

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

**Eighty-second Session
March 22, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Pat Spearman at 8:04 a.m. on Wednesday, March 22, 2023, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E 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 Pat Spearman, Chair
Senator Roberta Lange, Vice Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible
Senator Skip Daly
Senator Julie Pazina
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Carrie A. Buck
Senator Jeff Stone

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cesar Melgarejo, Policy Analyst
Kelly K. Clark, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nick Vander Poel
Sandy Anderson, Executive Director, Board of Massage Therapy;
Vice President, Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards
Kelli May Douglas, Military Community & Family Policy, U.S. Department
of Defense
Matt Shafer, Deputy Program Director, Council of State Governments
Elisabeth Barnard, Chairperson, Board of Massage Therapy
David Otto
Deborah Persinger, M.D., Executive Director, Federation of State Massage
Therapy Boards

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
March 22, 2023
Page 2

Lance Hostetter, Associated Bodywork & Massage Professionals
Jamie Cogburn, Nevada Justice Association
David Cherry, City of Henderson
Dalton Hooks, Nevada Self Insurers Association
Patrick Kelly, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Hospital Association

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

We will open the hearing with Senate Bill (S.B.) 270.

SENATE BILL 270: Revises provisions governing massage therapists.
(BDR 54-814)

SENATOR MELANIE SCHEIBLE (Senatorial District No. 9):

I am presenting S.B. 270. The bill provides for an Interstate Massage Compact for massage therapists. Joining me today are Nick Vander Poel and Sandy Anderson. Joining us online is Kelli May Douglas. Matt Shafer, with the Council of State Governments, will be assisting. He specializes in interstate compacts. There is one small amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) that makes minor changes to align with other states' language.

NICK VANDER POEL:

We appreciate Senator Scheible for introducing S.B. 270, the Interstate Massage Compact for massage therapists. I am going to turn it over to Ms. Anderson, with the Board of Massage Therapy.

SANDY ANDERSON (Executive Director, Board of Massage Therapy; Vice President, Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards):

I am here to provide background on this issue. For seven years, the Board of Massage Therapy has worked to streamline regulations and enhance benefits for our licensees and the public. For example, in the massage industry, we address human trafficking and sexual assault, issues that other trades do not encounter.

Senate Bill 270 is before you to ease movement into the industry. This Compact will help our massage therapy licensees have portability. It will allow employers, especially the massage spas in Las Vegas, more ready access to licensed employees to fill massage therapy positions. The Compact will establish a national database that will include everyone who participates. If we have a bad actor who does illicit acts in one state, all the states that are part of the Compact would know about it. The Compact adds an additional layer of

coverage that will increase safety and security for the consumer as well. We will be able to address problems at the national level, not just at the State level.

KELLI MAY DOUGLAS (Military Community & Family Policy, U.S. Department of Defense):

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) and military families, I strongly support the policy addressed in S.B. 270 to enact the Interstate Massage Compact in Nevada. I have submitted testimony, ([Exhibit D](#)), which I will read.

MATT SHAFER (Deputy Program Director, Council of State Governments):

My testimony will provide background on this Compact. Currently, there are approximately 300,000 licensed massage therapists in the U.S. Despite the high demand for their services, massage therapists are limited to providing services within their state borders. The Compact will provide licensees with opportunities for multistate practice. It will support relocating military spouses. It will reduce unnecessary burdens related to maintaining multiple licenses.

This bill would create an occupational licensing interstate compact, which is a legally binding agreement between states. It was developed through a cooperative agreement between the DOD and the Council of State Governments (CSG). For the past 18 months, the CSG has been developing the model language with stakeholders from the Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards. We appreciate that Ms. Anderson was able to participate in the Technical Assistance Group that worked to develop the model language.

The Compact will enable massage therapists to obtain a multistate license issued by their home state to practice in other participating states rather than apply for an individual license in every state where they want to practice.

Like the interstate compact for your driver's license, every Interstate Massage Compact member state agrees to mutually recognize the massage therapy practitioners' licenses issued by other member states.

The Compact is similar in form and function to the two occupational licensing compacts, of which Nevada is already a member. A massage therapist must hold an active and unencumbered license in their home state to be eligible to apply for a multistate license. Licensees must also pass a background check

and meet other eligibility requirements related to education, examinations and prior criminal history.

As Ms. Douglas mentioned, the Compact will benefit military families. When a military family is assigned to a new duty station in a Compact member state, that service member or spouse can continue to work using their current multistate license.

From a regulatory perspective, the Compact preserves the authority of each member state to protect public health and safety. A massage therapist practicing under a multistate license must abide by the laws, regulations and rules that govern the practice of massage therapy in the state where they provide the services.

When licensed massage therapists provide services in Nevada under a multistate license issued by another state, they must abide by all of Nevada's laws and rules.

Nevada's Board of Massage Therapy has jurisdiction over anyone practicing in Nevada under a multistate license. Like other occupational licensing compacts, this Compact will be governed by an Interstate Massage Compact Commission made up of delegates from the member states. For Nevada, the delegate will be a representative from the State's Board of Massage Therapy.

The Interstate Massage Compact will come into effect once enacted by seven states. This Compact is brand new. It has not been approved by any other states. However, several states have legislation slated. If enacted, Nevada will have a seat on the Commission when it holds its first meeting to establish rules and bylaws for the Compact.

We do not anticipate substantial costs for Nevada to participate in the Compact. There could be additional software required to synchronize Nevada's licensing information system with the data system. There is a cost associated with sending the State's representative to the Commission's annual meeting.

So overall, the Compact will increase license portability for massage and bodywork professionals in Nevada. It will support military families. It will also improve access to services for Nevada residents while maintaining the current system of State licensure in Nevada.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
March 22, 2023
Page 5

In addition, by ensuring the sharing of investigative and disciplinary information among participating states, the Compact will allow member states' regulatory entities to better protect public health and safety.

MS. ANDERSON:

We already have compatible software. Our Board of Massage Therapy will be able to absorb that marginal cost within the current budget. This bill should not affect our licensing fees at all. In terms of travel costs, our Board has a travel budget that will cover the expected cost.

SENATOR DALY:

If you heard my comments on the previous compacts we have had, you know I am not really a fan of them. I do not like the way this Compact potentially puts limits on what the State can do.

In the Compact, Article 5, subsections A and E, say the State can enact laws if they are "not inconsistent" with the Compact. Then the Compact can make rules and regulations that are binding "law."

It would be onerous and difficult if the State wanted to object to the Compact rules. You must convince a majority of the Compact states to object through legislation, which is the same way the Compact was adopted. The timing will be challenging, especially with Nevada's biannual sessions. Once you do all that, it is unclear to me whether you could get the states to agree.

I have a question on Article 8, subsection B, subparagraphs 1 and 2, describing who can be on the Commission from the State. It says the Commission can potentially put term limits on our State representatives.

There are several things that I do not like. If it was just limited to military spouses, I think we could probably do that through statute, without the Compact. How many states are in the Compact right now?

MS. ANDERSON:

There are zero states in the Compact right now. We are on the front end of this very progressive approach to licensing massage therapists throughout the Country. Mr. Shafer mentioned that I served on the technical assistance group (TAG). The Federation applied for grant money from the DOD to get the CSG to

work on the Interstate Massage Compact, because we think it is the best way to move forward.

We did that after multiple conversations at Federation meetings. We discussed it with board members, licensees, executive directors, investigators and inspectors. We brought those opinions to the table during the TAG and addressed many concerns.

The attorneys for the CSG included extra security in the Compact to help us do our job as regulators. The focus of the Compact is on the 80 percent of amazing, licensed massage therapists in this Country who want to be able to move to another state. The licensees have asked that their licenses be portable and that we make it easier for them.

If we create an Interstate Massage Compact, the massage therapists do not have to apply for a license in each state. They would apply for their Compact license. They can then move around between the states that are part of the Compact.

If approved by their legislatures, I think we will eventually see between 20 and 25 states participating in the Compact.

From the TAG working group, we found that the executive directors and their board members agree with creating the Compact. It will allow employers to bring licensees into the State. Canyon Ranch, which is the largest spa in Nevada, is located at The Palazzo at the Venetian Resort in Las Vegas. They also had a member at the table to represent the industry. What they want to do is be able to move a massage therapist from Nevada to Massachusetts, or to Texas, Arizona or California.

People need to be able to move around. That is really what this is about. I understand your concerns, but I really think for these licensed massage therapists, it is the right thing.

For a military spouse, we already have things in our statutes that assist them. We give them a discount. We license them as fast as possible. With the portability that the Compact provides, they do not even have to apply for that license anymore. They can just move from state to state as needed. That is easier for them than the continual application process.

SENATOR DALY:

Regarding the term limit provisions: Why would they want to limit that? How many states have approved? How close are we to seven member states?

MS. ANDERSON:

We may be the first State. I have talked to executive directors in three other states; they are working on it and have bills pending. I do not know whether any will be approved during their respective legislative sessions. Again, Nevada is set to be a leader. We are a leader in this industry anyway, but with this bill we will be leading again.

When the TAG met, we agreed the state representative to the Commission would be the chief lead officer from each state. For Nevada, that would be me, as the Executive Director of the Board of Massage Therapy. In another state, it would be the chief of licensing. For instance, at the Texas Department of Licensing & Regulation, their chief of licensing would be the representative to the Commission.

SENATOR LANGE:

Article 8 of S.B. 270 discusses the operations of the Commission that may involve costs. For instance, an annual financial report will be required, and staff will need to be hired. What are the anticipated costs? Will you absorb the costs or is that something you would ask the State to cover?

MS. ANDERSON:

We are self-funded. At this point, we are members of the Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards. Our Compact is still extremely small. At this point, I do not perceive any costs. We pay a membership fee to the Federation based on our number of licensees. That fee, at this point, will take care of most of those administrative costs.

As the Commission grows, it may potentially exceed what the Federation can handle. Then the rules will have to be developed. But we have surveyed the licensees in the State, and they are willing to pay anywhere from \$1 to \$500 for an Interstate Massage Compact license. I think the costs will be closer to \$40 or \$45. We will not know until we grow and build the Compact. This will not require any revenue from the General Fund.

MR. SHAFER:

I would like to provide a perspective from the other professional compacts we have worked with. The costs to the states are low because traditionally they are passed along and absorbed by the licensees.

From reading Article 8, the Commission could be a large operation since there are provisions for entering into leases, borrowing and making bonds. But I want to emphasize that these are small operations with an executive director and one administrative staff. They are usually housed within a parent organization, like the Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards. The Commission is not itself paying the salaries for staff.

The Compact is not going to establish a large operation that will draw from the financial resources of its member states. In other professional compacts, we usually have very little fiscal impact on the states. Most of the costs are passed along to the licensee.

SENATOR STONE:

I am a fan of compacts, especially in our growing State. Not only is our population growing quickly; but it is also very transient. I am particularly supportive of the military provisions that take care of our military spouses.

Will all the states have the same basic laws? How will each respective board be able to put their own local laws into effect so they can oversee massage therapists? Is it possible that a licensee can be disciplined by both the Commission and the Board of Massage Therapy?

MS. ANDERSON:

The laws for Nevada are slightly different. We have less of an education requirement than the Compact requests. It asks for 625 hours, but the attorneys allowed continuing education to be included to make up the additional hours.

Our licensees will not be impacted adversely, nor will the licensees in the states that only require 500 hours of education for licensing. In addition, there are allowances to grandfather in experienced licensees.

For instance, I have been a licensed massage therapist for 28 years. My massage program was 200 hours taken here in Carson City a long time ago.

But I can compile proof of my education and take that to the Commission, and their members would rule on whether I qualify as a multistate licensee. That is the major difference between the rules for the Compact and Nevada. Other than that, we are pretty much in line. That is partly because I had a voice at the table developing the language.

As far as discipline is concerned, Nevada can discipline a licensee. The Commission can also discipline a licensee. If Nevada disciplines a licensee, we will notify the Commission and they will discipline that licensee in all the states. That portability means that if we revoke the license, that license is revoked in all the Compact states.

SENATOR STONE:

Let us assume Idaho is part of the Compact, and somebody in Nevada moves there. If this person does something wrong there, will the Idaho board communicate the issue directly to our Board of Massage Therapy?

Ms. ANDERSON:

Idaho would report the issue to the Compact, and that body would report it to the State. Instead of me going directly to my counterparts in all the different states, the Compact database would help with that. It would make the disciplinary part of my job easier.

SENATOR STONE:

Congratulations on doing a great job. Since you already have the appropriate communications software, costs to members will be reduced. This Compact is not precedent setting for Nevada. We already have compacts for physical therapists and nurses that we hope will go forward this year.

I consider massage therapy to be not just a pleasurable service but a medical service. My wife has a traumatic brain injury that causes chronic migraine headaches. Massage therapy alleviates some of those symptoms.

This Compact will help the State import some of these professionals. They will open businesses and hire people. They will provide an essential service. With the growth in our population, this type of Compact is needed.

SENATOR PAZINA:

At what point does the multistate Compact officially form? Is it with seven states? How many states are currently forming this legislation?

MS. ANDERSON:

We know of three other states that are now fielding legislation to enter the Interstate Massage Compact.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

There is a national test for massage therapists. The national test that is given in Nevada is the same one given in Idaho and Mississippi. How does that work?

MS. ANDERSON:

The national test is provided by the Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards. It is called the MBLEx, Massage & Bodywork Licensing Examination. It tests entry-level qualifications to ensure public safety.

Anybody who wants to apply to take that exam and qualifies can take it in any state in the Country. We have 47 other states that are member states of the Federation. The exam is the same everywhere.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Then the testing standards have already been implemented and are the same everywhere. Does the Compact cause the State to lose any of its rights? If we are the first State to join the Compact, do we help determine the rules and regulations?

MS. ANDERSON:

Yes, that is correct. I would be a member of the Commission and our State would have that input. Remember, even though the Compact rules exist, every licensee that comes into Nevada still must abide by our statutes and regulations. They cannot veer from that. If there is anything we do not allow massage therapists to do in Nevada, they would not be able to do it, even with the Compact in place. The licensees are responsible for making sure they know each state's statutes and regulations.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Nevada is getting used to being first. We have the first female majority in the Country. Our State was also first in the Nation to revive the Equal Rights

Amendment, amending our State Constitution after 45 years, so we have a pretty good record at being first. We will hear testimony from those who support S.B. 270.

ELISABETH BARNARD (Chairperson, Board of Massage Therapy):

I am a licensed massage therapist. If we had a Compact when I moved to Winnemucca in 2010, I would not have had to wait five months to start practicing.

Back then, our statutes did not recognize the MBLEx as an approved exam. That is the exam I took in Washington. I had to go through the process to appear before our State's Board of Massage Therapy to have my application approved.

Now, that would not be the case. I could have met all the statutory requirements, but I would still be delayed waiting for my application to be approved.

This Compact, if approved, would allow a lot more mobility of our licensees across states. It would help our industry and the public.

DAVID OTTO:

I am massage therapist No. 103. I have been a massage therapist for 23 years, first licensed in 2005 when the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) were enacted. I support this bill. The Compact will be good for our State.

For 23 years, massage therapists have asked if there is a national license available. Our clients ask about it, too. The Compact would benefit Nevadans, both temporary residents and permanent residents. Notwithstanding the military members and their spouses, this Compact will save massage therapists both time and money when they move from one state to another and relocate their services.

Nevada does not recognize massage therapy as health care; we are a personal service. However, in recent years, manual lymphatic drainage has become one of the techniques in our practice that is utilized by doctors, patients and insurance companies. Therefore, there is a big need for specialized skill sets that may or may not be present in Nevada.

Tourism is one of the State's main industries. Massage therapy serves both the medical and tourism industries. I think a Compact would provide the space for people to relocate here without the high costs and complex vetting processes required to get a new State license.

DEBORAH PERSINGER, M.D. (Executive Director, Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards):

The Federation of State Massage Therapy Boards is comprised of 46 massage therapy regulatory boards and agencies in the U.S. and territories. The Federation's mission is to support our regulatory boards and to ensure that massage therapy is provided to the public in a safe and competent manner. The Federation supports the Nevada Board of Massage Therapy in its position that the Compact be adopted here.

I would like you to know that the Compact has been thoughtfully developed by a working coalition of subject matter experts representing massage therapy professionals, educators, employers, professional associations, consumers, attorneys, investigators and regulators.

The final language also resulted from input received during three months of public comment. The Compact will expand employment opportunities, increase consumer access to quality care and improve public safety. The Compact preserves state sovereignty as it retains each state's jurisdiction over individuals practicing in its state.

LANCE HOSTETTER (Associated Bodywork & Massage Professionals):

I represent 1,200 Nevada massage therapists and the 80,000 massage therapists nationwide who support S.B. 270.

This is a good bill that takes positive steps towards ensuring that massage therapists can work in the state where they desire to work, while also having the education, skills and licensure required to do that safely for the public. We provided a letter of support ([Exhibit E](#)). We urge you to support S.B. 270.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

As there is no opposition, and no one in neutral, we will close the hearing on S.B. 270. We will open the hearing on S.B. 283, which deals with electronic delivery of medical records. Vice Chair Lange will take the gavel while I attend another appointment.

SENATE BILL 283 - Revises certain provisions relating to health care records.
(BDR 54-555)

SENATOR JULIE PAZINA (Senatorial District No. 12):

I will be presenting S.B. 283. This bill serves to modernize statutes for customers who need their medical records for any reason, including an injury case for workers or for workers' compensation. Written and electronic records cost 60 cents per page except in cases of workers' compensation where the cost is 30 cents per page. That can really add up for affected people.

In 2023, we know that most hospitals and doctors' offices have moved to providing patients with electronic records rather than written records. This bill reflects this modernization by reducing the cost per page only for records that are being sent electronically to the requester.

To address the concerns of other parties, we have an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) to remove the portion of section 1 that mentions a person who owns or operates an ambulance. We have also added "or third-party administrator" in section 3.

JAMIE COGBURN (Nevada Justice Association):

This bill will update our statute. When all records were kept in paper format, it made sense to say copies of records cost 60 cents a page.

Nowadays, approximately 95 percent of all medical records are kept electronically. When a patient requests medical records, the provider usually sends these to you electronically, either via email or through an electronic portal on a computer. To continue to charge customers 60 cents a page, even though they are no longer receiving printed documents, is untenable.

This bill will update the statute to say if you request medical records in an electronic format, they must be provided in that format, and the provider cannot charge for their production.

In section 1, subsection 1, the request still requires written authorization on a federal signed form, referred to as HIPAA, for the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. The medical provider must comply with all required federal laws, along with all State laws. The records must be sent securely. Most providers have computer portals that you log into for verification and that would be the most common way for the transaction to occur.

Section 3 of the bill amends NRS 616B, which essentially applies to all workers' compensation cases. In the workers' compensation context, the provider is allowed to charge 30 cents per page, not 60 cents per page. The bill would be amended to say if you are requesting electronic medical records and they are kept in an electronic format, then you cannot charge 30 cents per page.

There is no requirement that the medical provider keep electronic records or make them available in electronic format. This bill only applies if the provider already maintains records in an electronic format and they are requested. In that case, the records must be provided without charge. Federal laws are in place, but some do not cover this situation.

For example, federal law does not contemplate a circumstance where a patient directs a third party to obtain his or her medical records. State law would clarify that the patient may designate whomever they wish to receive electronic medical records on their behalf.

VICE CHAIR LANGE:

I hear no questions from the Committee. Is anyone in opposition?

DAVID CHERRY (City of Henderson):

We are opposing S.B. 283 as written. We thank Senator Pazina and the bill's sponsors for hearing our concerns that, as a local government, we are responsible for safeguarding sensitive employee healthcare records. We appreciate the amendment, [Exhibit F](#), to remove ambulance operators from the bill, which is a service our City provides. If adopted, the amendment narrows the scope of the healthcare records we will be required to provide.

Our concern is about electronic record transmission and potential liabilities. Our City Attorney's Office has identified that section 1 and section 2 of the bill place all the risk on the City as the provider of the records. For instance, if a requester provides us with incorrect information for transmission, or a bad actor accesses the records after the City initiates a secure transmission, we could be liable. For these reasons, we cannot support S.B. 283 today. We appreciate the opportunity to continue working with the bill sponsors.

DALTON HOOKS (Nevada Self Insurers Association):

On behalf of our members, I join the prior commenters in opposition to this bill. We have some concerns, but we are currently working with the proponents to get some language adjusted that will allow us to support the bill.

PATRICK KELLY (Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Hospital Association):

We are neutral on this bill, but we do have concerns. Whether you request a paper record or an electronic record, there is a cost to process that request. That is part of why the 60 cents is built into the statute. We would like to review the federal laws and work with the sponsor to address our concerns.

SENATOR PAZINA:

If someone gives an incorrect email address, there is usually a link to authenticate. Often that includes part of a Social Security number or zip code. However, mailing to an incorrect address or transmitting a paper copy to an incorrect address offers the same risks.

This bill can really make a difference for people on a fixed income with health concerns by removing the additional cost of 60 cents per page.

Mr. Cogburn told me about a client who paid thousands of dollars to obtain medical records. That can be the difference between paying utilities for a month or having a roof over your head. Please support this important legislation to reflect the modernization experience regarding records transfer.

SENATOR DALY:

I am assuming the federal HIPAA laws include some security language. This must have been anticipated. There must be rules and guidelines in that regard.

For the Nevada part on liability, there is language in the public records chapter, NRS 239 that says if you accidentally release otherwise confidential information, it is a good faith mistake. The State, or whoever did that accidental release, is held harmless. You might look at that language. I do not know what HIPAA covers.

MR. COGBURN:

As you know, HIPAA is under federal law. The bill, as proposed, indicates everybody still must follow federal law and current Nevada law.

There is no private cause of action for a HIPAA violation. Nobody can sue a provider for a HIPAA violation. The only person that can enforce those violations is the Office of the Attorney General. I am unaware of any HIPAA case that has ever been brought in Nevada.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Even though it is an electronic record, and you are just transmitting it, there is always a cost for these activities. You have to pay someone who is going to be reviewing and handling requests all day.

I do not think 60 cents a page is reasonable, but I want to know more about the cost. Does anybody have an idea of what a reasonable cost would be to transmit electronic records to answer these requests?

MR. COGBURN:

I do not know what a reasonable fee would be. There is a federal high-tech law that came about in the early 2000s. That law set a reasonable fee of \$6.50. I can provide you with that information. They can also charge for actual costs. For example, if a provider puts the information onto a thumb drive, they would charge the actual cost of that thumb drive. That is how it used to be. Now it is usually a link because everybody stores data in the virtual cloud. I can pull that federal statute and get that information to the Committee.

VICE CHAIR LANGE:

Would the gentleman from the Nevada Hospital Association also like to respond?

MR. KELLY:

I do not have a specific amount in mind for the reasonable cost. That is one of the reasons we want to review it, to look at the related federal requirements. As the proponents said, an authorization is sent in; you have to review the authorization. If it is not correct, somebody must call and get it corrected. Going through that process takes time. Then, once it is identified as an acceptable record, you must go into the medical records and retrieve all the requested documents. I understand that is different from standing at a copy machine, but there is still someone who must do it. Where there were once costs to maintain the copier, there are now costs to maintain the computer and the IT improvements. So, all those things must be considered.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor
March 22, 2023
Page 17

VICE CHAIR LANGE:

We will now close the hearing on S.B. 283. Seeing no public comment, we are adjourned at 9:01 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kelly K. Clark,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Pat Spearman, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 270	C	2	Senator Melanie Scheible	Proposed Amendment by Nick Vander Poel
S.B. 270	D	3	Kelli May Douglas / U.S. Department of Defense	Support Letter
S.B. 270	E	12	Lance Hostetter / Associated Bodywork & Massage Professionals	Support Letter by Les Sweeney
S.B. 283	F	13	Senator Julie Pazina	Proposed Amendment by Kaylyn Kardavani on behalf of the Nevada Justice Association