MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, LABOR AND ENERGY

Seventy-sixth Session
March 16, 2011

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy was called to order by Chair Michael A. Schneider at 1:18 p.m. on Wednesday, March 16, 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 Joseph P. (Joe) Hardy, Clark County Senatorial District No. 12

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Matthew D. Saltzman, Esq., Kolesar & Leatham
David J. Dunn, President, Kingsbridge Trust Company, Inc.
George E. Burns, Commissioner, Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry
John Sande IV, Nevada Bankers Association
Scott Martin, Financial Journalist, “The Trust Advisor”

Jesse Wadhams, Nevada Independent Insurance Agents
Robert L. Crowell, Asurion Insurance Services
Brett J. Barratt, Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry
Keith Lee, Board of Medical Examiners; Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner
Robert Gastonguay, Health Services Coalition
Bryan Gresh, State Board of Osteopathic Medicine
Marla McDade-Williams, B.A., M.P.A., Deputy Administrator, Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services
Vincent Jimno, Executive Director, State Board of Cosmetology

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 198.

SENATE BILL 198: Revises certain provisions governing financial institutions. (BDR 55-822)

SENATOR ROBERSON:
Senate Bill 198 revises certain provisions relating to financial institutions. We need to create jobs in Nevada, make Nevada more competitive and bring in more capital investments. This bill will do that while protecting the public.

MATTHEW D. SALTZMAN, ESQ. (Kolesar & Leatham):
My law practice focuses on financial institution representation. We are involved in talking with people who want to get licensed in Nevada to operate banks and trust companies. We have experience in the regulatory process of getting these companies approved to do business in Nevada. Over the past 10 years, the Nevada Legislature has passed a number of laws to encourage trust companies to locate in Nevada. However, instead of an increase, there has been a reduction in the number of trust companies. This is due to changes in regulations regarding licensing of trust companies. Other jurisdictions, such as South Dakota, have passed laws making themselves more attractive to new trust companies.

Senate Bill 198 could help promote the development of these businesses in Nevada. These are not typical white-collar jobs involving large sums of money. The people who work for these businesses are highly paid. This is the kind of diversified economy often talked about as being favorable.

Senate Bill 198 proposes technical adjustments to existing laws involving trust companies (Exhibit C). Section 3 would improve the efficiency of the commissioner of the Division of Financial Institutions (FID), Department of Business and Industry, by removing the subjectivity in evaluating and approving trust company applications.

Section 4 of S.B. 198 clarifies change of control requirements. If persons want to acquire a Nevada trust company, it is not clear whether they have to apply for approval before they acquire the company or after.

There is also lack of clarity in the law about how Nevada trust companies could open offices in other states. The law says the company has to be licensed in the other state. However, other states do not require a full trust company license in order to do business in that state. It is current belief that Nevada trust companies should just do whatever the other state requires of it in order to do business there.

In Nevada, there is a $1 million minimum stockholders' equity requirement to become a licensed trust company. This is a substantial increase from 2 or 3 years ago when the stockholders' equity requirement was $300,000. The law requires half of the stockholders' equity be in cash in a Nevada bank, which is now $500,000. This is a large sum in cash. At the time the law was enacted, it is probably more than the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) insured in a depository institution.

We propose the law allow the capital be held in readily marketable securities of the type a bank can hold, such as government bonds, agency bonds, etc. This would provide some meaningful return on capital sitting dormant, probably never to be used.

Sections 7 and 8 of S.B. 198 pertain to updating the application procedures to allow for additional due process for applicants applying for a license for which there is an issue or a concern of the commissioner. These are technical matters, but they would help promote an important business in Nevada.

SENATOR ROBERSON:
The first proposed change in this bill is the deletion of lines 30 through 33 on page 3. It does not make any sense to make Nevada state-chartered banks write off 10 percent of their other real estate owned (OREO) property value

every year. By eliminating this requirement, we are putting state-chartered banks on a level playing field with other banks.

DAVID J. DUNN (President, Kingsbridge Trust Company, Inc.):
I moved to Nevada in 2008 for the purpose of starting a business. I am president of a South Dakota chartered trust company; however, I do not have an office in this State, which is why I am testifying today.

I came to Nevada after the failure of my former employer, Bear Stearns, and started my own firm. I run a multifamily office, which means we cater to 12 large, successful families. We handle all of their financial business. After some changes in the federal laws concerning investment advisors, we hired counsel and determined the best structure for us would be a state-chartered trust company. We wanted to charter in Nevada. We started exploring Nevada statutes and found there were changes in the statutes in 2009, making it apparent Nevada was not going to be a friendly venue for a start-up trust company.

We became a state-chartered trust company in South Dakota in July 2010. We have also opened an office in California, which has provisions in their laws which allow a state-chartered trust company from another state to have a representative office in their state. One of the changes made to Nevada laws during the 75th Session does not allow a state-chartered trust company from another state to have an office in Nevada.

I support S.B. 198, but I would like to propose an amendment to *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 669.080. It defines what is considered to be an entity that is not subject to NRS 669. Under federal law, a non-depository trust company is generally considered a bank. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) exempts a non-depository trust company chartered in any state from SEC regulation. Under the definitions in NRS 669.080, a trust company from another state is excluded from the chapter, which is why I located my trust representative office in California and not in Nevada.

We all have an economic footprint and where we locate, where we hire employees and where we do our business is where we spend our money. Nevada wants to diversify its economy, have high-paying jobs and allow people to start businesses, but the laws are not favorable to that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
What is the average net worth of your 12 families?

MR. DUNN:
The average net worth is in the range of $15 million to $20 million.

SENATOR ROBERSON:
Based on Mr. Dunn's testimony, California is actually more business-friendly than Nevada, which is shocking and should be problematic for all of us.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
You mentioned we had passed some legislation in the 75th Session that was against trust business, but then you said it had not passed, just introduced and discussed.

MR. DUNN:
I have done research on my own, and a lot of the legislation was proposed by the FID in the last Session. The legislation changed the capital requirements. The capital requirements for a non-depository trust company are there so if the FID has to seize a company and operate it, the funds will be there. Raising it from $300,000 to $1 million did not help anyone, especially when the FID had express authority to require more capital in any amount, at any time. That was already in Nevada law. The FID took a position to be unfriendly to new trust companies coming to Nevada. Nevada has not had one new application since 2009. South Dakota, a business-friendly venue, with regulators who are knowledgeable in this area, has licensed over 20 new trust companies with accompanying assets and revenue.

GEORGE E. BURNS (Commissioner, Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry):
I have submitted written testimony regarding S.B. 198 (Exhibit D).

MR. SALTZMAN:
We are in agreement that FID has a mission to ensure the safe practices of the trust industry. There is a lot of accord between what is contained in S.B. 198 and what the commissioner has discussed. These are fine-tunings of the statute. People coming to Nevada to open a trust company should be able to understand the process. It is important to understand that laws favoring Nevada as a domicile for trusts were not designed to promote the trust business to

Nevada residents only, but to promote Nevada as a center for financial services and reduce the administration of finance and trusts for people who live elsewhere. The goal of the FID has been to focus on providing services to Nevada residents. The Legislature is trying to promote Nevada as a place for people outside the State to bring their money and set up trusts with Nevada trust companies. This will promote employment in a positive way.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Even though these people from outside the State have hefty financial statements, we still have a moral obligation to protect them. They deserve the same protection as people living within the State. This is probably to what Mr. Burns was alluding. Perhaps the collapse of Wall Street was caused by lack of enforcement of regulations that were in place. This Committee has a long history of trying to protect the public at all costs.

SENATOR ROBERSON:
There is a fine line between responsible regulation and overregulation which prohibits the prospect of new businesses moving to Nevada. Commissioner Burns and I spoke earlier today, and we had come to an agreement on all of the provisions in S.B. 198. The one provision the commissioner touched on was the reduction in the cash requirement. Current law requires financial institutions to maintain 50 percent of their minimum capital in cash. Section 6, subsection 4, paragraph (b) of the bill proposes to change that to cash "... or in the form of readily marketable securities ... ." The commissioner indicated he would not object to modifying this language to require a minimum of 25 percent of capital in cash with the commissioner being given the reasonable discretion to require more. Is that a correct representation of our meeting this morning?

COMMISSIONER BURNS:
That is correct. Through further discussions, we determined we could give consideration to the cash portion being 25 percent, which is the normal liquidity range we ask for depository institutions. We want to ensure there is language in S.B. 198 to allow the commissioner to require a higher amount should it be necessary by the risk profile of the institution. The consideration there is the fact that if we see a trust company becoming troubled, we can ask it to begin to liquidate its securities portfolio, bring more cash on hand and have it readily available to manage and mitigate whatever stresses it is facing. I am open to discussions and look forward to working with Senator Roberson.

JOHN SANDE IV (Nevada Bankers Association):
I am presenting a proposed amendment to S.B. 198 on behalf of William Uffelman, president and CEO of the Nevada Bankers Association (Exhibit E).

MR. DUNN:
Laws in Nevada have discouraged the start-up of new trust companies. Previous statutes gave the regulator the ability to understand each applicant and to require capital at a level determined, by the FID, to be sufficient to protect the general public.

SCOTT MARTIN (Financial Journalist, "The Trust Advisor"):
I am neither for nor against S.B. 198, I am here to provide a national context. In my dealings with the trust industry, I talk every day with regulators, wealth managers, wealthy people and business owners across the Country. The message I get is financial services are now a national marketplace. Jurisdictions like Nevada, wanting to encourage local capital formation, are best served by not only protecting local capital, but by giving local vendors the tools they need to provide for out-of-state assets better. In the past, this has created a marketplace of winners and losers. Nevada has had the favorable statutes to be one of the winners, along with states like South Dakota, Delaware and Alaska. The number of vendors in Nevada has declined over the last year, whereas in South Dakota, the number of trust companies has risen dramatically. This is not a matter of weak regulation in South Dakota, but rather an issue of better examination, better standards and an encouraging climate that welcomes vendors to compete for nationwide assets. Losers in the industry, such as New Mexico, lost its bellwether trust company, Santa Fe Trust, to South Dakota because it was viewed by the principals of the firm that the regulatory climate in South Dakota was more favorable toward capital formation. South Dakota still protects the clients, but provides them a better proposition than New Mexico.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
For what publication do you work?

MR. MARTIN:
I am with a magazine called "The Trust Advisor."

SENATOR ROBERSON:
Do you believe Nevada does not have a favorable attitude toward encouraging trust companies to move here?

MR. MARTIN:
That might be fair. Everyone I speak with who is thinking about changing their charters, when it comes to Nevada's statutes, have a "pause."

SENATOR ROBERSON:
Would you elaborate on the "pause?"

MR. MARTIN:
The conversations begin, "There are several states out there with wonderful statutes, sophisticated menus of trust products and good regulatory climates." When I ask them why they are not considering Nevada or Delaware, the conversation turns from the wonderful statutes toward a sense that perhaps other states might be more welcoming or provide a better start-up environment to encourage them to move their charter to that state, whereas Nevada gives us that "pause."

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
I will close the hearing on S.B. 198. We should review the laws from South Dakota to determine what they are doing. We want to be progressive in this area, but we want investors to be safe.

We will start the work session with S.B. 136 (Exhibit F). There is an amendment proposed by Commissioner Burns, Exhibit F, which would shorten the period of time a bank can hold OREOs from the current ten-year period to a five-year period.

SENATE BILL 136: Revises provisions governing certain real property held by banks. (BDR 55-737)

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
I have discussed S.B. 136 with ex-Senator Raggio, Senator Rhoads and Mr. Uffelman. They are all agreeable with the proposed amendment. I would like to make a motion.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Before I take a motion, we have two options in the proposed amendment. We need to determine which is the preferred option.

MR. SANDE IV:
It is option one, which reduces the ten-year period to five years with an option for an additional five years.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
That is the one about which I was speaking.

> SENATOR SETTELMEYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 136 WITH OPTION 1 OF EXHIBIT F.
>
> SENATOR ROBERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will move on to S.B. 143 in the work session (Exhibit G). The Department of Motor Vehicles has applied a fiscal note to the bill.

SENATE BILL 143: Revises certain provisions governing insurance. (BDR 57-723)

JESSE WADHAMS (Nevada Independent Insurance Agents):
We will be meeting today to continue working on the proposed amendment to S.B. 143, Exhibit G. However, I would propose to delete section 4.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
The Nevada Independent Insurance Agents are proposing to delete section 4 of the bill which will remove the $3.8 million fiscal note.

There is another amendment proposed by Fred Hillerby on behalf of the American Council of Life Insurers, Exhibit G.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
According to Counsel, do the two amendments conflict with each other in any way?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
No, they can both be adopted.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
Since the amendment will remove the fiscal note, my concerns are resolved.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 143.

SENATOR COPENING SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will continue the work session with S.B. 152 (Exhibit H).

SENATE BILL 152: Revises provisions governing insurance adjusters. (BDR 57-939)

ROBERT L. CROWELL (Asurion Insurance Services):
I have proposed an amendment to S.B. 152, Exhibit H.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
Why is it important to know who owns 10 percent of a company as proposed in section 6 of the amendment?

MR. CROWELL:
That is for application purposes and not for continuing reporting purposes.

BRETT J. BARRATT (Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry):
The reason we want to know who owns these entities is because if we have taken action in the past against a "bad actor," we do not want that person

coming back and purchasing an agency. We want to know whose capital is behind the agency and who is controlling it.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
I understand your concern, but does that mean you do not enter them now, but add them later after their documents have been processed?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT:
I suppose that is possible.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
If you have already created a loophole around it, then why plug up our statutes with more stuff that someone could find a loophole around?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT:
I am not sure I have anything else to add. Generally, when these firms are licensed we review who the principals are. As the principals change, we ask the companies to update the information so we can determine who is operating the company.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Do you feel more comfortable with it in the bill?

COMMISSIONER BARRETT:
Yes, it was at my request that it is in the bill.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Mr. Crowell, are you comfortable with it?

MR. CROWELL:
Yes, I am okay with it.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 152.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

*****

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
The next bill in the work session is S.B. 168 (Exhibit I).

SENATE BILL 168: Makes various changes concerning public health. (BDR 54-837)

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
Could Counsel clarify if the proposed amendments remove the two-thirds majority vote requirement and the fiscal note on S.B. 168?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Counsel will review that, but I believe it does. There were some other concerns with S.B. 168. Senator Hardy has proposed a conceptual amendment which deletes section 17 of the bill, Exhibit I.

KEITH LEE (Board of Medical Examiners; Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner):
Marla McDade-Williams, Deputy Administrator, Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services, and I are working on language to resolve our differences on section 12 of S.B. 168. Section 12 mandates certain responsibilities on the Board of Medical Examiners to gather information and send it to the Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services, for action. We are suggesting the information go directly to the Health Division. The Health Division does not want that because it costs $15,000 a year. This is the only outstanding issue for the Board. The Board has no objection to the proposed amendment to delete section 17. This proposed amendment along with the Board's proposed amendment to delete the fee increase, Exhibit I, should do away with the two-thirds majority vote requirement.

Michael Murphy, Coroner, Clark County Officer of the Coroner/Medical Examiner, had proposed an amendment to S.B. 168, Exhibit I. He has authorized me to represent that he is satisfied with the way bill is drafted. He is suggesting the coroner, in any jurisdiction in the State, be notified of the autopsy findings in certain circumstances, within 30 days of the determination of the cause of death.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Is he withdrawing his amendment?

MR. LEE:
Yes, he is.

ROBERT GASTONGUAY (Health Services Coalition):
We have some unresolved issues with S.B. 168 and would like to be a part of the work group on this bill. We appreciate Senator Hardy's proposed amendment to delete section 17, which was one of our biggest issues.

BRYAN GRESH (State Board of Osteopathic Medicine):
We have submitted a proposed amendment to S.B. 168, Exhibit I. This amendment had originally been part of Senator Hardy's plan which includes the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine in the autopsy results and the pulling of licensing. The State Board of Osteopathic Medicine should be notified in a manner similar to the Board of Medical Examiners.

MARLA MCDADE-WILLIAMS, B.A., M.P.A. (Deputy Administrator, Health Division, Department of Health and Human Services):
As Mr. Lee indicated, there are some areas where we are in agreement and other areas where we disagree. The disagreement is with the premise of transferring the sentinel events to the Health Division. The question is how the process will be carried out and who will fund the activity; therefore, the fiscal note will not be removed.

We are asking for the consideration of making the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine consistent with the sentinel event provisions applying to the Board of Medical Examiners. I have also submitted a written statement, Exhibit I.

SENATOR JOSEPH P. (JOE) HARDY (Clark County Senatorial District No. 12):
When we were reviewing the Board of Medical Examiners for this bill, it was decided to ensure the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine and the Board of Medical Examiners mirror each other.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
In the amendments before us, which fiscal notes are removed?

MR. LEE:
The fact that we have taken out the fee increase does away with the two-thirds majority vote requirement. The way section 12 of S.B. 168 reads now, it would shift the responsibility of gathering information with respect to sedations in physicians' offices to the Health Division. This would cost about $15,000 a year to gather and send out the information. This would be the fiscal note.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
Would the deletion of section 17 remove the public safety $800,000 fiscal note?

SENATOR HARDY:
Yes, it would.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
I would suggest Mr. Lee, Ms. McDade-Williams and Senator Breeden meet to discuss the issues. Since there is no consensus, we will close the work session on S.B. 168 and open the work session on S.B. 193 (Exhibit J).

SENATE BILL 193: Makes various changes concerning the State Board of Cosmetology and persons and practices regulated by the Board. (BDR 54-637)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Senator Copening, did you have a question regarding the unavailability of surety bonds?

SENATOR COPENING:
Yes, I did.

COMMISSIONER BARRATT:
The Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, licenses surety companies and verifies a surety company has sufficient capital and meets financial qualifications. We may also conduct market or financial examinations of surety companies.

We also license producers who sell surety policies. However, pursuant to NRS 686B.030, a surety company is exempt from rate and form filing reviews. Since we do not regulate the rate and forms of surety business, we rely on the

Surety and Fidelity Association of America (SFAA), which is a rate service organization and a trade association for the surety industry, for information concerning surety products availability and rates.

According to Robert Duke, who is the director of underwriting and counsel for the SFAA, the cosmetology school has the financial obligation to its students. The bond requires that the school exhibit strong creditworthiness and financial conditions relative to the bond amount. Although the bonds are written, they may have a high penal amount. A penal amount is the amount of the bond. There are three players in a surety arrangement: the obligee, who is the student; the obligor, which is the school; and the surety company, the insurer. In this case, the surety company looks at the school's financial stability before a bond is issued to determine the rate and the collateral requirement.

Many schools have indicated they must have a 50 percent collateral requirement. According to the SFAA, the premium charge for these kinds of bonds for schools is generally 1 percent to 2 percent of the amount of the bond. The bond insures the businesses have the financial ability to make good on their promise to educate their students.

The SFAA suggested reducing the amount of the bond, which will reduce the cost and enhance availability of bonds. We did a cursory review of other states' bond requirements for schools. Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Arizona, South Carolina and Hawaii each require a $10,000 bond. Tennessee requires a $5,000 bond. Washington requires 10 percent of the total annual tuition up to a maximum of $50,000. Nevada's requirement of up to $400,000 seems high compared to other states.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:
The first thing people tend to stop paying is the bond.

COMMISSIONER BARRATT:
We get bond cancellations on a daily basis. Bonds are getting more expensive and more difficult to obtain, so people are letting them drop.

SENATOR COPENING:
Surety bonds are good protective measures, but the amount of the bond is too high and the schools cannot obtain them. We are repealing the entire requirement for a bond, not just reducing it. Have you investigated whether or

not a lesser bond can be obtained? Has that already been tested, and are the schools having the same problem with a lesser amount?

VINCENT JIMNO (Executive Director, State Board of Cosmetology):
It has reduced the problem somewhat. Insurance companies are making the price high and very difficult to qualify for if there is any financial instability. The cost is approximately $10,000 to $12,000 per year to renew the surety bond, plus the 50 percent collateral requirement. If the cost is reduced to $200,000, there is still a $100,000 collateral requirement, plus a $6,000 or $7,000 bill.

We have done a thorough review to determine if there is any way to get around it when a financially unstable school is about to close. We do not get notification from the insurance company until almost after the fact. We get notice a couple of months after the bond has lapsed. As soon as we get the notice, we immediately go after the school to determine if we can get a replacement bond. If the bond has lapsed, the only alternative we have is to close the school. I have also submitted written testimony on S.B. 193, Exhibit J.

SENATOR COPENING:
That is the dilemma. I am willing to take a risk on this and recommend a do pass.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 193.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
We will move on to the next bill in the work session, S.B. 213 (Exhibit K). This bill involves employee leasing companies. Helen Foley, representing the National Association of Professional Employer Organizations, has submitted a proposed amendment, Exhibit K. She indicated to me that she, Donald E. Jayne, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry, and Brett J. Barrett, Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry, all agree with the amendment.

SENATE BILL 213: Revises provisions governing the registration requirements for employee leasing companies. (BDR 53-1018)

SENATOR HALSETH MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 213.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

*****

Chair Schneider:
We will continue the work session with S.B. 215. A conceptual amendment for S.B. 215 was proposed by Senator Hardy (Exhibit L).

SENATE BILL 215: Makes various changes concerning chiropractors' assistants. (BDR 54-834)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Senator Hardy, have you reviewed your amendment and are you okay with it?

SENATOR HARDY:
Yes, I am.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:
Jason O. Jaeger, D.C., had made some suggestions on S.B. 215, Exhibit L. Are they covered in your amendment?

SENATOR HARDY:
Yes, they are.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:
We have received some additional correspondence on S.B. 215 from David G. Rovetti, D.C., President, Chiropractic Physicians' Board of Nevada, page 3,Exhibit L; James T. Overland, Sr., D.C., President, Nevada Chiropractic Association, page 4, Exhibit L; and Derek Day, D.C., Anthem Chiropractic, page 5, Exhibit L.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 215.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

*****

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:
Having no further business before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy, the meeting is adjourned at 2:54 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Michael A. Schneider, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBITS			
Bill	**Exhibit**	**Witness / Agency**	**Description**
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance roster
S.B. 198	C	Matthew D. Saltzman, Esq.	Provisions relating to trust companies
S.B. 198	D	George E. Burns, Commissioner	Written testimony
S.B. 198	E	John Sande IV	Proposed amendment
S.B. 136	F		Work session documents
S.B. 143	G		Work session documents
S.B. 152	H		Work session documents
S.B. 168	I		Work session documents
S.B. 193	J		Work session documents
S.B. 213	K		Work session documents
S.B. 215	L		Work session documents