

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

**Seventy-fourth Session
May 29, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Randolph J. Townsend at 8:31 a.m. on Tuesday, May 29, 2007, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Randolph J. Townsend, Chair
Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Vice Chair
Senator Joseph J. Heck
Senator Michael A. Schneider
Senator Maggie Carlton

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Marcus Conklin, Assembly District No. 37
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Assembly District No. 30

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brenda J. Erdoes, Legislative Counsel
Kelly S. Gregory, Committee Policy Analyst
Wil Keane, Committee Counsel
Jeanine Wittenberg, Committee Secretary
Scott Young, Committee Policy Analyst
Lynn Hendricks, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

William R. Uffelman, Nevada Bankers Association
Danny Thompson, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Judy Stokey, Nevada Power Company; Sierra Pacific Power Company

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 2

Tim Rubald, Executive Director, Division of Economic Development, Commission
on Economic Development
Rose McKinney-James, Clark County School District
Hatice Gecol, Ph.D., Director, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the
Governor
Renny Ashleman, City of Henderson

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will open the work session on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 128.

ASSEMBLY BILL 128 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to prescription
drugs. (BDR 54-108)

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 128.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will open the work session on A.B. 440.

ASSEMBLY BILL 440 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes concerning loans
secured by a mortgage or other lien on residential real property. (BDR 52-
879)

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We have proposed amendment 4214 to consider ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATOR HARDY:

With regard to the change in section 3, subsection 4, I was concerned that if
there was a violation, it would allow other people to cancel their mortgages
without cause. We added the phrase, "with regard to which the fraud was
committed," so if there is a conviction with regard to that loan, that loan can be
rescinded. I did not want to create a situation in which 200 good loans can be
rescinded because the lender was convicted of fraud on a single loan.

ASSEMBLYMAN MARCUS CONKLIN (Assembly District No. 37):

I am amenable to that change. In section 3, subsection 2, where we talk about a pattern of lending fraud, there needs to be a connection. Even if they are doing it in multiple cases, one of those loans has to be one that was used in the perpetration of that fraud.

I do have a concern about the amendment to section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b). The use of the word "commercially" seems to exclude personal assets from this process. Maybe I am misreading this or giving it too literal of an interpretation; I just want to make sure it is clear.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

The intent of the Committee was that the phrase "commercially reasonable means or mechanism" would allow individuals to use both assets and income streams as a means of securing a loan.

WILLIAM R. UFFELMAN (Nevada Bankers Association):

The term "commercially reasonable means or mechanism" is accepted practice in the industry. It includes both assets and income.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We will make sure that when the bill gets to the Senate Floor, we put that intention in the record.

Senator Heck has proposed an amendment to A.B. 440 that closes a loophole that was discovered in A.B. 478 ([Exhibit D](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 478 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing loans and loan services. (BDR 52-394)

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

When we discussed A.B. 478 previously, we were not aware that the Talent-Nelson amendment from the U.S. Congress does not identify certain licensing categories that we have, including those lenders commonly known as installment lenders who are covered by *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 675. As a result, there is a gaping hole in A.B. 478.

SENATOR HECK:

This amendment does not change anything that was established in A.B. 478. It simply takes the same military protections that were placed in NRS 604 and puts them into NRS 675. I have talked to a lot of judge advocate general (JAG) officers who tell me Nevada will now be setting the standard in protecting members of the military from predatory lending. In talking to some of these officers, I learned that most of their military career is being spent helping members of the military get out of the cycle of debt. One of the JAG officers told me of a naval base in South Carolina with a host of payday lending businesses clustered around the gates. One of them consists of an empty storefront with one clerk and a bank of computers. To apply for a loan, you sit at one of the computers and complete an online application to a company based in Nevada. This allows the company to get around South Carolina's usury laws. It is critically important that we carry the same protections from NRS 604 to NRS 675.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I could not agree more. We must leave no gap, as we inadvertently did two years ago. None of us want to come back here next Session and find that we have to fill another hole in the law.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 440 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 4214 AND 4147.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will open the hearing on A.B. 186.

ASSEMBLY BILL 186 (2nd Reprint): Revises various provisions relating to economic and energy development. (BDR 32-784)

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

As you will note, this bill is much thinner than it was when it was introduced. I have a mock-up of the version I intend to send to you this afternoon, which

includes a floor amendment that will be offered today ([Exhibit E](#)). This mock-up represents the resubmission of a provision that was accidentally taken out by the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means; they were intending to delete sections 1 through 8 and also deleted sections 9, 10 and 13. Since sections 9, 10 and 13 have no money impact and are rather policy decisions, I believe they were deleted in error, and [Exhibit E](#) puts them back in.

There is one thing in [Exhibit E](#) that needs to be changed. Section 10.3 allows the Division of Economic Development to audit those who apply for economic development tax abatements to make sure they comply with the promises they made. Section 13.5 makes section 10.3 retroactive, which was not part of the compromise agreement. Section 13.5 should therefore be deleted. There will be language here, but it will indicate that the earlier provisions of the bill are all going forward; nothing is retroactive.

DANNY THOMPSON (Nevada State AFL-CIO):

This version of A.B. 186 represents an agreement by all the parties; however, the amendment got fouled in the process. Assemblyman Conklin's changes put the bill back to the original agreement.

JUDY STOKEY (Nevada Power Company; Sierra Pacific Power Company):

I worked with the sponsor of the bill and Mr. Thompson, and this constitutes the agreement we came to.

TIM RUBALD (Executive Director, Division of Economic Development, Commission on Economic Development):

I would like to concur with Mr. Thompson's comments. We have no problem with the bill as long as section 13.5 is changed as Assemblyman Conklin described.

ROSE MCKINNEY-JAMES (Clark County School District):

We did not take a position on this bill in the Assembly. We have reviewed the bill in its revised form, and we can now support the bill in this form.

HATICE GECOL, PH.D. (Director, Nevada State Office of Energy, Office of the Governor):

We support the current version of the bill. I had objected to the provision in the previous version that proposed an advisory committee; with the removal of that provision, I will withdraw the fiscal note.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 6

VICE CHAIR HARDY:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 186 and call a recess at 9:02 a.m.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will call the meeting back to order at 9:22 a.m. and open the hearing on A.B. 621.

ASSEMBLY BILL 621 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes in the provision of tax abatements and exemptions based upon the use of energy and repeals certain prospective energy requirements for public buildings. (BDR 58-1512)

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I have handed out a page of issues for discussion on this bill ([Exhibit F](#)). I will review them so you can be thinking about them before our discussion on this bill this afternoon. I have also had discussions regarding these items with Assemblywomen Kirkpatrick and Smith, and I will give you their feedback.

Items 2 and 12 have to do with the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System for Core and Shell Development. If you look at section 2, subsection 2, paragraph (a), subparagraph (1), of the bill, this has to do with the two-year issue. We had said all the changes in the LEED standard must go through a regulatory process at the Nevada State Office of Energy. The Assemblywomen were not comfortable with that and wanted to leave in the two-year component. It would still cover LEED Core and Shell, which was adopted in July 2006.

Item 3 requests clarification that hotel condominiums are not excluded from the bill, which was the intent of the Assemblywomen. However, since hotel condominiums are commercial for the purposes of taxation, they are capped at 8 percent.

Item 4 requests that "affected local governments" be added where appropriate so they will be notified of qualifying projects, starting with section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (a). The Assemblywomen thought this was a good catch and should go into the other sections as well so local governments know what is coming for their planning purposes.

The Assemblywomen had no problem with item 5.

On item 6 of [Exhibit F](#), the Assemblywomen felt that given the potential growth particularly in Clark County, there would be enough revenue there to satisfy local government needs.

Item 7 requests clarification of the grandfathering clause in section 15.5, subsection 6, paragraph (a). The Assemblywomen stated 35 percent is not a mistake; it is a fixed amount that everyone will receive regardless of their level.

Item 8 requests clarification of sections 6 and 16 as they impact the PowerLight Nellis Air Force Base Solar Installation.

We need to put on the record that in consolidating all of these under one chapter, we did not change the intent. That was an incentive that was provided before A.B. 3 [of the 22nd Special Session] was passed, and that is not going to change, so that the PowerLight project would not be affected at Nellis Air Force Base.

Item 9 requests that in section 15.5, subsection 6, paragraph (a), "not more than 10 years" be changed to "10 years." This was the intent of the Assemblywomen.

Item 10 notes that retrofits for existing structures under LEED seem to be left out. However, the Assemblywomen believe they are in fact covered. Mr. Keane, I would like to have your analysis of that when we meet this afternoon.

Item 11 of [Exhibit F](#) requests clarification of the scope of the property tax abatement. The Assemblywomen feel comfortable that the building is the one to be covered and the land is exempt, and that the one reference to it, in section 3, subsection 4, paragraph (c), is appropriate.

Item 13 asks if section 2, subsection 2, repeals the LEED Environmental Tobacco Smoke regulation, and whether any projects are grandfathered under that regulation. The Assemblywomen believe that section 15.5 means everything going forward would be LEED plus what is in the current bill, which would be size as well as energy-efficiency issues. There would be no equivalents for now; under the original bill, it was the equivalent, which means that the regulation adopted by the Nevada State Office of Energy would stay in place for all current projects.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 8

On item 14, the Assemblywomen did not feel "Chief of the Budget Division" should be in all those sections.

On item 15, the Assemblywomen agreed that the term "public education" should be clarified, since in our constitution, "public education" includes higher education, whereas the intent of the bill was to protect the Distributive School Account. Mr. Keane, please talk to Ms. Erdoes to clarify that.

I will recess the meeting at 9:29 a.m.

I will call the meeting back to order at 5:39 p.m. and continue the hearing on A.B. 621.

ASSEMBLY BILL 621 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes in the provision of tax abatements and exemptions based upon the use of energy and repeals certain prospective energy requirements for public buildings. (BDR 58-1512)

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I have proposed amendment 4238 (Exhibit G, original is on file in the Research Library), and this amendment incorporates the issues in Exhibit F.

In section 3, subsection 2, we have added "each affected local government" to paragraphs (a) and (b). It is my understanding that because local government is in constant contact with the Department of Taxation, the office of Dino DiCianno, Executive Director, Department of Taxation, would be the one that would notify local governments under this provision. Is that your understanding, Mr. Ashleman?

RENNY ASHLEMAN (City of Henderson):

In conversations with Ms. Erdoes and others, a better solution would be to change section 3, subsection 3, to say that the Department of Taxation shall publish a fiscal note and send a copy of the application to each affected local government. These are overlapping jurisdictions, and some of them are very small. That will need to be changed throughout, on pages 3, 4, 16 and 17.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Would that be acceptable, Ms. Erdoes?

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 9

BRENDA J. ERDOES (Legislative Counsel):
Yes.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

In section 3, subsection 6, paragraph (c), subparagraph (3), we have adjusted the definition of "public education" to specify that it refers to kindergarten through Grade 12. Mr. Young, was there anything else?

SCOTT YOUNG (Committee Policy Analyst):

In section 15.5, subsection 6, paragraph (a), we have addressed the concern about the ten-year provision.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We wanted to clarify that partial abatement must be for a duration of ten years unless they lose their abatement due to losing their certification.

There will be a number of statements on the Senate Floor for the record. If there is any litigation in the future regarding these matters, the court can look to the Senate and Assembly records on this.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Section 2, subsection 2, states: "The Green Building Rating System must include standards and ratings equivalent to ... " the LEED standard. Is this the "substantially equivalent" language, or will this limit us to the LEED standard? That seemed to be a point of discussion.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

It was the desire of the Assembly to narrow this to the LEED standard only, with the exceptions noted in paragraph (b) relating to size. This is a result of the fact that our projects attempting to attain these levels are substantially larger than the average LEED component. The other exception is in paragraph (c), which relates to points of credit for energy conservation. This reflects the desire of the Assembly to improve on the energy conservation of the total LEED program. In answer to your question, it will stay LEED only; there will not be an equivalent for at least the next two years while we solidify this.

If there are things you would like to have in the record on the Senate Floor, staff will help with statements. As I mentioned, there will be one regarding the solar project at Nellis Air Force Base because it was outside of A.B. No. 3 of the

22nd Special Session. There is a possibility they will be doing a similar project outside Fallon, and we want to make sure they are not disadvantaged. This is part of an effort by our national security to get energy independent from the grid.

SENATOR HARDY:

I understand the necessity to limit it to the LEED standard, but some good work was done by the Committee broadening it to an equivalent. I would hope this will be something we will revisit in two years when we have a better understanding of the issues.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

I would like to see 4 or 5 pilot projects for the kinds of homes average people live in, involving smaller subdivisions of 50 to 100 units. The majority of construction in Las Vegas will be houses, and if we had a pilot project moving in that direction, I think that would be important.

Also, I am curious to know the effect of changing the 10 years to 5 years, and of changing the 35 percent to 25 percent, in section 15.5. How much more money would that get us, and what would it cost the industry?

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Before I answer that, I have a question for Ms. Erdoes. In section 3, subsection 4, paragraph (a), it still says "... not more than 10 years" Was that intentional?

MS. ERDOES:

Mr. Chairman, we understood the request to be for the ten-year change to only be made to the program that's in the back, for the existing folks, and so it wasn't made here to allow flexibility to not have them all be ten years. But you could certainly change that if you like. They don't have to be the same, though.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

With regard to Senator Schneider's question, if you changed the time in section 15.5 to five years, that would cut the abatement in half. If you changed the 35 percent to 25 percent, you would cut the abatement by a third. You would be back almost to square one with no abatement to speak of.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Do the property taxes revert to the rate they would have had after ten years if there was no tax benefit in there?

MS. ERDOES:

Yes. The way that I believe this will work is that you'll—you can—you'll still be applying—if you have that 3-percent or that 8-percent abatement—so the 8 percent for the commercial buildings—so you would be applying that first to the tax bill to capture that. And then you'd apply the 35 percent or the 20, whatever your abatement was. And then at the end, in the 11th year, for example, it would carry you forward to the same place you would have been had you just gotten the 8-percent abatement on your tax bill for those years. So it would take you back and make you whole at that point.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Do you not reset the base?

MS. ERDOES:

"No, and the 35-percent abatement doesn't carry – if you allowed that to stay in the base, then in essence, I think that abatement would go forever with the property."

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I do not think that was the intent. With regard to the pilot program for residential units, Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick and I included a provision on this in Senate Bill (S.B.) 437, but it was removed because of the fiscal impact.

SENATE BILL 437 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning generation and consumption of energy. (BDR 58-232)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH (Assembly District No. 30):

What we are looking at here is trying to maintain a program that keeps us moving forward cautiously based on what we have experienced so far with the results of A.B. No. 3 of the 22nd Special Session. Two years is a short period of time for us to see how all of this will play out. There are a couple of areas we felt would be reasonable to revisit in two years after we have had a chance to

follow this through the interim and make sure everything we have done so far is going to play out as we think it will.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We might want to spend some time on that with the working group during the interim, and include some of our colleagues from local government. Senator Schneider's idea is a good one, but there are perhaps other ways to do it other than just a property tax abatement. Perhaps we could develop something we can flesh out in the interim, working with our major developers who do housing projects, as well as some of our small folks who might be interested in something like that. I have heard of a zero-energy home in the Southwest, and we might be able to come up with a real incentive-based program for that. There is a huge demand for things like that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARILYN KIRKPATRICK (Assembly District No. 1):

We did look at other states, and one of the things other states offer is density bonuses that do not entail taking money out of local governments. We are moving in the right direction, but I would like to walk before we run. I agree with Senator Hardy that during the interim, maybe we can get together and come up with a Nevada standard as opposed to a LEED standard. I appreciate Senator Schneider's comments, but southern Nevada home builders have done a good job putting together energy-efficiency programs, and I would be curious to see how that works.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

My proposal was to limit the size of the subdivision to 50 to 100 units, and then do 3, 4 or 5 pilot projects so they can really be studied. Big home builders in Las Vegas are pulling out because the market is going down, so anything that gets going will probably be done by a smaller builder who lives there. If you did something today, they probably would not break ground till next Session because they still have to design everything. We could actually craft a program with these builders.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK:

My concern would be the amount of preparation required: adopting regulations on how it would come together, what type of paperwork we would need, determining who the developers might be and so on. We need to see if there is a market for it first before we go any further. We have done a lot so far. We need to see how what we have done works before we do any more.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

My thought was the big builders are pulling out of Las Vegas because the housing market is crashing down there. When all these hotel rooms are built a couple of years from now, there will be a demand for housing, and the big builders will come back in to meet that demand. If we had a couple of these small projects ready to go, they could see them up and running. I know they can be done through regulations. We have the lady back here that could help do regulations. I do not think the State has to do them.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK:

Yes, but we just assigned her 22 pages of new duties. We can continue to work during the interim, but there is no need to be as aggressive as that. I would like to see what local government can do and how the density bonuses work for other states.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Senator Schneider's point is an important one, though perhaps "crashed" is not the most accurate term. The growth in southern Nevada is certainly slower right now than the incendiary growth they have had in the past, but they will continue to build down there. My guess is that there is plenty to do during the interim.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 621 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 4238 AND THE ADDITION
SUGGESTED BY MR. ASHLEMAN.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I still have serious concerns about this, though I know we have to do it. This is wonderful work and much better than we had before, but I am concerned about the hole Clark County will suffer through for the next ten years. Originally, the bill said "up to ten years," and now we are guaranteeing it for ten years. I am concerned that two years from now, we will be back here and Clark County will be telling us what happened. They can tell projects not to build in the future, in essence stopping growth, but right now they must suffer this hole. I will oppose the bill now; but as I get more answers to my questions, I hope to get to the point where I can vote yes on the floor.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 14

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS CARLTON AND SCHNEIDER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We have a number of actions from the Assembly to consider, starting with S.B. 412.

SENATE BILL 412 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes regarding health care.
(BDR 54-540)

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Amendment No. 983 makes a number of changes to S.B. 412, the most significant of which is the deletion of the provisions authorizing the adoption of the nurse licensure compact.

SENATOR HECK:

I was a party to all of the changes except for one. That one amendment has to do with sentinel event reporting, and it needs to be revisited. For that reason, I would recommend not concurring.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 983 TO S.B. 412.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

The Assembly has substantially amended S.B. 18, adding 11 new sections to the bill. I would recommend that we do not concur and find out their reasoning.

SENATE BILL 18 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing deceptive trade practices. (BDR 52-587)

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 15

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT CONCUR WITH AMENDMENTS
NO. 709 AND 977 TO S.B. 18.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
The Assembly has completely gutted S.B. 436.

SENATE BILL 436 (3rd Reprint): Makes various changes to the provisions
governing common-interest communities. (BDR 10-234)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT CONCUR WITH AMENDMENTS
NO. 944 AND 1006 TO S.B. 436.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
The Assembly voted to not concur with our amendment to A.B. 178.

ASSEMBLY BILL 178 (3rd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to net metering
and energy. (BDR 58-1054)

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO NOT RECEDE FROM AMENDMENT
NO. 1013 TO A.B. 178.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 16

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Assembly Bill 396 was the bill into which we put a number of provisions from our homeowners' association bills.

ASSEMBLY BILL 396 (3rd Reprint): Makes various changes to the provisions governing common-interest communities. (BDR 10-1284)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT RECEDE FROM AMENDMENT NO. 1024 TO A.B. 396.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Next, we will consider A.B. 304.

ASSEMBLY BILL 304 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes to provisions relating to manufactured home parks. (BDR 10-1119)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT RECEDE FROM AMENDMENT NO. 911 TO A.B. 304.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

The next bill is A.B. 424.

ASSEMBLY BILL 424 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the licensure of counselors. (BDR 54-1294)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT RECEDE FROM AMENDMENT NO. 734 TO A.B. 424.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 17

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
The final bill is A.B. 496.

ASSEMBLY BILL 496 (2nd Reprint): Makes various changes concerning workers' compensation. (BDR 53-897)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO NOT RECEDE FROM AMENDMENT NO. 898 TO A.B. 496.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
May 29, 2007
Page 18

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Is there any further business to come before the Committee? Hearing none,
I will adjourn at 6:24 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lynn Hendricks,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Randolph J. Townsend, Chair

DATE: _____