

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

**Seventy-fourth Session
April 3, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Randolph J. Townsend at 8:02 a.m. on Tuesday, April 3, 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:

Senator Dina Titus, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7
Senator Steven A. Horsford, Clark County Senatorial District No.4

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kelly S. Gregory, Committee Policy Analyst
Lynn Hendricks, Committee Secretary
Wil Keane, Committee Counsel
Alysia Peters, Intern to Senator Titus
Scott Young, Committee Policy Analyst
Jeanine Wittenberg, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Patricia Elzy, Director of Legislative Affairs, Planned Parenthood Mar Monte
Sandra Koch, M.D.
Julianna Ormsby, Nevada Women's Lobby
Lawrence P. Matheis, Nevada State Medical Association

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 2

Denise Selleck Davis, Nevada Osteopathic Medical Association
Bobette Bond, HEREIU Welfare Fund
Jack H. Kim, Nevada Association of Health Plans
Robert A. Ostrovsky, Nevadans for Affordable Healthcare, Incorporated
Helen A. Foley, PacifiCare of Nevada
Scott Burns, Merck & Company, Incorporated
John Jeffrey, Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council
Danny L. Thompson, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Susan Fisher, Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada
Barbara Gruenewald, Nevada Trial Lawyers Association
Donna Sweger, Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers, Department of Business
and Industry
Michael Heidemann, Director, Nevada State Firefighters Association
Steve McClintock, Nevada State Firefighters Association
Rusty McAllister, Professional Firefighters of Nevada
David Oakden, Builders Insurance
Neil Davis, Davis Companies
Gary E. Milliken, Builders Insurance Company
Jim R. Jeppson, Washoe County
Robert A. Ostrovsky, Employers Holdings, Incorporated
Chas R. Nort, Nevada Alternative Solutions
George A. Ross, Nevada Self-Insurers Association
Michael Alonso, International Game Technology
Rose McKinney-James, Clark County School District
Steve Schneider
Darren J. Welsh, Esq.
Ray Brown
Robert W. Potter, Associated General Contractors
James Wadhams, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 409.

SENATE BILL 409: Requires policies of health insurance and health plans to provide coverage for a vaccine to protect against cervical cancer.
(BDR 57-1077)

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 3

SENATOR DINA TITUS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 7):
This morning I have with me my Legislative Intern, Alysia Peters, who will be presenting this bill.

ALYSIA PETERS (Intern to Senator Titus):
I have provided the Committee with a copy of my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

I have also provided the Committee with two letters of support for this bill. The first letter is from Jason W. Pollock, M.D., F.A.C.O.G. ([Exhibit D](#)), and the second letter is from Lynn D. Kowalski, M.D. ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
I think we have a wonderful Legislative Intern Program.

The fiscal impact to the counties would vary and the fiscal notes are minuscule. Have you been provided with a copy of the fiscal note?

SENATOR TITUS:
We know this is covered in the State budget. As a self-insured, I know there is some resistance from Clark County to provide this coverage.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:
We just received a copy of it and will provide a copy to you.

This information says the Clark County School District will have no impact and a lot of them just say an increase in expense and they have minuscule numbers listed after them.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:
Is this the same drug that the Governor of Texas has mandated?

MS. PETERS:
Yes.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:
Do you know how long this drug was tested?

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 4

SENATOR TITUS:

They have been working on this for 20-some years. We have the representative from Merck & Company, Incorporated here today to answer those questions. It was approved in June 2006. It has been approved and recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Health and Human Services and has been effective 95 percent of the time.

Remember, this is optional and we are not mandating it like they did in Texas. That was the big controversy.

PATRICIA ELZY (Director of Legislative Affairs, Planned Parenthood Mar Monte):
I am providing the Committee with a copy of information relating to this vaccine and my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#), original is on file in the Research Library).

SANDRA KOCH, M.D.:

I am a local physician specializing in obstetrics and gynecology. I am in support of this bill. Last month the CDC released a report stating that 45 percent of women ages 20 to 24 are infected with the human papillomavirus (HPV). It is important to know that one significantly abnormal Pap smear equals the cost of \$450 which is approximately the cost of the Gardasil vaccine.

I have a story about HPV to share about a local young woman that is the daughter of health care professionals in this community ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We appreciate that story, it makes it real. This is a serious issue.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I have two daughters and the word on this new drug spread rapidly. Young people are paying attention to health issues and are becoming educated on their options.

JULIANNA ORMSBY (Nevada Women's Lobby):

We would like to thank Senator Titus for bringing forward this legislation and urge the Committee to support this bill.

LAWRENCE P. MATHEIS (Nevada State Medical Association):

We support this bill and have provided a suggested amendment ([Exhibit H](#)).

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 5

DENISE SELLECK DAVIS (Nevada Osteopathic Medical Association):
As a profession that has a history in preventive medicine, we support this bill.

BOBETTE BOND (HEREIU Welfare Fund):
The culinary health fund began covering this vaccine April 1 and was excited to see this bill and hopes it passes.

JACK H. KIM (Nevada Association of Health Plans):
I agree with all the comments of the previous speakers. This is a public health issue and health plans are covering the vaccine. We cover the vaccine without having this bill.

As you know, we have always opposed any type of mandates. We oppose mandates because you are asking us to do things that in many cases we are already doing. We oppose mandates that increase health care cost.

The bill does not guarantee that all the large self-insured and other health plans will cover the vaccination. If you are trying to address this globally, I think you should address all other related public health issues.

ROBERT A. OSTROVSKY (Nevadans for Affordable Healthcare, Incorporated):
I would like to remind the Committee that these mandates affect small employers more than large employers. The impact affects the cost of policies to small businesses that have to purchase insurance on the open market.

HELEN A. FOLEY (PacifiCare of Nevada):
Ninety-five percent of the health plans in Nevada that are regulated by this legislation already cover the vaccine. That means there are many other young women that are not receiving this vaccination. The public health issue of vaccinations for the uninsured population is the bigger issue that should be addressed.

SENATOR HECK:
I know the vaccine covers 4 of the 6 antigenic types, 2 of which are responsible for 70 percent of the cancer. The vaccine is administered in 3 doses, initially, then at 2 and 6 months. Are there any studies regarding follow-up compliance with that scheduling? I have a hard time getting police and firefighters to return on a schedule of 3 hepatitis vaccinations.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 6

SCOTT BURNS (Merck & Company, Incorporated):

I do not have that specific data but we do have data on what the protection would be if they receive the dose either early, on-time or late. At no time can you restart the series of vaccinations. You would just catch the patient up on the series. There is still protection whether they receive the vaccination early, on-time or late. We tested knowing that in the real world the vaccination would not always be given on-time in the scheduling. We considered late as 138 days to 160 days after the second dose.

I am providing you with some prescribing information and clinical data ([Exhibit I](#)).

SENATOR CARLTON:

Is this the only vaccine available for HPV?

MR. BURNS:

This is the only current Food and Drug Administration approved vaccination for HPV.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Will this be classified as generic in ten years?

MR. BURNS:

Typically, that applies to the pharmaceutical industry and not to biological agents such as vaccines.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 409 and open the hearing on S.B. 353.

SENATE BILL 353: Revises provisions governing the selection of treating physicians or chiropractors by injured employees covered by industrial insurance. (BDR 53-1061)

SENATOR STEVEN A. HORSFORD (Clark County Senatorial District No.4):

Currently, employees who are injured on the job often have a difficult time navigating the workers' compensation system and recovering from their injuries. This bill attempts to address both of those issues. An injured worker is dependant on the physician hired by their employer to determine when they should be released back to work. Unfortunately, some workers are returned to

their jobs when they are not yet healthy enough. While this decision gets the employee back to work, it usually discontinues the employee's treatment for the injury. The unintended result of premature termination of care is that those who require additional treatment and therapy to recover are not able to. They remain unhealed which can lead to permanent injury. Once injured, workers in physical jobs have difficulty sustaining their duties. This can lead to absenteeism, pain medication dependency, disciplinary action and eventual suspension or termination. All due to the fact the injured employee was not given adequate treatment and recovery time.

I know that some opponents of this bill may claim that the bill will increase costs. That may be true in the short term. The other factor that should be considered is the cost to have an employee return to work who is not yet ready. Again, those circumstances ultimately have a greater long-term loss to the employer and injured worker.

The chain of events concerning workers' compensation is totally in the hands of the provider treating the injury. In this situation, the employee has few options. This bill is intended to give injured employees more options for their treatment and recovery to ensure they get back to work as quickly as possible, but also ensures they get back to work as healthy as possible. As all of you know, current statute is that an injured employee has the right to ask to change treating physicians once during treatment. However, any change must be requested within a limited time frame. Usually, this is not offered to the injured employee so they do not know to request for a change in treating physician. For employers that contract with their own workers' compensation providers, there are often few, if any, alternative choices for the injured employee.

This bill proposes to expand those options for injured workers. I have a proposed amendment for the Committee ([Exhibit J](#)) to consider based upon concerns I have heard from some of the opponents of the bill that I hope will address some of their issues.

This change allows injured workers who are now limited to one or two choices the opportunity for more choice in determining when they are ready to return to work while still restricting options to those already selected for the Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry's Panel of Treating Physicians and Chiropractors (the panel). In addition, I think the bill should be

amended if the Committee chooses to include a provision for injured employees to formally complain about their care when needed.

SENATOR HARDY:

What motivation would a physician or chiropractor have to release an injured worker early?

SENATOR HORSFORD:

Not all physicians treat people in the same manner. I have heard from people who relate the physician only saw them for five minutes and they were not able to relate to the physician all of their conditions. This bill attempts to get the injured worker a second opinion from another physician or chiropractor before that injured worker is required to return to work if they do not feel they are ready.

SENATOR HECK:

I am glad you proposed your amendment about keeping the physicians on the panel. That allayed one of my concerns. The statement in section 2, subsection 1, that says they are allowed to only make the change once irrespective of how many changes they may have made under previous provisions of law concerns me. In my experience, I have had patients that have changed treating physicians under the previous provision you mentioned. To me, this seems that we are opening it up to where the injured worker could change three or more times if they are not getting the answer they want. This is what is referred to as "doctor shopping" until they get the answer they want.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I would agree, we could look at the language because I do not support "doctor shopping" either. I do support an injured worker's right to pursue adequate medical care if they feel they are not ready to return to work. That is the intent of this legislation.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Regarding the qualifications you have listed under the *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 616C.090, what does a physician have to do to be on that panel?

SENATOR HORSFORD:

This Committee has more knowledge on board qualifications of a physician on a panel than I. I will defer the question to someone who is more qualified to answer that.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

In section 2, subsection 2, line 27, is it your understanding that means if you see another physician on the panel that narrows the reimbursement to what the contracted rate is for a physician on the panel or are you saying it is just whatever they charge?

We know there will be an argument on cost and I want to find out what the cost will be.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

As I understand it, the language in that section is the managed-care contracted reimbursement.

SENATOR HECK:

If an entity or an insurer has entered into a managed-care contract, they may in fact negotiate a better rate than the rate listed in the State fee schedule. In my mind this is saying that if the insurer has a contract with a managed-care organization, they are to offer the second opinion at their contracted rate. If the provider does not accept it, then by no means do they get paid more than the State fee schedule.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

That is the way I read it. What if the claimant chooses someone who is not on the panel? I do not read the bill as being able to do that without having to pay the fee out of your own pocket.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

That is correct. With the proposed amendment they would not even have that option.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

That is the philosophical problem because then you have stepped over to any willing provider. If you stay within the panel and contracted rates, that is a different cost issue compared to opening it up freely.

Ms. BOND:

We like this legislation. I think if this bill is implemented the way it is, it is actually giving the employee two choices.

We support the idea of a pathway for complaints when employees feel they did not receive proper medical care. We would like to see that added at some point.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Are you tracking those physicians who initially treat the injured worker and rush them back to work?

Ms. BOND:

After the last Legislative Session we started doing a lot more thorough record keeping of our workers' compensation injuries that seem to result in medical claims. A few years ago, we did identify a pattern with a few physicians.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

The only thing worse than rushing an injured employee back to work too soon may be leaving them out of work too long.

Ms. BOND:

In our industry, a lot of the injuries are physical injuries that are not just a simple contusion or something like that. Because it is so physical, they have to be in the proper physical shape when they return to work. Our employers do not appreciate an employee being returned to work if they are not ready.

JOHN JEFFREY (Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council):

I think this bill is about injured workers returning to work. I agree that there can also be a problem getting people back to work. The longer an injured worker is out of work, the tougher it is to get them back to work. I have heard some stories of physicians being pressured from insurers and third-party administrators to get injured workers back to work. In some cases, the physicians were removed from the panel because they refused to make that decision. This is what this is about. Physicians no longer work for the injured worker. This was not happening before the change to managed care for workers' compensation in 1993.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 11

DANNY L. THOMPSON (Nevada State AFL-CIO):

This bill is about return to work and someone feeling they have been wronged. There have been people who have testified before this Committee that the reason they are in the shape they are in is because they were sent back to work too soon. They did not reinjure the industrial injury; they had subsequent injuries from returning to work too soon. I do not think there is anything wrong with allowing a second opinion and that is why we support this bill.

SUSAN FISHER (Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada):
We support this bill.

BARBARA GRUENEWALD (Nevada Trial Lawyers Association):
We support this bill.

DONNA SWEGER (Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers, Department of Business
and Industry):
We support this bill.

MICHAEL HEIDEMANN (Director, Nevada State Firefighters Association):

I am providing the Committee with a copy of my written testimony and supporting documents to propose an amendment for this bill ([Exhibit K, original is on file in the Research Library](#)).

SENATOR HARDY:

Has Senator Horsford seen the proposed amendment?

MR. HEIDEMANN:

Yes. Although, I do not know how much time he has had to read it. This was suggested last Friday.

STEVE MCCLINTOCK (Nevada State Firefighters Association):

I work for the Clark County Fire Department and am in charge of approximately 350 volunteers throughout the 8,000 square miles of Clark County. I have 13 volunteer stations under my supervision. In 2001, we had a gentleman responding to a call in a county vehicle who suffered a massive heart attack and died while en route. Because he was over the age of 55, he was not covered under the NRS 617.457 for the heart attack and his family had to pay for the burial costs and services. He had recently had a physical with a clean bill of health to work as a volunteer. Last year we had a similar issue with a fire chief

in the Mount Charleston area who had a heart attack that required further medical care. He was also over the age of 55 and now has medical bills he is responsible for and was uninsured. Last year in Clark County alone, our volunteers responded to over 4,000 calls. The age group of our volunteers is getting closer to, and over, 55 years of age. The older volunteers are more dependable and take care of the citizens and visitors of Nevada. We would encourage the Committee to consider the amendment language proposed in [Exhibit K](#).

SENATOR HECK:

I support the intent of this proposed amendment but have a concern with the way the amendment is written. In your statement you say that you are not looking for the presumptive benefit, but with the way it is written it looks like you get that because it is in that NRS chapter and you are not excluding it.

MR. HEIDEMANN:

Should we add a section 3 to the proposed amendment that reads something to the effect of, "While they are actively fighting fires based on the time the incident goes until 24 hours after?"

SENATOR HECK:

That is a question for our legal counsel. I do not think, with the way it is drafted, that it clearly enumerates this is not a presumptive benefit.

WIL KEANE (Committee Counsel):

I think some of the confusion may be that the amendment as described on the first page in the e-mail seems to be different than the draft language on the second page. I would be happy to work with you to determine which is the language that you would like. If this is not going to be a presumptive benefit, we could add it as a separate section with perhaps some language regarding actually being involved in fighting a fire or something like that.

MR. HEIDEMANN:

That is the intent.

SENATOR HECK:

I would also recommend that you follow the same physical examination guidelines already in the NRS and not rely on the National Fire Protection Association standard.

MR. HEIDEMANN:

That was a suggestion from another fire agency.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

With all due respect to those who brought the amendment forward, it goes way beyond the scope of the intent of S.B. 353. I would respectfully request that the Committee work to include their proposed amendment into another more suitable bill.

RUSTY MCALLISTER (Professional Firefighters of Nevada):

In the era of cooperation, we certainly believe volunteers are needed in this State. Prior to the beginning of this Legislative Session there was discussion on adding this provision into legislation. We met with Mr. Heidemann and the president of the Nevada Fire Chiefs Association, Incorporated and expressed concern with regard to changing the statute. After that meeting, I thought we had an agreement on what they wanted to include. They wanted to remove the age 55 provision and we said we would not oppose that as long as they were willing to step up and do a few things. The provision for having the volunteers only having a physical every three years is a concern for us because we have to have one every year. During that meeting, it was agreed upon that the amendment they wanted to bring would have a provision that the volunteers would submit to annual physical examinations and they would have a provision to correct any predisposing conditions that are found in the physical examinations. As fire safety, we work side by side with the volunteers and if we have to meet certain standards, they should have to meet the same physical standard. This is the first I have seen of this language and I would be happy to work with them on language that works for everyone.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Thank you for the clarification. We will try to find a bill that is better suited for this. Senator Horsford's bill is very narrow and we want to deal with that on its own merits.

MR. HEIDEMANN:
That is fine.

DAVID OAKDEN (Builders Insurance):

The language on page 3, line 4 voids the first physician's opinion. That language is difficult to accept if an opinion would be voided just because the injured worker chooses a different physician. That does not make sense when we try to value the opinion of physicians. There is no recourse outlined in this bill for the insurer. This type of legislation is what led to California's problems with workers' compensation. This bill would increase the medical and temporary total disability costs exponentially. This bill also removes some of the managed-care discounts and allows an injured worker to seek an opinion outside of the managed-care network. That is blatantly unfair to the physicians who work with the insurance companies and try to provide care in a timely and efficient manner. We are opposed to this bill.

NEIL DAVIS (Davis Companies):

I am president and owner of the Davis Companies. The amount of time off is commensurate with the willingness of the employee to return to work. A study was performed in New York and one of the results was that one week of bed rest requires one month of rehabilitation. There are already provisions for an injured worker to obtain a second opinion from another physician. We do not want to open a can of worms by allowing them to doctor shop for the opinion they are seeking. I pay my employees just to have them walk in the door and show up for light-duty work. The current workers' compensation system is working fine without this proposed legislation.

SENATOR CARLTON:

In some industries there is no option for light duty.

MR. OAKDEN:

The issue in this bill is not whether or not they are full duty; it is if they are released to any type of work. An injured worker at modified duty can go find another physician to get the work restriction opinion they may be seeking.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I do not have a problem with someone having the right to a second opinion because they are the one who will have to live with the injury.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 15

MR. OAKDEN:

We agree with you on the second opinion because that is already allowed statutorily. That is not what is in this bill.

GARY E. MILLIKEN (Builders Insurance Company):

I would be glad to work with Senator Horsford on the language in this bill.

JIM R. JEPPSON (Washoe County):

The ability for an employer or insurer to use a managed-care organization was one of the most important and effective reforms passed in 1993. It allows us to get prompt medical reporting, have a relationship with the physician and is an effective claims-management tool. I do not believe this bill is as narrow in scope as was stated earlier. Our principal concern is that the injured worker would be allowed to go outside of the managed-care physician panel.

ROBERT A. OSTROVSKY (Employers Holdings, Incorporated):

This is an any-willing-provider bill. This bill would take us back to where we were prior to the managed-care bill in 1993. The physician panels were created for the purpose of managed care.

CHAS R. NORT (Nevada Alternative Solutions):

This is about choice and the injured worker already has the right to choose another treating physician within 90 days. We are opposed to this bill.

GEORGE A. ROSS (Nevada Self Insured Association):

We are opposed to this bill as written. We would be willing to work with the sponsor on this to try to work something out.

MICHAEL ALONSO (International Game Technology):

We are opposed to this bill and are willing to work with the sponsor as well.

ROSE MCKINNEY-JAMES (Clark County School District):

We are opposed to the bill as written and are willing to work on this bill with the sponsor.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 353 and open the hearing on S.B. 358.

SENATE BILL 358: Revises provisions governing the fiduciary duties of contractors. (BDR 54-995)

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

I bring this bill forward on behalf of my brother Steve Schneider and other property owners who have had problems with contractors. This only applies to single-family residences.

STEVE SCHNEIDER:

For the last two years I have been involved in a remodeling project on my home. I thought I had selected the best contractor for the job. Generally, the contractor signs a contract with the homeowner. The relationship is with the homeowner and the contractor and the subcontractor signs a contract with the contractor, not with the homeowner. This creates an awkward situation. The intention of the bill is to limit or explain the level of care the homeowner should receive from the contractor and subcontractor. It is intended to protect the interest of the homeowner.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

I want to make sure the bill specifically addresses the concern of Mr. Schneider.

DARREN J. WELSH, ESQ.:

I am here today on behalf of my client Steve Schneider. This bill is a simple attempt to label the duty between the contractor and the principal homeowner. It is specifically designed not to address large development. In the bill we are trying to state that the relationship is of a fiduciary duty. The main purpose is to assist the consumer in knowing the duties that a general contractor owes during their services of repairs and remodeling. That is a fiduciary duty.

RAY BROWN:

I am a homeowner in Henderson. I began an 800-square-foot room addition to my home 3 years ago. To date it has not been completed. There was a lengthy dispute between my contractor and me on schedules and completion. The contractor never met any of the schedules and timelines of the contract. My attorney and I contacted the State Contractors' Board (SCB) and went through a lengthy process with them. It provided the contractor with specific remedies to be able to come in and provide access on an agreement between the homeowner and the contractor. In my case, we did not trust the work being done because of problems on the job. I requested and came to an agreement

with the SCB that my inspecting engineer would be able to inspect any work being done to complete the job. About three days into that process, the contractor refused to tell my engineer that he was completing work and would continue to seal the walls and foundation so it could not be inspected. At that point, I terminated the contract and went through a hearing procedure with the SCB and I prevailed. The contractor appealed the SCB order to the court in Las Vegas. The judge stayed that decision and it will probably be another two years before things are resolved. Unfortunately, the process as it is now does not work. It gives the contractor significant protection. I have tens of thousands of dollars in engineering and attorney fees in just trying to follow the procedure that is set by law. The current law does not protect the consumer.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

Mr. Welsh, are you satisfied with the language in the bill?

MR. WELSH:

Yes. All we are looking for is a definition of a relationship in statute.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Senator Hardy, do you believe this language will not apply to the large contractors?

SENATOR HARDY:

I understand the intent of the bill, but need to look at it more thoroughly.

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We were supposed to have a work session today but due to time constraints, it is my intention to continue the hearing on this bill tomorrow.

ROBERT W. POTTER (Associated General Contractors):

I am opposed to this bill and have provided the Committee with a copy of my written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).

JAMES WADHAMS (Southern Nevada Home Builders Association):

We think the language of the bill goes far beyond home improvements and could encompass high-rise, single-family residences. We are opposed to the bill in its current form.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
April 3, 2007
Page 18

CHAIR TOWNSEND:

We will continue to work on this bill with the concerned parties. This is a serious problem that needs to be addressed.

The meeting is now adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jeanine Wittenberg,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Randolph J. Townsend, Chair

DATE: _____