

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

**Seventy-sixth Session
May 13, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy was called to order by Chair Michael A. Schneider at 1:58 p.m. on Friday, May 13, 2011, 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 Michael A. Schneider, Chair
Senator Shirley A. Breeden, Vice Chair
Senator David R. Parks
Senator Allison Copening
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Elizabeth Halseth
Senator Michael Roberson

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith, Assembly District No. 30

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Scott Young, Policy Analyst
Matt Nichols, Counsel
Matthew Walker, Legislative Analyst, Assembly Leadership
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

James T. Overland, Sr., D.C., Nevada Chiropractic Association
Marsha Berkbigler, Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada
Denise Selleck Davis, CAE, Nevada Osteopathic Medical Association
Boyd Etter, PT, Dip. MDT, OCS, Nevada Physical Therapy Association

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2011
Page 2

Alisa Nave, The Capitol Company; Nevada Justice Association
Adam Porath, PharmD, BCPS, Nevada Society of Health System Pharmacists
Amber Joiner, Nevada State Medical Association
Elizabeth MacMenamin, Retail Association of Nevada
James V. deProsse, Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department
of Business and Industry
Susan Fisher, City of Reno; Nevada Housing Alliance
Sheila E. Walther, Supervisory Examiner, Division of Mortgage Lending,
Department of Business and Industry
Donald E. Jayne, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of
Business and Industry
Bob Ostrovsky, Chair, Advisory Council to the Division of Industrial Relations,
Department of Business and Industry; Nevada Association of Health Plans

SENATOR BREEDEN:

I am opening the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 382.

ASSEMBLY BILL 382 (1st Reprint): Requires the Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada to establish a preceptor program. (BDR 54-1006)

JAMES T. OVERLAND, SR., D.C., (Nevada Chiropractic Association):

This bill only applies to chiropractic as it is now practiced in Nevada. It does not apply to any other health profession. This bill requires the Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada to establish a preceptor program that will benefit multiple parties and encourage chiropractic graduates to come to Nevada. There is evidence that language in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) is discouraging new graduates from coming here. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

One of the leading chiropractic schools, Palmer College of Chiropractic (PCC), is endorsing this bill. I am submitting a letter of support ([Exhibit D](#)) from Kurt Wood, D.C., Vice Chancellor for Clinic Affairs, Palmer College of Chiropractic.

We are aware of a proposed friendly amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) requiring malpractice insurance for students and unlicensed chiropractors working under a licensed chiropractor, or "preceptor." It was our intent to have our licensing board provide this requirement through regulatory changes. However, we are

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2011
Page 3

fine with the amendment and hope it will neither delay nor complicate the original intent of A.B. 382.

MARSHA BERKBIGLER (Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada):
We support this bill and the proposed amendment.

DENISE SELLECK DAVIS, CAE (Nevada Osteopathic Medical Association):
We want to make sure the term "manipulation" used in this proposed bill is intended only for chiropractors and is not used as a definition for osteopathic physicians who practice osteopathic manipulative treatments.

MATT NICHOLS (Counsel):
The definition "manipulation" here is used in two sections of NRS. They both apply only to the practice of chiropractic. In fact, they're limited only to the students which the earlier witness testified about; those who are waiting to take the examination in Nevada and participants in the preceptor program. The definition only applies where it is used, and it is only used in two sections that relate to these clinical training programs. It would not apply to, say, a physical therapist or an osteopathic physician.

MS. SELLECK DAVIS:
We are fine with that.

BOYD ETTER, PT, DIP. MDT, OCS (Nevada Physical Therapy Association):
We have the same concerns. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)). We are also fine with the clarification from counsel on the definition of the term "manipulation," which is something we often do as physical therapists.

ALISA NAVE (The Capitol Company; Nevada Justice Association):
We are in general support of this measure and have a friendly amendment to propose, [Exhibit E](#). Our amendment would do two things. On section 4, subsection 3, it would add a paragraph (c) requiring the student to be covered by the preceptor's professional malpractice insurance. The other change is to section 7, adding the same requirement to insure chiropractors who are in the licensure process and operating under a licensed chiropractor in the process. This will ensure that patients using chiropractic services are protected.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

I have received a letter of support for this bill from John J. Ediss, D.C., and will submit it ([Exhibit G](#)). I will close the hearing on A.B. 382 and open the hearing on A.B. 199.

ASSEMBLY BILL 199 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the practice of pharmacy. (BDR 54-875)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DEBBIE SMITH (Assembly District No. 30):

This bill is intended to allow a pharmacist to help manage a patient's care in partnership with a doctor under certain circumstances. We will need some technical amendments to get the language just right. This bill was the idea of Adam Porath, a pharmacist at Renown Regional Medical Center in Reno. The proposed bill would create a very controlled environment for the pharmacist to help manage a patient's care.

One scenario where this would be especially valuable is when a patient is using Coumadin, a blood thinner that needs close monitoring through frequent blood tests and dose adjustments. It can be difficult for patients to gain the required access to their doctor to monitor this type of therapy. However, a pharmacist could oversee the process. In a hospital setting, pharmacists do this. With our changing health-care environment, we have to look for new and better ways to provide care to patients when they need it. The intention of this bill is to expand that reach outside of hospital walls, and for pharmacists to be able to participate in concert with doctors to provide more accessible care for patients. We do have a proposed amendment ([Exhibit H](#)).

ADAM PORATH, PHARM.D., BCPS (Nevada Society of Health System Pharmacists):

I started the outpatient anticoagulation service at Renown Regional Medical Center (RRMC) in Reno. It is a collaborative clinic run by pharmacists with cardiologist medical directors. We provide care for patients on Coumadin and other blood thinners, managing those patients as they leave the hospital and return to the community.

When we established our business model, we wanted to provide care not only at the hospital, but also at our satellite locations throughout northern Nevada. This way, our patients in Fernley and Fallon could get better care by not having to drive frequently to Reno for monitoring. However, we found that under

Nevada law, we could not offer this to patients. We could only do this collaborative practice within the four walls of either a hospital or a pharmacy.

Our proposal has pharmacists seeing patients in a clinic setting with collaborating physicians. We underutilize pharmacists in Nevada, and we receive unique training that could be better utilized. All our neighboring states, California, Oregon, Idaho and Utah, allow pharmacists to practice collaboratively outside a hospital setting. It may be that the subject never came up in Nevada, since we do not have a State college of pharmacy.

Several published studies illustrate that a pharmacist providing direct patient care, or working on a team with doctors, decreases hospital readmissions and improves patient outcomes. We did a study at our anticoagulation service for the first six months, and found that compared to historical control data, we lowered the instances of clot-related readmission at RRMCC by 89 percent. We have the potential to make a major impact on patient care with this legislation, and we are willing to work on the language to bring it to fruition.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

Would there be any issues as far as coverage for health insurance?

MR. PORATH:

If we use the model of Coumadin management that we are currently performing at RRMCC, Medicare does cover this.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

If the Committee will indulge us, we will get the language finalized on this bill. Everyone is coming together now, and we will get an amendment drafted and to you for your consideration.

AMBER JOINER (Nevada State Medical Association):

We support this bill. We are trying to figure out how best to implement this proposal. We could propose the pharmacist be an agent of a physician, which would allow the pharmacist to call in prescriptions.

MS. SELLECK DAVIS:

We support the concept of this proposed bill and look forward to the new language so we can give it our full support.

MR. PORATH:

Our intent as pharmacists doing this work is not to have outright prescriptive authority. We would be working under specific protocols specifying what kind of medication would be appropriate to prescribe in certain situations. This is easy to do in a hospital working under chart orders, but out in the field, sending a patient home with a prescription is a different scenario. How to do that has been the sticking point for us with this bill.

ELIZABETH MACMENAMIN (Retail Association of Nevada):

We wholeheartedly support this bill. The pharmacists I work with see this as the future for their profession.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 199 and open the hearing on A.B. 363.

ASSEMBLY BILL 363 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing manufactured housing. (BDR 43-996)

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN C. ELLISON (Assembly District No. 33):

The first part of this proposed bill would allow counties to work with the Manufactured Housing Division (MHD), Department of Business and Industry, (DBI), to accept or adopt their own inspections. In some rural areas, if it is difficult for the State to get there, the rural county officials can work with MHD and create their own inspection division. This relationship can become a cosponsorship between the State's MHD and the rural county.

The second part of the proposed bill is labor-related. In the rural areas, it is difficult to get people to work on manufactured housing because of the MHD rules and regulations. We met with James deProsse, Administrator, MHD and the State Contractors' Board (SCB), and we came up with an idea to waive the requirements from the trade agreement. The worker would still have to purchase the license but would be exempt from the continuous training, which has nothing to do with specialty trades like electricians, plumbers, etc.

JAMES V. DEPROSSE (Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry):

I worked with Assemblyman Ellison on this bill and am in support of it. There is some overlap with the SCB licensing and our licensees. The solution we came up with is in this proposed bill.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

You mentioned this would be a cosponsorship between the MHD and the counties. Is this rural counties only?

MR. DEPROSSE:

The change in statute relative to the cooperative agreements with local jurisdictions is a relatively minor one. We now have cooperative agreements in place with Lander County and Humboldt County. The City of Winnemucca has also asked to enter into a cooperative agreement with us. It fits well with these counties where they have a need and we have no presence, so we can then partner with them.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

Is this legislation going to stipulate that only a certain licensed person can work on manufactured homes?

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON:

Yes and no. If I say I am a plumber and want a specialty trades license, I would get the license as a plumber. I could not go and set up the manufactured home or work on the roof; I could only do plumbing. A person can get a manufactured housing license to work on everything, but that is not what this law is about; it is for trades.

MR. DEPROSSE:

If someone is a now a licensed electrician with the SCB, that person is prohibited from working on manufactured housing. That is still the case, and that contractor must come to us at MHD for licensure. We have streamlined the process by eliminating the continuing education (CE) requirement. The SCB does not impose CE requirements on their licensees, which has been a sore point for some licensed workers who often must take CE training that does not align with their specialty.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON:

There are many licensed contractors in Nevada waiting for this bill so they can purchase this license. It would be good for the State.

SUSAN FISHER (City of Reno; Nevada Housing Alliance):

The City of Reno supports this. The rural areas in Nevada would benefit from this, especially workers wanting to install, service and inspect manufactured

housing in the rural areas. The City of Reno will pursue a cooperative agreement with MHD to do inspections. The Nevada Housing Alliance supports this proposed bill as well. We license service providers within our organization, so this would create more competition for them. It is a good thing because it will help the end user. There will be more workers available to service manufactured homes, especially in the rural areas where there are fewer licensed workers.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

Seeing no more testimony, I will close the hearing on A.B. 363.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will now open a work session hearing on A.B. 77 with work session documents, ([Exhibit I](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 77 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to mortgage lending and related professionals. (BDR 54-481)

SHEILA E. WALTHER (Supervisory Examiner, Division of Mortgage Lending, Department of Business and Industry):

There are three possible changes I want to address. We initially introduced a bill which would strike certain language in sections 44 and 72, eliminating the exemption for companies that are subsidiaries of banks. We met with industry people and agreed to leave that language so those entities would still be eligible for the exemption to avoid having to be federally registered and subject to State licensing. When this proposal was drafted, the change was made in section 72 to amend NRS 645E.150, but the change in NRS 645B.145 was missed. Our proposed amendment, page 3 of [Exhibit I](#), corrects that discrepancy so section 44 reads the same as section 72, as originally intended.

The second correction, page 5 of [Exhibit I](#), would make Nevada law consistent with the new Federal Trade Commission (FTC) rules. This is in section 97, changing the definition of "residence in foreclosure" to apply only to a homeowner's primary residence. The FTC loan modification rules apply to any dwelling that is a one-to-four-family unit, including mobile homes. Initially, we were recommending striking certain language in section 96 of the proposed bill. Instead, Counsel Matt Nichols recommended we instead strike section 97 and leave the definition of a "residence in foreclosure" as it is, which is a one-to-four family dwelling, including a primary residence. This way, where the phrase "residence in foreclosure" appears, it would be consistent with the FTC rules.

The final item would change language in A.B. 77 to be consistent with A.B. 308. In a previous Committee meeting, a change was added to the exemption for entities or individuals subject to licensing as loan modification companies to extend the exemption for attorneys to those attorneys' employees. Assemblyman Marcus L. Conklin introduced an amendment, page 7 of [Exhibit I](#), to A.B. 308 which would remove that exemption, making any employees of attorneys still subject to licensing. We recommend making A.B. 77 the same in that section, mirroring the language in the amendment for A.B. 308.

ASSEMBLY BILL 308 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the regulation of mortgage lending. (BDR 54-183)

SENATOR COPENING:

I have a proposed conceptual amendment, page 10 of [Exhibit I](#), to replace the conceptual amendment by Assemblyman Conklin. The added language prohibits loan modification counselors who are working in an attorney's office from not having to be licensed. We currently exempt attorneys from that licensing, and it has been a way for loan modification companies to get around the rules by working under an attorney. This will prevent that from happening. The majority leader has approved this bill.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I did receive a request for clarification, page 9 of [Exhibit I](#), from ex-Senator Warren B. Hardy II, representing Eagle Mortgage Company. His specific concern was with section 71 of A.B. 77.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am concerned about going from \$10,000 to \$25,000 on the fine and then suspending licenses and putting people out of business. I know we are having problems in this area, though.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

We can look at this bill again on May 16. I will close the work session hearing on A.B. 77 and open the work session hearing on A.B. 23 with a work session document, ([Exhibit J](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 23 (1st Reprint): Enacts the Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact. (BDR 57-473)

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2011
Page 10

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

This is a bill on behalf of the Division of Insurance, DBI. Since there are no questions or comments and we all understand the bill, I will close the hearing on A.B. 23.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 23.

SENATOR COPENING SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will now open A.B. 130, Assemblywoman Debbie Smith's bill about affordable housing, with a work session document, ([Exhibit K](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 130 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to affordable housing. (BDR 25-874)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

This bill allows affordable housing entities to participate in a program of joint self-insurance, and we have no amendments. Since we all understand the bill and no one has comments or questions, I am closing the work session hearing on A.B. 130.

SENATOR BREEDEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 130.

SENATOR COPENING SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will open the work session on A.B. 141 with a work session document, ([Exhibit L](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 141 (1st Reprint): Revises the frequency with which certain volunteer firefighters must submit to physical examinations to receive workers' compensation coverage for certain occupational diseases. (BDR 53-567)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

This is Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea's volunteer firefighter bill. It proposes moving the required physical exams for firefighters from every year to every other year. There are no amendments, and I did not hear of opposition to this bill. I am closing the work session hearing on A.B. 141.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 141.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will open the work session hearing on A.B. 253 with work session documents, (**Exhibit M**).

ASSEMBLY BILL 253 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning fines and settlement agreements relating to occupational safety and health. (BDR 53-100)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

We have a proposed amendment and statement of intent, pages 2 through 5 of **Exhibit M**, on this bill from Don Jayne, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations (DIR), DBI.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I have been talking to Don Jayne about this. Many settlement agreements deal with so many different aspects that if you have a violation, they write up everything including the kitchen sink. I am not comfortable with this.

DONALD E. JAYNE (Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry):

I share some of Senator Settelmeyer's concerns, which is why we brought the amendment with the intent to limit settlement agreements. We felt it was too broad. Each of the section corrections we made in the amendment are the way the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), United States Department of Labor, statutes are crafted. One section may address a serious violation, another one may address a normal violation and another may address a willful violation.

To handle the settlement agreements, we have placed that language in each of those sections. In the DIR, when we get to a settlement agreement problem, it means we have already been through the initial reason for an inspection, citations have been issued, they have been contested through the normal process and we have agreed in that contest period to a settlement. Everything in this amendment establishes our ability to enforce and remedy a situation where someone is not complying with the settlement agreement. This language is ours, taken from the OSHA world, to try to define the intent.

BOB OSTROVSKY (Chair, Advisory Council to the Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry):

This is a compromised piece of legislation. We know the DIR has had problems enforcing settlement agreements. This would give them an additional tool in their toolbox.

MR. JAYNE:

The revised language we brought for those settlement agreements was deliberately changed from "shall" to "may," which makes it permissive language.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will close the work session hearing on A.B. 253.

SENATOR BREEDEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 253.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS HALSETH, ROBERSON AND SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will open a work session hearing on A.B. 254 with work session documents, ([Exhibit N](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 254 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the issuance of a citation for certain occupational safety and health violations. (BDR 53-101)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

This is another occupational safety bill. It changes fines and settlement agreements. We do have a proposed amendment and statement of intent from Mr. Jayne on pages 2 and 3 of [Exhibit N](#).

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Did we solve the problem of access? It came down to whether an employer had the ability to access the problem and solve it. During testimony, we heard about the safety aspect of the bill and specifically defining the word "access." An employer cannot follow the law if he does not know the definition of access. Does the employer have access to someone else's equipment inside that person's vehicle because it is on the employer's property, with the employer not necessarily having a key to the person's equipment?

MR. JAYNE:

We moved this from our policy manual into statute because of the confusing aspects of this issue. We wanted to clarify access. The fact that my enforcement officer does not witness someone next to the hazard, but we have reasonable expectation that he or she could be exposed to the hazard, that defines access. I cannot issue a citation on access alone. Access is only one of four elements, but it is one of the most confusing elements we wanted to codify. Also, because those sections involving settlement agreements are open, my amendment is technically an amendment to make it permissive.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I am closing the work session hearing on A.B. 254.

SENATOR BREEDEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
A.B. 254.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS HALSETH, ROBERSON AND
SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
I will open the work session hearing on A.B. 396 with a work session
document, ([Exhibit O](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 396 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to industrial
insurance involving certain employees who are injured during certain
cooperative governmental activities. (BDR 53-1002)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
This bill extends workers' comp coverage when a worker crosses city or county
lines. There are no amendments. Seeing no discussion, I will close the hearing
on A.B. 396.

SENATOR BREEDEN MOVED DO PASS A.B. 396.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
I will open the work session hearing on A.B. 309 with work session documents,
([Exhibit P](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 309 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing insurance.
(BDR 57-516)

MATTHEW WALKER (Legislative Analyst, Assembly Leadership):

We have a [conceptual] supplemental amendment [pages 17 and 18 of [Exhibit P](#)], to amendment 6708, [pages 3 through 15 of [Exhibit P](#)], which was presented to the Committee May 2. If it's alright with you, I'll go ahead and run through those [changes seen in our conceptual amendment]. The first two, 1 and 2, are some additional compromises made with the industry on a couple of issues brought up in that hearing on May 2. No. 1 would allow insurers to reduce costs by e-mailing if they had a valid e-mail address for that policyholder, instead of sending mail concerns with a 15 percent minimum loss ratio, with the new federal legislation kind of capping the amount of money they'd have to spend on things like mailing.

No. 2, we have association plans are negotiated among a large group of individual purchasers. There was some concern with the industry that any one member of the association plan could come to the table and kind of slow down the implementation of a new contract. So this is just language that emphasizes that that's one of the factors that a commissioner or a consumer advocate would take into account before granting a hearing.

Next, 3 and 4, we have some issues with the definition of a small or large business. In the [6708] amendment presented to the Committee on [May 2], we used the federal definition of a large business, which would be 100 employees or more. There [are] some problems there, because the State currently uses a definition of a small business that's 50 employees or less. So this is going to revert back to the definition of individual and small plans defined by the State of Nevada, which would be 50 or less.

Sections 5 and 6 [of the conceptual supplemental amendment] exempt the children's health insurance program and Medicaid programs from the prior rate review associated with this bill. No. 7 is just a technical fix; we missed some language in the previous amendment [6708]. No. 8 and [No.] 9, the Chairman was kind enough to present us with some great ideas that would make the Consumer Advocate Office more independent and stronger. We've given the Consumer Advocate, under 8 and 9, the ability to

subpoena witnesses, papers and documents as well as be able to hire their own staff, their own witnesses and contract with folks for the rate review hearings. They'd be able to accept gifts and grants, if additional funds become available, they'd be able to use those at their discretion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

If we have no discussion or questions, I will close the work session hearing on A.B. 309.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 309.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR COPENING:

I have a question about the 6708 amendment, page 6, lines 1 and 2. Why was that added?

MR. WALKER:

This was an attempt to specify that large group health plans would not be subject to this rate review process. It is not required by the federal government under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Instead of exempting the large policies under this conceptual amendment, we are including the small group policies.

MR. OSTROVSKY (Nevada Association of Health Plans):

There are still two issues my client wanted resolved. One was what triggers a rate review and the other item was the definitions about trade secrets. Those are issues with which we still disagree, but we appreciate how far this bill has come since its introduction.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS HALSETH, ROBERSON AND SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2011
Page 17

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Seeing no more business, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy is adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Linda Hiller,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Michael A. Schneider, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 382	C	James T. Overland, Sr.,	Written Testimony
A.B. 382	D	Kurt Wood	Letter
A.B. 382	E	The Capitol Company	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 382	F	Boyd Etter	Written Testimony
A.B. 382	G	John J. Ediss, DC	Letter
A.B. 199	H	Assemblywoman Debbie Smith	Proposed Amendment 6083
A.B. 77	I	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 23	J	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 130	K	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 141	L	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 253	M	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 254	N	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 396	O	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents
A.B. 309	P	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents