

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Seventy-third Session
May 27, 2005**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Randolph J. Townsend at 8:04 a.m. on Friday, May 27, 2005, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4406, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Randolph J. Townsend, Chair
Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Vice Chair
Senator Sandra J. Tiffany
Senator Joe Heck
Senator Michael Schneider
Senator Maggie Carlton
Senator John Lee

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lynn Hendricks, Committee Secretary
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel
Scott Young, Committee Policy Analyst
Jane Tetherton, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Alice A. Molasky-Arman, Commissioner, Division of Insurance, Department of
Business and Industry
Samuel P. McMullen, Assurant Group
Van Mouradian, Chief Insurance Examiner, Division of Insurance, Department of
Business and Industry
James Wadhams, Citigroup
Rocky Finseth, Nevada Physical Therapy Association

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 2

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Committee, we will now take up discussion on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 338. Mr. Young, is the mock-up proposed amendment on A.B. 338 ([Exhibit C](#)) based on Insurance Commissioner Molasky-Arman's amendment ([Exhibit D](#))?

ASSEMBLY BILL 338 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes relating to insurance. (BDR 57-232)

SCOTT YOUNG (Committee Policy Analyst):

That is correct. There is one additional request that the insurance commissioner brought in this morning that is not in the mock-up. The addition is simple repetition of the language.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

My suggestion to the Committee is to adopt the insurance commissioner's amendment on A.B. 338 along with the repetition of language brought to the Committee's attention this morning.

ALICE MOLASKY-ARMAN (Commissioner, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry):

The Division of Insurance (DOI) did submit an additional proposed amendment [Exhibit D](#), because there were concerns raised by Senator Carlton. It is not so much in the terminology but in the definition as to "noticing" people to whom this applies. They must register and are subject to regulation. We believe the new definition "medical discount plan" instead of "discount health plan" will provide the appropriate "noticing." There are two health maintenance organizations in the State of Nevada whose names include the words health plan. So, I believe this provides a better definition and provides far better notice.

SENATOR CARLTON:

How did you arrive at using the definition "medical discount plan"?

MS. MOLASKY-ARMAN:

I believe the word "plan" is a fairly generic word. I do not believe it would be appropriate to change this.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 3

SENATOR CARLTON:

But it does not say "health plan" anymore, and I think it will help to clarify the issue.

MS. MOLASKY-ARMAN:

I think the word "plan" clarifies what the intention is better than the word "program."

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Ms. Molasky-Arman, have you had a chance to review the mock-up amendment, [Exhibit C](#), to make sure that it reflects the DOI's proposed amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) that you brought to the Committee meeting on May 26, 2005?

MS. MOLASKY-ARMAN:

Yes, we have reviewed the mock-up amendment and believe it to be consistent with DOI's proposed amendment in [Exhibit E](#).

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Does anyone have concerns regarding this amendment, [Exhibit D](#), brought by the insurance commissioner today and the amendment, [Exhibit E](#), which was presented to the Committee yesterday by the DOI? I suggest we adopt the insurance commissioner's two amendments to A.B. 338.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Since the fiscal note has been revised on A.B. 338, will the Chair be referring the bill to the Senate Committee on Finance or will our Committee process the bill and keep it within the Committee's purview?

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Unless something changes on this bill in the next four or five days, there would be no intention of transferring the bill to the Senate Committee on Finance.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 4

SENATOR TIFFANY MOVED TO AMEND A.B. 338 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IN EXHIBIT C AND EXHIBIT D.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR LEE WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

There were discussions from the May 26, 2005, Committee meeting that the bill was additionally amended by Mr. McMullen.

SAMUEL P. McMULLEN (Assurant Group):

I have revised the amendment (Exhibit F) that I requested the Committee to process yesterday. The changes happened after conversations with the insurance commissioner. The specific change was on item 2 relating to the ratemaking factors. We removed the related investment-income factor due to the confusion about what investment income really means in that context. This change is under (K), "Other relevant data" Also item 4 on Exhibit F can be deleted, because after further discussions, we decided there was no real interest in processing that language.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Is this amendment what you handed out at yesterday's Committee meeting?

MR. McMULLEN:

No, some changes have been made to the amendment from yesterday's meeting. We are requesting item 4 to be struck out.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

So you are striking item 4? Please explain the other changes.

MR. McMULLEN:

There was a reference to investment income and because of the confusion, we took it out.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 5

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I believe the testimony from the Committee meeting yesterday on May 26, 2005, was that the insurance commissioner felt there was no need to put into statute various components that the DOI uses to establish rates. Has that changed?

VAN MOURADIAN (Chief Insurance Examiner, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry):
Our position has not changed on that issue.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Are there going to be any other proposals independent from this amendment relating to A.B. 338?

SENATOR TIFFANY:

I agree with item 2 in [Exhibit F](#) regarding putting guidelines in the statutes. With reference to the amended change in item 1, I would like to ask the DOI if they would agree to the language in item 1 if the model legislation was taken out?

MR. MOURADIAN:

Item 1 (a) was already in section 105 and item 1 (b) was in sections 108 and 114 of our presentation from the May 26, 2005, Committee meeting ([Exhibit G](#)). Section (c) was not in our presentation and we feel it should not be in the law, because it indemnified the carriers against all other laws in the State of Nevada.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

What about item 3 in [Exhibit F](#) regarding the enrollment forms?

MR. MOURADIAN:

The enrollment forms as it states in item 3 are referenced in sections 108 and 49 of [Exhibit G](#). The DOI would like to be able to approve forms that the consumer completes in relation to the health industry. In *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 687B.120 it requires that all health forms and anything affiliated with them be submitted to the DOI and approved by the DOI before the forms can be marketed. This was done to protect the consumer from having to disclose their personal health information.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 6

SENATOR TIFFANY:

But item 3 on [Exhibit F](#) states, "delete the phrase 'enrollment forms' ... " Is that acceptable to the DOI?

MR. MOURADIAN:

No, it is not acceptable.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Why is that language not acceptable?

MR. MOURADIAN:

The DOI would like the opportunity to review and approve any forms relating to health matters prior to the consumers' usage of such forms.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Why does a health enrollment form need to be reviewed and approved by the DOI?

MR. MOURADIAN:

We want the opportunity to review the forms before they are used by consumers for the purpose of protecting the consumer.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Again it states, "delete the phrase 'enrollment forms'" so what you are saying is that it does not just delete the phrase, it deletes the ability for review?

MR. MOURADIAN:

Yes, it deletes the ability for the DOI to review the forms.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

In the amendment in [Exhibit F](#), you are stating that items 1 (a) and (b) are already in the model legislation, so that language is not necessary. The DOI does not agree with item 1 (c). Also, the DOI does not agree with the language in items 2 and 3. The DOI does not want the enrollment forms to be deleted. It sounds like the DOI does not agree with this amendment.

MR. MOURADIAN:

That is true. The insurance commissioner and staff at the DOI had spent quite some time meeting with industries that would be involved on these issues. The

DOI objected to some of the issues, including item 2 for example, regarding the consumer credit area with relation to putting the rating into regulation. Unemployment, life and disability insurance all have different formulas to be considered by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners' (NAIC) model regulations. To put this language into statute as to exactly what the DOI will consider and what the DOI will not consider, relating to those specific issues, the DOI felt was inappropriate.

MR. McMULLEN:

On the issue of item 1 (c), the only reason we included that language was because it seemed to clarify the language from prior statute. Also, because it was in existing law and understandable, we felt that it was appropriate to maintain that clarity.

Regarding the issue of enrollment forms, the current law under NRS 690A.080, subsection 4 states:

The Commissioner may adopt by regulation forms for use in the issuance of credit insurance, including applications, policies, forms for claims and any other forms required for the sale, issuance and administration of credit insurance. An insurer may elect to use those forms in lieu of any other forms. If an officer of the insurer submits, in the manner prescribed by the Commissioner, a written certification to the Commissioner that the forms used by the insurer are identical to those adopted by the Commissioner, the insurer is not required to file those forms with the Commissioner for approval.

This is an area where there can be several forms. Mr. Mouradian is correct, that language should be included in sections 49 and 108 of A.B. 338. The language should be added in [Exhibit F](#).

In considering the factors in item 2, we tried to make those general enough so that the language would extend and apply to any type of credit insurance. This is just a transition from rates set by statute to rates that are not going to be set by statute.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 8

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Assuming the insurance commissioner is in opposition to the amendment, [Exhibit F](#), what do you think is the most important part of the bill that you want passed?

MR. McMULLEN:

First and foremost is the issue of having factors established. Second, was the maintaining of the current process relating to enrollment forms.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

That relates to items 2 and 3 on the amendment.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Would the language be more palatable if the word "shall" was replaced with the word "may"?

MR. MOURADIAN:

The word "may" is more agreeable; however, we would ask that the DOI take out the words "without filing" because the DOI would like the rates to be filed with our office in order to review them.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Could you clarify the language in item 2, in [Exhibit F](#) where it states: "The Commissioner may establish rates that may be used by any insurer without filing."

MR. McMULLEN:

Basically, rates are established as being presumptive rates. Then the individual would file by letter that they are within those specific rates.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Is that process typically known by the term as "file and use"?

JAMES WADHAMS (Citigroup):

I believe what Mr. McMullen was trying to reference is a system where the insurance commissioner adopts by regulation certain benchmark rates which the insurer can simply send a letter in stating that the insurer is adopting those rates. Mr. McMullen's client may have a problem if the commissioner does that through regulation. If his client sends in a letter, why should they make an

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 9

additional filing beyond simply saying they are going to use the rates that the DOI has adopted through the regulatory process? The process is completely different than "file and use."

SENATOR CARLTON:

I would be opposed to the language in item 3 regarding the enrollment forms. I believe it would be good policy to have the DOI review the forms first to make sure the consumer is protected.

SENATOR HECK:

Does section 108 of A.B. 338 pertain to all lines of insurance or just credit insurance with regard to enrollment forms?

MR. MOURADIAN:

The enrollment forms pertain to credit insurance only.

KEVIN POWERS (Committee Counsel):

We could retain the enrollment forms as part of sections 108 and 49. To achieve what Mr. McMullen is talking about, would be to incorporate subsection 4 of the NRS 690A.080 into sections 49 and 108 of A.B. 338. I believe that is what Mr. McMullen was trying to say.

MR. McMULLEN:

Yes, that would be acceptable, but I would like to say that we do not have any concerns with following what the insurance commissioner develops as to what the language should be in the bill. However, it will take multiple forms to follow that process and we feel that the process should not require multiple forms to be filed.

Again, the forms required are not dealing with questions on the individual's personal-health status. It is based on whether or not that individual has purchased an item and if they qualify for the insurance based on that. There is nothing that is reviewed in the enrollment form that decides whether or not a person qualifies for insurance.

MR. POWERS:

What we would be doing in sections 49 and 108 of A.B. 338 is requiring all the forms to be filed with the insurance commissioner

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 10

with the exception, that if the commissioner adopted standard forms, as provided in subsection 4 of the NRS 690A.080, then the insurer could adopt those standard forms and use those in their business.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Does the motion need to be amended to accommodate what Mr. Powers just stated?

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Yes, it would.

SENATOR TIFFANY MOVED TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS 2 AND 3 OF [EXHIBIT F](#) TO [A.B. 338](#).

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MS. MOLASKY-ARMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I had stated earlier that the DOI had reviewed the mock-up amendment, [Exhibit C](#), and that it was consistent with what we had submitted. I realize that you have already voted on those amendments; however, I was just reminded by my staff that there are two sections, 81 and 92, that were not deleted.

MR. POWERS:

The Research Division prepared the mock-up as an aid for the Committee. Our Legal Division will be using the document that the insurance commissioner submitted at the May 26, 2005, Committee meeting, [Exhibit E](#), as the master document to work from. I believe we will be able to accomplish everything that the commissioner is referring to.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Ms. Molasky-Arman, since this is an exempt bill, we will adopt these amendments but, not at this Committee meeting because we have pressing

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 11

matters on nonexempt bills. The Legal Division will prepare this and we will probably adopt it on the Senate floor so as not to hold up the process.

SENATOR TIFFANY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 338.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Committee, we will now deal with concur and nonconcur requests. The first bill is Senate Bill (S.B.) 134.

SENATE BILL 134 (1st Reprint): Requires providers of Communication Access Realtime Translation to be qualified and makes various changes related to practice of interpreting. (BDR 54-142)

MR. YOUNG:

This bill would extend the time for compliance with the certification requirements from 2005 until 2007. There are also two other changes. One change is a requirement that the Legislative Committee on Persons with Disabilities conduct a study during the interim on how school districts best meet or can best meet the needs of the deaf and hearing impaired. The other changes require school board trustees to review the salaries that they pay to interpreters who provide services to students.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I was in the Assembly the day section 10 of S.B. 134 was addressed and apparently the school district is having problems getting some of their interpreters up to a competent standard level. This bill will allow those particular individuals an additional two years to achieve that goal.

SENATOR HECK:

It is important to note that the provisions that were amended in this bill have nothing to do with the real-time transcription services of the original bill. It has to do with the interpreters who are used for the hearing impaired in schools.

I believe there was a similar bill that was brought forth and defeated which tried to allow what may be considered competent interpreters to work with school children. The current law states that an interpreter has three years to reach the competency status necessary from the time they begin employment. This bill would extend the time period until 2007 regardless of how long the interpreter has been employed. It would also provide another study to find out why the school district is having such a hard time getting qualified interpreters.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

There is also the issue on the study of salaries or review in salaries.

SENATOR HECK:

That is one of the reasons the school districts are having a hard time finding qualified interpreters. My concern is that if an individual has not made adequate progress after three years, which is already allowed in the statute, how much longer do we allow an individual who is less qualified to provide these services for our school children?

SENATOR TIFFANY MOVED TO NOT CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 760 TO S.B. 134.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Committee, we will now have discussions on S.B. 152.

[SENATE BILL 152 \(2nd Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to physical therapists. (BDR 54-471)

MR. YOUNG:

The amendment to S.B. 152 allows a physical therapist assistant to obtain a temporary exemption from licensure similar to the exemption for physical therapists which is currently in the bill. It allows the assistant to practice while they are waiting to take the examination for licensure. In order to be eligible for the temporary exemption, the applicant has to be a qualified first-time applicant

whose application has been approved by the State Board of Physical Therapy Examiners and who has not previously failed the examination during the period of the temporary exemption. The applicant must practice under the supervision of a licensed physical therapist and comply with any requirements imposed by the Board. They are also limited in the title that they can use. Basically, the applicant can state that they are a student graduate and the applicant is subject to the regulatory and disciplinary authority of the Board. The exemption is valid until the applicant takes the examination and receives the results of the examination, or if they failed to take the examination, then on the date the examination is given their temporary licensure expires.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Since there are only 10 days left in the 2005 Legislative Session and the physical therapy assistants involved with this amendment have not fully discussed what their issues or concerns are, I would move to not concur.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

Several of the boards have exemptions such as the one in this bill where an individual has taken an educational course and completed the required training hours and the individual is just waiting to take the examination. I am not necessarily against this amendment. Unless there is another issue in S.B. 152 that the Committee needs to discuss, I will support the bill.

SENATOR HECK:

I believe offering the exemption to physical therapy assistants will help them while their examination is pending, and it will increase the ability for people to receive quality care.

SENATOR HARDY:

The bill states that if a physical therapy assistant has not previously failed an examination, the exemption applies. This would not be a tool they can use to keep practicing when they are not competent. I also agree with the fact that the assistant is required to practice under the supervision of a licensed physical therapist and must comply with any other requirements imposed by the Board. I am in support of the amendment.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I want to make it clear that this may be a good provision and it may be needed; however, no one has come before this Committee and explained why this is

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 14

necessary. I believe in order to give an individual this exemption, the least that they could do is come before the Committee and discuss their issues or concerns.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Are there any individuals here today who represent physical therapists? Mr. Finseth, this Committee is currently discussing S.B. 152 with Amendment No. 720. Senator Carlton brought up an issue on which the Committee would like your input.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Mr. Finseth, are you familiar with this amendment dealing with physical therapist assistants requesting a temporary licensure exemption?

ROCKY FINSETH (Nevada Physical Therapy Association):
I am somewhat familiar with the amendment

SENATOR CARLTON:

Did you make this proposal in the Assembly?

MR. FINSETH:

No, I did not.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Do you know who did propose this amendment in the Assembly?

MR. FINSETH:

I believe the amendment came directly from the State Board of Physical Therapy Examiners.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Do you have any knowledge of the concerns that the physical therapy assistants have regarding S.B. 152?

MR. FINSETH:

I do not.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 15

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO NOT CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT
NO. 720 OF S.B. 152.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS TIFFANY, HARDY, HECK AND LEE
VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
Do the Senators on the previous motion for S.B. 152 need to further review the
issues?

SENATOR CARLTON:
Mr. Chairman, I will follow through with my stand on this bill.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 720
TO S.B. 152.

SENATOR TIFFANY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS TOWNSEND, CARLTON AND
SCHNEIDER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
The hearing is now open for discussions on S.B. 174.

[SENATE BILL 174 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes relating to chiropractic.
(BDR 54-699)

SENATOR CARLTON:
The policy decision we made on the liability insurance was kept in the bill and
the fees associated with chiropractic physicians were eliminated.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 16

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Did you, Senator Carlton, or anyone else involved in the discussions have an opportunity to check with the administration of the Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada? If the fees were left in the bill, would they be vetoed?

SENATOR CARLTON:

No, it was not that the fees would be vetoed, it was that S.B. 174 would not have enough votes to pass.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

My understanding and the reasoning behind the fee increase was to keep the Board afloat.

SENATOR CARLTON:

That is correct.

SENATOR TIFFANY:

We do not want to have our boards become ineffective. I did not feel the fee increases on the original bill were abnormal. The Board did make their case on this issue. The fees do need to be addressed, because some boards are just not solvent enough. I also believe that it has been quite some time since the Board had raised their fees.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I have been in constant contact with the Board and their representative. The Board realizes that they are going to have to tighten their belts but felt that if the bill was going to fail, the most important part of the bill was the liability insurance. The Board was willing to make that public-policy statement. They are willing to tighten their belts and eliminate the fees in order for the provision relating to liability insurance to pass.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Committee, we will contact the administration in the Office of the Governor and find out if the fee issue could be a problem. We will hold off on voting until further review has been done on S.B. 174.

Committee, we will now hear discussions on S.B. 226 which includes Amendment No. 705.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 17

[SENATE BILL 226 \(3rd Reprint\)](#): Makes various changes to provisions governing payment of certain workers' compensation claims. (BDR 53-891)

MR. YOUNG:

Amendment No. 705 reverses the effect of Amendment No. 574 that the Senate adopted in S.B. 226. In Amendment No. 574, the hospitals were removed from the definition of health-care providers. In Amendment No. 705, it includes hospitals and makes them subject to the provisions of the bill.

SENATOR CARLTON:

As Mr. Young stated, the Senate originally removed the hospitals from the bill. We testified in the Assembly and Assemblywoman McClain asked why the Senate deleted hospitals from the provision. The Senate did not think the deletion of that language would create any significant problems. I will agree with whatever the Committee does. If we find a problem in the next two years, we can always add hospitals back in the bill.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Who handled this bill originally?

SENATOR CARLTON:

I did.

SENATOR HECK:

This bill repeals S.B. 121 which has already been signed into law by the Governor. When S.B. 121 was passed, the Senate attempted to assure me that the same provisions would be placed into S.B. 226, but I do not believe that occurred. If you remember, S.B. 121 allowed the insurer or the individual to be directly reimbursed by the workers' compensation carrier should the claim be found later to be a true workers' compensation claim. In S.B. 226, it is only after an appeals officer has issued an opinion that this would occur. I have overturned decisions on workers' compensation cases before it ever gets to appeal. In that case, the individual or private insurer would not be able to be reimbursed by the workers' compensation carrier. So I do not believe that all the provisions of S.B. 121 have been incorporated into S.B. 226.

[SENATE BILL 121 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing payment of certain workers' compensation claims. (BDR 53-1021)

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 18

MR. POWERS:

In fact, all of the provisions of S.B. 121 should be in S.B. 226. I believe that they are. When S.B. 226 was drafted as an amendment before it left the Senate, S.B. 121 was used as the base. Additional provisions were then added. I will work with Senator Heck to make sure that is correct.

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO NOT CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 705 TO S.B. 226.

SENATOR TIFFANY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Committee, we will now hear discussions on Amendment No. 721 to S.B. 276.

SENATE BILL 276 (2nd Reprint): Establishes uniform disciplinary process for certain regulatory bodies which administer occupational licensing. (BDR 54-98)

MR. YOUNG:

This adds the Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada to the list of regulatory bodies that are exempt from the uniform disciplinary procedures in S.B. 276.

SENATOR HECK:

The previous testimony on this bill, with both Ms. Fisher and representatives from the Board, did request to be exempted, but somehow the request was overlooked when the list of provisions was made. Ms. Fisher came to me after the vote and asked about getting the provision included, and I told her to take up the issue with the Assembly as the Senate had already voted on the bill.

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 721 TO
S.B. 276.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We will now hear discussions on S.B. 381 with Amendment No. 761.

[SENATE BILL 381 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to manufactured homes, mobile homes and commercial coaches. (BDR 43-1325)

MR. YOUNG:

A portion of the bill involves technical corrections. There are several bills where the language referred to "coaches" and "manufactured housing" and this amendment makes the corrections to indicate that the language includes manufactured housing and mobile homes. The other provisions are under section 3, subsection 2 that a person must be licensed to engage in the business of a dealer, manufacturer, rebuilder, serviceman or installer in this State. I believe section 4 of this bill is where the amendment of this bill changed the passage and approval date for the purpose of adopting regulations.

SENATOR TIFFANY MOVED TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 761
TO S.B. 381.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 27, 2005
Page 20

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor is now adjourned at 9:06 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jane Tetherton,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Randolph J. Townsend, Chair

DATE: _____