditions met, should this bill pass, Nebraska could expect funding in perpetuity for our PDMP program. Finally, I would like to thank former Senator Howard for assisting me with this bill. She had carried this bill in 2019 with no opponents. I also would like to thank the Pharmacists Association and CyncHealth for their help with the language of the bill. With that, I ask for the advancement of LB, LB86 to General File. And I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. And thank you, Senator Bostelman. Can you help me a little bit with the the fiscal note on this or somebody behind you--

BOSTELMAN: Sure.

WILLIAMS: --if that works better? Because what I'm understanding you saying if we qualify, that fiscal note--

BOSTELMAN: Goes away.

WILLIAMS: --goes away. Right?

BOSTELMAN: I think majority of it. Maybe someone behind me will say maybe there's a small portion, but I believe the entire thing goes away. Yes.

WILLIAMS: That's what I wanted. Thank you.

BOSTELMAN: Yes.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, are you going to stay to close?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

BOSTELMAN: Yes.

***BOB HALLSTROM:** Senator Arch, members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Robert J. Hallstrom and I submit this testimony as registered lobbyist for the Nebraska Pharmacists Association in support of LB86. The Nebraska Pharmacists Association represents pharmacists, interns, and technicians in all areas of practice in Nebraska. LB86 would require credential holders under the Uniform Credentialing Act who actively prescribe or dispense prescription drugs to register with the Department of Health and Human Services for the Nebraska Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP). Many pharmacists across Nebraska are already using the PDMP, particularly in the chain area where it is mandatory to utilize prior to dispensing a controlled substance. Pharmacists are the highest utilizer of the PDMP of all healthcare professionals in Nebraska. There are over 5200 pharmacists that are licensed in Nebraska, many of whom do not live or practice here. As a result, excepting practitioners who don't provide active patient care from the registration requirement is certainly appropriate. For these reasons, the NPA would respectfully request that the Committee advance LB86 for further consideration by the full Legislature.

***DEXTER SCHRODT:** Chairman Arch and Members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Dexter Schrodte, Vice President of Advocacy & Regulation for the Nebraska Medical Association testifying in support of Sen. Bostelman's LB86. Our physician members are cognizant of the role prescribing practices have played in the opioid epidemic and believe that registration to the prescription drug monitoring program is the logical next step in ensuring everyone plays their part in scaling back those practices. The PDMP is an important tool for accountability that nearly every state has adopted around the country. To streamline this process, instead of requiring renewal of both PDMP registration and credential at the same time, we would suggest implementing this in an opt-out format. Having the Department do a one-time entry of all prescribers and dispensers would alleviate the on-going burden of double registration on both the Department and providers. The Department would be left to process just the opt-outs on a biennial basis, and going forward, new prescribers and dispensers would then automatically be registered. Currently, our members are required to undergo continuing education on the PDMP and are supportive of the objectives of this important public health program.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

The NMA respectfully requests the Committee to advance LB86 to General
File. Thank you.

ARCH: OK, thank you. First proponent for LB86. Is there anyone wishes
to testify as a proponent? Seeing none, any opponents for LB86?
Welcome.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Hello. Good afternoon, again, afternoon,
Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee.
My name is Felicia Quintana-Zinn, F-e-l-i-c-i-a
Q-u-i-n-t-a-n-a-Z-i-n-n, and I am the deputy director of the Division
of Public Health within Department of Health and Human Services. And
I'm here to testify in opposition of LB86 and would-- which would,
with limited exceptions, require prescribers and dispensers to
register for the PDMP or the prescription drug monitoring program,
PDMP, as a condition of a new application and renewal of credential.
One reason that the agency opposes this bill is that it would mandate
all prescribers and dispensers to register with the PDMP by October 1,
2021. The department opposes additional mandates on providers as DHHS
already mandates the dispense prescriptions-- that dispense
prescriptions be reported daily to the PDMP. Therefore, additional
requirement is not necessary. If enacted, LB86 would require
registration beginning October 2021 and this is a very short time
frame given the large number of persons who would need to be
registered. Currently, approximately 4,500 out of 18,000 licensed
prescribers, or about 25 percent, have completed the registration
process. The percentage of licensed pharmacists or dispensers is
similar. Approximately nineteen-- or 1,920 out of 5,200, or
approximately 37 percent, have completed the registration process.
This leaves nearly 16,800 persons to be registered within a few
months. The licensure unit is currently modernizing the credentialing
software and would need to adjust current customizations and timelines
already underway in order to meet the requirements set out in this
bill. Both the PDMP registration and the updates needed to current--
to the current modernization projects will be time and resource
intensive to accomplish by the current implementation date. However, a
schedule that resembles the current biennial licensing renewal process
would be less burdensome. For example, physicians are required to
renew on October 1 in even years; dentists on March 1 in odd years;
pharmacists on January 1 in even years, etcetera. Extending the
registration time frame would give DHHS staff more time to set up
appropriate processes, procedures, and technology requirements to

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

register prescribers and dispensers and develop capacity to appropriately share registration information within DHHS to meet LB86 requirements. The additional time could also be used to educate licensees about the new requirements and provide a user-friendly way to register and renew their licenses. DHHS also has concerns with LB86 requirement on new applicants and renewals. By statute, in order to register for the PDMP, the registrant must have a current and active license. However, as noted in this bill, in order for the registrant to be credentialed, they must first be registered to the PDMP. This presents a paradox and in order to meet both requirements, credentialing would need to have a window, for example, of 30 days for registration to be completed so professionals can maintain their licenses. Currently, if you register for the PDMP, you do not need to renew your PDMP registration, unlike prescribers' and dispensers' licenses which need to be renewed biennially and do not currently require PDMP registration. However, LB86 would require PDMP registration renewal as a condition for maintaining the professional credential. And this would require the creation of additional processes and technology changes to adequately document and monitor PDMP renewals, plus additional staff time and resources. In summary, LB86 would require more staff resources than DHHS is able to provide due to the bill's short time frame for registering all prescribers and dispensers in the state. We respectfully request that the committee not advance this legislation and thank you for the opportunity to testify today. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

ARCH: Questions? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. And thank you, deputy director, for being here. In Senator Bostelman's opening presentation, he talked about qualifying by October 1, 2021, to receive federal funding. Do you agree that that would be in the best interest of Nebraska to meet that deadline?

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: So I think you can register for the PDMP, which we currently have, without needing to require a mandate. And that's-- that's the biggest piece here is-- is the mandate piece.

WILLIAMS: So you-- it seems to me that you have a question about the mandate, but then also the, the timeline of--

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Yes.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

WILLIAMS: --of the registration and getting that done.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: With regards to adding it to renewal
credentialing requirements,

WILLIAMS: Assuming work that detail out, but then finding a way to do
that.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Um-hum.

WILLIAMS: If that timeline was given more time to implement on a,
would that reduce what you believe would be your cost at HHS to do
this implementation?

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: No. The-- the-- the cost that's associated with
this is primarily staff time, and that's still going to be needed with
regards to making sure that people have the questions that they have
that they ask us answered and appropriate time frames and then making
updates to our systems that we would need to update.

WILLIAMS: But you certainly see the value of the PDMP.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you. Other questions? I have one and you may not be able
to answer this question, but--

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: OK.

ARCH: --one of the things that Senator Bostelman said was that there
is a federal requirement that-- that prescribers be able to, and I'm
going to paraphrase here, be able to look up other meds that the
patient is receiving.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Um-hum.

ARCH: If-- if not in the PDMP, if not-- if not enrolled through that,
do you have any idea how a provider would be able to do that with--
with the systems not necessarily talking to each other all the time?

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: So they can still enroll and register for the
PDMP. It's just that they wouldn't be mandated. So if-- if the mandate

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

isn't there, like they can still currently register for the PDMP and
they--

ARCH: I see. It's the mandate.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: --would still be able to make up that
information.

ARCH: It's the mandate.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Yep. Um-hum.

ARCH: So right now you're receiving information from the pharmacy, not
from the prescriber.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Correct. So PDMPs receive the dispensed
prescriptions from the pharmacies daily.

ARCH: Thank you.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Um-hum.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Walz.

WALZ: Yeah, I'm-- I'm still going to follow up on your question
regarding the communication and their ability. Did that answer? Did I
miss that?

ARCH: It ans-- it did for me, yes.

WALZ: OK.

ARCH: Yeah.

WALZ: So if it's not mandated, even if it's not mandated they'd still
have the ability to have that communication and--

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Um-hum.

WALZ: OK. All right. Thank you. Sorry.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

FELICIA QUINTANA-ZINN: Thank you very much.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Any other testifiers in opposition to LB86? Seeing none, anyone
want to testify in a neutral capacity?

KEVIN BORCHER: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch and members of the Health
and Human Services Committee. My name is Kevin Borchner, K-e-v-i-n
B-o-r-c-h-e-r, and I'm testifying in a supportively neutral capacity
to LB86. I'm testifying here today as a prescription drug monitoring
program director at the Nebraska Health Information Initiative, or
NeHII, now doing business as CyncHealth. The value of PDMPs across the
country is recognized on both federal and state levels. Several
federal agencies recommend and support the use of the PDMP. As was
mentioned through the CMS quality payment program Merit-based
Incentive Payment System, a big word, the MIPS program, a measure for
performance requires the prescriber to check the PDMP for Medicare
recipients beginning in 2022. Currently eligible hospitals, eligible
providers receive bonus points for these, and it will be required in
2022. In the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act signed into law
October 2018, prescribers will be required to check the PDMP for
Medicaid beneficiaries prior to prescribing an opioid or other
controlled substances beginning October of this year based on state
requirements. Registration is the first step in ensuring providers'
success in this process. Pharmacists understand the benefits of
reviewing not only the patient's opioid and other controlled substance
prescriptions, but in Nebraska, having the access to view all
dispensed prescriptions for a more thorough and comprehensive picture
of the patient's medication history. This is important for medication
reconciliation systems that clinicians use and contributes to safe
clinical care everyday through avoidance of medication errors. In
addition, a comprehensive medication history improves outcomes by
preventing medication errors that lead to extended hospitalizations.
As of January, there were 46 states which require prescribers or
pharmacists to either register with or queried their state PDMPs. In
Nebraska, there are approximately 4,800, I'm sorry, 4,500 of over
18,000 or about 25 percent of the allowed prescribers and around 2,400
of 5,072 or 47 percent of pharmacists who have voluntarily registered
to use the PDMP. While these healthcare providers are seeing the value
of the PDMP, there are others that, as one physician told me, don't
know what they're missing. By offering clinicians access to this
valuable tool, we're enabling providers to have ready access, which
will soon be a required process for full reimbursement. LB86 helps
align the Nebraska PDMP with federal policy and regulations by

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

supporting access to check the PDMP. I thank you for allowing me to speak today. I'm honored and fortunate to be Nebraska's PDMP director in keeping Nebraska's successful implementation of the PDMP noticed across the country. With your help, we can continue to build on the strong foundation that the Nebraska Legislature, that it's created for the PDMP. With that, I would be willing to answer any questions you may have. I'd be glad to expound upon Senator Williams' question earlier. There was one piece of the fiscal note you had mentioned, and I-- I can't really speak to the DHHS FTEs, but they do mention that the PDMP contractor, which is CyncHealth, would take approximately 4,100 hours. If we had an amendment to this bill to require prescribers to include their NPI and DEA numbers, that could automate that process and cut down the number of hours significantly, which is currently manually. And our estimate is going from that 4,100 hours to less than 1,000 hours.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions? I do have a question, just a second here. So is there-- is there any other way for the prescriber to meet the requirements, you said now in 2022 for everything, to meet the requirements in 2022 other than through the PDMP? Is there another way that prescribers could meet that requirement?

KEVIN BORCHER: The federal requirements mandate that they check the PDMP. Now sometimes that could mean that the PDMP is integrated into the HIE or the EHR and that would allow for that instead of having to go to a separate system.

ARCH: But it's still the PDMP.

KEVIN BORCHER: It would still have to be the PDMP through that integration.

ARCH: Oh, I see. So if it is integrated into the EMR, then they wouldn't necessarily have to enroll in the PDMP at that point?

KEVIN BORCHER: They would still-- my understanding is they would still need to enroll as a prescriber or dispenser to access the PDMP and then that would help to meet the requirement.

ARCH: Even if it's integrated into the EMR.

KEVIN BORCHER: That would be my interpretation.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: OK. So I guess what I'm hearing is they're going to do this by 2022. Whether we mandate it, don't mandate it, they're going to have to-- they're going to have to get into the PDMP to meet the requirements, the federal requirements that will take effect.

KEVIN BORCHER: I believe so.

ARCH: OK. So cost, the cost to the prescriber. There's only 25 percent right now. You're getting information from the pharmacies. The cost to the prescriber for enrolling in the PDMP and staying, maintaining that, what would that be?

KEVIN BORCHER: There is no cost for prescribers or dispensers, i.e. pharmacists to register to the PDMP. That is currently in 71-2454.

ARCH: They may have technology costs in order to-- in order to look at the PDMP, in order to, whether it be interconnectivity to their-- to their EMR or looking it up separately, they would have technology costs. But that's-- that's, there's no cost that the prescriber does not need to pay CyncHealth money to participate.

KEVIN BORCHER: That's correct.

ARCH: OK. Thank you. Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

KEVIN BORCHER: Thank you.

ARCH: That was supportively neutral. Is that how you described that?

KEVIN BORCHER: That's correct.

ARCH: OK, I thought I caught that. Anyone else wish to testify in a neutral capacity? Seeing none, Senator Bostelman, while you're coming up, I would note that there were no letters in support or opposition. We did, however, receive two written testimonies this morning: Dexter Schrodtt from Nebraska Medical Association and Bob Hallstrom from the Nebraska Pharmacists Association, both proponents.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This bill was brought before this committee last session. There was no opposition to it. There was opposition on the original bill, and that was the exemptions. That was worked with DHHS and all the parties involved to clear up those

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

objections. There was no opposition to-- from DHHS over a year ago. We provided this bill to DHHS in advance and we heard no objection until yesterday. I can tell you and you have heard from Senator Howard the need for this to be in place. My brother died four years ago. And he was given medications, as my sister-in-law would say, by the bagful, opioids, others. He died of cancer. If we don't have a mechanism to help prescribers, help pharmacists be able to identify the overprescribing or if someone is, I'll say shopping, we heard the person goes to this doctor and goes maybe across into another town to get another one. You know, I think we need to take it serious. We know what the opioid problem is in this country. We know what distributing medications are in this country. If we don't do this, and I do think there will be a significant cost, fiscal cost to DHHS because they're going to have to do it one way or the other. So if not now, when? If we don't get on board and get the federal funding behind us to provide that support, then we're going to have to come up with General Funds. So this gives us an opportunity to meet the requirements of federal law, of H.R.6. And my understanding is-- is-- is the providers and the pharmacists out there want to do this. They're not-- they don't object to it. We're just providing that vehicle for that to happen. And DHHS hopefully will get on board and we'll be able to work something out. So I'll take any other questions you may have.

ARCH: Any questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thanks for bringing the bill again, Senator Bostelman. You talked about last year when you brought the bill and you worked with them. And I apologize. I was a little bit late this afternoon, so I'm not fully caught up on what the opposition is from the department. Is it different from what it was last year?

BOSTELMAN: The bill, no.

M. CAVANAUGH: No, I mean the opposition.

BOSTELMAN: Opposition? Yeah, well, yes. The-- my understanding there was DHHS did not oppose the bill. There-- the only objections to the bill, if you were, was the exemptions and those exemptions were-- have been included. There was actually an amendment done, I think I brought to the committee. The memo was it was approved. I think it got kicked out onto the floor, but we ran out of time.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: Right.

BOSTELMAN: This would have been done last year, but we just ran out of time.

M. CAVANAUGH: And this version now includes the amendment that we kicked out to the floor.

BOSTELMAN: Yes. Yes, it does.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

BOSTELMAN: Yes.

ARCH: Any other questions for Senator Bostelman? Seeing none, thank you very much.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you.

ARCH: This will close the bill, the bill LB86 and we will now open the hearing on LB411. Welcome to HHS, Senator Lathrop.

LATHROP: It's a pleasure to be here, Mr. Chairman, members of the Health Committee. My name is Steve Lathrop. I'm the state senator from District 12, which includes Ralston and parts of southwest Omaha. It is a pleasure to be here to introduce LB411. I'm passing around an amendment for your consideration as you consider this bill today. LB411 seeks to improve healthcare across the state by making it easier for providers to access a complete history of a patient's past care. It does this by requiring healthcare providers and medical insurers to provide clinical information to the state's designated health information exchange, a system that facilitates the sharing of medical record. It achieves this at no cost to providers. For decades, the U.S. healthcare system has been building towards the capacity for digital medical records to follow patients wherever they are receiving care. President George W. Bush created the Office of National Health Information Coordinator in 2004 and doubled funding for these efforts. Every administration since then has sought to increase the capacity, capability, and integration of healthcare information systems. In 2009, Governor Heineman designated NeHII, now known as CyncHealth, to operate a statewide health information exchange. Thousands of providers and insurers across the state, including most of our hospitals, are already participating in this system. We now have an

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

opportunity to increase the value of this system for everyone by making it inclusive of all relevant health records. The reason this is a good time to do this is that there are currently federal grants to reimburse the cost of building software systems, to translate providers' electronic records into a form that can be incorporated or imported into the statewide system. This bill takes advantage of that funding, which is why there is a deadline found in the bill. All this asks providers to do is authorize CyncHealth to access their existing electronic records by July 1, 2021, and CyncHealth does the rest. My interest in this matter is simply to benefit consumers of healthcare, which is all of us, by making sure medical practitioners have ready access to a complete medical history when making important decisions about our care. Currently, if I get into a car accident and I'm taken to the emergency room somewhere in the state that hasn't treated me before, they don't-- and they don't participate in the health information exchange or my providers back in Omaha don't participate, then the doctors treating me may not have access to important parts of my medical history. If I'm unconscious and can't tell them about ongoing health problems I-- that I experience, that could impact my-- the best course of treatment. They have no way of knowing that. This bill would change that. We've already built the infrastructure we need to do this. Everyone is in agreement that this is in the best interests of patients. This bill won't cost providers anything and doesn't require them to do anything they aren't already doing. To ensure that's the case, I'm bringing an amendment, AM122. This does two things. First, it simply provides for a process administered by the Health Information Technology Board, whereby healthcare providers included in the definition of this bill that do not have electronic medical records can self-identify and be exempt from participation. It is not the intent of this bill to force providers to create electronic records they don't already have or to change their existing recordkeeping or reporting practices. Second, there's language that ensures that the bill affects only those insurers whose information is relevant to the health information exchange. Improving the quality of electronic medical records is clearly in the best interest of everyone receiving healthcare. This is the direction the country is moving and there is currently federal funding available. I think it makes sense to take this opportunity to make our patient health records complete and to do so at no cost to our providers. Those testifiers who follow me today will be able to discuss the technical issues involved and talk about the many benefits and potential cost savings of doing this

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

for our patients, providers, and insurers. Thank you for your
consideration.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Any questions?

LATHROP: And this is usually where the introducer says I'd be happy to
take questions. Mostly, I'm hoping you'll ask the people that come up
[INAUDIBLE].

ARCH: Do we have any hard questions for Senator Lathrop? Senator
Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. And thank you, Senator-- Senator
Lathrop. I do have a question either for you or for somebody
following. And it's-- and it's digging into the weeds a little bit on
the fiscal note, when it says in the fiscal note: The expected cost
for data sharing could range from \$56,000 for a simple transaction to
as much as \$859,000 for a more complex one. And of course, fiscal note
used the high number on that.

LATHROP: Sure.

WILLIAMS: Do you have any comment about that at this point?

LATHROP: No. I think I'll let the people behind me--

WILLIAMS: OK.

LATHROP: --answer whether they-- they anticipate there is something to
the fiscal note or whether the people that prepared the fiscal note
just didn't understand something that's going to take place.

WILLIAMS: It's my understanding, at least, that the exchange is
already there and the process for doing that and this is more flipping
a switch.

LATHROP: That's my understanding as well. And I know that there are
federal grants available and that's why there's a deadline in the bill
and why it makes sense to mandate it now is we're asking people to do
it now while they can get their hands on these federal grants or the
federal dollars to-- to take care of the cost of doing that rather
than miss the deadline for the federal dollars and then be told to do
it, and find out they've got to pay for it out of their own pocket.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

WILLIAMS: Thank you.

LATHROP: Sure.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So in the work with the YRTC Oversight Committee, it came to my attention that the healthcare records at those facilities and within Corrections are not digital and not shared with the NeHII system. So would your bill without-- without the amendment, would it include state-run healthcare facilities?

LATHROP: To be honest with you, I'm not sure the answer to that. But I know it's an issue. At the Department of Corrections, they're trying to develop their own program for electronic medical records and that's still underway. Because they're-- they don't have it done, they can self-identify and be exempt from the mandate, at least at this point in time. I know it's an issue. And in the time that I investigated or worked on the issues at the Beatrice State Developmental Center, it was a very significant issue because they would take one of the residents from BSDC to the local hospital and then they'd have to dig in and try to access medical information about a patient that may not be able to communicate accurately their health history.

M. CAVANAUGH: And that's the problem we saw with the youth when they were discharged, that their medical records didn't necessarily follow them and were lost. So I just was curious if this was maybe an opportunity to do something there. Thank you.

LATHROP: OK.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, will you be staying to close?

LATHROP: Yes.

ARCH: OK. All right. Thank you.

LATHROP: I will.

ARCH: All right. First supporter, proponent.

JAIME BLAND: Good afternoon, Senator Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Jaime Bland, J-a-i-m-e

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

B-l-a-n-d, and I am president and chief executive officer for CyncHealth, also known as NeHII. I'm testifying today in support of LB411. This legislation creates universal participation for healthcare facilities and payors within the state-designated Health Information Exchange. The secure movement of health data across the state and beyond profoundly impacts the health of individuals and communities in Nebraska and other regions. Since its inception as a statewide HIE in 2008, until-- until its codification as the-- as the statewide designated entity in the Nebraska statutes with the passage of LB1183 last year, CyncHealth has worked to create a comprehensive longitudinal healthcare record for Nebraskans receiving healthcare. The benefit of the Health Information Exchange is that comprehensive information is shared where it's needed when care is delivered and the information is easily accessible to providers. By securely sharing a patient's health information among healthcare providers, pharmacists, emergency rooms, and urgent care facilities, we enable a healthier community in Nebraska and across the region through the availability of health information. Information sharing is an important part for patient safety, for providing the right information to clinicians at the right time. Through utilization of the HIE, a provider has access to their patients' health-- health records at one point of access when receiving care and it's easily accessible. I want to make clear that this legislation is not intended to create any additional burden on utilization of resources for facilities who participate. There's no manual entry. There's no additional burden beyond the connection of the-- to the EHR that they currently use. CyncHealth technology does carry this burden and works directly with the EHR companies and provides for an offset of funding for those-- those facilities and any time that they dedicate. Facilities are tasked with giving access to their EHR and allowing us to work with their vendor to create seamless data sharing through the transitions. Our organization is vendor agnostic and we will work with any organization within their means to create a connection. The importance of including payors has many benefits for care management and other member management for quality members-- measures. Using patient data, assist with performance improvement projects and even member migrations to a new plan. By using HIE data to update contact information to aid managed care organizations, we can improve-- improve member attribution upon enrollment. In 2020, health data became a key instrument in the fight against COVID-19. CyncHealth assisted state efforts by serving as a conduit for testing data to populate Nebraska-- Nebraska's COVID

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

dashboard. And within two weeks we created a comprehensive COVID-19 dashboard that provides critical information for decision makers in the state related to the availability of beds, PPE, ventilators, and more. And I think we're still the only state in the country that actually provides the COVID-19 test results to providers directly. Our organization shows a commitment to seeing Nebraska through this period by assisting with efforts to carry out contact tracing and, furthermore, believe that having a longitudinal health record for patients will be an effective tool as we confront the long-term effects of COVID. At the federal level, the Department of Health and Human Services is committed to developing a nationwide infrastructure of interoperability across the healthcare continuum. The large scale federal interoperability regulations released in 2020 by the Office of the National Coordinator in which I've included in your packets, now require healthcare providers to share information with any and all providers that treat a patient, sharing not only in near real-time manner, but also providing complete and usable information in electronic format. LB411 will help Nebraska's providers meet the requirement and stay at the forefront of these federal guidelines. States that will thrive in the fast-paced interoperability development at the national level will be the ones where providers are actively participating in establishing the Health Information Exchange, which does most, if not all, of the heavy lifting of compliance for interoperability. Please note, I have also passed out a letter from Dr. Don Rucker, who is the former head of the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, on the benefits of the health information exchanges and how their expansion in the marketplace has a benefit on a national level. We also worked directly with Dr. Rucker during his time at ONC in a number of national COVID efforts. In closing, we believe that this work can be better accomplished when all facilities share data and facilities align with one another in the best interest of the patient and patient safety. I thank you for your time and attention to this important matter, and I would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

ARCH: Questions? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. And thank you, Ms. Bland, for being here. Would you agree that CyndHealth is the envy of most other states?

JAIME BLAND: Yes, sir. Yes, Senator.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

WILLIAMS: I just wanted you to have to say that. We're very proud of
that, by the way.

JAIME BLAND: Thank you.

WILLIAMS: You heard my question to Senator Lathrop concerning the--
the what I call a discrepancy in the fiscal note.

JAIME BLAND: Yeah. So

WILLIAMS: Are you the one that could address that? I know you talked
about technology--

JAIME BLAND: I can.

WILLIAMS: --and the ease of that in your opening comments.

JAIME BLAND: I just want to pull up the notes so I can look at it.
Yes. So in the fiscal note, there's a-- the cost-- the cost, I think
is believed related to these in the interoperability rule, which is
this fact sheet that I provided. There's some peer-to-peer data
exchange and some APIs that are required of Medicaid that I believe is
part of this cost and fiscal note. And we have scoped some of that
data sharing with the department historically, and it will be
integrated into their-- into their platform and the sharing of that
information. Now, we don't intend to, through this legislation,
require the department to do anything that's not within the Medicaid
regulation of what data that could be shared. We are just asking to,
one, not only share data, but also provide data back to providers that
can be helpful in care coordination, patient safety, the use of the
right medication, you know, understanding the comprehensive patient
history.

WILLIAMS: And they're sharing a lot of that data now--

JAIME BLAND: Yes, correct.

WILLIAMS: --correctly with the system.

JAIME BLAND: That's correct.

WILLIAMS: And that-- that interface is working for them at this point.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

JAIME BLAND: Correct.

WILLIAMS: Thank you.

JAIME BLAND: At the department, we do not have the interface ready at this time. I think there's still development within their systems that need to take place. And I think some of that's addressed in this fiscal note that the-- and I believe that there's somebody here from the department to answer more specifically, but. So there's the \$85,900 of the General Funds and then there's the 90 percent match, which would be the eight-- that \$859,000 of what is what they are indicating here.

WILLIAMS: Yeah.

JAIME BLAND: And then to share clinical information from some of their systems, I believe.

WILLIAMS: Thank you.

JAIME BLAND: Yeah.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Day.

DAY: Thank you, Chairman Arch, and thank you for being here today. I think you answered some of this with Senator Williams, but I just want to clarify. So you do currently work with the department when it comes to data sharing--

JAIME BLAND: Yes, we do.

DAY: --as would be required. OK. And then in terms of the current contracts that you have with the department, do you feel like they would support the onboarding that would be required in LB411?

JAIME BLAND: So I will say this. I have very good working relationships with the department. We work very well together. We're collaborative. And I understand that there's costs that may be incurred should there be a requirement for certain integrations. I think some of that can be overcome with resources, but it's-- it's not-- there may be some changes within their claims system that they would have to do. I don't know what the scope of that would be, but I don't think that's the intent of the bill. I think the intent of the

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

bill is to encourage data sharing across providers and healthcare systems and payors so that we are consistent in our information that's available and then ultimately for consumers to have access to that information, a longitudinal health record to-- to meet the portability components underneath HIPAA. We haven't achieved that as a country yet today.

DAY: OK.

JAIME BLAND: So-- but I would let the department speak to their specific system requirements--

DAY: OK.

JAIME BLAND: --and any changes that may need to take place.

DAY: Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? I have a couple.

JAIME BLAND: Sure.

ARCH: So the interoperability rule, effective this year?

JAIME BLAND: Correct.

ARCH: What-- do you know the date?

JAIME BLAND: There's several dates of compliance. One of the first ones is April 20, April 20 where [INAUDIBLE] notifications would be required of eligible hospitals to provide to the community.

ARCH: So admission, discharge, transfer,--

JAIME BLAND: Correct.

ARCH: --ADT. OK. And-- and there was also in the opening, I think there was illusion, an illusion, that's not the word. Anyway--

JAIME BLAND: Reference to.

ARCH: Reference, referencing funding.

JAIME BLAND: Yes.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: And the possibility that funding will run out at some point--

JAIME BLAND: Yep.

ARCH: --to help providers be compliant.

JAIME BLAND: So right now there's what's called HITECH, which is some of the legislation that Senator Lathrop introduced with HITECH that started under Bush and continued through the other administrations that actually that piece of legislation sunsets on September 30 of 2020. They've chosen, they being HHS, chosen to integrate much of the EHR funding for the nation within Medicaid regulations. So that does sunset September 30, 2020, but there are other funding mechanisms through the Medicaid Enterprise Services that will continue on. It is a different structure than the HITECH 90-10. But there is still components that would allow for providers to be on boarded to different data sharing mechanisms that would be supported past that date.

ARCH: Would you go so far as to say that their costs would be covered?

JAIME BLAND: Right now the costs are covered.

ARCH: OK.

JAIME BLAND: Yeah.

ARCH: OK.

JAIME BLAND: Yeah. And we have worked with the department historically to ensure that that's the case and that we do provide the option for the-- for that for providers.

ARCH: OK. Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

JAIME BLAND: Yes.

ARCH: Other proponents for LB411.

JEANETTE WOJTALEWICZ: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch and members of the HHS Committee. My name is Jeanette Wojtalewicz, J-e-a-n-e-t-t-e W-o-j-t-a-l-e-w-i-c-z. I'm the senior vice president of finance and

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

chief financial officer for CHI Health, and I'm here today speaking in support of LB411. CyncHealth's Health Information Exchange, the HIE, has been a critical resource for our hospitals and providers. When a patient comes to one of our facilities for the first time or in conjunction with care received outside of our CHI health network, that information from participating facilities in the HIE is available to our providers; and we are able to deliver more informed care by having the full context of that patient's record. Having this information available takes the burden off patients trying to remember complicated medical terminology of past diagnosis or procedures, lists of the names and dates and results of lab tests that they've had, names and dosages of medications prescribed, and other details that may be relevant or necessary for the treating provider to be aware of. Additionally, the added value of CyncHealth's event notification system provides that there isn't the financial or system burden of having an outside vendor to run this program for CHI Health. Similarly, this also removes the burden on the provider to try to piece together an unclear or incomplete medical history and still, despite gaps in information, offer an accurate diagnosis or treatment plan. In emergent situations where patients may not be able to recount specifics of their medical history due to the urgency of the situation or the patient's state of consciousness or ability to communicate, the immediate availability of this important data through the HIE can be lifesaving. As the current national health emergency with COVID-19 has demonstrated, information about underlying and chronic conditions can be vital to a provider's ability to assess if a patient is at greater risk of complication and needs additional monitoring or preventative measures. With universal participation in the Health Information Exchange, both patient and provider can be confident that most, if not all, of the patients longitudinal health record from all care received at Nebraska healthcare facilities is conveniently and immediately available to the provider at the point of care. This ensures patients are at the center of their own care and providers are as informed as possible. Additionally, recent federal regulations released from the Centers of Medicare and Medicaid require hospitals to send event notifications when a patient is admitted, transferred, or discharged from an emergency department or inpatient stay. These electronic notifications must be sent to a patient's treating provider, any postacute care providers, and any other providers that the patient designates. CyncHealth's event notification system helps hospitals meet this new condition to participation. And while the requirement

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

does not currently apply to nonhospital healthcare facilities, those facilities need to be able to receive the event notification alerts for the coordination of care to take place as designed. Universal participation in the Health Information Exchange would ensure that all alerts sent by hospitals are able to be received by all Nebraska providers. Lastly, while LB411 provides for the universal participation of the Nebraska healthcare facilities in Nebraska statewide designated Health Information Exchange, it is extremely important to note that CyncHealth's network extends beyond our state borders to several partnering neighboring states. For Nebraska patients who live or work near or outside of our state borders, especially in rural areas, and who may occasionally see out of health-- out-of-state healthcare providers, the value of that extended exchange network is immense. When they return to their routine Nebraska provider, the provider can easily and quickly get caught up on any out-of-state care encounters. And for facilities where-- where-- who serve out-of-state patients come to Nebraska to work or vacation or seek specialized treatment, providers can still demonstrate quality, well-informed care by incorporating medical records from any participating out-of-state facilities. In closing, I would ask that you support LB411, and I thank you for your time and attention to this important matter. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you for your testimony. Any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

JEANETTE WOJTALEWICZ: Thank you.

ARCH: Next proponent for LB411.

JUSTIN BIRGE: Good afternoon, Senator Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Dr. Justin Birge, J-u-s-t-i-n B-i-r-g-e. I'm an internal medicine physician and informatician at Nebraska Medicine UNMC. I also serve on the board of directors at CyncHealth. I'm here today in support of LB411. State Health Information Exchanges like CyncHealth are important. Accessible, complete, and accurate health information is an asset to both the clinicians and patients of Nebraska. To achieve maximum impact, this asset should be recognized and utilized to its full potential. Physicians and healthcare providers are often overloaded with burdensome data review and administrative tasks. This can compromise

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

or erode the time and attention devoted to patient care and clinical activities during a patient visit. Evaluating historical patient information through faxed, printed, mailed, hand-carried paperwork is one such burden. Having patient medical history accessible, complete, and organized, especially information from healthcare encounters outside the network the physician or provider has access to, having that information integrated into the natural workflow in the health information system they are using to care for patients in their own practice allows the physician or provider to efficiently gain valuable context and insight without additional administrative effort or relying on the patient to recollect and restate their complete medical history in detail. Additionally, Health Information Exchanges are important when caring for patients without the ability to provide medical record or medical history, and who may be without a patient advocate. An unresponsive or ill patient may be unable to provide important information about their medical history. Health information technology is a critical tool for data review in these time-sensitive scenarios. A complete and integrated Health Information Exchange improves clinical decision making and patient safety through communication of allergies, medication reactions, crucial regional health events, and other vital information. I know this committee is aware that patient access to their own medical information has many benefits. This information belongs with the patient readily available to any healthcare provider or facility they may see without the burden to collect, update, organize, archive, retrieve, and manage accessibility on their own. It is also important to acknowledge the current and future benefits to our healthcare infrastructure. The administrative burden of sharing medical records is greatly reduced when all facilities and providers can access complete health information directly and simply through the Health Information Exchange. The Health Information Exchange also operates independent of any one specific system. And should local health information systems become unavailable, patient medical records remain accessible through the Health Information Exchange. With universal participation in our Health Information Exchange, all patients, healthcare workers, and systems in Nebraska will benefit from a stronger and more sophisticated data infrastructure. This foundational concept will empower Nebraska to continue advancement as a national leader on technical interoperability, patient choice, patient data ownership, and patient-centered care. I urge the committee to support LB411. I'll be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very
much for your testimony.

JUSTIN BIRGE: Thank you.

***KATIE ZULKOSKI:** Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human
Services Committee. I am Katie Zulkoski testifying on behalf of the
Nebraska Hospital Association (NHA) and I thank you for this
opportunity to present this testimony. I am expressing (for the public
record) the NHA's support for LB411 introduced by Senator Steve
Lathrop. Hospitals have shifted from using paper medical records to
electronic health records (EHR) to create, access and store patient
information. Interoperability, the ability for electronic systems to
speak the same language to one another and to efficiently and
correctly transmit information, is an important issue for hospitals.
Interoperability requires collaboration across many private and public
sector entities, including hospitals and health systems, technology
companies, payers, consumers, and federal and state governments. Our
hospitals are making significant ongoing investments in attempting to
achieve this goal and hospital EHR data use is increasing. The NHA
welcomes the sharing of clinical information required by LB411. The
NHA encourages this committee to ensure that the sharing of
information mandated by this bill does not create new or additional
costs for participating hospitals. We look forward to working with the
Health Information Technology Board to help determine the policies
around this issue. The NHA thanks Senator Lathrop for bringing this
bill and we encourage the Committee to advance LB411. Thank you for
your consideration.

***JAMES WATSON:** Chairman Arch and Members of the Committee, good
Morning. My name is James Watson, and I am the Executive Director of
the Nebraska Association of Medicaid Health Plans (NAMHP). Those plans
include Nebraska Total Care, UnitedHealthcare Community Plan and
Healthy Blue Nebraska. Thank you for this opportunity to testify
before your committee. I am here to respectfully express the
Association's support for Legislative Bill 411 (LB411) as a measure
which would add two important provisions to the Population Health
Information Act. The current version of the Population Health
Information Act does not require health care facilities to participate
in the health information exchange provisions. Yet without sufficient
facility participation the exchange has incomplete data
infrastructure. LB411 takes the important step of requiring health

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

care facilities to share clinical information with the exchange and, as an additional incentive, provides that they participate with the added incentive that their connection to the exchange is of no cost to them. All three of the Medicaid Managed Care Organizations participate in the health information exchange and participation by all health care facilities in the state of Nebraska would greatly benefit the MCOs and the members we serve. Having access to all aspects of healthcare from all health care facilities in the state ensures that we have a complete picture of a patient's health and treatments. In addition, LB411 also requires health care payors to participate by sharing information as determined by the Health Information Technology Board. While the NAMHP respects the role of the HIT Board, we do express some concern with giving this appointed board the unlimited opportunity to request information from payors and would encourage collaboration with the DHHS Division of Medicaid to ensure proper use of patient data. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on LB411.

***ERIC DUNNING:** Chairperson Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Eric Dunning, and I am testifying in support of LB411 on behalf of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nebraska. Blue Cross Blue Shield is a founding member of NEHII, now CyncHealth, and actively support their mission to bring trust and value to health information technology by creating solutions for moving health data forward. Health data is a vital piece of the puzzle for all participants in the healthcare system: providers, patients, and insurance providers. Without adequate health data, tests and procedures are often needlessly repeated, driving up the cost of health care. Without data, transitions of care as patients step down from intensive care units, for example, are bumpy at best and can result in preventable readmissions. This is why Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nebraska has promoted and continues to support NeHII and supports LB411. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nebraska has been a partner of CyncHealth for over 15 years and has worked hard to get other payers involved in this effort. We appreciate Senator Lathrop introducing LB411 and encourage the committee to advance LB411 to General File.

ARCH: Next proponent for LB411. Seeing none, is there anyone that would like to speak in opposition to LB411?

KEVIN BAGLEY: Good afternoon.

ARCH: Good afternoon.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

KEVIN BAGLEY: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch, members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Kevin Bagley, K-e-v-i-n B-a-g-l-e-y. I'm the director for the Division of Medicaid and Long-Term Care within the Department of Health and Human Services. And I'm here to testify in opposition to LB411 which, as one of its provisions, delegates decision-making authority for Medicaid data to the Health Information Technology Board for the purpose of exchanging clinical information within the state's Health Information Exchange. The department's primary concern with the bill is the delegation of authority to the HIT Board for the use and sharing of Medicaid data, which is inconsistent with federal and state requirements mandating Medicaid program data be administered by a single state agency. LB411 would allow the state's HIT Board to define which clinical information the Medicaid program would share within the HIE. As the committee may be aware, Medicaid information is highly protected by a variety of state and federal statutes. Violating such statutes would come with considerable risk, including the loss of federal financial participation in the Medicaid program. DHHS solely retains the obligation to make determinations that any information shared in the furtherance of the administration of the Medicaid program be appropriate. Additionally, any entity that receives Medicaid information must maintain a duty to similarly safeguard the information and cannot use it for any purpose other than those predetermined by DHHS. LB411 would also impact state-run facilities managed by DHHS in its current form. Our current record system, while serving our needs, isn't capable of the interoperability that is typical in most healthcare electronic medical records. If enacted, we would likely need to procure and implement a new technology system to support that requirement. From an MLTC perspective, we would also note, and this is where I'll speak to some of the potential costs outlined in the fiscal note that Senator Williams asked about earlier, that making changes to our data warehouse to facilitate the exchange of that information, the creation of some of those APIs that would be required will come at cost to the agency. As well as the deadline meeting those-- those requirements by September 30, 2021, would likely be a challenge depending on the nature, structure, and complexity of the data being shared. Now, in summary, I'd like to emphasize that we at the department fully support the state HIE, the value it has brought and will continue to bring as it evolves in Nebraska. We also support data interoperability, the democratization of data for consumers in order to help support population health initiatives.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

However, our opposition lies in both requiring state-run facilities to participate in the delegation of authority outside of the Medicaid single-- single state agency for the sharing and use of data as proposed. For this reason, we respectfully request that the committee oppose the legislation. I'll note here that the amendment discussed by Senator Lathrop, we have not had a chance to review yet and that may change some of the items I've mentioned here. But not having had the chance to review that, we present that testimony. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

ARCH: Are there any questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So I'm just going to start with a statement. I'm confused. I don't-- I don't quite understand what your opposition is. Do you not currently share data with NeHII?

KEVIN BAGLEY: We do. I think to-- to clarify that a little bit, some of the language in the bill allows for that Health Information Technology Board to make decisions around how the data is shared. And that is not a-- an authority that we're in a position to delegate as a department.

M. CAVANAUGH: So currently, how-- how are the decisions made at NeHII around the data that they have? How is it--

KEVIN BAGLEY: So we have-- we have contracts with NeHII that-- with CyncHealth that we'll continue to monitor and discuss with them. We have a very close working relationship with them as-- as has been discussed in other testimony.

M. CAVANAUGH: So I would, and maybe this is a wrong assumption, but in those contracts, do you outline how the data shall be used and shared?

KEVIN BAGLEY: Typically, that would be the case, yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: So-- and then there is a board already with NeHII that makes decisions for the organization. So they take those decisions and-- and incorporate them into their policies. Correct?

KEVIN BAGLEY: I can't speak for how the board functions. But in terms of the sharing of Medicaid data, we're happy to share what data we're able to in the ways that are appropriate under federal and state statute.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: And you--

KEVIN BAGLEY: I think our concern really lies in the delegation of the
authority to make decisions on what data is shared and how.

M. CAVANAUGH: But you haven't to date had an issue with what data is
shared and how.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, not that I'm aware of. That being said, I think we
still have retained the ability through that contracting process to
make those determinations.

M. CAVANAUGH: So--

KEVIN BAGLEY: Delegating that authority to a separate board that was
independent of the department would present risk.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, thank you.

ARCH: Any other questions? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. I'd like to just follow up on
Senator Cavanaugh's question there. Have you thought about a solution
to that issue, knowing that the sharing of information is vitally
important to Medicaid people and all the people of the state?

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, I think as I-- as I've sat back and listened to
the proponents of the legislation, I think I'm certainly in a position
to sympathize with a lot of the discussion of the need to have the
data be available and readily so. I think our opposition really lies
in the delegation of that decision making. We would be happy to sit
down with-- with any stakeholders that we would need to in order to
help facilitate better data sharing. I don't think our opposition is
to the sharing of data, but rather to-- how the decision to share and
what it's shared for.

WILLIAMS: I understand that and I would suspect that that could be
taken care of contractually in this arrangement somehow so that your
opposition on that delegation would-- would diminish or go away. The
timetable that you talked about, it would be burdensome by the
September 30, 2021. Is there a date that you think would be suitable
for HHS to make that work?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

KEVIN BAGLEY: So that's a great question. I think the struggle we've had as a department as we look at the legislation is just that it's not clear to us what those interfaces would need to be. And I'm-- I'm certainly not suggesting that that be included in the language of the bill. But really, I think there's just uncertainty on our part as to what the level of effort would be required from a technical standpoint. So I-- it may be truthfully that the September 30 date is feasible. It may be that that date would need to be pushed out substantially. I can't speak to what the date would be unless I'm sure what the level of effort would be.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bagley.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So just-- I just want to be clear. The concern is over being compliant with state and federal law and losing-- losing funding. But this doesn't preempt this. It actually says to the extent not preempted by federal law. So is there a concern that NeHII would not be in compliance with state and federal law?

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, again, I don't want to speak to NeHII's operations. That-- that's not something I can do. But my-- my concern is really just the delegation of the authority to make the decision. So to the extent that federal law preempts state law, certainly that would be part of the discussion. And I think as long as there were still a provision whereby the Medicaid agency could retain the ability to frankly make different decisions about sharing its data based on how we see our risk associated with-- with federal statute, that would be something that would be critical [INAUDIBLE] as an agency.

M. CAVANAUGH: So are there-- so as long as they are federally and state compliant, what additional restrictions would you want the authority to put on the use of data?

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, I think that's a difficult question to answer as well, just because I'm not sure exactly what APIs and sharing would look like. That being said, I think when we talk about Medicaid data, that's a very sensitive area. We want to make sure that we balance the need to share the information to provide quality care and timely care, but also the need to manage privacy and the security of that information on those participants' behalf.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Well, I-- I know Senator Lathrop well, and he is a judicious lawyer and would never, I think, bring anything to this committee that would jeopardize our federal funding or the fidelity of data. So I would encourage you and the department to work with him on coming to a solution for this. Thank you.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Thank you. We'd welcome that.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Thank you.

ARCH: Next opponent for LB411. Welcome.

HEATH BODDY: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch, members of the committee. My name is Heath Boddy, H-e-a-t-h B-o-d-d-y. I'm the president and CEO of the Nebraska Health Care Association. And on behalf of 423 of our not-for-profit and proprietary skilled nursing facilities and assisted living communities, I'm here today to testify in opposition to LB411. This bill would require facilities to share clinical information with the state-designated Health Information Exchange, as we've discussed today, known as CYNCHHealth or NEHII by September 30. I want to first note that our members support data transparency and prioritization of population health. Nursing facilities already share extensive resident and facility data with various federal and state agencies. Copies of residents' clinical records are made available to them within 24 hours. Our members' concerns with this bill are really in two different buckets and I'd like to address them separately and then just talk about a few potential solutions that we would see. I plan to highlight and reference the handout that you got, but not going to read through it today. So let me first talk about assisted living. Assisted living in Nebraska is designed to be a social model. It is not a medical operation. Providers offer a range of nonmedical services for individuals wanting assistance with meals, housekeeping, and activities of daily living. They do offer limited medical services for those requesting them. The majority of assisted living facilities do not have a nurse on staff. They have a nurse consultant who visits regularly to oversee medication provisions. Because assisted living is not a medical model, providers are not required to maintain clinical records. If you look at page 4 of your handout, you'll see a handout that lists the only information required in the assisted living's resident record; and you can see it's not clinical. Second, let's talk

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

about nursing facilities. Our association worked collaboratively with NeHII for over a year, offering ideas on how to make their database more attractive to nursing facility providers. You can imagine we were surprised to discover this bill was introduced as we had no advance notice. As I understand it, NeHII was really designed as an acute care tool and we have been encouraging them to make modifications that would provide nursing facilities with information that would be helpful to their operations. We feel making these changes would increase voluntary participation and not require this mandate. According to NeHII, 39 of Nebraska's 206 nursing facilities currently participate in their program. As referenced before, Nebraska nursing facilities already submit extensive resident and facility data to various state and federal agencies, including Nebraska DHHS. As an example, every three months or upon a change in a resident's condition, the facility must complete a 45-page multidisciplinary assessment of each resident. This data is submitted to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and to Nebraska DHHS. And if you want to see examples of some of those, pages 8-12 in your handout would give you some good examples. The majority of this data is deidentified and publicly available. Resident identifiable data would be available from DHHS or from CMS. During the public health emergency, nursing facilities had additional reporting requirements. This initially revolve-- involved reporting the same data to both federal and state agencies. And we were pleased that DHHS worked really hard to eliminate the duplicative efforts. They recognized that the additional requirements take staff time away from care at the bedside and making sure those residents were cared for as they deserved to be. Our members are concerned that there are no limitations on what data will be required to be shared with the NeHII board. Any additional information would need to be manually entered into the resident records so it could be extracted by NeHII. In addition to this administrative burden, our members are also concerned about the additional cost that would be involved after July 1. In discussions with NeHII, they've indicated they would not rule out additional costs in the future associated with this participation. So let's talk about offering some solutions. Our association and our members believe strongly in not just saying no, but trying to identify solutions where we can work together. If you look at pages 16-18 in your handout, you'll see some of those alternatives. First, let's talk about Nebraska DHHS already shares information with NeHII. We've heard some about that today. NeHII could extract the resident clinical data from

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

nursing facilities that was already submitted to DHHS. And rather than requiring each nursing facility to share that, then becoming redundant sharing, we could encourage NeHII to continue to work with providers and provider associations to enhance the resources offered to nursing facilities. This would encourage voluntary participation, again not requiring a mandate. And third, exempt assisted livings from sharing clinical data with NeHII as they do not collect this information. Resident clinical data would be available from each of those Nebraskans' physicians already. I want to emphasize one last time our members agree with data transparency. They understand the overall goal of NeHII, but feel like this is not the approach. Thank you for your time and your consideration today, and I'd be happy to try to answer any questions.

ARCH: Any questions from the senators? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. Excuse me. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Boddy, for-- for not only coming, but coming with some solutions. Appreciate that. My question is pretty simple. On the last one with assisted living facilities, I think we're aware that there are some facilities that combine assisted living with a graduated move into skilled nursing. Would you see an exemption there as a problem or are those two, even those-- those facilities can be in the same physical building, are they licensed separately so that that would not be a problem?

HEATH BODDY: They are indeed licensed separately, Senator. So there should be a wall, if you will.

WILLIAMS: So you could still work with an exemption like that?

HEATH BODDY: It would seem so.

WILLIAMS: OK, thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thank you for being here, Mr. Boddy. The amendment, have you seen the amendment?

HEATH BODDY: I don't believe I've seen the amendment.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: It's-- there's an exemption for if this were a technological burden. Does that address the concern for assisted living that wouldn't have the technology?

HEATH BODDY: Thanks, Senator. Perhaps it would. My question would be sorry, not up to speed on the amendment, would that be something they'd have-- they would apply for once? Who would they apply to that for or would that be something they'd have to do over and over, whether it be quarterly, annually? I'm not-- I'm not really sure.

M. CAVANAUGH: It says annually.

HEATH BODDY: I'm sorry, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Annually.

HEATH BODDY: So perhaps it would help. Would there be an opportunity to have it-- have an amendment like that be a longer term thing, but maybe annually is the right number.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, thank you.

***KENT ROBERT:** Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. I am Kent Rogert with Jensen Rogert and I am here on behalf of LeadingAge Nebraska to testify in opposition to LB411. LeadingAge Nebraska is a non-profit association that represents non-profit providers of long-term care services across the state. The past year has been a significant challenge for long-term care providers, in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. Providers have been challenged by workforce, PPE, testing, census, vaccinations, and reimbursement issues and are laser focused on keeping COVID-19 out of their buildings in order to protect Nebraska's seniors. LB411, while an understandable approach to information sharing, requires health care facilities to participate in the health information exchange to share clinical information. Skilled nursing facilities fall under the health care facilities that would be subject to this requirement. While the option to have the costs associated with establishing health information exchange for facilities would be covered if established by July 1st, 2021, given the current environment related to COVID-19 and the more pronounced workforce shortage in long-term care, it would be very difficult for some providers to focus on getting these projects completed by July 1, 2021. If facilities are unable to establish the

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

connections by that timeframe, they would be left to cover the cost of facilitating the necessary connections, which would be burdensome to them given that most have seen a reduction in census and therefore the associated reduction in funding since March of 2020. LB411 does not provide information related to how month to month costs associated with facilitating this exchange or changes or updates to the provider interface would be charged or covered. If there is an on-going cost to facilities to submit or receive this information, that would also be challenging to many long-term care providers. LeadingAge Nebraska recognizes the value of information exchange for the purposes of data collection and continuity of care. We also appreciate the efforts made to help defray the cost of participation within a set timeframe. However, the potential cost to providers at a time when they are putting all efforts and funding into protecting residents from COVID-19 does not make the proposed timing for establishing connections free of cost (July 1, 2021) realistic for many providers. In addition, Section 1, Paragraph (4), Line 8, indicates that the information to be shared "shall be determined by policies adopted by the Health Information Technology Board." It would be helpful if a reasonability provision could be included. To mandate sharing of information that is determined by the HIT Board may result in continued changes and increased reporting requirements that long-term care providers would have to timely accommodate, even if not reasonable for all providers. Each change to reporting requirements results in IT and other staff time to accomplish. If something like LB411 is contemplated for skilled nursing facilities, the time frame would need to be expanded, there would need to be funding to cover any IT related costs for build out, connection, and monthly fees for providers. LeadingAge Nebraska supports voluntary reporting for long-term care providers. Situations vary among providers and some may be able to participate in information sharing, or may be sharing already, under a voluntary approach. Some providers, especially based on the past year of COVID-19 related challenges, will not have the time, staff, human or funding resources to undertake what is being set forth in this bill.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. Next opponent for LB411. Seeing none, is there anyone that would like to testify in a neutral capacity?

ROBERT M. BELL: Good afternoon. Chairman Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee, my name is Robert M. Bell,

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

spelled R-o-b-e-r-t, middle initial M., and last name spelled B-e-l-l. I'm the executive director and registered lobbyist for the Nebraska Insurance Federation. I am here today to testify in a neutral position on LB411. And I should say, with apologies to Senator Williams because he hears this all the time, but since it's the first time I've been before HHS Committee this year, I just want to tell you a little bit about the federation. We are the primary trade association of insurance companies domiciled in or with a significant economic presence in Nebraska. Currently, the federation consists of 29 member companies and 8 associate members. The members write all lines of insurance. One of the goals of the federation is to promote the concepts and importance of insurance products to the public. Nebraska insurers provide high-value, quality insurance products to Nebraskans that help Nebraskans during difficult times. Not only do Nebraska insurers provide financial protections to Nebraskans, but insurers also provide high-paying jobs. Members of the Nebraska Insurance Federation alone provide well over 14,000 jobs to the Nebraska economy. And according to a recent economic survey back in 2015, the insurance industry had a \$14.24 billion impact on the Nebraska economy. And so get into the meat of my testimony. First, let me express my gratitude to Senator Lathrop and his staff and CyncHealth for agreeing to narrowing the definition of healthcare payor that was found in the green copy to the language that is now found in AM179, which limits the scope of the bill to health insurance plans. Many types of insurance companies make a variety of medical payments, but typically those are just financial transactions and not necessarily related to patient management, like they would be in a health insurance plan. It'd have that clinical data that CyncHealth seeks. So we very much appreciate everybody listening to the concerns of the insurance industry as a whole. There's this one minor thing I just wanted to bring up with the committee. I have health insurance plans or the federation has health insurance plans that do participate already and are big supporters of CyncHealth. I have some health insurance plans that do not participate currently, although they are all supportive of the ideals of having a statewide health information system and do see the benefits from a payor perspective. However, there have been some data privacy concerns that a couple of my or at least one of my member companies has, and they would like to sit down with CyncHealth and talk about those particular issues. So their concern would be, you know, having a hammer and legislation that they have to participate by a certain amount of data. When you sit down at

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

the negotiation table and try to work out two things, when you have a law bearing down on you, it makes it pretty tough to negotiate. So I just-- I put that before the committee, just a consideration to think about. And data privacy, when you think of it from an insurance standpoint, it's interesting. The doctor from Nebraska Medicine kind of caught my attention. I got a letter yesterday from Nebraska Medicine saying my health information had been compromised and I was not alone. Right? There's 200,000 people that-- that had their health personal information compromised. When you're an insurance company and that happens, you also have to provide notification. But there's also some-- there are also other steps within the insurance code that you may have to do. And depending on what state you may be domiciled in, there may be additional requirements that your state of domiciliary puts on you. So these are, I mean, for data privacy is very important. I'm sure it's very important for CyncHealth. I know it is. But it's also important to insurance companies that they protect their consumer data. And thus, you know, they would like to sit down and discuss those with, you know, the attorneys, the smart people on both sides. Well, the attorneys on both sides. How about that? So speaking as an attorney myself. So anyway, thank you for the opportunity to testify.

ARCH: Any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

ROBERT M. BELL: You're welcome.

***COLEEN NIELSEN:** Chairman Lathrop and Members of the Judiciary Committee, my name is Coleen Nielsen. I am the registered lobbyist for the Nebraska Insurance Information Service testifying in a neutral position on LB411. LB411 provides that a payor as defined in 25-21,247 shall participate in the state designated health care exchange. This broad definition of payor would include all types of insurers including property casualty insurers. We are neutral on this bill if the definition is modified with the following amendment: 4) On or before September 30, 2021, each health insurance plan care payor as defined in section 25 21,247 shall participate in the designated health information exchange through sharing of information. Such information shall be determined by policies adopted by the Health Information Technology Board. For the purposes of this subsection, a health insurance plan includes any group or individual sickness and accident insurance policy, health maintenance organization contract, subscriber contract, employee medical, surgical, or hospital care benefit plan, or self-funded employee benefit plan to the extent not

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

preempted by federal law. Health insurance plan does not include (a) accident-only, disability income, hospital confinement indemnity, dental, hearing, vision, or credit insurance, (b) coverage issued as a supplement to liability insurance, (c) insurance provided as a supplement to medicare, (d) insurance arising from workers' compensation provisions, (e) automobile medical payment insurance, (f) insurance policies that provide coverage for a specified disease or any other limited benefit coverage, or (g) insurance under which benefits are payable with or without regard to fault and which is statutorily required to be contained in any liability insurance policy. Thank you for the opportunity to testify in this manner.

ARCH: Anyone else wish to testify in a neutral capacity? Seeing none, Senator Lathrop, you're welcome to close. While you're coming up, I will mention that we did receive three letters, proponents for LB411. We also received three written testimonies this morning: Nebraska Insurance Information Service, Nebraska Hospital Association, Blue Cross Blue Shield, all proponents; and LeadingAge Nebraska, an opponent in written testimony.

LATHROP: OK, well, that was helpful. You know, sometimes you introduce a bill and people will come and try to work through the bugs before you get to the hearing. And sometimes you need a hearing to smoke out the people that won't come forward in a timely manner and talk to you about the concerns that they have. I am hopeful that we can and we will try to address the concerns to the extent they can and consistent with the mission of Health Information Exchange, try to address the concerns that we heard. And then what I'll do is come back to you as a committee and say I've worked through them or we worked through all of them and here are the ones that just can't be worked through and whether they're reasonable concerns or just sort of a pretext for not wanting to-- this is all scary. And so we don't want to do it because it's scary, which I think is a little bit of some of the opposition. But this is important. It's really important and it's the future of healthcare. And this whole process has been a build. And we're now at the place where it's time to get everybody on board because the infrastructure's there and patients will benefit from it. At the end of the day, the details can-- can get worked out. But at the end of the day, it's about the patients getting the best quality of care and all those people that roll in to an ER and can't speak for themselves or maybe they're accompanied by a child or a family member that doesn't know about their-- the particulars of their medical history

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

that'd be important to a physician. So my office will continue to work through some of the concerns that you heard. You're welcome to contact me, but I'll be in touch after we've kind of tried to check all the boxes. And-- and if we can't get them all checked, I'll tell you why.

ARCH: Very good. Thank you.

LATHROP: OK, perfect, thanks.

ARCH: Any questions? Any final questions? Senator Day.

DAY: I do just want to ask while you're here in front of us, what you-- how you felt about do you have concerns being as though NeHII or CyncHealth is the state-designated information exchange, do you-- how-- do you have concerns about the data sharing? Or I don't know if this is something that you're going to come back--

LATHROP: You mean the security?

DAY: Correct. Correct.

LATHROP: So I would have to defer on that because I'm--

DAY: OK.

LATHROP: --believe me, some of you have heard me say this. In the morning, I have to have Isela in my office that get me on a Zoom call. So I'm not a technical person and I'm just not--

DAY: OK.

LATHROP: --I'm not equipped to really address the-- what-- what are the measures taken to make sure this doesn't turn into a leak where people's--

DAY: Sure.

LATHROP: --private information gets out? I'm sure they have that base covered, but that would be a question for their technical people.

DAY: Thank you.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

LATHROP: OK. Thanks. I appreciate it.

ARCH: This will close the hearing for LB411. And the committee is going to take a ten-minute break and we'll start a little bit after 3:00. This will now open the hearing for LB238, and Senator McDonnell, you may proceed.

McDONNELL: Thank you, Chairman Arch and all members of the human relations committee, Health and Human Services Committee. I will start by providing some history behind this legislation. In 2017, I introduced LB578 with the simple goal of providing additional funding to first responders in our state. The bill called for the implementation of what is referred to as the Ground Emergency Medical Transportation, or GEMT program, which allowed for a supplement payment structure for emergency transports through state Medicaid programs. LB578 was adopted on Final Reading with a vote of 41-0 and signed into law by the Governor on May 22, 2017. To comply with enacted provisions of LB578, DHHS submitted a State Plan Amendment, SPA, to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services that it knew was not likely to be approved. This may have been done to meet the letter of the law basically as set forth by LB578, but it did not meet the overarching intent of LB578 as approved by the full Legislature. The Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services gave DHHS the opportunity to modify the 2017 State Plan Amendment and its proposed methodology to align with the programs approved in other states. DHHS declined to accept the recommendations from CMS, which would have met the legislative intent of LB578. When a 911 call is received, our state's first responders are not able to decide if they want to respond based on the patient's ability to pay or what insurance they have, and rightfully so. The first responders react immediately and provide the necessary assistance. This means that there are many times when there is no reimbursement for the services provided. Even when the emergency care and transfers are for patients with Medicare and Medicaid coverage, the reimbursement rate falls well below the actual cost of providing the services, thereby creating a gap in funding. The Ground Emergency Medical Transportation program required by LB578 when it was passed in 2017 was a means to address this gap in recognition of the underpayment by federal and state payors. Ground Emergency Medical Transport programs are intended to be cost neutral to the state Medicaid agencies, and the state's reasonable costs directly associated with the program are intended to be reimbursed through the process. This is reflected in the May 4, 2017, fiscal note for LB578,

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

which reflected no fiscal impact to the state General Fund. Most of our fire and rescue departments across the state are financially strapped and critically in need of additional funding to help protect our Nebraska communities, in part because the cost of providing emergency response services is exceeding the level of reimbursement that providers are receiving. I recognize the fiscal restraints we face as a state, especially as local entities try to recover from the ongoing devastation we have seen this past year. Once this program is up and running, it will help local departments fill a funding gap without dipping into the state's General Fund, just as it is doing in 14 other states that currently have a Ground Emergency Medical Transportation program. LB238 proposes to implement this supplemental payment program as continued effort for Ground Emergency Medical Transportation through the state Medicaid agency for public ambulance providers. Nebraska has participated in Medicaid for over 30 years. However, the state plan does not recognize first responder ambulance services as part of the higher reimbursement allowable under the regulations administered by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. A minor change to the language in the state plan will allow the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to reimburse at a higher rate, which is imperative to the state of Nebraska. The testifiers who will follow me today will provide additional perspective relating to the need for this legislation. You will be hearing from Fire Chief David Engler, Lincoln Fire and Rescue; Darren Garrean, president of the Nebraska Association of Professional Firefighters; and Jack Cheloha, representing the city of Omaha. Additionally, you also have received written testimony from Omaha Fire Chief Dan Olsen and Omaha Fire Assistant Chief Cathy Bossman. I'm here to try to answer any of your questions and I will also be here to close.

ARCH: I have a-- any other questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thank you for being here, Senator McDonnell. Remind me and I'm sorry I missed the beginning of your opening, so maybe you already said this. But you brought this bill two years ago.

McDONNELL: So originally, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, this bill was passed, LB578, and signed by the Governor in 2017. I brought a bill a year ago based on the idea that I thought if I introduced new legislation, it would hopefully bring all parties together and they would figure out a way to do this since 14 other states have been

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

doing this for a number of years and we already know that 7 are pending right now and the need we have for the-- the state of Nebraska. Between 15 to 30 million dollars this could bring in for needed equipment and training for firefighters that are paid and volunteer across our state. That did not work. That fell on deaf ears. I'm back with a new bill. I mean, yes, it does feel like Groundhog Day. We're repeating the same bill, trying to improve in any way. But there's also got to be a will. There's got to be a will to actually follow the direction of the Legislature. If there's no will, I don't-- I don't know where to go basically, when you have a bill that was approved and signed by the Governor and there-- there was no, I don't think, the will to-- to actually implement it. And that's sad based on the number of people that those monies could have went to the departments to help people when they call 911.

M. CAVANAUGH: And I apologize. I forgot that you have passed a bill in 2017. That was before my time. And then you brought, in 2019 you brought a bill because they hadn't enacted it. And--

McDONNELL: That's correct.

M. CAVANAUGH: And it seemed that the department at that time had taken your law as a suggestion.

McDONNELL: I felt that way. I felt like they were-- the Department of Health and Human Services were basically the fourth branch of government and had decided to veto my bill.

M. CAVANAUGH: And so this bill seeks to do what hasn't happened yet.

McDONNELL: Correct.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, thank you.

ARCH: Thank you. Any other questions?

McDONNELL: And I'll be here for closing.

ARCH: Thank you. First proponent.

DAVE ENGLER: Good afternoon, Senator Arch and members of the Health and Human Services Committee. For the record, my name is Dave Engler. That's D-a-v-e E-n-g-l-e-r. I'm the acting fire chief for the city of

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

Lincoln. And today, I'm speaking in support of LB238 on behalf of both the city of Lincoln and other fire agencies throughout the state. For review and for the new committee members, I will try to provide some insight into the crisis growing within the emergency medical field and how LB238 would provide some relief to first responders, local taxpayers, and Nebraskans statewide. The average cost of running an ambulance call for my department is over \$500 per transport. Medicaid pays around \$180 for this service. The underpayment means that we must charge other non-Medicaid patients who receive the same service over \$1,200 to make up the budget deficit the underpayment creates. Accordingly, CMS has approved GEMT programs in 14 states. At least eight other states are currently pursuing GEMT programs. The Medicaid programs in nearly all of these states have managed care components and yet still realize the advantages of a GEMT program as a complement to the managed care delivery model. These states, the medical industry, and CMS recognize the value initial EMS treatment and transport has on definitive care. Definitive care is a term used to describe medical care that makes a difference in patient outcomes. Patient outcomes are the same focus for managed care delivery models. Outcomes are measured in percentage of patients that survive a medical emergency, the level of care provided in the hospital, the length of the hospital stay, how treatment was needed after discharge and etcetera. Proper EMS deployment improves a patient's chance of surviving a sudden medical emergency. It decreases the amount of medical intervention needed in the hospital, and it lessens the need for subsequent care. Conversely, improper EMS deployment, typically due to funding shortages, means a lower chance of survival and more expensive medical interventions afterwards. Lincoln began pursuing a GEMT program for the state in cooperation with a group of stakeholder agencies in 2017. The group, supported by Senator McDonnell, succeeded in passing the bill that required Medicare-- Medicaid to implement the GEMT. DHHS interpreted the bill as requiring a methodology it knew CMS would not allow. CMS denied the SPA submitted and the program was never implemented. In 2019, Senator McDonnell introduced a follow-up bill and DHHS assigned a large fiscal note to it. The bill ultimately did not advance from committee. It's notable that the Fiscal Office wrote that the costs are significant and more information is needed to evaluate the potential costs for LB238. I have-- I have just a few comments on the fiscal note, otherwise, from a general perspective as the fire chief and not as the Medicaid director. First, the program involves a very small number of claims, an estimated 11,000 per year

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

compared to the millions of claims the Medicaid program processes annually. It appears that there will always be claims that do not fit into the managed care box and will need to be processed by a claims broker or the MMIS until the claims broker is in place. Given the small volume for these GEMT claims in comparison to those other nonmanaged care claims, it seems unfair to attribute the entire cost of this alternative method for processing claims solely to GEMT. Second, DHHS is asking for a lot of FTEs, especially when it only called for one in the original bill that required implementation of the GEMT program in 2017. As an example, Indiana runs this program with a half FTE and the entire state of California has 1.5 FTEs to run its more complex version. Third, GEMT programs require keeping the state Medicaid programs whole. This means that the cost DHHS is-- has directly associated with the implementation of the program will be reimbursed once the program is up and running. It also means that any cost that DHHS has for the program would need to be directly associated with the GEMT program and eventually justified to CMS. So while it may take some time before the costs are fully reimbursed and the local agencies begin to receive any supplemental payments, the supplemental payments will eventually start being disseminated to the local agencies, with DHHS costs continuing to be covered. In summary, requiring DHHS to complete the implementation of the GEMT program the Legislature has already supported and authorized in 2017 will mean the difference between service levels deteriorating and maintaining high service levels across the state. It will also help provide some relief to the other patients and minimize the need for subsidization of the services from local taxpayers. Along with the other stakeholder agencies across the state, we ask for your support on LB238 to finally implement this GEMT program. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you for being here. I'm looking at the-- the staffing that you mentioned. And what was-- do you recall what the staff, the one FTE was from 2017, what the position was?

DAVE ENGLER: I do not.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, I can look that up. I just was curious because this is a lot of--

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

DAVE ENGLER: The-- the number of people proposed in the fiscal note is highly inconsistent with any other state that actually handles more claims.

M. CAVANAUGH: It's-- it is robust.

DAVE ENGLER: It is.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

DAVE ENGLER: Thank you.

ARCH: Next proponent for LB238. Welcome.

DARREN GARREAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch, members of the Health and Human Services Committee. My name is Darren Garrean, D-a-r-r-e-n, last name is G-a-r-r-e-a-n. I am president of the Nebraska Professional Firefighters Association, representing approximately 1,400 firefighters, EMTs, and paramedics across the state of Nebraska. This is theoretically Groundhog Day. We've been here before. As you heard both from Senator McDonnell and Chief Engler, that this was passed not only unanimously by the body, but signed into law by the Governor. And-- and here we are years later with-- with something that has not been enacted. I want to read something just as a context of how this plays out. On March 23, 2020, your Scottsbluff firefighters are asking for your help. We're dangerously low on the PPE needed to protect us in firefighting and fighting COVID-19. If you or your business can donate unopened boxes of N-95 masks, surgical masks, please reach out to us immediately. Your Scottsbluff firefighters are on the front lines of treating this virus and are unable to obtain the needed resources to protect ourselves. If you are willing-- if you are willing and able to donate, contact-- contact us via and has a telephone number. And I say this in a context where in 2017 this was enacted and signed and you've heard some numbers of upwards of \$30 million that could come back to Nebraska and the fire departments. I'm not saying that that wouldn't have solved a problem for Scottsbluff, but a reasonable person would deduct that the money coming back to the fire departments may have had an impact as it could have related to the global pandemic. That being said, you know, I don't know why we're

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

here again. This should have been done a long time ago. We support
this and ask that you do the same. Are there any questions?

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very
much.

DARREN GARREAN: Thanks.

ARCH: Next proponent for LB238. Please.

JACK CHELOHA: Good afternoon, Senator Arch and members of the
committee. My name is Jack Cheloha. That's spelled J-a-c-k; last name
is spelled C-h-e-l-o-h-a. And I'm the lobbyist for the city of Omaha.
I want to testify in favor of LB238 this afternoon. First of all, I'd
like to thank Senator McDonnell for his stick-to-it-iveness, if that's
a word, on this issue. You heard from two previous witnesses the
frustration that has already overtaken some of us regarding this
issue. And so if I could, I want to implore this committee to-- to
help us this year. It's very important. Our fire chief did submit a
letter of support to this committee. Just to reiterate some of the
major points in there, Omaha Fire and Rescue makes roughly 51,000
transports a year. And of that amount, 81, I'm sorry, 85 percent of
them are Medicare and Medicaid participants. So with that, if we're
only being reimbursed \$180 for these calls, it's dramatically below
what the actual cost is for the city of Omaha. And so we question why
would the taxpayers of Omaha have to subsidize the U.S. government
relative to these transports? And if-- if indeed there is a policy and
a program in place to get us a higher rate of return, then we should
pursue it. We've actively pursued it since 2017 and we think we found
a way to-- to get it done. Before I finish what I handed out, I'd like
to read into the record relative to the fiscal note, because as we
read it, we're as frustrated as anybody else. The city of Omaha has
reviewed the fiscal note to LB238 provided by the Department of Health
and Human Services. The city believes the department has greatly
exaggerated the cost to implement this piece of legislation, primarily
with regard to the issue of fee for service claims processing. The
department has had for several years the objective of placing as many
Medicaid-eligible persons under managed care contracts as possible.
The city acknowledges their goal, but takes no position as to whether
this goal is in the best interest of all persons eligible for Medicaid
services. The city does acknowledge from discussions with the
department staff and the current fee-for-service payment system known

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

as MMIS is outdated and that alternative mechanisms to pay claims outside of managed care must be developed. As you know, this legislation does require that GEMT service claims submitted by the city fire and rescue departments be paid via a fee for service in order to obtain the additional federal funds. The payment of GEMT claims under fee for service is really an issue within an issue. Unless the department is able to successfully put every service and every claim under managed care, the central issue of an alternative means of paying a valid Medicaid claim must be addressed. It seems reasonable to the city of Omaha that there will always be situations where claims will need to be paid outside of managed care. It is hard for the city to believe that the managed care entity has the experience and expertise that the cities have in providing emergency transport services. And then on summary, we basically say we're willing to work with not only the department, but this committee to come up with the proper way to-- to word this and to get it done. In closing, I think why we feel frustrated is it's turned into a, you know, the statewide fire and rescue services have ended up being at odds with the Department of Health and Human Services in order to obtain the federal funding. It seems like we, the state people, should all be working together to get this higher rate of return. And it would be beneficial not only from Omaha, which submitted a fiscal note of this could help us roughly \$4 million a year to departments as were mentioned in Scottsbluff-Gering area. So with that, we support LB238. We thank Senator McDonnell. We thank this committee and hopefully we can advance this bill to General File. It seems like it's very similar to LB101 this committee has already looked at and addressed and advanced 7-0 where you've extended the ability to do these types of payments. So we'd appreciate your help. Thank you.

ARCH: Thank you. Any questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So it looks like we're losing out around \$5.3 million in federal funds every year from the fiscal note. You said around \$4 million for Omaha.

JACK CHELOHA: That was our estimate, Senator. Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Or maybe it's more than that. I'm--

JACK CHELOHA: And that's a-- it'd be a voluntary program for each department. So depending if you signed up and we get it up and moving,

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

that number could grow. I think some other witnesses said as high as
maybe 15 to 30 million.

M. CAVANAUGH: And I did look up the fiscal note from 2017 and there
was one employee. It was a DHS program specialist at \$46,376 a year
and operating of \$20,964. I mentioned that to give those that are
coming after you the opportunity to address how all of a sudden we
need so many more people to do this. So thank you.

JACK CHELOHA: Thank you.

ARCH: Any other questions? Thank you for your testimony.

JACK CHELOHA: Thank you.

***LYNN REX:** Senator Arch and members of the Health and Human Services
Committee, my name is Lynn Rex and I represent the League of Nebraska
Municipalities. We support LB238. The League has historically
supported the Ground Emergency Medical Transport Act and its
implementation. We support LB238 and its goal to implement a
supplemental payment program through the state Medicaid agency for
public ambulance providers. The program considers the providers'
actual costs in providing ground emergency medical transport services
to produce a supplemental payment to help bridge the gap between the
reimbursement rates and the actual costs. The League appreciates that
participation in the Ground Emergency Transport Program will be
optional to the local agencies. Thank you for your time and
consideration on this matter.

ARCH: Next proponent for LB238. Seeing none, is there anybody that
would like to testify in opposition on LB238?

KEVIN BAGLEY: It would appear I'm back in the hot seat.

ARCH: Good afternoon.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch, members of the Health and
Human Services Committee. My name is Kevin Bagley, K-e-v-i-n
B-a-g-l-e-y. I'm the director in the Division of Medicaid and
Long-Term Care within the Department of Health and Human Services. I'm
here to testify in opposition to LB238. As currently written, LB238
would require the division to create a supplemental reimbursement
program effective July 1, 2021, for ground emergency medical

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

transportation services and further require that those services be paid on a fee-for-service basis. I would note before I continue, as has been brought up already, that the agency opposed similar legislation, LB645, during the 2019 session. GEMT services are currently paid by the Heritage Health managed care plans. As part of an episode of care, this bill would remove an important piece of management of care for individuals for whom the rest of their healthcare services are managed by our managed care organizations. Requiring fee for service payment for GEMT services is in dissonance with the division's long-term strategy and approach with respect to managing health outcomes for Medicaid beneficiaries. Furthermore, requiring fee-for-service claims processing contradicts the Medicaid Information Technology Architecture modernization strategy and would complicate DHHS's ability to move forward with our progress toward sunseting pieces of our 40-year old functionality, such as the claims processing module in the legacy Medicaid Management Information System or MMIS. If claims processing continues under a fee-for-service basis, we estimate a significant cost to implement a more modernized system. In 2016, the department received a cost proposal in excess of \$24 million to implement a more modern claims broker service for fee-for-service claims processing. This bill would not allow the department to incur any unreimbursable costs to implement the supplemental payment, adding that as a condition of receiving supplemental payment providers shall agree to reimburse the department for any costs of implementing and administering the program. In addition to creating agreements with each provider to make supplemental payments, the department would need to establish separate payment arrangements with each participating provider to receive any administration reimbursement and determine an allocation methodology to distribute costs fairly for each provider. The supplemental arrangements and administrative operationalization would lead to the necessity for additional staff, as reflected in the fiscal note. And I'm happy to answer any questions along those lines as well. The department has concerns about the ability to implement the program as required by July 1, 2021. In addition to the State Plan Amendment necessary to perform a supplemental payment, the department would also need to remove GEMT services from capitation rates with our managed care plans, execute contract amendments, amend the federal 1915(b) waiver, update the MMIS and provider enrollment systems and processes, as well as hire and train additional staff and possibly acquire consulting services to implement the requirements and subsequently

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

support it in operations. The department would also note that this bill only appears to apply to ambulance ground emergency medical transports, leaving air emergency medical transport and nonemergency medical transportation within the managed care delivery system. Finally, I'd like to speak to an initial rate evaluation that the division completed in 2017. This evaluation determined that the rate Nebraska Medicaid was paying for GEM service-- GEMT services was on average above what other states in the region were paying for similar services. Furthermore, we discovered that one state that implemented a supplemental payment for GEMT services appeared to do so to address an even lower rate than is currently paid in the state. In this case, their fee-for-service schedule rate plus the supplemental payment is roughly in alignment with the Nebraska Medicaid fee schedule right now. It's for the state of California. In summary, the department opposes LB238 because it does not align with our long-term strategic vision to manage patient care. The bill introduces complexities in the delivery system in order to enhance payments for services that appear to be in alignment with other Medicaid programs. We respectfully request that the committee not advance the legislation. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. OK. Yeah, let's hear about the staff.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Sure.

M. CAVANAUGH: What can you tell me? That's a lot of staff.

KEVIN BAGLEY: So to-- to address it at a little bit of a high level without going into too many details, one of the complexities that comes out of this is the need to really contract with each of those entities to manage the certified public expenditure as outlined in the bill. So that requires substantive contracting and accounting staff, as well as some additional staff to perform the oversight needed from an auditing perspective to make sure that none of the additional funds going out are going to be subject to recoupment from a federal audit. So that's substantive, really. That's probably the bulk of those individual employee costs.

M. CAVANAUGH: And then the information system would be \$28 million.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

KEVIN BAGLEY: That's correct. So as I mentioned in my testimony, in 2016 the department received a bid.

M. CAVANAUGH: Oh, I'm at-- this whole committee is very familiar.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Sure. So we, we took that \$24 million and really just inflated it to be more reflective of the current time period.

M. CAVANAUGH: So--

KEVIN BAGLEY: That being said, I think it's-- that is a piece that would be necessary if we were to perpetuate fee-for-service payments into the future.

M. CAVANAUGH: So I don't know if anyone within the department agency informed you, but that that information system has been attached to many, many bills over the last couple of years. And it seems like something that the department should be asking for in their budget--

KEVIN BAGLEY: So--

M. CAVANAUGH: --instead of attaching to senators' bills.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Rather than try to address that, I'd like to to speak to it a little bit differently.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Our long-term vision as a department within Medicaid is really to move toward managed care payments. What that does is it provides a more stable budget outlay. It provides for more integrated care and really provides for a higher quality of service for members.

M. CAVANAUGH: So but do you need this information system to do that to [INAUDIBLE]?

KEVIN BAGLEY: We would not.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

KEVIN BAGLEY: If-- if we moved to a spot where all of our services were provided through a managed care service delivery system, we would not need this additional claims brokering system.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: So the current system that we have that we've needed to replace for over 20 years would be just fine if we didn't pass this bill.

KEVIN BAGLEY: That system would be sunset as we move toward putting all of our services into a managed care framework. There's still a lot of work to be done on that. As is noted, this would not be the only fee-for-service service as-- as currently outlined in our-- our service delivery system.

M. CAVANAUGH: And what's the target for having everything within managed care?

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, I can't give a good date for that right now. That's something that I've been evaluating as I've come into this role.

M. CAVANAUGH: Are we talking years or decades or?

KEVIN BAGLEY: We would be talking years.

M. CAVANAUGH: And would there need to be legislative authority, action taken to make that happen?

KEVIN BAGLEY: I don't believe that there would need to be current legislative action taken. That being said, there have been other bills that have been mentioned here, LB101, for example, that pushes out the date at which the state would be able to implement a managed long-term services and support system.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

KEVIN BAGLEY: That would be a substantive undertaking on our part, but one that we've really been pushing for for several years. It would take a lot to do correctly, but that is something we believe would be beneficial to members.

M. CAVANAUGH: I have more questions, but I assume others might want to jump in.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Walz.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

WALZ: Thank you, Senator Arch. I'm just curious, do you guys have information on how many departments are-- are really struggling to keep their heads above water and be able to provide ground services in general?

KEVIN BAGLEY: You know, that's not information I've seen. Having-- I know the department has had a lot of conversations with the Lincoln and Omaha department, fire departments around this in the past. And I can obviously say that has been before my time here.

WALZ: Um-hum.

KEVIN BAGLEY: I haven't had the chance to sit down and have that discussion with those entities yet. I'd welcome it. Being able to go through and look at the cost-base reimbursement that may be associated with taking that approach is something we could look at. That would be a departure from how we've set rates in the past for this service. But it's an approach to rate setting that could be looked at.

WALZ: Yeah, I think that's really an important piece to investigate, especially if, you know, you talk about the long-term strategy and approach with respect to managing health outcomes for Medicaid beneficiaries. And I think just making sure that people who pay taxes can continue to receive the services that they deserve is-- is important. And obviously, I mean, I think it's imperative that you talk to fire stations across the state and find out who's struggling. That's got to be part of your strategy.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Yeah. And like I said, we would very much welcome those discussions. I'd-- I'd be happy to talk with folks as we adjourn here, and I'd be happy to set up some time.

WALZ: OK.

ARCH: I have a couple of questions. One is you said you're currently processing other fee-for-service claims now.

KEVIN BAGLEY: We are.

ARCH: It's not all you're migrating to a managed care platform where you really get out of the business of claims processing, correct?

KEVIN BAGLEY: That's correct.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: So is it possible, one of the suggestions in earlier testimony was the possibility of outsourcing claims processing for this particular, for this 11,000 claims or whatever the number, whatever the number might be? Is it possible to outsource?

KEVIN BAGLEY: I-- it is. I would say that that's typically where that \$24 million price tag comes in. And I can't speak to-- I don't have a current bid, I guess would be the way to say that.

ARCH: Because the \$24 million is-- is really replacing the MMIS system.

KEVIN BAGLEY: That's my understanding.

ARCH: Which would then, that would be investment to keep going into fee-for-service processing, which probably will decline over time in fee for service. But it was just whether or not-- whether or not you'd be able to take those 11,000 or probably the bigger question, which is a really big question, is take all the fee-for-service out and sunset the MMIS system now and just move to-- move to claims processing with a third source. But that's a bigger question.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Sure.

ARCH: But at any rate, it sounds like it would be possible to do out-- outsourcing of claims processing. Do other-- other-- other states do that? Do you happen to know?

KEVIN BAGLEY: It varies between states as to kind of what level of control they exercise over that. There are some states where that is largely outsourced, including some of the-- the policy and review of those claims. And there are other states that have that all done in-house. So I can't speak specifically to this scenario--

ARCH: OK.

KEVIN BAGLEY: --or to what the cost could potentially be, but they could be substantive.

ARCH: Well, for that, for that matter, the utilization of MCOs is outsourcing.

KEVIN BAGLEY: It is.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

ARCH: They become a claims processor as well that you're--

KEVIN BAGLEY: That's correct.

ARCH: --that you're outsourcing so.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Yeah.

ARCH: OK, thank you. Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So looking over the numbers here, it looks like in failing to enact the-- this program in 2017 after it was passed into law and signed by the Governor, the department is now increasing the staffing budget by 90 percent. And we would experience, if we were to move forward with this system, whether or not that is actually what we would do, it's an additional 14 percent or \$4 million. And so we talked about the timeline here. And I-- I still-- I know you weren't-- you weren't here when we-- when we enacted this. You weren't here when we had another hearing about this. But I still don't understand what the department's problem is with doing this. They-- they-- we shouldn't be here today. This should have already happened. We passed a law. And if the department needed the millions of dollars to enact this, they should have put it in their budget in 2018. So why does the department not want to do this? I mean, we could all get up right now, walk out that door and you could still do this because the law has passed. It hasn't been unpassed. You haven't been compliant with the law since 2017. Maybe speak to that.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Sure. So, Senator, as the saying goes, the devil's in the details. And I think really in this case, it comes down to the-- the method of implementation that's outlined in the bill would incur additional staff costs, would incur--

M. CAVANAUGH: Would incur more staff costs than the bill that's already law.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, so then let's just do what's already law.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, and that's something that the department did. The department submitted that State Plan Amendment.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: The department submitted a State Plan Amendment that they knew would be rejected. It was purposely drafted to-- to be rejected.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Well, I don't want to speak to the motivation of the staff that would have participated in the submission of that. But I can say it-- it's difficult sometimes to implement, as outlined, when there's an awareness that CMS may not be willing to accept the terms that come with the legislation that's passed. And in this case, that was something that was the case. We did not see a way that we could implement as outlined in the bill--

M. CAVANAUGH: I guess--

KEVIN BAGLEY: --while making the changes to that State Plan Amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: It's intriguing to me that you say that because the department seems to be able to find ways to get done what they want to do with CMS contrary to what, say, the voters might vote on requiring and compelling you to do or what the Legislature might pass and requiring you and compelling you to do. When the will is there, the department seems to be very creative in executing these things. And I guess why is there no will to pay our first responders?

KEVIN BAGLEY: I think I'll go back and say I would welcome additional conversation with stakeholders on this, on how we could make this a better outcome for everyone.

M. CAVANAUGH: Well, I think four years is a long time for there not to be a resolution to a law that was passed. But I appreciate you being here. I'll stop asking you questions.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

KEVIN BAGLEY: Thank you.

***JAMES WATSON:** Chairman Arch and Members of the Committee, good Morning. My name is James Watson, and I am the Executive Director of the Nebraska Association of Medicaid Health Plans (NAMHP). Those plans include Nebraska Total Care, UnitedHealthcare Community Plan and Healthy Blue Nebraska. Thank you for this opportunity to testify before your committee. I am here to respectfully express the Association's opposition to Legislative Bill 238 (LB238) as a measure

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

which would carve out ground emergency medical transport services from the Heritage Health managed care program. Prior to the implementation of Heritage Health, most Medicaid and CHIP enrollees in Nebraska received their physical health benefits through one of two regional health plans, their behavioral health services through a separate statewide health plan, and their pharmacy benefits through a State-managed pharmacy program. In contrast, Heritage Health offers a health care delivery system in which all of a Medicaid member's behavioral health, physical health, and pharmacy services are provided by a single statewide health plan. MLTC has been delivering Medicaid services through a managed care delivery system since 1996. After more than 20 years of experience in running managed care programs, Nebraska Medicaid realized that the integration of services enhances communication among primary care providers and behavioral health providers while providing opportunities for preventive care. It also provides a single point of contact for Medicaid members for assistance and questions. More importantly, integration allows Medicaid Health Plans to receive a complete picture of the information in the claims system. Such information allows the health plan to conduct care management programs, which are important to medically fragile individuals in the Medicaid program. As NAMHP pointed out in its 2017 testimony on LB645, carving out an important subset of services such as emergency transportation creates a serious disadvantage for the MCO. LB238 would change the structure of the carve out, but the result for MCOs and their members is still the same i.e., missing care management information. And if the MCOs do not have a part of a package of services that is this important to their members' well-being, it will compromise the type of care that the MCOs are able to provide to the most vulnerable Nebraskans.

ARCH: Any other opponents to LB238? Seeing none, is there anyone that would like to testify in a neutral capacity to LB238? Seeing none, Senator McDonnell, you may close. And while you're coming up, I would say we had two written testimonies provided this morning, one from the League of Municipalities, Nebraska Municipalities; the Nebraska Association of Medicaid Health Plans, excuse me, the League of Nebraska Municipalities was a proponent in written testimony. The Nebraska Association of Medicaid Health Plans was an opponent in written testimony. We also received three letters for the record that were all proponents of LB238, no opponents, and no neutral. You may close.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

McDONNELL: Thank you, committee members. The problem that was brought to me by departments east, west, north, south, paid and volunteer in the state of Nebraska in 2017 hasn't gone away. People call 911 every day and they have an emergency and they expect people to show up that are well trained and equipped and make a difference in their lives. When they came, they said, we're always going to answer the bell. When that bell goes off, we're going to go and we're going to do the best we can. We need your help. And this isn't, you know, brain surgery here. We've got an idea based on the, that 14 other states have put this program in place. And today's dollars, it could be anywhere between 15 to 30 million dollars going to fire and rescue across our state. So we have a situation where maybe LB578 wasn't the best bill. Maybe there was all these problems. OK, what-- what do you want us to do to change it? We'll introduce another bill. But also we had a situation to where you basically you're a kid and you're in school and the dog ate my homework. And there's a test today. And I didn't study. And the teacher said, you know what? Go ahead and move two seats to the right. You'll get an A. Copy off that person. That's what happened with this plan. Basically, they said, here, redo your plan and do it this way and it'll be right because you're not plowing new ground. They've done it in 14 other states. No effort, zero effort, nothing. I don't care how we get from A to Z because this isn't about me and it's not about my bill. It's about the people out there that are responding every day to those emergencies and they're asking for help. And it is impacting because the idea of that next dollar and a bill to invest that dollar that could be coming back into those departments and not everyone has to participate in this if the department doesn't want to. But we have to have a statewide plan. But that next dollar that comes back and says, oh, we can buy that piece of equipment, we can do more training, it is going to make a difference in someone's life. That's the goal. And that's what I need help with. I am open to suggestions, ideas, amendments. Let's just not be too proud to borrow a good idea from other states and follow through with it. Please, I'm asking you for help.

ARCH: Thank you. Senator Cavanaugh.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. So if we did a new State Plan Amendment taking the advice of CMS, we could implement this program, is that correct, in your assumption?

McDONNELL: Yes.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

M. CAVANAUGH: You're on the Appropriations Committee.

McDONNELL: I am.

M. CAVANAUGH: Have you been-- had-- since 2017, has there been a
request to fund this [INAUDIBLE]?

McDONNELL: No. You know, and also, I think there's an attempt here by
its death by fiscal note.

M. CAVANAUGH: Well--

McDONNELL: We've got an idea. We're-- we're going to kill your bill
and based on the fiscal note. I just-- I just-- you can see it. You
asked the question earlier, Senator Cavanaugh. You looked at that
fiscal note and what it was in 2017 compared to today. It's
embarrassing. I mean, it's flying in the face of logic and they really
don't care. I don't know how anybody could sign that. I don't know how
anybody could send that over. And we are going to discuss some things
in Appropriations.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: Senator Walz.

WALZ: Thank you, Chairman Arch. I was just curious, Senator McDonnell,
over the last four years, has there been any communication from the
department regarding this?

McDONNELL: I can't tell you the effort that's been made by the fire
departments, the-- the city of Lincoln, the city of Omaha, the east,
west, north, south, I mean, people trying to say, OK, how can we do
this? How about this idea? How about this idea? Would this work? And I
really, I was naive because I thought when I brought back the next
bill, I thought, oh, there'll be time. And really this, the second
bill wasn't-- because LB578 was signed by the Governor and put in
place, it was really to say, OK, well, it forces everyone to sit at
the table, work together, because who wouldn't want to get potentially
15 to 30 million dollars into the state at no cost to the General
Fund, no cost to the taxpayers of the state of Nebraska through the
General Fund, and help these departments and help people that are
calling in emergency situations. So I was naive because I really
thought we'll work this out. We'll figure it out. I mean, 14 other

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

states have done it. Some other states are in play. We'll get this
done.

WALZ: I guess what I'm asking is, has there been conversations from
the Department of Health and Human Services to, you over the last
[INAUDIBLE]

McDONNELL: That's who they were-- they were reaching out to--

WALZ: OK.

McDONNELL: --as the stakeholders, and that was part of LB578.

WALZ: OK.

McDONNELL: Hey, we're going to work together. The stakeholders are
going to work with-- with the department, yes, definitely.

WALZ: OK.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

McDONNELL: Thanks for the opportunity.

ARCH: This will close the hearing on LB238 and we will now open the
hearing on LB418.

MURMAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Arch and members of the Health and
Human Services Committee. For the record, my name is Dave Murman,
Senator Dave Murman, spelled D-a-v-e M-u-r-m-a-n. I represent District
38, which includes the counties of Clay, Nuckolls, Webster, Franklin,
Kearney, Phelps and southwest Buffalo County. I am pleased to come
before you today to introduce LB418 for your consideration. It was-- I
was contacted last year by Ohio Representative Jim Butler, who has
sponsored similar legislation in the state of Ohio. HB345 was recently
passed by the Ohio Legislature and offers an innovative approach to
finding cures for deadly diseases like cancer, Alzheimer's,
Parkinson's, HIV and diabetes. LB418 intends to adopt the Solemn
Covenant of States to Award Prizes for Curing Diseases compact. The
bill provides that upon enactment, enactment by six states, the
governing Solemn Covenant of States Commission is established and the
compact becomes binding and effective as to any other state that
enacts it into law. The commission is granted the power to review

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

treatments for the cure of diseases specified by the commission, to award prizes for successful cures and to make treatments widely available for use. The commission establish its criteria for defining and classifying diseases for which prizes will be awarded, which must include at least 10 major diseases determined by their severity, survival rate and public health and treatment expenses. The commission also adopts criteria for a successful cure. The prize amount for each cure shall be equal to the most recent estimated total five-year savings in public health expenses for the disease in all compacting states. And number two, money donated by other, others intended for the prize. And number three, any other factors the commission finds appropriate. The bill requires a two-thirds favorable vote for all members for a cure approval to be effective and requires the prize winner to transfer the patent and all related intellectual property for a treatment to the commission in exchange for the prize. I have a flowchart that explains more clearly how this bill will work better than I can describe it to you in this testimony, testimony. I offer it now as a handout. After the introduction of this bill, I was contacted by the representative for the Nebraska Association of Trial Attorneys who proposed an amendment to the immunity section of the bill to match the level of liability any state employee would have under the same or similar circumstances. Since this change would not be a substantive change, I will offer an amendment to address their concern. Earlier this week, I received a written statement from Lewis Lainhart, who works for the Ohio House of Representatives and specifically worked on the cure bill in Ohio. He offers a unique perspective that I would like to share with you. So I've got another handout from him. Thank you for your consideration of LB418. At this time, I would be open to questions, but I am very pleased to have Jim Butler, the former speaker pro tem of the Ohio House of Representatives, with us today to testify in support of LB418 and explain, explain the rationale behind the bill and answer your questions. Do you have any questions for me?

ARCH: Are there any questions for Senator Murman? Senator Williams.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Arch. And thank you, Senator Murman. I understand what this does. What I am missing is why would we want to do this? You've not told me anything about the purpose for this.

MURMAN: Well, the purpose of the bill is to cure these devastating diseases, and our present health care system does not offer adequate incentive to find cures. It, the present health care system

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

incentivize basic research, and we need the final research that's needed to find the actual cure. The basic research is just designed to find treatments, not cures. But Senator Butler could explain that further.

WILLIAMS: OK, I just want to be sure that-- are you aware of the programs through the University of Nebraska, NUtech Ventures, the different programs through Innovation Campus that are highly incenting people to to find cures, then working with patents, holding those patents, which then become the intellectual property of people in Nebraska to, to handle those? I just want to be sure that you're aware that we have many things like that going in our state.

MURMAN: I'm somewhat aware of those, but this incentive would be much bigger than the incentives you're talking about. And also, you know, it's not limited, I mean, the cure could come from Nebraska, but wherever it comes from, it wouldn't cost the taxpayers of Nebraska any more than what they're, they would be paying for the care of the person with that disease right now. So the cure would be a great thing, and it's at no cost. It's a win-win situation if we're in the compact.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Hansen.

B. HANSEN: So it sounds like kind of the return on investment is the cure, right?

MURMAN: Yes, and there's no investment until a cure is found.

B. HANSEN: Sure. And so, and the cure then you discern, OK, whatever disease it is, however much the state is going to save by not having that disease anymore is what they then distribute--

MURMAN: Yes.

B. HANSEN: --as the incentive? OK.

MURMAN: Yes.

B. HANSEN: For one year, whatever that is?

MURMAN: It's for five years.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

B. HANSEN: OK.

MURMAN: But actually, if you're in the compact, the royalties from selling-- or not selling the patent, but other states that aren't in the compact or other countries that aren't in the compact, those royalties would probably pay for what it would cost us to treat that disease for five years. So actually, we'd probably gain on it. We wouldn't-- we're guaranteed not to lose and most likely would gain.

B. HANSEN: But we would split up between all those states, right?

MURMAN: Yes.

B. HANSEN: Just curious. Thanks.

ARCH: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you.

MURMAN: Thank you.

ARCH: I'd like to call the first proponent for LB418. Welcome to the Health and Human Services Committee in Nebraska, a fellow traveler from Ohio to the Unicameral, the only unicameral in the nation.

JIM BUTLER: I love it.

ARCH: No comment. Welcome.

JIM BUTLER: We need that in Ohio. So thank you, thank you, Chair Arch, members of the Health and Human Services Committee. Good afternoon. My name is Jim Butler, J-i-m B-u-t-l-e-r, and I am a former member of the Ohio House for the past 10 years. So I'm just recently back to the private sector. And I know from 10 years of being in the legislature what it's like to be on a committee and be the last bill for a committee and seeing, you know, four pages of written testimony in front of you. So I'm not going to read my testimony. You have it there to, to review. I'm going to-- hopefully I'll be a lot shorter than that, but happy to answer any questions that you might have. And so I want to just at first start, Senator Williams, what you had asked Senator Murman about, and that's why, where did this bill come from? Why do we need it? And the overriding reason is the system as a whole, actually the global system as a whole, is not designed and incentivized at all to find cures for diseases. It's heavily incentivized to find treatments for diseases. And the reason-- I

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

didn't know this at all until, until a personal-- I'll tell you my personal story here in a minute. But now, after a lot of research, all the money that NIH spends, which is a third of all of research and development that happens in the United States annually, it's \$34 billion a year, and all of the money that charities spend-- almost all, never-- it's not completely absolute, but \$6 or \$7 billion a year, all of that money will never cure anything. It will do great basic science research for a new product. We're talking new products now. It will, you know, it will make amazing discoveries from, you know, starting in test tubes, identifying, you know, potential great cures and treatments for that matter. That might happen. It goes all the way through animal studies, which is why we see in the media and everyone gets so excited that, you know, multiple sclerosis or Alzheimer's or cancer or, you know, it was cured in a mouse or another animal. And that's a big story and people have a lot of hope about it. Which is, it's good. And that's great research that a lot of research universities do, and very necessary. But the problem is the human clinical trials almost always are done by the private sector. They're the ones that put, that go through human clinical trials for a new drug, for a new potential product that needs to be tested. And the problem is there's no money in finding a cure. And we have private businesses, their job is, their number one thing is to make money. There's just not money in finding a cure, so the incentive isn't there for them. They really, I'm sure, would love to find a cure. But the incentive is all around treatments instead of cures. And actually they're even punished if they find a cure instead of a treatment financially. And really for that's for three reasons. First, when you, when you have a-- when you're looking at all the great research that's done by the research universities, and a lot of times they partner. So they do, they are in this. Once they make an amazing discovery, they can partner with a private sector company, and under a 1980 amendment that the U.S. Congress passed, they can take a commercial stake in that and it can benefit people in Nebraska if it's, if it's here or in Ohio. Which is absolutely great, I'm all for that. But they still need that private sector partner. And the private sector, when they're looking at all the great research out there that they want to invest in and invest billions of dollars sometimes in trying to find their next product that they're going to, they're going to launch, then they're going to, obviously they're going to pick something that's going to have the greatest likelihood of success. And more likely than not, that's going to be a change in an existing treatment that's still

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

going to get them a new patent and, you know, six or seven years of sales. And it's great. I love treatments, I'm sure we all do. Better treatments, that's a great thing. But it's much more likely to happen because if you just change a small piece of, of an existing treatment that you already know works and it has a better side effect profile, better efficacy, just it's better business. It's a better business move to do that. And then you also a lot of times if it's a treatment, then you're going to have repeat customers. There are a lot of treatments that we take, if you're on blood pressure medication, cholesterol, you know, heart, the heart medications, blood thinners, it's something that you have to take for a long period of time instead of a cure that you might have to take once or a short period of time. So pricing becomes a big issue, trying to get that covered by insurance companies. It's more difficult if it's something that's a short period of time versus a long period of time. And so for those reasons, I just-- it's unfortunate that that's our system, but that will tend to have the private sector when they're choosing what they want to invest in, to invest in a treatment instead of a cure. And what can actually punish companies for developing a cure instead of a treatment is all the existing treatments that are out there. Because if you cure disease, then the disease is gone. Then any existing treatments that you already have a patent still, more patent life on, you're still selling it or you have stuff in the pipeline, because it takes a long time to develop a new drug, and you have these drugs in the pipeline as an industry, then those drugs are going to be not needed. And so you actually can get in this perverse situation where it can, it can, it can be a perverse incentive for looking for a cure. And all of this I found out from, from talking to people in pharmaceutical and biotech, from talking to researchers at universities. And, and that's, that's just unfortunate the way the system is. And maybe it's because before 1980, then, you know, private-- or public universities or public entities couldn't take an ownership stake in any intellectual property. And that's the way the system developed. I'm not sure how we got here, but that's where we are right now in terms of how the system works. And it's not necessarily bad, it's just that there needs to be more of an incentive for cures for the private sector in addition to the incentive that they already have, the financial incentive for treatments. And that's why this multistate compact will pool the potential savings that states will see. And it's dynamically scored on a budget, so it's not, it's not just what the disease itself cost, but actually how much

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

money states truly save and then pool that as a potential-- as a reward for somebody who comes along and cures the disease and, and causes that savings to happen to the states. It doesn't happen unless the cure happens. So there is no, as Senator Murman mentioned, there's no upfront appropriation, there's no cost. And the only thing that can ever be spent by the states that are in the compact is simply what you actually save down the road after a cure already happened. So there's no risk in doing that.

ARCH: Could I stop you for just a second?

JIM BUTLER: Sure.

ARCH: We have a light system and you see it's kind of like a Christmas tree right now. The red light is on. That means your time is up. But I'd like to give you more time so you--

JIM BUTLER: Thanks.

ARCH: So, so please, please, please continue.

JIM BUTLER: OK, thank you.

ARCH: I just want to be consistent with our light system. So please.

JIM BUTLER: If it's OK, then I'll just-- I just wanted to tell you kind of how this came about for me and how-- I've talked to so many people who have gone through this themselves for various diseases. But almost exactly 20 years ago, last month, my mother passed away of breast cancer. And before she passed away, her cancer spread. And again, this is an all-too-common story. Then I thought there's got to be something that's currently in clinical trials because we exhausted the chemo and everything. So there's got to be something that you can try it, even if it has a 0.5 percent chance of success, at least it's a hope that you will be cured. And I looked at every-- spent months, looked at every clinical trial, called the researchers, looked-- read every book I could, found everything-- because I thought I for sure I could do that for my mother. And I couldn't because every single human clinical trial that was listed, and there were hundreds, was for a treatment that could extend her life for two weeks or two months, but it wouldn't actually save her. That's, that's not what the product was going to do. So then we were, and this happened so much we were then saying, well, let's-- maybe it's something we can find. We'll get you

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

into a clinical trial so that you'll live two more months and then somebody will put in a clinical trial that might cure you. We'll just buy, get you-- buy some more time so that somebody might come along and find and propose a clinical trial. But no clinical trial was ever going to be proposed because of the way the system worked. And sure enough, that was the case because seven years later, my father was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer and I went through the exact same thing with him and he passed away. But at the time, I had no idea why it was that there was actually zero cure, you know, you know, potential cures and human clinical trials. And subsequently to that, it's that way not just for cancer, but for, for every major chronic disease. So that's what this bill does, is it, it does-- it's all the private sector. So the compact just operates as a conductor. Just between-- you have the flowchart in front of you, and I'm happy to answer any questions, between the bank, the banks that will underwrite the essentially loan that's based on future savings and the risks, all with the private sector, which they're good at, and monetizing risks. We want the private sector to, to take that risk. It has the contract manufacturer. They're the ones that will manufacture and distribute and get all the license and do all the liability for the cure itself. And then, of course, any inventor for a cure, and it's totally permissive. So there's this-- if nobody comes forward or if somebody develops a cure and wants to sell it themselves, they don't have to claim the reward, obviously. It's entirely permissive and it doesn't cost anything and there's no risk to the taxpayer. So, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the extra time. I really appreciate it.

ARCH: Sure. With that, questions. Senator Hansen.

B. HANSEN: All right, thanks for traveling and coming here and testifying. So you had mentioned a little bit about the liability. Would it be on the person inventing the product or finding the cure? The state will not have any kind of liability in case the cure comes out and two years later, finds out it does something that it wasn't intended to?

JIM BUTLER: OK, so that the liability for that type would go to the contract manufacturer. So when they bid on, hey, we want to mass-produce the cure, that's part of what the price will be that, for the, for the cure and will encompass taking on that risk. So that risk is offloaded onto the contract manufacturer. The states would never have any liability for anything like that.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

B. HANSEN: OK. And so then when it is mass-produced-- I'm looking at the flowchart, there's that-- those, they, they'll break your mass-produced cure at cost. And so then those who are in the compact get it at a different price compared to those who weren't?

JIM BUTLER: Correct. So they, if you're in the comp-- there's every advantage to being in the compact, because besides being part of the potentially great thing of curing diseases, you get it at the manufacturing cost and license your distribution, just the cost. Everybody else, as Senator Murman mentioned, they have to pay a royalty on top of the cost. It's still going to be way less than virtually every other drug out there, less than a generic. But they have to pay a royalty that's equal to their projected five-year savings so that everyone pays their five-year savings. So and that's added per cure dose. So however many doses are projected, five-year savings, say Ohio wasn't a member compact, in the compact and Ohio wanted to buy the cure after it's invented. Then Ohio would pay the cost plus a royalty equal to the number of projected cure doses or the five-year, projected five-year savings divided by the number of cure doses. That royalty money, that's extra money. It's not part of the reward that goes to pay the bank interest, day-to-day operations of the compact. And then it goes to pay the compacting states and offsets any required savings payments that they would have. So being in the compact, not only do you get the cure at cost, the compacting states will likely never have to share in the four-- to five-year savings. They'll be able to get the savings right away because there will be more people outside of the compact, the whole rest of the world, compared to those that are in the compact.

B. HANSEN: OK, and who verifies the cure?

JIM BUTLER: So the cure when it's presented has to be-- of course it's in the bill, it has to be approved by the FDA. So the FDA has already approved it as a product that's, you know, it's safe and effective for humans. So that's part of this process. But even after that, the bank that is-- different banks can underwrite different diseases that are posted by the, by the compact. But jointly with the compact, the bank will come up with cure criteria. So in addition to being approved by the FDA, it has to have this level of efficacy, this level of side effects or less, you know, maybe this manufacturing cost. [INAUDIBLE] I'm an attorney, you know, all the legal requirements. And that's, that verification will happen jointly between the bank and the compact

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

because the bank is the one taking the risk and it has to meet that legal requirement. That was essentially an open offer by the bank, that if your, if your product meets these requirements and you, and you want to, you don't have to give up, trade us your intellectual property and your patent for the reward, then that's a, it's a legal transaction.

B. HANSEN: OK, the FDA wouldn't verify the cure.

JIM BUTLER: They have, they have to verify and approve that product as a product.

B. HANSEN: Yes.

JIM BUTLER: But it doesn't necessarily meet the cure criteria.

B. HANSEN: Yeah, and that's what I was wondering, because when you get the FDA involved, now you're getting government involved and trying to find a cure and trying to get the private sector involved. And that just muddies the whole waters, especially when the FDA is mainly made up of pharmaceutical companies.

JIM BUTLER: You're exactly right.

B. HANSEN: It's a--

JIM BUTLER: Totally, totally.

B. HANSEN: I've been in the national health care field for a long time. For decades, we've been talking about how nobody really wants to find a cure in pharmaceutical because then you won't make any money off of it. At least that's the old adage anyway, not saying that they don't. But when, when somebody does develop a cure, is there a difference between a medical versus a natural cure?

JIM BUTLER: No, there is not. It could be a natural cure. It doesn't necessarily have to go through the FDA if it does-- if it normally wouldn't have to go to the FDA. So if you find out that, you know, feeding you know, putting extra pepper in your soup--

B. HANSEN: Yeah.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

JIM BUTLER: -- cures cancer and you prove it and it saves money, has to result in savings. And it was, it was listed as a, an open offer for a reward if you meet these requirements, then it can be a natural cure.

B. HANSEN: I know natural is kind of a--

JIM BUTLER: Could be anything.

B. HANSEN: -- bastardized term, but it kind of is now. You know what I mean? It's been, been used for all of these different kind of purposes. And so--

JIM BUTLER: That's right.

B. HANSEN: -- I appreciate the innovative approach to this, because I think that's usually how you get stuff done. That's kind of what America was kind of founded on, you know, [INAUDIBLE] private sector and trying to find, you know, supply and demand-type free market kind of policies, so I appreciate that. Thank you.

JIM BUTLER: Thank you.

ARCH: I have a question. Who pays for the research?

JIM BUTLER: So, Chairman, the research is all private sector. So the compact sent with the banks, they put out that open offer, which is cure criteria, plus projected five-year savings for what the reward will be, and then they're done. And if somebody, if the private sector sees \$20 billion if you cure Alzheimer's, which is roughly what it would be if about 10 states were part of the compact project-- state savings for Alzheimer's. And then all of a sudden, you know, not just biotech and pharma, but I would foresee startup companies saying, hey, I'll raise \$500 million and I'll do all this research in the private sector at different research universities and find and meet the criteria. All that's done in the private sector. And if they want to meet that cure criteria, if that's what they're aiming to do. Of course, they can just sell it if they, if they would rather, and then they come forward. So it's all in the private sector that's doing the research on their own. So that's, the government is not involved in that at all other than if they want to come and claim the reward, it has to be ethically done research. So that's one thing that's very clear in this, in this bill, is the ethical standards for the research

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

have to be the highest common denominator of all 50 states, whether they're in the compact or not. So it's the highest of ethical standards.

ARCH: So I'm sure you're familiar with the process generally that happens. NIH funds research, there's a, there is a scientist that discovers a cell-signaling process, discovers the-- discovers how, how to block the signaling and stop the progression of the disease. But in that process, the scientist has discovered something--

JIM BUTLER: Absolutely.

ARCH: -- that is patentable.

JIM BUTLER: Yes.

ARCH: And they go out and get it patented and then they go and present it at, at the conferences and tell people what, what they have discovered. But it's already, it's already, it's already protected by the scientist.

JIM BUTLER: Yes.

ARCH: I guess I'm stumbling on how then does that-- first of all, why would the scientist give up the patent? Why would, why would the scientist turn a patent over to the, to the compact, to the commission? And then, of course, what generally happens is more money comes from the manu-- the pharmaceutical company, if it's, if it happens to be a drug process. But the pharmaceutical company that provides the dollars to the scientists to go into phase one, phase two, phase three.

JIM BUTLER: Sir.

ARCH: And more dollars are coming and but, but the scientist still controls the patent.

JIM BUTLER: Yes.

ARCH: So this is a very different model. And, and of course, while, while I understand your, your, your concept that we seek treatment, not cures, the finding of a cure would not be a short-term process with no guarantees of outcome, long-term, large dollars on the hope

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

that a cure would result with no real payoff in between until the cure
is found, correct?

JIM BUTLER: Well, so I guess I'll, Chairman, I'll start with that
because--

ARCH: [INAUDIBLE] questions in there.

JIM BUTLER: -- because you absolutely described it perfectly.
Typically, the scientist that has the patent, just like they would now
as they partner, they maintain those rights. You know, that's
obviously worth a lot to them, worth a lot of money. They might, and
they, if it was sold in the open market, they'd share in the revenue
and they'd be able to make a lot of money with that. Because they have
the right to the patent and the intellectual property, it would be up
to them. They wouldn't have to. But if they wanted to get \$20 billion
upfront in exchange for their work, they would be able to say they
have a 50 percent deal with the pharmaceutical company for future
revenues. And then they, they have to agree because they have the
intellectual property to do it. So they say, yeah, we want 20, \$20
billion, we'll take 10, you take 10. That's their choice, completely
up to now if they want to do that. And then in terms of the delay,
that's currently what happens. There's a lot of money invested. You
don't make anything until it's approved by the FDA and launched, and
then you make money. This actually is better because if you do want to
claim the reward, the bank gives you a check up front. So you, it's
even better from a, from a private sector perspective, because that's
a sure thing for you. You've met the criteria. You come forward,
you're essentially selling your intellectual property, your patent in
exchange for the reward, and then you get a check and you're done.
Unlike now where you go through that years and years and years and
lots of money and investment, and then you still have to hope that
something doesn't happen down the road, you know, and somebody comes
up with a better, better cure or better treatment in this case in the
current model. And then you don't make as much money as you thought.
This way you just get it up front. So it's, according to talking to
lots of different researchers and biotech and pharmaceutical
companies, that would be even more attractive, but it's still
completely up to them if they want to do it or not. So there's--

ARCH: All right, thank you. Senator Day.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

DAY: Thank you, Chairman Walz [SIC], and thank you for being here today. I think this is a really fascinating and interesting concept, and I appreciate you traveling all the way to talk to us today and including the state of Nebraska in the conversation. It says that it would take six states to pass the cure bill before the compact is formed. Are you currently working with any other states on this?

JIM BUTLER: Yes, there, there are-- we, I started this after July of 2019 when we passed it in Ohio. And then I started talking to other states. We had 14 states introduce it, about 6 others were about to introduce it before COVID hit. And so then we took, there was, obviously everybody had a little bump in the road there. And now we have 31 states, I think, or maybe a couple more that have either already introduced it this session, which I think we're at 12 or 13. And then, and in fact, I just testified in Utah virtually--

DAY: OK.

JIM BUTLER: -- I think last week. But then so it's moving through the process just like it was. So it's really a new--

DAY: OK.

JIM BUTLER: -- a new process. But a lot of it's, and it's bipartisan in every state and there's a lot of enthusiasm. So we're very hopeful that it will get to that six states.

DAY: OK, great. Thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Hansen.

B. HANSEN: It sounds like the general philosophy is to get government out of it. I mean, as Senator Arch was talking [INAUDIBLE] the NIH typically involved, you have data to some extent, pharmaceutical companies, but actually making this more of a private sector-driven enterprise. I mean, instead of the typical way we've been doing it for, I don't know, 40 years? I mean, and about controlling symptoms and not finding a cure. I mean, because that's really, really, really only gonna get compensated, when they actually find a bona fide cure. And I think that's kind of the keystone to your whole flowchart.

JIM BUTLER: It is.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

B. HANSEN: Is that finding the cure, because if you're wrong and it's not a cure and you just paid somebody a bunch of money, then that's on the states. I mean.

JIM BUTLER: It's, it's on the bank.

B. HANSEN: It's on the bank. OK, not the states?

JIM BUTLER: Just like an investment bank.

B. HANSEN: OK.

JIM BUTLER: Like they bet on companies all the time.

B. HANSEN: OK.

JIM BUTLER: And I've talked to banks. They're very enthusiastic about this because they can decide by the cure criteria.

B. HANSEN: They'll have a say in it.

JIM BUTLER: Yeah, a big say.

B. HANSEN: OK.

JIM BUTLER: So that's a good bet for them. And then, like as I mentioned earlier, they can charge interest for the risk. So they can monetize the risk, which is what the private sector is very good at. But if it falls short, and they calculated wrong, you know, and the cure criteria didn't pan out the way they thought, the states never pay anything unless they save money.

B. HANSEN: So the states would almost be like the equity that the banks then would rely on if they actually, if they were right.

JIM BUTLER: Correct. For future savings.

B. HANSEN: Yeah, OK. That's what I'm trying to wrap my head around.

JIM BUTLER: Yeah.

B. HANSEN: So.

JIM BUTLER: So they're betting on future savings.

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per our COVID-19 response protocol

B. HANSEN: OK, all right. Good, I like it.

ARCH: Other questions? Senator Walz.

WALZ: I just, I have a quick question. Is there a lot of opposition from the inventors. I don't know what other word to use, inventors, on this bill?

JIM BUTLER: So pharma in some states, either sometimes they're neutral and they're behind the scenes, not working against it or they're outright opposed to it. So kind of big pharma, just for the same reasons I just mentioned at the beginning of my testimony, because they stand-- if there is a cure, they stand to lose a lot of money. It's not their fault, but that's the way the system is. So in states that it's pharma who has shown to be in opposition or behind the scenes, you know, opposition to this bill. But the inventors, the research scientists, they love it. So Emory University, for example, in Georgia, they testified as a proponent when I was in Georgia, because they get it, that this is a big problem. And they're going to, they're likely going to get even more research that will come in. And a lot of those researchers, they get into the, they become researchers because they want to, you know, either personally they were affected or they just, they want to do something great for society and cure one of these diseases. And they go through the process and get this money from NIH and from the charities and they know they can cure these diseases. And I've heard it so many times. And then they can't get funding for human clinical trials. It's, and it's, and they get-- and they're very frustrated about it. So this gives them the potential, the extra incentive for whether it's pharma, biotech or brand new companies that are just saying, hey, we're going for the cure and we're going to invest in all these human clinical trials, we're going to partner with research universities and do that. That gives them the opportunity to see their dreams fulfilled and have these diseases get cured.

WALZ: OK, thank you.

ARCH: Other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

JIM BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Appreciate it.

ARCH: Other proponents. Yes?

*Indicates written testimony submitted prior to the public hearing per
our COVID-19 response protocol

JIM BUTLER: I also wanted to thank Senator Murman for all of his
leadership on this.

ARCH: Certainly. Other proponents? Seeing none, any opponents? Seeing
none, anyone wish to testify in a neutral capacity? Seeing none,
Senator Murman, you're welcome to close. And we had no letters and no
written testimony.

MURMAN: Thank you, Chairman Arch and fellow committee members. With
LB418, I believe that Nebraska has a great opportunity to be a
founding member of the cure act compact and join this cause to fund
cures for diseases that afflict us today. If no cure is found, as we
talked about, no prize is awarded. I see tremendous upside potential
for this bill and virtually no downside. I wish to personally thank
Mr. Butler for traveling from Ohio to join us today. If you have any
questions.

ARCH: Any questions for Senator Murman? I'm sure we'll think of others
later. This is just kind of starting to, to percolate, right? All
right. Thank you.

MURMAN: Mr. Butler has given me a lot of answers for probably about
anything you can shoot at me, as you've seen, seen already.

ARCH: OK.

MURMAN: Thank you.

ARCH: All right, thank you very much. This will close the hearing for
LB418 and the hearings for the day.