

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

**Seventy-fifth Session  
February 9, 2009**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 1:33 p.m. on Monday, February 9, 2009, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412 E, 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 Maggie Carlton, Chair  
Senator Michael A. Schneider, Vice Chair  
Senator David R. Parks  
Senator Allison Copening  
Senator Dean A. Rhoads  
Senator Mark E. Amodei  
Senator Warren B. Hardy II

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator John J. Lee, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1  
Senator Valerie Wiener, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Carol Allen, Committee Secretary  
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary  
Kelly S. Gregory, Committee Policy Analyst  
Daniel Peinado, Committee Counsel  
Vicki Folster, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michael Heidemann, Executive Director, Nevada State Firefighters' Association  
Steve McClintock, Nevada State Firefighters' Association

Krista E. Leach, CPCU, CIE, Acting Risk Manager, Risk Management Division,  
Department of Administration  
Donald E. Jayne, CPCU, President, Jayne & Associates, Inc., Management  
Consultants  
Pat Irwin, Lovelock Volunteer Fire Department  
Raymond (Rusty) C. McAllister, President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada  
Craig Michie  
Barbara Gruenewald, Attorney, Nevada Justice Association  
Lesley R. Dickson, M.D., President, Nevada Psychiatric Association  
Michelle Carro, Ph.D., Clinical Psychologist, Nevada Psychological Association  
Morgan Bunker, Faiss Foley Warren  
Elizabeth Neighbors, Ph.D., ABPP, Board of Psychological Examiners  
Martha Mahaffey, Ph.D., Board of Psychological Examiners  
Captain Philip K. O'Neill, Division Chief, Records and Technology Division,  
Department of Public Safety

CHAIR CARLTON:

We will open the hearing with Senate Bill (S.B.) 6.

**SENATE BILL 6:** Revises provisions regarding occupational diseases of volunteer firefighters. (BDR 53-46)

SENATOR JOHN J. LEE (Clark County Senatorial District No. 1):

The Mt. Charleston Fire Department responded to 265 calls in 2008. It takes a minimum of two hours for every call. If a paid unit from town responded, there are two people on rescue and four people on engine response. Each individual is paid \$40 per hour (depending on time and services) which does not include benefits. At \$80 for one person multiplied by the 265 responses, we get about \$21,000 per person for a full-time firefighter. In this case, volunteers do it for free, no cost, no wages, no benefits. This is a cost savings of about \$21,000 for just one department. There are 13 volunteer stations in Clark County, and they responded to almost 3,000 calls in 2008. That is no small amount for all the volunteers across the State. If you accumulate all the time in hours that has been provided to us, it is a wonderful service for us. Madam Chair, I urge the Committee to listen to the testimonies of the people here today and understand the benefit need for these individuals.

MICHAEL HEIDEMANN (Executive Director, Nevada State Firefighters' Association): Speaking on behalf of volunteer firefighters of the State of Nevada, I have with me Steve McClintock, the rural coordinator for the Clark County Fire Department, in charge of the 13 volunteer fire stations Senator Lee spoke about. Currently, volunteer firefighters in the State are not covered under workers' compensation benefits once they reach the age of 55. Our proposal is to amend Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 617.457 to include these people in this benefit program. To do that, we have put in checks and balances to require them to have physicals once they reach the age of 50 to identify any potential problems and give them 5 years to correct any predisposing conditions. We have also added an amendment to address loss of benefits for nonparticipation. I have distributed a packet ([Exhibit C](#)) with several letters of support from the State Board of Fire Services, the Fire Services Standards and Training Committee from last Session, the Nevada Fire Chiefs Association, and several cities and counties. They address the potential fiscal impact to their local municipality based on the physicals that will be required and a potential claim that could increase their workers' compensation insurance rates. They all agree S.B. 6 is a good thing. They cannot run their communities without the volunteer firefighters. They support this program even with the potential fiscal note.

Even though physicals will be required at age 50 under this new amendment, currently volunteer firefighters are required to have a physical every 3 years. The over-50 population would be required to get a physical every year. Many communities, municipalities and districts already require physicals every year for their firefighters. I ask for your support for this bill.

The Nevada State Firefighters actively promote heart-healthy programs, including, "Are you at risk?" refrigerator magnets, a heart-healthy program, and a heart-healthy firefighter's cookbook. People over 55 can have heart attacks more frequently than those younger. It is important to realize this is not a presumptive benefit for volunteer firefighters. It is only while they are actually protecting the property and lives of our citizens that they would be covered under this benefit. It is a rebuttable injury, proving that it happened as a result of fighting a fire. These volunteers are truly unpaid professionals and our first line of defense for any natural disasters in this State. We request the Committee's support of this bill.

SENATOR RHOADS:  
Who pays for the physical?

MR. HEIDEMANN:

Each local municipality, recognizing the volunteer fire department, pays under chapter 616 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*. The volunteers are employees of the city, county, district or township that recognizes them.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Mr. Heidemann, you mentioned an amendment. Will you be presenting it?

MR. HEIDEMANN:

My understanding is that it is coming from "POOL/PACT."

STEVE MCCLINTOCK (Nevada State Firefighters' Association):

The National Volunteer Fire Council uses a calculation formulating the areas that are protected, population, and the amount of volunteers available, etc., to come up with a savings figure. I ran some figures that show volunteers save Clark County about \$25 million per year. The areas surrounding Clark County are all covered by volunteers. We had over 3,000 calls last year to our 13 stations. One person in 2001 responded to a call, had a heart attack and died in a county vehicle; he was not covered. His family had to pay to go to California to pick up his body because he was responding as a "mutual aid" call into California. They had to cover all the expenses to bury this man, and he was doing a favor for the community. We had another gentleman who was fighting a fire. The next day he had chest pain and was put into the hospital. The doctor attributed his condition back to the fire he was fighting the night before. Again, he was not covered. We had another gentleman in Sandy Valley. The same thing happened to him, and he was not covered; he was over the age of 55.

Clark County requires physicals every two years. It costs approximately \$300 for a volunteer's physical and \$600 for a physical that includes a treadmill test after age 50. This is a minimal cost when compared to what the volunteers provide to our State and counties.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Is there anyone else you would like to bring up, Mr. Heidemann?

MR. HEIDEMANN:

There may one or two who would like to speak. I would like to address a couple of other issues. One of them is the cost of a paid firefighter versus a volunteer. Another has to do with their insurance ratings with the Insurance Services

Offices (ISO) group that rates homeowner insurance policies. Fallon has a Class 1 ISO rating; it is one of only two such communities served by volunteer fire departments in our country. The volunteer firefighters in the State are very well trained, and they save our communities a lot of money. In my community, we went from a Class 6 to a Class 2-3 rating, which dropped our insurance rates by 30 percent. This is happening all over the State. Many rural departments would be either nonrated or at a rating of ten, which leads to extremely high insurance rates, without small volunteer fire departments which are losing two to three percent per year. We need to retain our guys after they are trained.

Many of you are aware of the claims that Mr. McClintock spoke of. There has been some federal action in regard to a lawsuit based on these claims. Clark County filed a motion to dismiss on December 27 of last year. In February, that motion was denied based on the fact that Nevada statute violates the federal law on age discrimination. It is interesting that on January 30, the same ruling came down in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, for career departments who were denying employment to individuals over the age of 40. They were required to reinstate jobs to all their qualified applicants over the age of 40. This could happen if we do not get this fixed.

CHAIR CARLTON:  
Are there any questions from the Committee?

SENATOR HARDY:  
Did we process something similar to this last Session? If that is the case, what happened with it?

CHAIR CARLTON:  
We did process it during last Session, and it ended up in the Senate Committee on Finance. During the last two days, it ended up being taken out in order to allow other measures to move forward. That is when the commitment was given to Mr. Heidemann that we would make this item one of the first things out of the box this Legislative Session.

KRISTA LEACH, CPCU, CIE (Acting Risk Manager, Risk Management Division, Department of Administration):

I am here to alert the Committee that there is a fiscal impact to the State for the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) firefighters who volunteer. We have not fully determined the impact yet; however, we are in the process of drafting the fiscal note.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Just so that I understand, we do exams already, so this would be ... .

MS. LEACH:

I believe the NDF does examinations up to the age of 55, and they are, per *Nevada Revised Statutes*, currently every 3 years. The revised bill opens that up to an annual physical, so there is a fiscal impact to the NDF for the cost of the physicals. There is an impact to the Risk Management Division for potential claims' costs, for workers' compensation heart claims.

CHAIR CARLTON:

In the past, discussion on fiscal notes included a cost-benefit analysis. If we lose a firefighter, how much would this cost us and how much does it cost us to provide coverage for him? Will that be included within that fiscal note? If it is not, may I have that information?

MS. LEACH:

We will attempt to figure that out.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

DONALD E. JAYNE, CPCU (President, Jayne & Associates, Inc., Management Consultants):

I am testifying on behalf of the Public Agency Compensation Trust (PACT). Earlier testimony referenced an amendment brought by the POOL/PACT on S.B. 6; a copy is in your packets ([Exhibit D](#)). There are two areas for potential impact. If an entity is not currently conducting physicals, there would be a new impact. If there is a claim from an individual volunteer firefighter who is over age 55, that would be a new impact.

As with many things concerning insurance, it is impossible to predict exactly when one will occur or how many claims you will have. We call that severity versus frequency. Frequency is a lot of issues or claims that could happen and we certainly do not see a frequency issue. We may have a severity issue if there is a claim that happens while a volunteer firefighter is responding to an event. We have our actuaries looking at it, and we believe there will be some impact. We spread the risk out amongst the entities. We believe there will be some impact to their rates. It may be somewhat minimal in aggregate dollar impact unless we catch a claim early, and then we will have to address that claim as it happens.

With the intent of this amendment we brought before you, [Exhibit D](#), we tried to look at the population of individuals to clarify what individuals will be eligible for this benefit once we remove the age 55 criteria. In the first part of the amendment, you will see the modification to section 1, subsection 2 is coming in after the removal of the age 55 criteria and inserting, "and who has maintained continuous status as an active volunteer firefighter on the roster of the volunteer fire department." We would want this to be limited to individuals who are responding to fire calls and to individuals who are keeping up with their training. It is my understanding that Mr. Heidemann is supportive of that, and other items in this amendment.

The change at the bottom of the first page, section 1, subsection 3, is redundant in three places because we were not completely certain, and perhaps the legal staff can assist us, of where to put this particular change. What we are attempting to do is to realize once a physical is complete, if there are any medical conditions that exist that the doctor recommends they address, that they go ahead to address those. Failure to take the physical, failure to address those changes or failure to maintain their status would result in removing them from qualification for the benefits. We have addressed this with the bill sponsor as well as with Senator Lee. On page 2, the redundancy of the language results from not knowing exactly where to put it. Rusty McAllister advised that he thought the inclusion in subsection 6 was inappropriately addressing the full-time firefighting force. If that is the case, we would have that removed.

CHAIR CARLTON:  
Are there any questions from the Committee?

SENATOR PARKS:

Mr. Jayne, referencing subsection 3, page 2, your requested words, "... or by his employer ... ," may cause some problems if the employer inadvertently overlooks the requirement of scheduling, could it not? I have a concern with the wording.

MR. JAYNE:

I support the fact that employers do end up paying for the physicals and other tests that may be ordered as a result of the initial physical. We are not challenging that. The intent would be if they do not go to a scheduled physical, they would be in default.

MR. HEIDEMANN:

I agree with Mr. Jayne and suggest that the word "or" should be stricken. These physicals are required by the employer and are required to be scheduled by the employer. I would like to speak to the comment of physicals for the NDF. It should be noted that NDF budgeted \$30,000 toward physicals for the volunteers in the northeast section of our State; \$10,000 was spent, and they returned the remaining money. I do not believe that is a huge fiscal note to them at this point. The true spirit of risk management is the purpose of this bill. A study done by the University of Maryland addressed volunteer fire departments and concluded that training is good, equipment is good, dedication is good, but it found two faults: physicals and accountability. This bill addresses those faults. For every dollar you spend in prevention, you will save three down the road. By identifying risk factors and people who physically should not be on those fire grounds, this is true risk management, and it should be noted that way.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

MR. JAYNE:

You requested earlier that we evaluate the fiscal impact, and we will do the best we can to look at those impacts. We view it spreading out minimally amongst our entities, but certainly it exists, and we know that the bill was somewhat misleading. We will try to do a cost-benefit analysis as well.



CHAIR CARLTON:

The intent is to determine the value of a volunteer firefighter versus the value of a physical. We need to have these analyses on the record to improve on it.

PAT IRWIN, (Lovelock Volunteer Firefighter):

When we talked with our firefighters, we found that there is a fiscal impact of the reverse thought process. If we do not push this through, we will lose a lot of volunteer firefighters in our community. For the last two years, they have been holding on and volunteering, knowing they are not covered under the actual event of a fire. If this amendment does not happen, what will we do to replace these volunteers? We are already at the point where we cannot get volunteers, and it is getting more difficult. As we lose people, it is taking us time in hours and years to replace a 20- or 30-year veteran. We have five in our department that will walk out the door. There is going to be a huge impact on us as a county.

RAYMOND (RUSTY) C. MCALLISTER (President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada):

After reviewing this amendment proposed by PACT. [Exhibit D](#), we have no problem with the first modification in section 1. As to modifications to section 1, subsection 3, page 2, we would like to remove the added portion. The only section that deals with volunteer firefighters is subsection 4, page 2, line 21, where they added the amendment. We want to be on record informing you we prefer not to change the laws that currently exist. If you want to change it for the volunteer firefighters, we could help write this for them. We understand the amendment is being proposed for the volunteer firefighters under that specific subsection. We would rather not see additional amendments added that affect the career firefighters. Referencing subsection 6 on page 2 and subsection 3 on page 1, Mr. Jayne informed me that it was not his intent to change the law for current paid firefighters.

CHAIR CARLTON:

For clarification, the language that is under section 1, subsection 4, page 2, and section 1, subsection 2, page 1, are the correct two. The other two you would like to see stricken because those go into the professional firefighters' language, correct?

MR. MCALLISTER:

Yes, Madam Chair. That is correct.

CRAIG MICHIE:

As I have watched the issue of the firefighters and police officers over the last ten years, I realized the issue of dealing with volunteers is a very serious one. The real issue that needs to be recognized is one of exposure, not how long somebody has had their name on a roster in regard to the necessity to provide care and treatment. Especially in the area of first responders or crisis responders, you cannot exclude an individual from treatment and care of which they are, and should be, entitled simply because their name has not been put on a roster for a certain period of time. Based upon some of the web reports I have read, people are being denied simply because they do not fit into the square of the box.

BARBARA GRUENEWALD (Attorney, Nevada Justice Association):

We support deleting the requirement that the volunteer firefighter has to reach the age of 55 years as stated in section 1. In 1988, I represented a volunteer firefighter, Alan Sebastian. He suffered a heart attack in the course of his duties as a volunteer firefighter, but was denied coverage because he was over the age of 55 years. We appealed to the district court, and the judge found that this provision was unconstitutional. I do not have a copy of that case, because it was back in 1988 when I was the Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers. I went to the district court this morning to obtain a copy, but there was none. Therefore, I want to make the Committee aware that a district court has found the provision of the 55 years of age requirement unconstitutional. We support the deletion of that provision.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are there any questions from the Committee? Is there anyone here in opposition to S.B. 6? Are there any public comments? We will close the hearing on S.B. 6. We will now move on to S.B. 17.

**SENATE BILL 17**: Revises provisions governing health care records.  
(BDR 54- 607)

SENATOR VALERIE WIENER (Clark County Senatorial District No. 3):

I am providing written testimony in support of S.B. 17 ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR CARLTON:

Do you have any idea what type of time frame we are looking at?

SENATOR WIENER:

My Committee manager has already scheduled a meeting. We will provide that information as soon as possible.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

SENATOR HARDY:

Madam Chair, we have Dr. Dickson and Dr. Carro here in Las Vegas, who both signed up to testify.

LESLEY R. DICKSON, M.D. (President, Nevada Psychiatric Association):

We have spoken with Senator Weiner, and she is addressing our concerns. We have considerable concern about confidentiality issues ([Exhibit F](#)). Confidentiality is a long-protected right of patients concerning their treatment of any type of medical or mental health issues where confidentiality should be guarded. We want to be sure that, whatever happens with this bill, it continues to be true.

MICHELLE CARRO, PH.D. (Clinical Psychologist, Nevada Psychological Association):  
I have provided written testimony in opposition to S.B. 17 ([Exhibit G](#)).

MORGAN BUNKER (Faiss Foley Warren):

I am testifying on behalf of Helen Foley and the Association of Marriage and Family Therapists. We are willing and happy to take part in the evolution of this bill going forward.

CHAIR CARLTON:

If we had electronic medical records, the patient could find them at their convenience, and we could solve many of these problems. Is there anyone else who would like to testify on S.B. 17? We will close the hearing on S.B. 17. We will open the hearing on S.B. 40.

**SENATE BILL 40**: Revises provisions relating to the licensure of psychologists.  
(BDR 54-320)

ELIZABETH NEIGHBORS, PH.D., ABPP (Board of Psychological Examiners):

I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)) in support of S.B. 40.

MARTHA MAHAFFEY, PH.D. (Board of Psychological Examiners)

I support S.B. 40, specifically in regard to the change in language from "oral examination" to "examination." We require psychologists applying for licensure to take the national examination in addition to a state examination. The reason is to ensure that psychologists possess the minimum knowledge and competence to be license-worthy psychologists specific to the State, and that they are familiar with State law specific to the practice of psychology. It will also ensure public safety and welfare.

For the past 20 years, our examinations have been oral. The trend throughout the nation has been to move from an oral examination to a multiple-choice examination. A multiple-choice examination allows us to have a more psychometrically-sound examination to which we can apply statistics. That being the case, it will be more in line with standards for educational and psychological tests established by the American Psychological Association. Because it is testable, we are able to address issues such as reliability and validity. In so doing, we have developed a more legally-defensible examination whenever there is an issue of appropriateness of the examination. It is also more cost-effective. The oral examination requires us to train about 20 examiners each six-month period to administer the examination orally. The multiple-choice examination will eliminate that and will be more cost effective.

A majority of the states throughout the United States are moving toward multiple-choice examinations. California was one of the first states to change from oral to multiple-choice in 2001. In 2005, the Board of Psychological Examiners hired a psychometric firm called Comira to do a validity study. Their recommendation, after analyzing our examination, is that we move from an oral to a multiple-choice examination. In 2006, we began working with the Comira group. In 2008, we started developing the new examination. Once we change the language in the law, we may implement the new examination as early as August.

CHAIR CARLTON:

How does the State Board evaluate the national examination? Is it a pass/fail? Is it a percentage? Do you have a threshold that needs to be met before the grade is accepted?

DR. NEIGHBORS:

That examination is a test designed by the "American Board of State Psychological Examiners." There is a threshold percentage they require, which we accept.

DR. MAHAFFEY:

Yes, that is the same threshold across the nation.

CHAIR CARLTON:

In the past we have had problems with national examinations and people accepting part of them, but not accepting other parts. In regard to the oral examination, are you actually writing it, or did I understand you to say you are taking pieces of it from another examination?

DR. MAHAFFEY:

We wrote the oral examination, and we would also write the multiple-choice examination. We are working with the psychometric firm, Comira, to ensure the process meets the standards that are set for licensing boards and examinations.

CHAIR CARLTON:

What does it take to pass the exam? What type of score?

DR. MAHAFFEY:

We are moving from having a 70-percent pass rate to a criterion-referenced cut score. Just having a certain pass rate did not allow us to consider the difficulty level of each examination. We are now learning to assess the difficulty level of each question and, therefore, the difficulty level of each examination. The cut score will vary, test by test, depending on the difficulty of the test, based on statistical analysis.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are the questions in the test weighted?

DR. MAHAFFEY:

All the questions will be weighted equally. Each question will be ranked on a five-point scale, and one of the answers will be correct. There will be 50 questions, and each one is worth 2 points. The difficulty level is weighted. We determine the cut score based on the difficulty level.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Do I understand that you have not asked applicants for licensure to submit fingerprints in the past? Is this a brand-new requirement for you?

DR. NEIGHBORS:

Yes, that is correct, we have not.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Is the reason we are doing it now to catch up with everyone else?

DR. NEIGHBORS:

It is a better way to screen for any type of criminal activity and backgrounds. We have previously received information from national repositories about people who had sanctions against their licenses. There are other ways we have gathered information, but we have never actually submitted fingerprints to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for that type of criminal background check.

CHAIR CARLTON:

What about current licensees? Do you have any plans for discipline of those licensees to ask them for fingerprints? Will you have the same information on current licensees as you do on future licensees?

DR. NEIGHBORS:

We have not addressed that issue, but we will certainly explore that question.

CHAIR CARLTON:

There is one way we have addressed it with other boards who did not want to go back to fingerprint everyone. If a disciplinary action came up as part of the resolution of the action, they asked the licensee to submit fingerprint cards. Perhaps that is something you may want to do.

DR. NEIGHBORS:

We will explore that.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are there any questions from the Committee? Is there anyone else in favor of the bill?

CAPTAIN PHILIP K. O'NEILL (Division Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety):

I am neither in favor of nor opposed to the bill. However, I have several questions that I would like to bring to your attention. Several years ago, a bill was passed about furnishing fingerprint information, and it did not "pass muster" with the FBI security requirements. Although it was in the statutes, we could not release criminal information to the agency.

Based on questions I have, I propose some amendments. As it stands, it is not clear who pays. If the fingerprints are only done during initial licensing or during renewals, as some of the other authorities or licensing boards require, the current procedures outlined are hard-card submissions. Currently, hard-card submissions are taking up to ten weeks to get a response from the FBI. We are trying to move to an electronic format, and responses would be returned within a few days. Once the bill's modifications are made, we would like to submit it in time for the FBI to review and provide feedback. Madam Chair, I ask that you authorize or approve us to work with the Board of Psychological Examiners. We could then come back with some additional language and modifications before it is moved out of Committee.

CHAIR CARLTON:

That would be a good idea to have it match some of the other boards' basic language. While you are working on that, could you possibly add in a suggestion I made earlier about current licensees? Could you refresh my memory on the releasing of information to the agencies?

CAPT. O'NEILL:

Currently, the specific statute says it can only go to government agencies. We cannot send criminal history to a private company unless it is authorized by the actual individual. We suggest it go to the licensing agencies; they can make a determination on whether the criminal history is applicable as a negative impact to the license. When I spoke to you during the last Legislative Session, we had described some scenarios of individuals with criminal records who could not attain a license for the job in their specified field. The arrest record did not have anything to do with their work environment. The best example was an off-duty nurse who was accosted by a drunken individual in a bar. She pushed him back, he fell and cracked his head open. She is arrested for assault. If the individual dies, it would become manslaughter because of her initial violent act of pushing the individual back. She has an unfortunate record, but it has no bearing on her

ability to be a nurse. The statutes state "if they are convicted of a felony." It limits who can and cannot be licensed. We recommend, from our studies on a national level, that licensing boards look at the entire record to make an assessment and set up their own regulations on what is applicable.

CHAIR CARLTON:

The requirement for licensees to submit fingerprints is in NRS 622.360.

DR. CARRO:

Our membership is in support of the provisions in S.B. 40.

CHAIR CARLTON:

Are there any questions from the Committee? Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 40? Is there any public comment on S.B. 40? Hearing none, we will close the hearing on S.B. 40. Since each of these bills discussed today come with amendments, we will review them and schedule them in two weeks.

Having no further business, this meeting is adjourned at 2:34 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Vicki Folster,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_