

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 13, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy was called to order by Chair Kelvin Atkinson at 1:58 p.m. on Monday, May 13, 2013, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 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 Kelvin Atkinson, Chair
Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Vice Chair
Senator Justin C. Jones
Senator Joyce Woodhouse
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator James A. Settlemeyer
Senator Mark Hutchison

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Assembly District No. 11
Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Assembly District No. 32
Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Assembly District No. 1
Assemblyman Peter Livermore, Assembly District No. 40

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marji Paslov Thomas, Policy Analyst
Dan Yu, Counsel
Wayne Archer, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thoran Towler, Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner, Department
of Business and Industry
Lawrence Matheis, Nevada State Medical Association

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2013
Page 2

Jeanette K. Belz, M.B.A., Nevada Academy of Ophthalmology
Lesley Pittman, Nevada State Society of Anesthesiologists
Denise Selleck Davis, Nevada Osteopathic Medical Association
Randy Brown, AT&T
Michael Bagley, Verizon Wireless
Susan Lipper, T-Mobile USA
Helen Foley, T-Mobile USA
Debrea Terwilliger, Assistant Staff Counsel, Office of the Staff Counsel, Public
Utilities Commission of Nevada
Bob Ostrovsky, Cox Communications

Chair Atkinson:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 339.

ASSEMBLY BILL 339 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing compensation for overtime. (BDR 53-968)

Assemblyman Peter Livermore (Assembly District No. 40):

I will read my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

Thoran Towler (Labor Commissioner, Office of Labor Commissioner, Department of Business and Industry):

I support A.B. 339 because it will eliminate unintended consequences.

Senator Hutchison:

Can you clarify how A.B. 339 will resolve the unintended consequences of the existing law and what those consequences are?

Mr. Towler:

Existing law provides an exemption from daily overtime requirements for employees who work four 10-hour days. To qualify for the exemption, there must be a mutual agreement between the employer and the employee, and the employee must actually work the scheduled four 10-hour days. The Legislature intended to prevent employers from scheduling employees for four 10-hour days and then sending them home on the third day. As a result, an employer must pay overtime if an employee does not work the full 4 days. This is not good for employers or employees. Historically, other labor commissioners have determined this is a management issue and left the decision to employers during disputes, which could result in employees being fired.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2013
Page 3

Chair Atkinson:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 339 and open the hearing on A.B. 456.

ASSEMBLY BILL 456 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing health care.
(BDR 54-1102)

Lawrence Matheis (Nevada State Medical Association):

Assembly Bill 456 is an amended version of Senate Bill (S.B.) 211, regarding healthcare professional transparency, which has already been passed by this Committee.

SENATE BILL 211 (1st Reprint): Requires certain health care practitioners to communicate certain information to the public. (BDR 54-14)

As introduced, section 1 of A.B. 456 mirrored the language in S.B. 211 and required all health care professionals to let patients and families know who they are and what degrees and licenses they hold. It required postings and identification badges with that information. The Assembly amended S.B. 211 to require only the name tag. Assembly Bill 456 requires health care professionals to wear a name tag whenever providing health care services. We support the principle of informing the patient, regardless of the form, because it is difficult to know who is providing services. Health care teams have been expanded, and this will provide a greater level of transparency.

A friendly amendment to be proposed by Nevada Academy of Ophthalmology would exempt professionals from the requirements of A.B. 456 while performing sterile procedures.

Senator Hardy:

Would an embroidered name and "M.D." or "D.O." be sufficient to describe the license, or would a physician have to name and indicate "American Board of Family Practice?"

Mr. Matheis:

It is my interpretation the identification of the board would only be required if your specialty is listed. If you are asking if an embroidered lab coat is considered a name tag, I do not know. It would satisfy me.

Senator Hutchison:

Is there anything in A.B. 456 that conflicts with S.B. 211, or does this just address a portion of S.B. 211?

Mr. Matheis:

Assembly Bill 456 does not conflict with S.B. 211, but it is not as inclusive. Additionally, this Committee exempted health care professionals providing services in health care facilities. Assembly Bill 456 would cover those facilities, presumably because badges are required in health care facilities.

Senator Hutchison:

Are you saying A.B. 456 is broader then?

Mr. Matheis:

It is broader in that respect, but it is narrower in that it has fewer requirements for health care professionals.

Senator Jones:

I want to clarify your statement regarding health care facilities. It was not the Committee's intent to remove the credentialing requirement with regard to wearing a name tag within a health care facility. Rather, the Committee was concerned with the requirement that health care providers post their certification in hospital settings.

Mr. Matheis:

I will confirm that the exemption applies to all sections of S.B. 211 and report back to the Committee.

Senator Jones:

Why did the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor remove the posting requirements for physicians in their own offices?

Mr. Matheis:

The Assembly Committee did not feel the posting was necessary, but it felt every health care professional should have a name tag.

Jeanette K. Belz, M.B.A. (Nevada Academy of Ophthalmology):

The Nevada Academy of Ophthalmology has proposed a friendly amendment to A.B. 456 ([Exhibit D](#)). Our amendment is supported by the Nevada State Medical

Association, the Nevada State Osteopathic Medical Association, the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine, the State Board of Nursing, and the Board of Medical Examiners.

Chair Atkinson:

Did you run your amendment by Senator Cegavske?

Ms. Belz:

Senator Cegavske admitted she did not think of exempting health care professionals performing sterile procedures, but I am not certain what she will do.

Senator Hutchison:

Do all the groups you identified prefer to have the postings that were contained in S.B. 211, versus the narrower requirements in A.B. 456?

Ms. Belz:

I cannot speak for the other groups beyond their support for our amendment, but I will review the issue with all of those groups.

Lesley Pittman (Nevada State Society of Anesthesiologists):

We support A.B. 456. Recent studies confirm increasing patient confusion about the many types of health care professionals providing services, including physicians, nurses, physician assistants and technicians. We believe each of these plays a distinctive role in providing the health care delivery system, but ambiguous nomenclature exacerbates patient confusion. With the many changes in the health care industry, it is important patients have adequate information with which to make informed decisions.

Senator Hutchison:

Based on your testimony, I would assume you would prefer S.B. 211 because it would provide patients with even more information. Is that correct?

Ms. Pittman:

You are correct. We support as much transparency as possible. We testified in support of S.B. 211.

Denise Selleck Davis (Nevada Osteopathic Medical Association):

We support A.B. 456 because it will increase transparency.

Chair Atkinson:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 456 and open the hearing on A.B. 486.

ASSEMBLY BILL 486 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to telecommunication providers. (BDR 58-970)

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz (Assembly District No. 11):

Section 2, subsection 1 of A.B. 486 outlines how a provider of last resort may be relieved of its duty to provide such service when certain alternative services are available. A provider of last resort may request relief in one of three circumstances: There must be least one other provider utilizing wireline technology. There must be two or more providers utilizing a wireless technology. There must be three or more providers that utilize any technology on or after June 1, 2015. The provision requiring three or more providers utilizing any other technology is intended to protect consumers in an instance where one or more of the providers is a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service. We do not want to leave the consumer hanging with only one possible provider for telecommunications services. We want at least two service providers to promote competition.

Section 2, subsections 2 through 15, spell out the process by which relief may be granted to a provider of last resort. The providers did not want to leave this decision to Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) because they wanted to know exactly what would be required to obtain relief to a provider of last resort. Among other things, providers of last resort must provide a map of the area and hold certain consumer protection sessions to obtain relief.

Section 2, subsection 12 provides that if the PUCN declares an emergency exists in any area in which alternative voice service is not available and where a competitive supplier has been granted relief from its obligations as a provider of last resort, the PUCN may call a provider of last resort back to satisfy its duty.

Randy Brown with AT&T will propose a friendly amendment that makes technical changes to A.B. 486. Both the PUCN and the telecommunications providers are comfortable with his amendment.

Assemblyman Ira Hansen (Assembly District No. 32):

I was involved in the discussion to ensure the interests of rural Nevada were protected and that rural Nevadans would not be left without adequate telephone services. The process for obtaining relief for providers of last resort will be phased in and gives the PUCN substantial regulatory oversight. Assembly Bill 486 addresses the substantial changes in technology. In addition to the PUCN, the federal government will have oversight as well.

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick (Assembly District No. 1):

Section 2, subsection 10, exempts certain telecommunications companies because this is not within their business model at this time, but section 3 does affect their business. Section 3 is very clear with respect to federal regulation. It is possible Congress may amend federal regulations, but we wanted State law to conform to current regulations. The PUCN will retain its regulatory authority for the purposes of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. Specifically, the authority under United States Code (USC), Title 47, Sections 251 and 252, is referenced in section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (c), subparagraph (1) of A.B. 486. Some of the providers have proposed amendments to this language in section 3, but I oppose those amendments. The State should maintain its authority under the Telecommunications Act as long as it is in effect.

Senator Hutchison:

How will the authority of the PUCN be affected if the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) deregulates VoIP and Internet Protocol (IP) services?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I will let your Counsel or the PUCN answer your question.

Randy Brown (AT&T):

I have proposed a technical amendment to A.B. 486 ([Exhibit E](#)).

Senator Hutchison:

How will the authority of the PUCN be affected if the FCC deregulates VoIP and IP services?

Mr. Brown:

I want to clarify that VoIP and IP services are not regulated by the PUCN. Assembly Bill 486 makes it clear that VoIP and IP services will not be regulated. This has been passed in 26 other states. We are only preserving whatever

regulatory authority the PUCN has now. Assembly Bill 486 provides certainty that these services will not be regulated in the future. If the FCC changes the regulatory authority of the states with regard to IP interconnection, A.B. 486 would allow the PUCN to implement those changes.

Senator Hutchison:

Are you saying the intent of A.B. 486 is to deregulate VoIP at the State level, but that the PUCN will follow the federal regulations if they should change?

Mr. Brown:

That is correct

Senator Hutchison:

Can you speak to the financial incentives for telecommunications providers that are considering entering the market in Nevada?

Mr. Brown:

Getting the proper language in section 3 would be a major incentive for providers to enter Nevada, which is why 26 other states have passed similar legislation. We do not want to have 50 different regulatory regimes because it creates a great deal of uncertainty. Across the Country, telecommunications are transferring to IP platforms. Companies need a predictable regulatory environment before they invest millions of dollars. We operate across a national landscape, and it would be very costly, inefficient and difficult to operate in 50 different states with 50 different regulatory regimes.

Senator Jones:

Can Mr. Yu speak to the regulatory authority of the PUCN if A.B. 486 becomes law?

Dan Yu (Counsel):

Just to add some additional clarification with respect to this provision in section 3 of the bill ... I think really ... and just to kind of reference back to what the Speaker [Kirkpatrick] was saying earlier in her testimony in presenting the bill—I think she is absolutely correct in the sense that it does preserve the status quo as the authority of the PUC[N] currently exists. I think what Senator Jones is asking me to clarify on is perhaps moving forward

into the future whether or not the PUC of Nevada would retain any authority that would be independent, and I mean that would exist independent of any authority that would otherwise flow from sections 251 and 252 of the federal Telecom Act of 1996. I think the answer to that is, the way that it's currently drafted in this first reprint, if that were to be enacted, the PUC[N] would be divested of any authority going forward. That's what I wanted to clarify for the members of this Committee here, because if we were to read subsection 2 of section 3, paragraph (c), subparagraph (1), the way to read this is it says: "The provisions of subsection 1 must not be construed to affect or modify any right or obligation of any telecom provider or the authority granted to the Commission pursuant to 47 USC Sections 251 and 252, including, without limitation, any authority granted to the Commission to address or affect the resolution of disputes regarding reciprocal compensation and interconnection."

So, the proper way to read that provision from a statutory construction and interpretation standpoint would ... I guess another way to put this ... is to say that the authority granted to the Commission would flow directly and only from the provisions of Sections 251 and 252. So, stated differently what that means is, depending on how the rule making process goes before the FCC, depending on how the determination is actually handed down after the FCC makes an assessment of the petitions that are pending right now with its open docket, if it determines that, you know, the FCC is not going to exercise jurisdiction over IP to IP Interconnection, or if it otherwise states that it does not have jurisdiction over IP to IP interconnection, it may or may not be silent with respect to the roles of the state PUCs. But, again with respect to how this provision is currently drafted, I just wanted everyone to be sure of the fact that if it were to be enacted in its existing form, outside of any authority granted by federal authority, the State PUC[N] would not have any independent authority outside of what flows from the federal government, or I should say the federal statute.

Senator Hutchison:

Does A.B. 486 conform to legislation other states have passed?

Michael Bagley (Verizon Wireless):

The core of A.B. 486 is very similar to legislation passed in other states. Individually, this legislation conforms to State law. For example, some of the references to surcharges in Nevada reflect the surcharges in Nevada. Otherwise, the core aspects of A.B. 486 are the same. Staff at the PUCN independently reviewed the statutes in other states to ensure our legislation would be similar to that in other states.

Susan Lipper (T-Mobile USA):

T-Mobile USA is concerned A.B. 486 would diminish the regulatory authority of the PUCN. The regulatory authority unrelated to 47 USC Sections 251 and 252 could be helpful in dealing with interconnection disputes in the future. We support preserving the authority beyond 47 USC Sections 251 and 252. For example, wireless carriers are charged a fee when a telephone call travels from a wireless antenna and connects with an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC). Wireless carriers negotiate the rate and location of connections with ILECs. There are certain places where those rates are higher than what we believe is appropriate, such as Colorado and Kentucky, where similar bills have failed. Preserving the authority of the PUCN will help in the dispute resolution process.

Senator Hutchison:

Are you saying that the PUCN would not be involved in any kind of interconnection disputes in the future under A.B. 486, and that this is the reason similar bills failed in Colorado and Kentucky?

Ms. Lipper:

That is correct.

Senator Hutchison:

Would carriers be prevented from going to court to resolve interconnection disputes if A.B. 486 passes?

Ms. Lipper:

Carriers would not be prevented from resolving interconnection disputes through the court system, but it is harder and more expensive. In the context of Nevada,

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick testified she wants to preserve the PUCN's existing authority over interconnection compensation. We would prefer additional language that would clarify the PUCN would retain authority for the purposes of interconnection compensation.

Senator Hutchison:

Are you saying that you proposed such an amendment to Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick, but she rejected it?

Ms. Lipper:

I think Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick is justly frustrated with the different interpretations of this section. She followed counsel's advice and did not believe the change was required to protect the PUCN's authority. She testified today that she wants to preserve that authority. This is an arcane and convoluted law.

Senator Hutchison:

Is there an issue between Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick's position and your position? Is her position that A.B. 486 accomplishes what you want to do and you disagree?

Helen Foley (T-Mobile USA):

This is very difficult because we proposed an amendment that included language addressing interconnection compensation that has been included in A.B. 486. However, the location of the language in the bill ties it directly to 47 USC Sections 251 and 252. Counsel for Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick and the PUCN advised her the current language is sufficient. We disagree. Our interpretation is that the PUCN would no longer have regulatory authority over interconnection disputes if 47 USC Sections 251 and 252 were deregulated by the FCC. Based on the testimony of Mr. Yu, the current language is insufficient. Throughout the process, Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick has indicated her support for preserving the PUCN's regulatory authority, but we are concerned this is not sufficient.

Mr. Yu:

I'm happy to provide some additional clarification. I have had the opportunity to discuss this issue with some of the parties who are involved, and I have taken the time out to try and study up on it as much as I can. Now, as we all know, federal telecom law is, it's

really a niche area where certainly I cannot get completely up to speed in a matter of days. To the extent that I could, especially with reference to section 3 of this bill. Again, by way of example here, I guess what I was trying to say earlier is that because my interpretation of this from a statutory construction viewpoint is that any authority that is going to be retained by the PUC[N] as it's currently drafted in the first reprint of the bill, says specifically flows directly from those sections of the Telecom Act. Now, with respect to the rule making process, if the FCC determines at a later date, once the pending petitions are resolved, if it says for example, that they're not going to retain jurisdiction over IP to IP, over the VoIP services, but it is silent with respect to what the states can do, then there is going to be a question of law. That may be a question of first impression. I mean, I really can't speak to how a court of competent jurisdiction, for example, would come down on a ruling. Now, if the FCC on the other hand says specifically perhaps not 251 and not 52 of this federal statute, but perhaps some other statute or if it does say specifically, for example, that the state regulatory commissions may exercise jurisdiction with respect to VoIP IP to IP, the way it's currently drafted, that does not contemplate such a situation because it says specifically the authority that is vested in the PUC of Nevada only flows from 251 and 252. In other words, to put it in a nutshell, if 251 and 252 go away, so would the authority of the PUC of Nevada. So, I guess the point I was trying to get across, and to be perfectly clear, being nonpartisan staff here in the Legal Division, it's not my place nor my role to speak to anything with regard to policy. I mean, that is certainly up to the members of the Committee to decide.

I haven't had any discussions with the Speaker [Kirkpatrick], but my understanding of the background and all the negotiations and the work that came with this is that, I was of the understanding, anyway, based on what was presented to me, that the Speaker [Kirkpatrick] does want to retain authority for the PUC of Nevada to the extent that any such authority may exist independently of any federal statute. Again, I can't attest to the veracity of that, but that is how it was presented to me. Again, that's really a policy decision. From a pure legal drafting position, I don't think the way

the bill is currently drafted in this first reprint would actually quote, unquote, do the trick.

Ms. Foley:

We did not want to propose an unfriendly amendment, but we do believe a couple of changes could help preserve the authority of the PUCN. We suggest inserting "or any other provision of law" to A.B. 486, section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (c), subparagraph (1) after the reference to Title 47 USC.

Senator Hardy:

Inasmuch that I would like to preserve as much regulatory authority as possible, I would suggest inserting a new section. It seems counterintuitive to trust the federal government to solve the State's problems. Do the proponents of A.B. 486 understand the issue, and are they amenable to this?

Ms. Lipper:

This has been disputed across the Country, and I suspect they would oppose such a change.

Debrea Terwilliger (Assistant Staff Counsel, Office of the Staff Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada):

The PUCN is neutral on A.B. 486.

Senator Hutchison:

Does the PUCN have an opinion on whether the language in section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (c), subparagraph (1) preserves the PUCN's regulatory authority on interconnectivity disputes?

Ms. Terwilliger:

The FCC is currently undertaking rule making regarding IP interconnection. So far, the FCC has indicated those sections operate technologically neutral, so they could be construed to cover IP interconnection, now. Lawyers can disagree on what they will say in that rule making. If the FCC says no authority flows for interconnection disputes from 47 USC Sections 251 and 252, Mr. Yu has represented that any independent authority beyond Sections 251 and 252 would not be preserved. Deregulation is a policy decision. As Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick said, any authority remaining independent of Sections 251 and 252 is speculative. These statutes and regulations are old. There are even general regulations governing carrier-to-carrier disputes. Under

Mr. Yu's interpretation, it is arguable the PUCN would not have authority under that as well.

Senator Hutchison:

Notwithstanding Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick's position, are you suggesting the Committee should take Senator Hardy's suggestion if it wants to be crystal clear with regard to the PUCN's authority to resolve interconnectivity disputes, or are you saying the Committee should deregulate and force carriers to resolve their disputes in court?

Ms. Terwilliger:

I am not advocating for any changes to section 3 of A.B. 486 on behalf of the PUCN. That is a policy decision for the Committee.

Senator Hutchison

Do you think A.B. 486 makes it clear how far the State wants to go to regulate interconnectivity?

Ms. Terwilliger:

It is clear the PUCN will lose its jurisdiction over interconnection issues if the FCC determines Sections 251 and 252 of 47 USC no longer apply to interconnection.

Bob Ostrovsky (Cox Communications):

Cox Communications was in support of A.B. 486, but based on testimony from Mr. Yu, I signed in as neutral on A.B. 486. Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick made it clear she wants the PUCN to retain its regulatory authority over interconnectivity issues. Cox Communications prefers interconnection agreement disputes be handled by the PUCN because the legal process is long and expensive.

Customers should have unequivocal confidence that when they place a telephone call it will connect successfully. When a call is placed, it travels through a series of interconnections with different carriers to its terminus. Removing interconnection activity from the jurisdiction of the PUCN may interrupt this process. Interconnectivity has been an issue for the FCC for many years, and it could go on for many more. I would suggest the Committee do as much as it can to protect the State now and revisit the policy during future

sessions if changes are needed. We also support relief of providers of last resort for ILECs because the world of telecommunications has changed substantially.

Senator Hardy:

If the Legislature fails to preserve affirmatively the PUCN's authority over interconnectivity, will courts construe our inaction as its intent to remove this authority of the PUCN?

Mr. Yu:

Thank you for that question, Senator [Hardy]. I believe that's true. Another way to say this is we have regulations and statutory authority on the books, so to speak. Certainly, the courts would be guided by such parameters. In a situation where a utility, for example, or telecom provider, is not specifically regulated or, in this case I think what we are talking about is completely deregulated, it would be difficult for me to ascertain, you know, by I guess what indicators a court would be moved by in the complete absence or void of any statutory or regulatory authority that says, "this is what the telecom provider must do with respect to interconnection issues." So, yes, to answer your question, there would be no directive from the Legislature, and certainly there would be nothing on the books with respect to NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*].

Chair Atkinson:

We have also received a letter ([Exhibit F](#)) from the Voice on the Net Coalition in support of A.B. 486. I will close the hearing on A.B. 486. I will now open the work session.

Marji Paslov Thomas (Policy Analyst):

I will read the work session document for A.B. 11 ([Exhibit G](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 11 (1st Reprint): Revises the provision requiring insurers to report to the Division of Industrial Relations of the Department of Business and Industry certain claims relating to diseases of the heart or lung and occupational diseases that are infectious or relate to cancer. (BDR 53-351)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 11.

SENATOR HUTCHISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 23 ([Exhibit H](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 23: Clarifies provisions governing providers of services pertinent to the sale, installation and occupancy of manufactured homes. (BDR 43-359)

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

SENATOR JONES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 39 ([Exhibit I](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 39 (1st Reprint): Provides restrictions on the retail sale of certain products that are ephedrine and pseudoephedrine based. (BDR 54-218)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 39.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 90 ([Exhibit J](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 90 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing representation of injured workers in hearings or other meetings concerning industrial insurance claims. (BDR 53-820)

SENATOR WOODHOUSE MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 90.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 94 ([Exhibit K](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 94: Revises provisions relating to the examinations for licensure as a professional engineer or professional land surveyor. (BDR 54-618)

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 94.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 173 ([Exhibit L](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 173 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing rates which may be charged by certain electric utilities. (BDR 58-966)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 173.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 334 ([Exhibit M](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 334 (1st Reprint): Provides certain exemptions from provisions relating to contractors. (BDR 54-921)

Senator Hutchison:

I want to note the State Contractors' Board has proposed a clarification related to residential properties as defined in NRS 624.031.

Chair Atkinson:

I understand the proposed amendment from the State Contractors' Board, but Assemblyman Healey will not accept the amendment.

SENATOR HUTCHISON MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 334.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 277 ([Exhibit N](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 277 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing dental hygienists. (BDR 54-788)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 277.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read from the work session document for A.B. 354 ([Exhibit O](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 354 (1st Reprint): Prohibits the manufacture, sale or distribution of certain consumer products that contain or come in direct physical contact with Bisphenol A. (BDR 52-789)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 354.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Ms. Paslov Thomas:

I will read the work session document for A.B. 434 ([Exhibit P](#)).

ASSEMBLY BILL 434 (1st Reprint): Revises certain requirements for an application for a certificate of registration to practice as a registered interior designer. (BDR 54-1172)

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 434.

SENATOR WOODHOUSE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy
May 13, 2013
Page 20

Chair Atkinson:

The meeting is adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Wayne Archer,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Kelvin Atkinson, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.B. 339	C	4	Assemblyman Pete Livermore	Written Testimony
A.B. 456	D	1	Jeanette K. Belz	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 486	E	4	Randy Brown	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 486	F	2	Chair Atkinson	Letter from Voice on the Net Coalition
A.B. 11	G	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 23	H	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 39	I	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 90	J	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 94	K	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 173	L	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 334	M	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 277	N	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 354	O	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 434	P	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document