

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

**Seventy-ninth Session  
May 17, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy was called to order by Chair Kelvin Atkinson at 8:18 a.m. on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B 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 Pat Spearman, Vice Chair  
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro  
Senator Yvanna D. Cancela  
Senator Joseph P. Hardy  
Senator James A. Settelmeyer  
Senator Heidi S. Gansert

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Julia Ratti, Senatorial District No. 13  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo, Assembly District No. 3  
Assemblyman James Oscarson, Assembly District No. 36

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Marji Paslov Thomas, Policy Analyst  
Bryan Fernley, Counsel  
Christine Miner, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Neena Laxalt, Board of Psychological Examiners  
Colleen Platt, Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug and Gambling Counselors  
Morgan Alldredge, Executive Director, Board of Psychological Examiners  
Jason Mills, Nevada Justice Association

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 2

Bob Ostrovsky, Employers Insurance Group; Nevada Resort Association  
James P. Kemp, Nevada Justice Association  
Paul Enos, Nevada Self-Insurers Association  
Rusty McAllister, Nevada AFL-CIO  
Robert Balkenbush, Public Agency Compensation Trust

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 457.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 457 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to certain professional licensing boards. (BDR 54-410)

ASSEMBLYMAN JAMES OSCARSON (Assembly District No. 36):

I will present A.B. 457 as the Chair of the Interim Legislative Committee on Health Care. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Are the two amendments submitted on A.B. 457 friendly amendments? One is from the Board of Psychological Examiners ([Exhibit D](#)) and the other from Dr. Jim Jobin, Chief Operating Officer, Vogue Recovery Center ([Exhibit E](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON:

Both of the amendments are friendly.

NEENA LAXALT (Board of Psychological Examiners; Board of Massage Therapists):  
The Board of Psychological Examiners is pulling the amendment [Exhibit D](#). There is a related bill, Senate Bill (S.B.) 162 with differing terminologies. The amendment was proposed to align terminologies. Instead, the Board has asked the Legislative Counsel Bureau to ensure terminology is in alignment in both bills.

**SENATE BILL 162 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to psychological assistants, psychological interns and psychological trainees. (BDR 54-614)

CHAIR ATKINSON:

What is happening with the two amendments?

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 3

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON:

The amendment, [Exhibit E](#), has already been addressed. Section 32 of [A.B. 457](#) revises the makeup of the Commission on Behavioral Health. The amendment proposes cleanup language to clarify one representative be licensed by each of the behavioral health boards.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

Shall we discuss the amendment you are accepting?

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON:

Amendment, [Exhibit D](#), has been pulled. The issues in the second amendment, [Exhibit E](#), have been addressed.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are both of the amendments addressed?

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON:

Yes.

COLLEEN PLATT (Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug and Gambling Counselors):  
The Board of Examiners for Alcohol, Drug and Gambling Counselors appreciates the sponsor and the Department of Health and Human Services for working with it on the bill.

MORGAN ALLDREDGE (Executive Director, Board of Psychological Examiners):  
The Board of Psychological Examiners wants the Legislative Counsel Bureau to be aware that upon passage of [S.B. 162](#), the terminology for "intern" means something different than what is implied in [A.B. 457](#). Interns for psychologists are pregraduate interns. Interns as described in [S.B. 162](#) are in postgraduate training.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON:

Some of the issues changed at the last minute, and I appreciate the interested parties coming together and working on the issues. It is good legislation to move our mental health providers forward in Nevada, which is desperately needed.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will close the hearing on [A.B. 457](#) and open the hearing on [A.B. 458](#).

**ASSEMBLY BILL 458 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing industrial insurance. (BDR 53-489)

JASON MILLS (Nevada Justice Association):

The Nevada Justice Association worked for many months on A.B. 458 with many stakeholders including insurance companies, employers and organized labor. The bill attempts to address some court rulings that adversely affected the workers' compensation system and includes some fixes to help move claims forward more effectively.

Section 2 concerns overturning a decision by the Nevada Court of Appeals which renders the C-4 form useless. The C-4 form is the form that brings employee claims for compensation in workers' compensation cases. The language added to the bill to resolve the issue is from the exact recommendation of members of the Court of Appeals.

Section 3 allows a second opinion for the independent medical examination for a claimant if there is a dispute of care on a claim. The injured employee is allowed to obtain only one independent medical examination per calendar year. When someone is ordered to have surgery, typically the patient will want a second opinion. In litigation, the examinations are usually required, but the exams happen 6 to 14 months into the claim when ordered by the court. It is wise to put the mechanism into statute for the parties to get a second opinion early in the claim.

Section 4 provides for a vocational rehabilitation counselor to be appointed by the insurer and the injured employee when a written assessment is requested or when a plan for a program of vocational rehabilitation is required. When an injured worker is permanently restricted from returning to work per the claim, the bill allows the claimant to have a say in which vocational counselor he or she can select. The insurer provides a list of vocational counselors consisting of no fewer than three to the claimant. Within seven days, the claimant can select the counselor. If the claimant does not do this within the seven days, the insurer assigns one. The insurer and the claimant agreeing on who the counselor will be is allowable under the law.

BOB OSTROVSKY (Employers Insurance Group; Nevada Resort Association):

Section 7.3 of A.B. 458 deals with administrative claim closures. Language in statute has permitted these kinds of closures since 1979. Since 1999, a dollar

value of \$300 for medical benefits on these very small claims can close administratively after appropriate notice to the claimant. The \$300 value is not appropriate in today's medical world. The bill proposes to raise that amount to \$800 for medical benefits for very small claims not continuing with medical care.

Section 7.7 deals with reopening of claims. When a claimant wants to reopen a claim, the claimant's medical condition and further temporary total disability payments are considerations. In statute, if a person is retired, that person cannot get temporary total disability, but there have been some disputes over what constitutes retirement. Language added to section 7.7 defines what retirement is and makes it clear that if a person is working during retirement and is on social security, wages and loss of wages are recognized and the claimant may be entitled to compensation. If a person is retired and drawing a pension and is not in the workforce, the bill defines that situation. Clarification is made by stronger and clearer definitions for all parties concerned on reopening of claims.

JAMES P. KEMP (Nevada Justice Association):

Section 8 of A.B. 458 deals with permanent partial disability (PPD) evaluations and the way benefits are awarded. It addresses a Supreme Court of Nevada case *Public Agency Compensation Trust (PACT) v. Blake*, 127 Nev. 836 (2011). That case has caused injured workers to lose benefits by changing which version of the *American Medical Association (AMA) Guide to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment* gets used. For decades calculations were done very simply. For an injury to a body part, for example a lumbar spine, the injured employee might receive a PPD award of 10 percent. Years later, a subsequent injury happens to the same employee on the same body part, and the injured employee receives a PPD of 28 percent. Compensation awarded is 18 percent PPD, which is decided by subtracting the original 10 percent from the current 28 percent PPD.

The *PACT v. Blake* case confused things by saying medical award consideration will be made on the condition the injured worker was in years before when the first injury was evaluated, and to judge the condition of the worker under the new AMA guidebook. These calculations cause loss of benefits. Section 8 corrects the problem and returns to the simple subtraction calculation. Previous regulations of the Division of Industrial Relations (DIR) were adopted for this

section for calculations of a disability for benefits. It is a fairer practice for injured workers and their families.

Section 9 has 2 parts. It codifies back in statute how much a person can receive for a lump-sum PPD award. If a claimant gets a PPD of 40 percent, then under new claims he or she would be able to take 30 percent PPD as a lump sum. This calculation was delegated to DIR. It has been found DIR does not make any changes unless the Legislature demands it. They did in 2015 and the DIR finally updated the calculation to 30 percent. It is a policy decision belonging with the Legislature and in statute. This bill puts the policy determination back into statute that a person can take up to 30 percent of his or her PPD award in a lump sum.

The second part of section 9 of A.B. 458 refers to calculations of the lump sum PPD award. There is a regulation in statute which requires a table be used to determine how much a lump sum PPD should be. The idea is to reduce the lump sum PPD to its present value, to allow if an amount of money is invested in conservative investments today, by the time the person receiving the benefit reaches age 70, the person would have the same amount of money. The factors in that regulation had not been changed since 1987. The factors are based on mortality rates and interest rates. The DIR is required to have a consulting actuary look at this every year, but it had not been done. The bill streamlines and makes it easier for DIR to do this because it specifically identifies what mortality table will be used which is published by the IRS and to use the average 30-year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate for interest rates. By identifying these factors, it makes the job for DIR easier and less expensive. Additionally, it requires DIR to update the tables used to calculate the lump sum to be adjusted on July 1 of each year. This allows claimants to get the present value of their PPDs. The July 1 date coincides with the updates of average monthly wages.

PAUL ENOS (Nevada Self-Insurers Association):

The Nevada Self-Insurers Association supports A.B. 458. This bill streamlines some of the processes in workers' compensation claims. It clears up the 30 percent lump-sum benefit, updates the tables for DIR from 1987 and raises the dollar amount for administrative claims.

RUSTY McALLISTER (Nevada AFL-CIO):

The Nevada AFL-CIO participated in the discussions and supports A.B. 458. Its concerns have been addressed by the insurance industry regarding the limits of the dollar amounts for closing a claim. It agrees with the definition of retiree and the ability for retirees to receive temporary partial disability payments after retirement.

ROBERT BALKENBUSH (Public Agency Compensation Trust):

The PACT opposes some and is neutral on some of the provisions of A.B. 458. I will highlight the points from the written testimony of Wayne Carlson ([Exhibit F](#)).

In section 2, the PACT opposes making certain language in the C-4 form equivalent. The language a doctor uses to report an injury "directly connect this injury or occupational disease as job incurred" is the same thing as "a degree of reasonable medical probability that the condition in question was caused by the industrial injury." No physicians gave testimony to state that when they use either phrase it means the same thing. There is a lack of foundation to conclude that using such phrases is what the doctor means. The phrases are practically and legally not the same. The C-4 form is the document used to initiate a claim. The questions on the document require the physician to fill in a yes or no box. One of the questions on the form to the physician is "does he or she believe the injury or disease is job incurred?" The statement is a statement of association. In many cases a medical report accompanying the document is sufficient. It is not a medical opinion establishing legal causation. In the phrase "to a reasonable degree of medical probability that an injury or disease was caused by the work-related accident or environment," the physician is making a statement of medical causation. The admissibility of that statement depends on the method used to derive the opinion or conclusion. It is governed by laws. There is an evidence code provision in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 50.275 and the Supreme Court has two decisions directly on point which we have cited in [Exhibit F](#).

The reason this is being proposed is to allow the C-4 form to be sufficient to prove the claim. The fact that something happened at work does not mean it was caused by that work. The worker has to prove that the injury arose out of and in the course of employment.

The PACT opposes section 3 as set forth in our written testimony, [Exhibit F](#). There is an inconsistency in this provision with existing law.

Regarding section 4 on vocational rehabilitation, the PACT asserts it is unnecessary based on current regulations in the law. This section, as written, will do nothing more but unnecessarily increase litigation and monetary expense over this very minor aspect of the entire rehabilitation process. The PACT agrees with current law favoring injured employees.

The PACT supports section 7.3 with caution and section 7.7 with some caution as described in our written testimony, [Exhibit F](#).

The PACT opposes section 8, subsections 9 and 10. The proposed bill is an attempt to overrule the decision in the *PACT v. Blake* case. Should the bill pass, it will affect two other areas the Legislature already governs on claim reopenings. One is subsequent injury accounts. These are accounts addressing when an employee is injured and later has another injury with the same employer. The second is an avenue for reimbursement for the cost of the second claim. The bill only addresses sequential injuries, not the other two factors. There is a pending Nevada Supreme Court case on claim reopening which will be decided this year.

The PACT supports section 9, subsection 1, paragraphs (d) through (f) and are neutral on section 9, subsections 5, paragraphs (a) and (b) as per [Exhibit F](#).

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

When we heard the firefighters bill, one of the things you asserted was that the counsel provided for workers is sufficient and independent counsel is not necessary. Your testimony today seems to place the burden of proof on the injured worker and not on the insurer. Disagreeing with the fact that the employee can choose a rehabilitation counselor in section 4, and the objection without substantiation in terms of why it would be onerous to do so, is going too far. Someone who is injured and working with their physician or chiropractor knows better than someone who is not directly involved.

MR. BALKENBUSH:

I am not sure I understand your question on section 4 about vocational rehabilitation.



SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Do you think the injured person should be able to select a different rehabilitation counselor?

MR. BALKENBUSH:

I was trying to convey that the current law is very pro-injured employee. To be a vocational rehabilitation counselor there cannot be a conflict of interest that might adversely affect the injured worker. Under law, there is a primary duty obligation to the worker first over the insurer. There are supervision requirements for vocational rehabilitation counselors. There are protections in law for the injured worker concerning vocational rehabilitation. In a rare instance, there is a breakdown in the relationship between the vocational rehabilitation counselor assigned and the worker, and it is remedied quickly by communication with the injured employee, the claims adjuster or the lawyers who represent the parties. Attorneys for injured workers commonly do that. Existing laws are sufficient to protect injured employees. This proposal presumes injured employees are not sufficiently protected and the PACT contends the enactment of this section is unnecessary.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Can you repeat your testimony about injured employees being allowed to select their own counselors would result in added legal expenses?

MR. BALKENBUSH:

Regardless of representation by counsel, if the bill is enacted, there will be increased litigation if parties do not agree on the selected rehabilitation counselor. This will create increased expenses. I did not see any evidentiary metric that would show this is necessary on claims over time. The law as it exists is sufficient to protect the injured worker.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

Are you saying you do not see any evidence supporting this section of the bill? Section 4, subsection 4 reads,

The vocational rehabilitation counselor that is selected by the injured employee or personal or legal representative of the injured employee pursuant to subsection 1 or 3 must be assigned to provide all vocational rehabilitation services for the claim.

Section 4 also indicates the insurer is the one who suggests a vocational rehabilitation counselor to the injured employee and that alternate selection must be made within seven days. Your premise is that allowing the worker to select a different counselor would lead to more litigation. If the assumption is, based upon the language of the bill, that there has been no actual evidence presented, where is your evidence saying there will be additional legal consequences? Do you have precedents for that?

MR. BALKENBUSH:

If there is a list of three vocational counselors and the parties cannot agree on any of them, then at some point someone has to make a decision. I am indicating the insurer who pays for the vocational rehabilitation counselor generally makes the selection. The bill is allowing the choice of the counselor be put into the hands of the injured worker and his or her attorney. It is clear there is likely to be disagreement. Disagreement resolution creates costs and slows the process down. I have not heard of any identified problems for a foundation to change the law.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

Were you able to speak to the sponsors of the bill about your issues?

MR. BALKENBUSH:

No, I do not know who the sponsor of the bill is.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I do not understand that. You claim you have been doing this for 25 years and have been before the Legislature. How can you not know who the sponsor of the bill is or have not been able to find out? I am the Chair of the Committee, and you have not approached me. You testified on this bill in the Assembly. It should have given you some indication who presented the bill. You could have talked to the sponsor and tried to air out your differences prior to coming before this Committee. Most opposition has been worked out by the time the bill gets to this Committee from the Assembly. Opposition is worked out by speaking to the parties concerned. Some of your opposition could have been addressed. I am not sure where you are going with this testimony. You must resolve your issue of not speaking to sponsors of bills you have concerns with.

MR. BALKENBUSH:

The PACT has submitted written testimony and has verbally testified. It has not received any contact from the sponsors.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I disagree with that. I am offering suggestions on how it works, and it would be beneficial for you to take this advice. If you disagree and continue to do it the way you are, you may never get anywhere.

Are any of the issues presented by Mr. Balkenbush resolvable?

MR. MILLS:

We reviewed the testimony of the PACT, and the issues are identical to the ones presented in the Assembly. We do not feel we can resolve any of the issues.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 458. We will open the work session on A.B. 61.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 61 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing trust companies.  
(BDR 55-162)

MARJI PASLOV THOMAS (Policy Analyst):

I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 61.

SENATOR CANCELA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will move to A.B. 179.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 12

**ASSEMBLY BILL 179 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing massage therapy. (BDR 54-766)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary from the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion on A.B. 179.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 179.

SENATOR CANELA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will now move to A.B. 431.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 431 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing alcoholic beverages. (BDR 52-1018)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).

SENATOR JULIA RATTI (Senatorial District No. 13):

I am grateful to the sponsors of the bill who have worked on this important legislation for District 13 where many of the proprietors of breweries and wineries operate. The amendment adds a type of winery, a proprietorship, that was unintentionally excluded when the rules were put into place. It is a federally licensed winery, and there is one in Reno ready to open, but is not recognized in the law. The sponsors and all stakeholders involved have approved this amendment.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 13

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I appreciate the amendment and thank Mr. Alonso for discussing the amendment, and I approve helping the winery owners concerned. There is still one section of the bill I am concerned with but support the bill with the amendments.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 431.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will move to A.B. 262.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 262 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to contracts for the sale of vehicles. (BDR 52-937)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 262.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will move to A.B. 267.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 267 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing industrial insurance. (BDR 53-650)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit K](#)).

SENATOR HARDY:

What are we doing with the amendment by Wayne Carlson?

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We are not entertaining that amendment.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is there an end to the appeals process with regard to the \$200 per day penalty as proposed in the second amendment?

ASSEMBLYMAN NELSON ARAUJO (Assembly District No. 3):

The end of the claim is when the claim is deemed credible. If a case takes 120 days, that would be the end of that claim. If a claim is never deemed credible, there would be no end.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is there any stopgap for a claim, perhaps one to three years?

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO:

These claims could last that long. The intent of the bill is to prevent lengthy claims. The problem we are addressing are the long-drawn-out claims. The stakeholders came to this compromise to set a hammer for getting claims processed and reviewed in a timely manner. The penalty is intended to incentivize all parties to settle the claims whether the claims are deemed credible or not.

SENATOR GANSERT:

I think the \$200 is a steep penalty, versus being a fixed amount. The bill says "must impose" which does not allow discretion.

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO:

I appreciate your concerns, but it takes me back to the original point. We had originally placed reasonable attorney's fees in the bill, but the monetary penalty was a more tangible compromise for the concerned parties. The parties who would be impacted by such credible claims justified by the courts were more agreeable to this compromise.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

The amendment from Mr. McAllister is the acceptable one?

ASSEMBLYMAN ARAUJO:

Yes. Mr. McAllister worked closely with interested parties on this amendment, and it was a team effort to work out the language.

MR. MCALLISTER:

I am good with the amendment and the questions that have arisen. The \$200 per day was proposed as an alternative to paying attorney's fees.

SENATOR GANSERT:

It is helpful to have some background on the amendment.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

The last sentence on the amendment states, "In the event the workers compensation insurer prevails in the case, the insurer must be reimbursed under the provisions of NRS 616.C.138." It is not a frivolous claim that is presented. Is it correct that in the event the claimant does not prevail, the reimbursement must be made to the insurer?

MR. MCALLISTER:

Yes, if the insurer prevails, it would be reimbursed for the medical costs it paid out on behalf of the injured worker. There is language in statute that discusses reimbursement at the rates paid out.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

It is reimbursement of the medical costs, not the legal costs.

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 16

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 267.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GANSERT, HARDY AND SETTELMAYER VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:  
We will move to A.B. 339.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 339 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to health care.  
(BDR 54-729)

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit L](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR CANCELA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 339.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:  
We will move to A.B. 425.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 425 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing alcohol, drug and problem gambling counselors. (BDR 54-1031)



Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 17

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit M](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 425.

SENATOR CANCELA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will move to A.B. 361.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 361 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing business practices. (BDR 52-320)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit N](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 361.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will move to A.B. 429.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 18

**ASSEMBLY BILL 429 (1st Reprint)**: Enacts provisions governing the interstate practice of psychology. (BDR 54-351)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit O](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 429.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR ATKINSON:

We will move to A.B. 455.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 455 (1st Reprint)**: Authorizes the electronic delivery of certain notices and documents relating to policies of insurance. (BDR 57-112)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit P](#)).

CHAIR ATKINSON:

I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR GANSERT MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 455.

SENATOR CANCELA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 17, 2017  
Page 19

CHAIR ATKINSON:

Having no more business, I will adjourn this meeting at 9:39 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Christine Miner,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Kelvin Atkinson, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.B. 457	C	8	Assemblyman James Oscarson	Written Testimony
A.B. 457	D	1	Neena Laxalt / Board of Psychological Examiners	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 457	E	1	Jim Jobin / Vogue Recovery Center	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 458	F	5	Wayne Carlson / Public Agency Compensation Trust	Written Testimony
A.B. 61	G	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 179	H	3	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 431	I	2	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 262	J	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 267	K	6	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 339	L	9	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 425	M	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 361	N	10	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 429	O	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 455	P	1	Marji Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document