

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

**Seventy-sixth Session
February 18, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy was called to order by Chair Michael A. Schneider at 12:01 p.m. on Friday, February 18, 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:

Senator Valerie Wiener, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Matt Nichols, Counsel
Scott Young, Policy Analyst
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Keith Lee, Board of Medical Examiners
Amber Joiner, Nevada State Medical Association
Lynette Daniels, Chief of Licensing, Board of Medical Examiners
David A. Johnson, M.D., Chair, Advocacy Committee, Nevada Academy of Family Physicians
Derek Beenfeldt, Nevada Academy of Family Physicians

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
February 18, 2011
Page 2

John Pappageorge, Health Services Coalition
Bill M. Welch, President/CEO, Nevada Hospital Association
Dianna Hegeduis, Esq., Executive Director and Board Counsel, State Board of
Osteopathic Medicine
Kim Frakes, L.C.S.W., Executive Director, Board of Examiners for Social
Workers
Randy Reinoso, L.S.W., President, Board of Examiners for Social Workers
Mark Nichols, Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers
Susan Rhodes, Public Policy Advocacy Chair, National Association of Social
Workers
Jim Bertone, Board Member, Board of Examiners for Social Workers
Constance J. Brooks, Clark County
Jim deProsse, Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department of
Business and Industry
Peter Krueger, Subcontractors' Legislative Coalition

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 117.

SENATE BILL 117: Revises provisions governing the licensure of certain
physicians. (BDR 54-194)

SENATOR VALERIE WIENER (Clark County Senatorial District No. 3):
The Attorney General had a one-day health summit regarding the health-care
services workforce in Nevada. I was at the summit. One concern of the
participants at the summit was the glitches in how we license some of our
physicians. Because of a snag in our licensing requirements, there are a few
weeks delay to meet residency standards. It is easier to go to Pennsylvania and
sit for licensing if they do not meet the residency requirement in Nevada. My
concern is that someone who goes to Pennsylvania to sit for licensing might
stay in Pennsylvania.

I spoke with the Attorney General and, as the Chair of the interim Legislative
Committee on Health Care, asked for a presentation on this issue and said that
I would entertain, with the permission of the Committee, a bill draft request to
address this concern. We had a presentation portraying the concerns and the
remedies which resulted in S.B. 117. There is also a proposed amendment to
this bill which I support ([Exhibit C](#)).

KEITH LEE (Board of Medical Examiners):

The Board of Medical Examiners (BME) would like to offer a proposed amendment to S.B. 117, [Exhibit C](#). This amendment was created in conjunction with the American Academy of Family Physicians.

AMBER JOINER (Nevada State Medical Association):

This measure is straightforward. Page 3, lines 11 through 14 of the bill state "... a resident who is enrolled in a postgraduate training program in this State, has completed at least 24 months of the program and has committed, in writing, that he or she will complete the program ...". This would then enable the resident to apply for a license.

We heard testimony during the interim that residents can be delayed for up to six months from becoming physicians. During that time the residents may receive offers from other states. This creates an unnecessary barrier.

Section 2, subsection 2 would require the applicant to prove satisfactory completion of a postgraduate education before the license would be effective and before being able to practice medicine independently.

The Nevada State Medical Association (NSMA) supports S.B. 117. The NSMA only received the amendment today and has not been able to present it to its members. However, it appears the NSMA could support the concepts of the amendment.

MR. LEE:

The Board of Medical Examiners has proposed an amendment to S.B. 117, section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (d), subparagraph (3), [Exhibit C](#). The term "progressive" has been added prior to "postgraduate training" in line 1. This reflects *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 630.160, subsection 2, paragraph (d), subparagraph (1), which refers to the 36 months of postgraduate training as progressive postgraduate training.

The language being added expands the scope of the intention of S.B. 117 to include attendees of any United States or Canadian accredited medical school. The way the bill was written, it could be said that it applies only to attendees of the University of Nevada School of Medicine. We want to expand this to include potential doctors who may consider coming to Nevada.

The American Academy of Family Physicians and the BME have spoken about how this change in the law can be used to begin recruiting physicians for Nevada from around the country and from Canada. This will lower the barrier of the time frame for admission to practice medicine in Nevada.

In section 2, subsection 2 of the bill we are proposing to change the requirement of 120 days to 60 days. The 60 days would be enough time for applicants to submit their information to the BME. The fully accredited licenses could be issued that much faster.

With the 36 months of progressive postgraduate training that we require, it is an additional assurance that we have the highest quality physicians coming to Nevada. This bill and the amendment, without endangering the required training, allow us to recruit physicians earlier and possibly keep them here.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Would any regulations need to be revised or added as a result of the passage of this bill?

MR. LEE:

No, they would not.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

After the applicant has turned in the documents, how long does it take to issue the license?

LYNETTE DANIELS (Chief of Licensing, Board of Medical Examiners):

By the time the 24th month of training has been completed, the applicant should have applied for a license. As soon as we have all of the information verified, the license will be issued. Applicants will be able to apply to sit for board certifications, to start the hospital credentialing process and the process of credentialing for their insurance providers. It would be quick.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

What do you mean by "quick"?

MS. DANIELS:

We are licensing individuals between 30 to 60 days.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

How does Canadian medical training compare to the requirements for American medical training?

MS. DANIELS:

It is similar to the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education requirements.

DAVID A. JOHNSON, M.D. (Chair, Advocacy Committee, Nevada Academy of Family Physicians)

Some of the difficulties physicians face upon coming out of residency and practicing are not only the need to have the license but being able to sit for board certification as well. This exam is offered twice a year, in July and December. The board certification is important to help physicians get credentialed to start working. To apply for the exam, they must have an unrestricted license to practice medicine in any state, which is not now possible in Nevada. Many of us have gotten licenses from other states to sit for board certification.

If applicants cannot apply to take the exam by May, then they will not be able to take it until December. There is a lag time where they cannot use their board certification to help them credential so they can start working and the employers can start getting reimbursed on their behalf.

The license is also important for the credentialing process. The credentialing process can take anywhere from three to six months. My employer was still trying to credential me with some insurance providers more than six months after I started working. Some residents with whom I worked got their licenses in other states. Many of our residents coming out of training have left the State because they must wait three to six months before they can start working in Nevada.

This bill corrects a long-standing problem which we have seen for many years in the residency program. The Nevada Academy of Family Physicians (NAFP) fully supports the amendments which have been proposed. It will allow us to keep our physicians and allow us to start recruiting physicians who have left the State.

Nevada ranks 47th for primary care physicians per capita, and ranks 50th for pediatric subspecialists per capita. Of concern to me, in my community of the Carson Valley, since I started three years ago, we have lost four family physicians, three pediatricians, one neurologist, one psychologist and an emergency room physician. They have all closed their practices and left the community.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Why are these physicians leaving?

DR. JOHNSON:
Everyone has different reasons, depending on their specialty. The specialists have left because the primary care physicians have left. Pediatricians who were in our community were supporting two practices, one at Lake Tahoe and one in the Carson Valley. They could no longer continue to care for patients in both areas. They closed their Carson Valley practices and are now practicing only at Lake Tahoe. They left 4,000 pediatric patients for us. We are absorbing them, but we are feeling the strain.

I have submitted a letter from Thomas J. Hunt, M.D., President of the NAFP and myself supporting S.B. 117 ([Exhibit D](#)).

DEREK BEENFELDT (Nevada Academy of Family Practice Physicians):
Family medicine residency is three years. One of the documents presented to you indicates that Nevada is one of the few states requiring three years of postgraduate training prior to licensure ([Exhibit E](#)). The three-year residency program for a family physician places a burden upon those residents as they are beginning to graduate.

I have been working with the residents and, as April, May and June approach, they are trying to make decisions as to what they are going to do and where they are going to go. Without fail, they discuss the difficulty of the issuance of a license in Nevada and the fact that they may have to apply for a license out of state in order to sit for their board exam.

It makes sense that the goal of Nevada is to recruit and retain physicians who have been trained. When the residents are graduating and are weighing the pros and cons of whether to stay in Nevada or go to another state, this has weight in

the decision-making process. By rectifying this situation, we have a better ability to retain those physicians who are being trained here.

JOHN PAPPAGEORGE (Health Services Coalition):
We support S.B. 117.

BILL M. WELCH (President/CEO, Nevada Hospital Association):
We also support this bill.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 117 and open the hearing on S.B. 132.

SENATE BILL 132: Revises provisions governing licensure of osteopathic physicians. (BDR 54-195)

SENATOR WIENER:
Senate Bill 132 brings parity to licensing opportunities for the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine. The language in this bill for licensing by endorsement is the same language in statute for D.O.s and M.D.s. The BME is able to do this now without an expiration date of the statute. The same provision was in statute for the osteopathic physicians, but the statute had an expiration date. They requested the removal of the expiration date which would allow them to do the same kind of licensing they had been allowed to do anyway. This bill removes the expiration date so there is parity between the boards to do this licensure by endorsement.

DIANNA HEGEDUIS, ESQ. (Executive Director and Board Counsel, State Board of Osteopathic Medicine):
If the expiration date is removed as proposed in S.B. 132, it will allow us to license physicians faster and easier. I have provided correspondence for your information ([Exhibit F](#)).

It takes approximately two to three months to license individuals for a full license to practice osteopathic medicine. With endorsements, if they meet certain criteria such as board certification, have been practicing for five years or more and have no disciplinary action on their record, we can license them in between board meetings. This allows the osteopathic profession to gain more physicians expeditiously. Removing the expiration date allows us to remain business friendly and encourage physicians to come to Nevada. The Board has

monthly meetings so we can ensure physicians are licensed as quickly as possible; but with endorsements, they may be licensed in between the board meetings.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Do you have to revise any of your regulations?

MS. HEGEDUIS:
No, we do not.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will close the hearing on S.B. 132.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 132.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will open the hearing on S.B. 61.

[SENATE BILL 61](#): Makes various changes relating to social work. (BDR 54-506)

KIM FRAKES, L.C.S.W. (Executive Director, Board of Examiners for Social Workers):

I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)) and a packet of information regarding S.B. 61 ([Exhibit H](#) and [Exhibit I](#)).

Senate Bill 61 proposes an additional level of licensure, the licensed master's social worker (LMSW). We offer three levels of licensure now, the licensed social worker (LSW) who is either the bachelor's or master's level of social work; the licensed clinical social worker (LCSW), who is an individual who has completed a master's examination, has completed 3,000 hours of postgraduate work in the clinical field and has successfully passed a clinical examination; and the licensed independent social worker (LISW), who is an additional master's level for those who want to go into more advance generalist practice. The

LMSW will have completed a graduate level program in social work and successfully passed an examination which measures minimal competency. The public will be better informed regarding the education level of the social worker who is working with them.

The LMSW will provide a setting for a master's level social worker in which to do some limited clinical social work. This will be worked out through regulations. Hopefully, this will address some of the social worker shortages we have in the mental health profession.

I have included in my presentation a table of other states which offer a postgraduate level of licensure without the internship experience, [Exhibit H](#). If individuals from other states come here for endorsements, even though they may come to this State with an LMSW, they would be included in the LSW level of licensure. The third handout shows the levels of practice, the degree required, the areas and scopes of practice and the LMSW as proposed in [S.B. 61](#).

RANDY REINOSO, L.S.W. (President, Board of Examiners for Social Workers):
There is a distinction between a person who has a bachelor's level of education in social work and a person who has a master's level in social work. There is an incongruity between education and the level of licensure offered in this State.

There are 27 other states offering the LMSW or LGSW. They are called something different, but in concept they are the same. It is an identification of someone who has a master's level of education.

The proposal is, a person would take a separate, nationwide, standard exam given by the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB). During the two years in which a person is working on a master's degree, the education is more specific. It can range from clinical work to work in social service policy and administration.

Many employers in a health-care setting are looking for someone who has a master's level of education, but currently in Nevada we only offer the LSW for those individuals, unless they want to go on and become an LCSW. This bill would offer a better way to distinguish between the nuances among the levels of education. It would be better for the public and employers by knowing who is capable and competent to provide the needed services.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

Once someone graduates with a master's degree, is there a time frame in which the examination for the LSW needs to be taken and what is the cost?

MS. FRAKES:

There is no time limit in which you must apply for licensure.

SENATOR BREEDEN:

What is the fee for the examination? Can it be taken locally?

MS. FRAKES:

The examination is offered by the ASWB. The cost is approximately \$100, and it can be taken locally throughout the nation.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Do you have to change regulations to do this?

MS. FRAKES:

Yes, we would address a lot of things in regulation.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Have you spoken with anyone at the Office of the Governor about the regulations?

MS. FRAKES:

We would hold public workshops for the regulations.

MR. REINOSO:

No, we have not spoken with anyone at the Governor's Office.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

The Governor has proposed a freeze on all regulations this year. You should speak with someone at the Governor's Office to determine if this would come under the freeze.

SENATOR PARKS:

I have reviewed this bill. I have received half a dozen e-mails from individuals in the licensed social work business opposing the passage of this bill. Part of their

opposition deals with the internship. What are the changes in this bill to the internship requirement?

MS. FRAKES:

Individuals who are in either clinical or independent social work internships are LSWs who have taken the masters exam and have an MSW and a registration number. This bill would require them to transition to the LMSW. This is something we would be addressing in regulation.

SENATOR PARKS:

I am getting the sense, from the e-mails I have received, that this would open the door to poor practice. You have had rather stringent regulations and now you are becoming more lenient. Is there a reason why this bill is coming forward now?

MS. FRAKES:

This bill was proposed in the last legislative Session but was not enacted.

MR. REINOSO:

There is a misunderstanding of the bill. If anything, in terms of the internship, it would be a much easier and quicker way of identifying someone as being qualified to be in an internship. Now, an LSW could mean any number of things. It is too broad. The LMSW would add a level of specificity which would be more meaningful to the public. There should be no issue about the internship.

The concern might be that the LMSW would be on a par with the LCSW and be able to do the same things as the LCSW. That is not what we are suggesting in this bill. The LCSW is definitely a higher level of social work licensure. The LMSW would be doing clinical work under the supervision of an LCSW. This would enable the LCSW to focus on the more complex, clinical work. The LMSW would be doing more basic work.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Would you please explain section 8, subsection 2, paragraph (e) of the bill?

MS. FRAKES:

Sometimes when someone is applying for a license, and we get the background check, that person may be in the process of a continued appeal and may not yet have been convicted.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

If they have been found guilty, can they continue to practice if they are on appeal?

MS. FRAKES:

No, we can refuse a license.

MATT NICHOLS (Counsel):

The way I read section 8, the existing language says "The Board may refuse to issue a license ...". The Board is authorized to refuse to issue the license. How that interplays with section 7, the existing language that says "The Board shall grant a license ..." I couldn't say for sure. So, there might be a bit of a grey area there in terms of whether the Board has the authority to refuse to issue a license if the person has been convicted but that conviction is on appeal.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Section 8, subsection 2 says "The Board may refuse ...", it does not have to refuse someone who has been convicted. That is problematic from my perspective.

Section 8, subsection 2, paragraph (a) says "... good moral character" What is your definition of "good moral character?"

MS. FRAKES:

Moral character is a subjective term. The specific phrase "good moral character" is standard language for all regulatory licensing boards. It is not specific to our board. The Commission on Ethics' definition of "good moral character" is what any ordinary person would consider as being either good or poor moral character.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I understand this is not part of the amendment, but I am concerned about the subjectivity.

MARK NICHOLS (Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers):

I have submitted written testimony in support of S.B. 61 ([Exhibit J](#)).

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
February 18, 2011
Page 13

SUSAN RHODES (Public Policy Advocacy Chair, National Association of Social Workers):
On behalf of our board of directors, I concur.

JIM BERTONE (Board Member, Board of Examiners for Social Workers):
Adding the LMSW to the continuum of licensing would increase the pool of social workers available to the State. We have a lot of rural areas that are not addressed, and people in rural areas also have mental health issues. Licensed clinical social workers could supervise LMSWs in rural areas, giving us a better representation of social work in mental health services at rural clinics. This was one of the intentions of S.B. 61.

CONSTANCE J. BROOKS (Clark County):
Clark County supports S.B. 61 because it would increase the availability of social workers, particularly in the mental health area. We utilize social workers in various sectors of county government including Family Services, Social Services, the University of Nevada Medical Center, Juvenile Justice Services and the County Manager's and County Commissioner's offices.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Please meet with Senator Roberson to review the wording in section 8.

We will close the hearing on S.B. 61 and open the hearing on S.B. 80.

SENATE BILL 80: Makes various changes to the provisions governing manufactured housing. (BDR 43-480)

JIM DEPROSSE (Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry):
There are three components to S.B. 80: a new category of licensure, clarification of factory-built housing and manufactured buildings, and clarification of written agreements for licensed work.

There are now several licensure categories: dealers, manufacturers, and a group of licensees that pertain to the installation and repair of manufactured housing. In the category of installation and repair, we have a general service person and various trade categories such as plumbing, electrical, etc.

The category of general service person was designed to mirror what a general contractor would be, but in the world of manufactured housing. There is one component in the general service person licensure category specific to the installation of manufactured homes and commercial coaches. That requirement essentially disqualifies some individuals who have applied for licensure.

A general contractor who is licensed with the State Contractors' Board who comes to us to get a general service person's license would be unable to, unless he has two years of installation experience of manufactured homes. The new category, limited serviceperson, would allow a general contractor to be licensed and oversee projects, work on electrical systems, plumbing, etc., but would not be able to install or uninstall homes for transport.

The new category of license, licensed serviceperson, would satisfy those individuals who have come to us in the past who do not have the installation experience or do not wish to install homes, but just want to repair them.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Why would someone need another specific license to install electrical components other than a general electrical license? Is there something special about a manufactured home that requires a different skill level?

MR. DEPROSSE:

There is a difference. Manufactured homes are built to federal building standards, which is the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, or the "HUD Code." It is different from the International Building Code for stick-built homes.

Nevada Revised Statute 624.284, the State Contractors' Board statute, limits the scope of anyone licensed with the State Contractors' Board. That statute states: "A contractor's license issued pursuant to this chapter does not authorize a contractor to construct or repair a mobile home, manufactured home, manufactured building or commercial coach or factory-built housing."

In addition, NRS 624.031 states: "The provisions of this chapter do not apply to: "... The construction, alteration, improvement or repair of personal property" A manufactured home is personal property; it can be moved. A stick-built home is real property; it is affixed to the land.

The drafting of this bill was due to these exemptions within the State Contractors' Board. We have created a licensing division and also act as the State building official for manufactured housing, commercial coaches, etc.

The next component of the bill relates to factory-built housing and manufactured buildings. We have a lot of definitions regarding homes and/or structures built in factories, then taken to a site. In S.B. No. 89 of the 75th Session, definitions for factory-built housing and manufactured buildings were inserted throughout NRS 489. There are some locations in the statute where those two definitions should not have been inserted. For example, when a manufactured home is delivered to a site and installed, it is personal property. The intent of manufactured buildings and factory-built housing is once they arrive at the site, they are actually real property. They are assembled in their full finished state and become real property.

The insertions of the definitions in S.B. No. 89 of the 75th Session require some of these manufactured buildings and factory-built housing to be titled. We only title personal property; we do not title real property. There is a disconnect just by definition.

Through S.B. 80, we are trying to withdraw from NRS 489 the inappropriate insertions of manufactured buildings and factory-built housing.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

What happens to the mobile home to make it real property?

MR. DEPROSSE:

There is a process whereby a manufactured home, sitting on land owned by the same person, can be converted to real property. It can become affixed to the land.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

It would have to be set on some sort of foundation with the wheels and tow package removed.

MR. DEPROSSE:

That is correct. It typically happens on private land.

SENATOR COPENING:

If the definitions are taken out of NRS 489, are they mentioned in some other statute that refers to real property? Does that mean that a report of sale would not be required on these two items? I am concerned we are going to drop something here.

MR. DEPROSSE:

Factory-built housing is addressed in NRS 461. It also appears in some places in NRS 489. The intent of factory-built housing is different than a manufactured home. When a factory-built house arrives at the site, it is real property once it is fastened there. Inserting it into NRS sections which require it to be titled with us because it is personal property is a conflict. It never becomes personal property.

SENATOR COPENING:

This then might be a task for our legal team, to make sure that if it is stricken here it is addressed elsewhere, specifically for the various aspects mentioned here.

MR. DEPROSSE:

The third component of this bill pertains to written agreements. In NRS 489, when a new manufactured home is sold to a homeowner, it is required that there is an agreement in writing for the installation and setup of the home. There is no requirement for the installation and setup of a used home, nor is there a requirement for any kind of a written agreement for any repair work done.

Part of the Manufactured Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry's role is to oversee the complaints from consumers against our licensees. Most of the complaints relate to the fact that the consumer was unaware of what they were paying for. Both parties would be protected if there was a simple process which would require a written agreement to be signed by both the consumer and the licensee.

There are no regulatory requirements with this bill.

PETER KRUEGER (Subcontractors' Legislative Coalition):

Our concern is in section 1 and the new license for the limited service person. The State Contractors' Board already licenses plumbers, electricians, etc. Some of our contractors would have to maintain two licenses.

In addition to being licensed as a plumber, etc., the current law and this proposed legislation requires licensees to attend an eight-hour class conducted by the Manufactured Housing Division. Of those 8 hours, only 15 minutes addresses the specialty trade; the rest addresses skirting and tying down a mobile home and all the other mobile-home-specific requirements. This license costs, depending on the size of the business, anywhere from \$500 to \$1,500 a year. Our goal is to work with the current administrator of the Manufactured Housing Division to try to iron out the differences between NRS 624 and this bill.

MR. DEPROSSE:

The fee for a new, two-year license is \$450 and \$350 for a renewal. This bill will increase the pool with more people who want to do repairs but not installation.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Perhaps an individual licensed in another area, such as traditional homebuilding, could get a reduced fee for this license.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Is it a violation for an in-park maintenance man to do minor repairs, at no cost to the homeowner, on homes in a mobile home park?

MR. DEPROSSE:

Technically, in NRS 489, it is a violation.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 80.

We have a bill draft request (BDR) for introduction, BDR 54-219.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST 54-219: Enacts provisions relating to energy efficiency, renewable energy and building construction. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 181](#).)

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 54-219.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I would like to have a vote on S.B. 58.

SENATE BILL 58: Makes various changes relating to an employer who knowingly misrepresents or conceals a material fact relating to a person's eligibility for industrial insurance benefits. (BDR 53-287)

SENATOR BREEDEN MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 58.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HALSETH ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
February 18, 2011
Page 19

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Having no further business, the meeting of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy is adjourned at 1:38 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Michael A. Schneider, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy

Date: February 18, 2011

Time of Meeting: 12:01 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 117	C	Keith L. Lee	Amendment
S.B. 117	D	David A. Johnson, M.D.	Letter from Nevada Academy of Family Physicians
S.B. 117	E	Derek Beenfeldt	State Specific Postgraduate Education Requirements
S.B. 132	F	Dianna Hegeduis	Letter from State Board of Osteopathic Medicine
S.B. 61	G	Kim Frakes, L.C.S.W.	Letter from Board of Examiners for Social Workers
S.B. 61	H	Kim Frakes, L.C.S.W	States which provide Post-Graduate Masters Level of Licensing
S.B. 61	I	Kim Frakes, L.C.S.W	Spreadsheet, prerequisites & scope of practice
S.B. 61	J	Mark Nichols	Written Testimony, National Association of Social Workers