

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Eighty-Second Session
June 2, 2023**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Elaine Marzola at 3:25 p.m. on Friday, June 2, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Chair
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shea Backus
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblywoman Selena Torres
Assemblyman Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy (excused)
Assemblyman Steve Yeager (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Skip Daly, Senate District No. 13

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst
Sam Quast, Committee Counsel
Joe Steigmeyer, Committee Counsel
Cyndi Latour, Committee Manager

Minutes ID: 1330



Spencer Wines, Committee Secretary
Garrett Kingen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian Reeder, representing Receivables Management Association International
David Reed, representing Debt Buyers Association; and Receivables Management Association International
Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association
Mary Young, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry
Kim Frankel, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Jason Leshar, President, Washoe County Sheriff's Deputies Association
Wendy Leonard, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
John Abel, Director, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Christopher Waddle, President, Reno Police Protective Association
Al LeHoullier, Private Citizen, Kingman, Arizona
Justin Norton, President, Washoe County Employees Association
Dalton Hooks, representing Nevada Self-Insurers Association
Jeannette K. Belz, representing American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Misty Grimmer, representing Employers Insurance Company of Nevada
Victoria Carreon, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry

Chair Marzola:

[Roll was called and protocol was reviewed.] We are going to hear two bills, Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint) and Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint). I will not be taking those in order. We will also have a work session. We will be doing the work session first. Our only work session for the moment is Senate Bill 234 (2nd Reprint). Ms. Paslov-Thomas, you may begin when you are ready.

Senate Bill 234 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing communications with offenders. (BDR S-810)

Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit C.] Senate Bill 234 (2nd Reprint) revises provisions governing communications with offenders. It is sponsored by Senator Scheible and was heard on May 31, 2023. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 234 (2nd Reprint)? I do not see any. I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 234 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DURAN MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 234 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Yurek:

I just want to say, when I prepared for this hearing, read the bill, and came in, I thought I knew where I was going to go with this, and it was not until I heard that extremely polished and well-presented colleague of mine present this bill that I became overwhelmingly convinced that this is a great piece of legislation, and I will be in favor of supporting it today.

Chair Marzola:

I would have to say ditto to what my colleague said. We appreciate your coming.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HARDY AND YEAGER
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign myself the floor statement. We will close our work session.

[The Committee recessed at 3:29 p.m. and reconvened at 3:29 p.m.]

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint), which revises provisions related to collection agencies.

**Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions related to collection agencies.
(BDR 54-158)**

Brian Reeder, representing Receivables Management Association International:

Senator Lange is sorry that she could not be here and asked me to handle her portion of the presentation for Senate Bill 276 (R2). This bill has two primary goals, to expand the definition of collection agencies to include debt buying companies, and to modernize the Collection Agency Act, which was first adopted 50 years ago.

Currently, 35 states license collection agencies, and in most of those states, the definition is broad enough to include debt buying companies, but that is not the case in Nevada. The only difference between a collection agency and a debt buying company is who has title to the debt. Debt buying companies own the debt, while third-party collection agencies collect the

debt on behalf of another company or entity. The debt buying industry came about after the collection agency laws in Nevada were adopted and as such, the Collection Agency Act does not clearly pull debt buyers into the law.

This bill will rectify this by amending the definition of collection agency to include debt buyers. As of October 1, 2023, this bill and the amendment [[Exhibit D](#)] that we will address in a moment is the result of more than a year of discussions and collaboration between debt buyers, collectors, the Division of Financial Institutions (FID), and the Nevada Justice Association.

David Reed, representing Debt Buyers Association; and Receivables Management Association International:

Receivables Management Association International (RMAI) is a nonprofit trade association which represents debt buyers, law firms, collection agencies, banks, and credit unions. Receivables Management Association International supports the passage of Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint), including the proposed amendment because it will not only require debt buying companies to be licensed, but it will also modernize an act that was first adopted in 1969, eight years before the Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. This bill will also replace qualified managers of a collection agency with a compliance manager, aligning with the requirements of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and RMAI certification; focused on complying with state and federal laws and regulations.

This bill will also permit employees to work from home provided the collection agency abides by rigorous requirements designed to ensure oversight compliance and data security. This bill streamlines the licensing process by requiring a single corporate license rather than multiple licenses for each branch facility. We appreciate Senator Lange's introduction of this bill to license debt buyers and to modernize the Collection Agency Act, and RMAI supports its passage.

I would now like to address the S.B. 276 (R2) amendment on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit D](#)]. The amendment does the following: it provides that the mandatory compliance training does not have to take place in the company's principal place of business. It requires direct oversight and mentoring for new hires for a supervisor for seven days. It reduces the record retention of phone calls from four years to three years to match federal requirements. It clarifies that the compliance manager is responsible for collection operations and finally, the amendment ensures that the statute of limitations on consumer debt cannot be revived.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, are there any questions? I do not see any. I will start with support testimony of Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint).

Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association:

We would like to say thank you to the bill sponsor and to the proponents of the bill for working with the organizations. Generally, the Nevada Justice Association always supports such good legislation as this that enforces and strengthens consumer protection laws. We urge your support on this particular bill.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint)? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint). [There was none.] We will move to neutral testimony for Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint).

Mary Young, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry:

I am here to answer any questions that you or the Committee members may have.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, are there any questions? I do not think there are, but we appreciate your being here today. I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint).

[The Committee recessed at 3:36 p.m. and reconvened at 3:36 p.m.]

With the Speaker's permission, we are waiving the 24-hour rule and we are going to work session Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint). Members, are there any questions before I take a motion? I do not see any. I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 276 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 276 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HARDY AND YEAGER
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Duran. We will close our work session.

[The Committee recessed at 3:37 p.m. and reconvened at 3:40 p.m.]

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint), which revises provisions related to industrial insurance.

**Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to industrial insurance.
(BDR 53-946)**

Senator Skip Daly, Senate District No. 13:

I have Kim Frankel here with me to tell a little bit of her story. I told her to keep it short, so I will just go over the bill quickly. Then I will close out with what our intent is. Section 1 requires the Administrator of the Division of Industrial Relations (DIR) to post on their Internet website certain information of persons found in violation of the workers' compensation laws under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 616D.120. Section 2, subsection 3, paragraph (a), increases the benefit penalty. We will go into that a little bit more on what that means: from \$5,000 to \$17,000 and it was capped at \$50,000. Now the maximum is \$120,000.

Section 3 establishes the timeline for the processing and determination of a violation complaint. Once a complaint comes in, they have 30 days to recognize that, they have 30 days to start an investigation, then they have another 60 days to complete an investigation, and then they have another 30 days to issue a determination. In the other provisions when we had to make the amendment in the money committee it was brought up with a technical amendment because when we change that time frame, then we need to change the time for an appeal to happen and give it 150 days because we changed it to 120. What I found out in that particular deal when we made that amendment was that oftentimes you have to have that appeal because the administration was not doing anything within 120 days. They either were not making a decision, or they were just not doing anything. You had to appeal their nondecision. That was the reason for some of those technical changes, which is part of the reason we are bringing this bill as well, which I will explain further.

Section 4, subsections 1, 2, and 7 conform with the changes in section 3. Section 4, subsection 7 provides for the benefit penalty to be doubled if the appeals office or district court upholds the imposition of a benefit penalty. Section 4, subsection 8, makes it clear that if an insurer enters into a settlement agreement regarding the benefit penalty case, the insurer must pay directly to the claimant the amount agreed to not later than 15 days after the stipulated date in the settlement agreement.

Section 4, subsection 9 allows the Commissioner of Insurance to potentially suspend any certificate issued by the Commissioner if an insurer fails to timely pay any benefit penalty. What we are trying to get to is to put a little transparency into the process when an insurer, self-insurer or otherwise—it seems to be a self-insured issue more than anything else and especially government self-insurance. They will slow play, they will stonewall, they will deny claims, there will be an appeal, they will deny the claim, there will be a hearing appeals officer's determination, they will deny the claim, continue, and that is what happened to Kim Frankel.

This is not going to affect her case, but it will hopefully affect other people going forward. We are trying to make sure that people pay the claims, and that is why we are trying to increase the benefit penalty, which is why we are trying to have the transparency, putting any

settlement or benefit penalties on to the website and notification of the Insurance Commissioner when a benefit penalty claim is opened. If the insurers are acting poorly, I have been told by the Insurance Commissioner they will take a greater look at this and intervene if they need to and take their certificate from being able to act as a provider of insurance in this state if they continue to act in this bad fashion.

That is the bill directly. What the intent is that we are trying to get to—which is transparency, actually paying the claims—is having some type of teeth in this for the bad actors when they do not follow through with what they said they would do under our system, which is an exclusive remedy state. We do not have the right to sue, and we want to make sure that the claims are being paid. With that, I will let Kim give her little bit of testimony.

Kim Frankel, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a disabled detective formerly employed by the Washoe County Sheriffs' Office. The two of us are here speaking in support of Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint) because on June 25, 2020, I was hit by a driver under the influence while on duty. I am not permanently incarcerated by my industrial injury diagnosis of functional dystonia, some of the symptoms that you are currently seeing displayed, as I speak. I am not permanently incarcerated by my industrial injury diagnosis of functional dystonia because I was hit by a drunk driver. I am permanently disabled due to the intentional and malicious delay of treatment at the hands of my employer, Washoe County, and their third-party administrator, Cannon Cochran Management Services, Inc. (CCMSI) and their legal team.

Despite court orders and benefit penalties, the care I needed to recover was denied by them when even their own neurologist, Dr. Charles E. Quagliari, documented and informed them back on March 5, 2021, that I had functional dystonia on an industrial basis. In quotes, "I think the claimant, Kim Frankel, is very motivated and in light of the intermittent nature of her symptoms, I expect her to recover."

In September 2022, after I discovered I had no civil recourse to the damage caused by their actions, I went public about my industrial injuries and my experience in Nevada's broken workers' compensation system. The response I received was overwhelming. It was and still is heartbreaking hearing from the thousands of Nevadans and their families unnecessarily suffering the same as I have. Throughout my successful 17-year career in law enforcement, I specialized in crimes against children, and I earned the trust and respect of the state of Nevada. I made a public promise to advocate for all workers of Nevada to make Nevada a bad faith state again.

After our presentation to the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee, our bad faith language was amended during negotiations. The bill now only covers injured workers hurt after January 1, 2024. However, I still strongly support S.B. 274 (R2) because the amendments provide transparency, raising of the fine cap, and the addition of doubling the penalty if appealed, as Senator Skip Daly said, by the insurer and they do not prevail. These amendments should be enough of a deterrent for insurers, employers, and their third-party administrators to stop the intentional and malicious mishandling of claims.

Due to the limited legislative time and in cooperation with our previous presentation to the Senate Committee of Commerce and Labor, I will not go into details of my case, but I think it is important for you to know; I do not, I repeat, I do not personally benefit from this bill passing. This bill will not give me back my career that I loved. It will not give me back my career, my finances, my independence, the ability to sleep, or stop the piercing sound in my ears, the vertigo, the nausea, or stop the violent and repetitive head to toe twisting and jerking and the involuntary muscle contractions I endure and suffer 24/7. But I certainly welcome, encourage, and embrace any of you to ask me any questions about my case.

In closing, you cannot change my situation by supporting this bill and passing S.B. 274 (R2). But you will provide future injured workers a better chance of getting the medical treatment they need and humanely deserve so they can return to the workforce and/or the job they earned and loved. On the 25th of this month, it will be three years and I still, despite court orders and benefit penalties, have not received treatment.

Senator Daly:

Before we take questions, which we are happy to do, I just wanted to get on the record that from when we first presented the case, we did start out with bad faith where you could sue. People were concerned over the disruption of the exclusive remedy potential. We did negotiate with the parties, and we came to a consensus where we had everybody to neutral. It is my understanding everybody was in the room that wanted to, we had several meetings, went back and forth, and got to here. This is a fair compromise. There is more transparency. There are actually increased penalties; there will be better enforcement. At the end of the game, you have the Insurance Commissioner, who can basically put the bad actors out of business if they do not do what they are supposed to do, which is pay claims that they are receiving a premium to pay. With that, I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Marzola:

Thank you and thank you for your presentation today. Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman Yurek:

Senator Daly, I want to thank you for bringing this bill. Detective Frankel, I thank you so much for the courage that you have demonstrated to come forward and share your story. Full disclosure, I practice in this field. I did not go to law school to be an attorney, and I ended up becoming one because, to be honest, I did not really like attorneys. I love what I do, and it is because I get to help people like you, and I am so sorry you had to endure this. As the managing partner for the largest workers' compensation firm in the state of Nevada, I see way too many instances of injustice that results maybe not quite in the extreme circumstances and condition that you have had to deal with. I see this on a regular basis.

I will be honest, bad faith is the holy grail in workers' compensation. We need to get that back, to hold insurance companies accountable. They are not all bad actors, but there are too many that operate in that space, that operate in bad faith. As an exclusive remedy

jurisdiction, we do not have the ability to hold some of these insurers and third-party administrators accountable. The only remedy we have is through these benefit penalties. I applaud your efforts to bring this piece of legislation. I am wholly in support of it.

Chair Marzola:

Anyone else have a question? I do not see any. I just want to say thank you, Detective, for being here today. I know it is difficult for anyone to get up in front of us and share their story. We appreciate your strength. Thank you. We will start with support testimony of Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint).

Jason Lesh, President, Washoe County Sheriff's Deputies Association:

We are here in support of Kim, and I urge you to please pass this legislation.

Wendy Leonard, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

You are going to hear a lot of opposition to this bill. You are going to hear from your financial backers why this is bad. When all of you became politicians, you promised yourselves and you promised us as constituents that you would not be a dirty politician and that your votes were not for sale. When you hear from your financial backers that they are afraid that this might cost them money, I have a very good answer for you. I want you to be strong and to look them in the eye and tell those backers that if they do the right thing and if they do what is already required of them under NRS Chapters 616 and 617, which is providing workers' compensation benefits to employees who are injured on the job, this bill will not affect them in a negative way. Not even by one dime.

When you hear that this might muddy the process, you can look those people in the eye and tell them that this process does not work. Kim Frankel has appealed through the process as it exists, and she has won every level of appeal. The county still refuses to treat her condition, and she is disabled for life because they refused to treat her when they were mandated to do so by law.

I am asking you to be strong. You are sitting in these seats because we trust you and we believe in you. We believe that you have the strength to do what is right. We believe that you have the ability to look at those who have supported your campaign and tell them that you are going to do what is right for every Nevadan. Please support Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint). Be strong enough to look your financial backers in the eye and tell them that you are going to do what is right for the state. Thank you very much for what you do.

Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association:

I am here in support of this particular piece of legislation. As a piece of background, it is important to understand in the Nevada Industrial Insurance system, the sole remedy, the only remedy that a claimant has by law is under NRS 616D.140. They have to proceed through this system. They cannot sue, they cannot bring a case, they cannot bring a bad faith action where every other insurer is subjected to bad faith claims.

The only deterrent that exists is in NRS 616D.140. If it is not robust enough, it encourages bad actors to continue to engage in bad action. Good actors have nothing to fear from these changes or amendments. Only bad actors have to worry about it. Those are the people that this bill and those are the companies that this bill addresses, not good actors. Again, the Nevada Supreme Court has indicated in multiple pieces of case law that the only remedy is these statutes, and if these statutes are not working, then they are not providing the deterrent effect they were designed to create when they were implemented in 1993. The Nevada Justice Association encourages your support from every one of your members.

John Abel, Director, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:

Many of our members have had nightmare stories with CCMSI. It is unfortunate that Kim's case shines a light on the fact CCMSI operates on their own set of rules. For that reason, we support this bill fully.

Christopher Waddle, President, Reno Police Protective Association:

We, too, are still living the nightmare of CCMSI, even though they are no longer our third-party administrator. We are a strong supporter of this bill and urge every one of you to please forward this through.

Al LeHoullier, Private Citizen, Kingman, Arizona:

I am here to support Kim Frankel, her family, and all the others and also for Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint). My three adult children and grandchildren all live in the state of Nevada and my son-in-law, too, is a firefighter in Las Vegas, so they are employees for the State of Nevada. I would just like to urge your support for this bill.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint) in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone line wishing to provide support for Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint)?

Justin Norton, President, Washoe County Employees Association:

I will be very brief, just to spare your time, but we are strongly in favor of this. I wish it were stronger, but we will take what we can get. We support it.

Chair Marzola:

We will move to testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition?

Dalton Hooks, representing Nevada Self-Insurers Association:

We have worked with the sponsor to amend some of the language to get to an amicable solution onto this bill, but we were not able to get there. The Nevada Self-Insurers Association and its members must oppose the bill. Just a couple of points. The bill seeks,

among other things, to add parity between the general insurance defense system as well as bring that into parity in terms of dollars for the penalties.

It is important to note that the system that we have, as Mr. Mills mentioned, is a legislative system that is a carefully crafted legislative scheme. The premiums are different, the approach is different, and there is not an agency charged with overseeing administrators in the system such as there is in the system. With respect to the efficacy of the current system, of course, you have heard some harrowing stories, but there are hundreds of thousands of claims processed in the state without issue.

You heard testimony in other Committees about this over the past two years. The Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), in terms of having benefit penalty complaints, not valid benefit penalty issues, but just complaints, the average was 230 over the past two years. Thus far in this year, there have only been 69 complaints. That is out of thousands of claims that are processed.

There are potential negative effects including, as the sponsor mentioned, the Insurance Commissioner taking away licenses from third-party administrators and others who might be found to run afoul, which then can potentially impact other workers in the state of Nevada depending how that process, which is as the bill is drafted, fairly nebulous. For these reasons and others, the Nevada Self-Insurers Association must oppose the bill.

Chair Marzola:

I will move to neutral testimony of Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint).

Jeannette K. Belz, representing American Property Casualty Insurance Association:

We sincerely appreciate the many meetings that we had after hours with Senator Daly. The changes that were made did bring the Association to neutral. This is a very difficult topic, but with perseverance, I think we were able to get to a good point.

Misty Grimmer, representing Employers Insurance Company of Nevada:

We are also neutral on the bill and absolutely appreciate the willingness of Senator Daly to have multiple meetings with us to come to a neutral position, a compromise on this bill. He is definitely a tireless advocate for injured workers in Nevada. I know compromise is not easy for him, but we do appreciate what he did.

Chair Marzola:

Can you hang on, Ms. Grimmer? I believe Assemblyman O'Neill has a question.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I have got one question for you. With the compromise, if that had been in effect when this incident occurred after the effective date of this bill, if it is passed, would this incident, this failure to address this young lady's needs have happened? Have we actually addressed the issue?

Misty Grimmer:

On this specific case, I do not know enough about it to actually reference any of the details of the case. We are on the right track. If there is a better and a more transparent process in place and if there is a bit more of a hammer for bad actions, then there is not an incentive to kick the can down the road and end up in a circumstance where somebody's treatment is delayed.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I appreciate that and thank you, Chair, for allowing me the time.

Victoria Carreon, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry:

We are neutral on this bill. We do have a fiscal note, and we are available for any questions you may have.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, are there any questions? I do not think we have any questions, but thank you for offering. Senator Daly, would you like to give any closing remarks?

Senator Daly:

To answer a couple of the questions that I heard, obviously for Assemblyman O'Neill's question, there is no way to know what would have happened on this. With the steps we are putting in place here, there is a greater deterrence, so there is less of a chance. I did want to respond to some of the opposition. I know Mr. Hooks was in every one of the meetings that we had on these various things. In fact, some of the compromises were at his suggestion. Sometimes if you do not have anything nice to say, I will just stop there.

The final thing was from DIR on the fiscal note. All of the costs to the Division for workers' compensation is paid out of an assessment. Any cost does not directly affect the state's budget. The insurers pay an assessment that covers the cost for that. Not that you are the money committee, but I know the Chair of Ways and Means is here. It was determined and it was discovered that there is enough money in the assessment already. They do not even have to raise it to cover the cost of their fiscal note. If there are any additional questions—I do want to just say it is not me, Assemblyman O'Neill. It is easy for me to put in a bill, do the work, and do what my job is. Kim Frankel is the person who has made this move. I will thank her again.

Chair Marzola:

Thank you, Senator Daly. I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint).

[The Committee recessed at 4:11 p.m. and reconvened at 4:11 p.m.]

We will now open a work session on Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint). Members, are there any questions before we work session this bill? I do not see any. I will entertain a motion to do pass on Senate Bill 274 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 274 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Yurek:

Thank you, Chair, for this opportunity. Once again, thank you, Detective Frankel and Senator Daly for this bill. I am also truly grateful for the large stakeholders in this industry who came to the table in good faith to negotiate a deal that will increase accountability, transparency, and help injured workers and prevent tragedies like this.

I also want to go on record and say how displeased I am at the Nevada Self-Insurers Association coming to the table to negotiate and extract concessions and to still come here in opposition. I think that is in poor taste. I am in complete support of this bill. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else? I do not see anyone with any further discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HARDY AND YEAGER
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblyman Yurek. With that, I will now close the work session.

I will now open for public comment. [There was none.] Before we adjourn and because I am not sure if any additional bills are going to come to Commerce and Labor, I just wanted to take a moment to say thank you first and foremost, to the staff. You guys keep us together, you definitely make me look good. I appreciate that. And to all my Committee members, you guys are incredible. Thank you for hanging in there. Thank you for helping me come into my own with my first time chairing a Committee. I appreciate each and every one of you. Thank you.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

If I may say as the Minority Leader, we have been totally impressed and have enjoyed maybe not every minute on every bill, but you have really conducted yourself as a professional. You made sure that this Committee has addressed the issues and have proffered your positions and have ensured that the constituents, our citizens, and visitors to the state, are well protected and address their needs. We are appreciative of it and cannot thank you enough for it. We look forward to being back with you in a few months and doing this all over again, for the good of the state, and that is what you are here for and that is what we appreciate the most from you, you are here for the good of the state. Thank you very much for all your work, Chair. I know it has not been easy putting up with me at times.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Ditto.

Chair Marzola:

This meeting is adjourned [at 4:15 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Spencer Wines
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 234 \(2nd Reprint\)](#), presented by Marjorie Paslov-Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 276 \(2nd Reprint\)](#), submitted by Brian Reeder, representing Receivables Management Association International.