

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TAXATION**

**Seventy-fourth Session
March 20, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Taxation was called to order by Chair Mike McGinness at 1:35 p.m. on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 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 Mike McGinness, Chair
Senator Randolph J. Townsend, Vice Chair
Senator Dean A. Rhoads
Senator Mark E. Amodei
Senator Bob Coffin
Senator Michael A. Schneider
Senator Terry Care

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dina Titus, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tina Calilung, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Russell J. Guindon, Senior Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Laura Adler, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

David K. Schumann, Nevada Committee for Full Statehood
Julianna Ormsby, Nevada Women's Lobby
Michael Alonso, International Game Technology
Dino DiCianno, Executive Director, Department of Taxation
Jessica Brown, President, Nevada Chapter of the National Organization for Women

Senate Committee on Taxation
March 20, 2007
Page 2

Melissa Clary, President, Southern Nevada National Organization for Women
Lesley A. Pittman, Vice President, Corporate and Government Relations, Station
Casinos, Incorporated
Victor McGuire, Regional Director, Children's Choice Learning Centers,
Incorporated
Vicenta Montoya, Communications Director, Nevada Hispanic Democratic
Caucus
Jonathan Lyon, President, Mesquite Lutheran Church
Susan Holecheck, City Council, City of Mesquite
Larry Gherring

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 102.

SENATE BILL 102: Makes various changes regarding state business licenses.
(BDR 32-238)

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

The bill is fairly easy to understand. The difficult part of the bill is the impact if we start collecting the business license fee over a five-year period. That is of concern to many people, myself included.

The original intent of the tax was to do two things. First is to broaden our tax base where businesses would be paying something. The biggest component of the business license fee was the ability to track businesses in Nevada to make sure they did a number of things: were they growing, who were they hiring, who were they not hiring, were they paying their workers' compensation, etc?

One or two others on this Committee sat on the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor during the terrible time of the explosion in Douglas County, where there were at least two fatalities and a number of serious injuries. It was found that the company did not have any workers' compensation coverage. It came at the time Douglas County had no business licenses, and there was no way for them to track that.

The purpose of this bill is to see if we can reduce the tax, particularly on our small employers, and continue to track the information that the State, Legislature and Executive Branch need to better deal with public policy. The fiscal note is devastating to the State General Fund. If anyone is paying

attention to the projections, the money committees have deep concerns. Those affected by this are swallowing hard as it is a tough call.

My recommendation, Mr. Chair, is we listen to all the tax reduction and increase bills coming before us, and look at the policy in terms of tracking this information and how to accommodate it. I recommend this bill be a vehicle for doing a number of things, primarily to give options to our small employers.

Many employers have multiple companies, and every year they have to write multiple checks. If it were an option for the Department of Taxation to put together, this would impact cash flow and make it difficult to project. Rather than writing a check for \$100 every year, the bill says the business would write it every five years for \$100, which is a huge reduction in revenue. Many people would like to prepay a fee over a three-, four- or five-year period where they do not have to worry about it for a long time. They still need to report the necessary information to the Employment Security Division (ESD). There is a well laid out document the Department of Taxation provides every quarter on changes in the workforce, revenues gathered, types of people hired and industries. It is an important component to the state public policy debate, particularly the tax policy debate and the things that impact economic development.

I ask the Committee to consider allowing businesses an opportunity to prepay fees over a period that works for them and gives flexibility, particularly to the small employer.

I appreciate the time afforded me by the Committee. This is a devastating reduction, but I also have a respect for those who pay and recognize the impact on those who find it more of a nuisance and would like to prepay.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

The requirement of reporting the number of employees every three months to the Department of Taxation, is that new?

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

That is new, but unless Mr. DiCianno corrects me, we collect that in another agency, the ESD. After this was drafted, I realized we already collect that in the document provided to us. That part is not necessary because we already have it. I hope whatever committee you sit on gets this document, and I will make

sure you get a copy of the latest version as it is an important document to provide that information.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

This is not a new requirement on businesses. Is it that they have to provide it?

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

We should no longer have it in the bill, so we do not put one more requirement on business.

DAVID K. SCHUMANN (Nevada Committee for Full Statehood):

We are in support of anything that reduces the impact of taxes on business, allows business to work more efficiently, employ more people and create more wealth for the state. We support a five-year payment instead of every year and agree that doing these reports every three months is burdensome.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 102 and open the hearing on S.B. 211.

SENATE BILL 211: Authorizes deductions from the state taxes on financial institutions and other businesses for certain expenditures by employers for the provision of day care to the children of their employees. (BDR 32-676)

SENATOR DINA TITUS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 7):

This bill would grant tax credits to businesses that provide day care for their employees. It is based on a similar incentive granted to companies that provide health insurance coverage for their employees.

Numerous states offer tax credit to employers who provide child care for their employees. Eligible expenses and the amount of the credit vary from state to state. I have provided you with a sample of such programs compiled recently by the National Conference of State Legislatures ([Exhibit C](#)). States with programs are diverse in size, location, demographics and partisanship. They include Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and West Virginia—28 all together. Programs are pending before several other legislatures. As Susan Seitel, president of the Work and Family

Connection, said recently on MSNBC, "I wouldn't be surprised if that number soared in the next couple of years."

States are taking this route because studies abound on the benefits of on-site day care—for the community, business and individuals, including parents and children. Securing reliable, affordable child care is an increasingly critical issue facing employees today. The availability of child care space at a high-quality, community-based child care center is at a premium, with infant care the most difficult to find. Working parents are caught in the middle of a dilemma that has far-reaching implications.

As a result, employers, with the help of government, are embracing this issue aggressively by offering on-site child care aimed at supporting employees with dependent child care concerns. Employers offering on-site child care feel strongly their investment of company resources will yield a more stable workforce with fewer unscheduled absences and interruptions in the workday. Work-friendly employers know that on-site child care offers several key benefits beyond simply reducing absenteeism and tardiness. On-site child care can play an important role in employee recruitment and retention as well as raise morale and enhance the public image of the organization. Employers and employees alike can appreciate the added benefit that the child care center can match company hours, allowing flexibility in work schedules and eliminating the need of odd-hour child care arrangements.

Sufficient evidence supports the notion that on-site child care encourages loyalty from employees who utilize the child care benefit as well as those who do not. The result is a stable, productive workforce in which employer and employee maximize resources and effectiveness.

A new book, *Kids at Work*, by Rachel Connelly, a Bowdoin College economist, with Deborah DeGraff and Rachel Willis, focuses specifically on child care provided by employers in on-site centers. The study finds that on-site day care is not only affordable, it is in many cases profitable. They also discovered that on-site day care relates to something less quantifiable: human caring. "I was impressed with the near universality of positive feeling workers showed about working for a company that had a child care center," Connelly says.

They liked the idea that their company took care of the person who worked down the row from them. Economists don't generally want

to hear about people caring about each other. But it shouldn't be so surprising that people who work with each other five or more years should care about each other and that that actually translates into economic behavior.

In short, the five reasons employers should care about providing child care are:

1. Your employees will be more productive and committed.
2. The workforce is more diverse.
3. You want a tax break from the dependent care tax credit.
4. You care about the quality of life in your community.
5. You care about the future workforce.

A *CNNMoney.com* list of the 100 best companies to work for in 2007 shows 32 that offer an on-site child care center. They include The Men's Wearhouse; AFLAC, Incorporated; Publix Super Markets, Incorporated; DuPont, Johnson & Johnson Incorporated; CIGNA, Corporation; The St. Paul Companies; Apple Incorporated; Hewlett-Packard Company; Station Casinos Incorporated; and Intel Corporation, among others.

SENATOR TITUS:

This list is impressive as is the list of states offering tax credits, but the number of companies taking advantage of the credits and providing on-site child care is still relatively small. This has prompted the National Women's Law Center to hold a series of meetings with policy experts to look at the issue. They concluded that tax-based approaches offer distinct advantages over direct spending programs which are typically dependent on annual appropriations from the legislature and thus inevitably require intensive advocacy efforts in which different interim groups are pitted against one another in a scramble for scarce budget dollars. Unfortunately, they also found that many employer tax credits go unused because the programs are not widely publicized; the administrative costs are too costly and time consuming; and the benefits are not adequate incentives for the initial cost incurred.

These issues have been taken into account in the bill before you. First, we are using an established tax credit program for a model as in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* 363A and 363B. So there is no new bureaucracy or complicated red

tape to discourage use. Second, we want to make the incentive available to as many businesses as possible. Toward that end, I suggest a change to the bill.

Section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (a) states that the tax credit is allowable for an employer that provides on-site day care without charge to its employees. This is too limiting. No companies provide this service completely without charge, so I ask that the language be broadened to allow a deduction equivalent to the investment. Similarly, in section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b), the language should be broadened to include any subsidy amount. While subsidies are not as good as on-site facilities, they should certainly be encouraged and rewarded.

I thank you for your time and urge your support of this measure. It is a win-win proposition and will more than pay for any loss of tax revenue it generates. It will enhance productivity of employees, reduce absenteeism and lower turnover. It will help bring more women into the workforce, and it will lead to the construction and operation of more much-needed day care facilities in our state.

The witnesses in favor of this bill include women's organizations, some companies in Nevada that have recognized the value of providing day care for their employees and one of the child care companies that works directly with businesses, hospitals, casinos and government agencies here in the state.

Carole A. Vilardo of the Nevada Taxpayers Association has some suggestions for improving the language, including the provision that the tax break, in conjunction with other breaks, cannot equal more than the tax owed. I support those suggestions.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

I read an article about five years ago saying young people are taking jobs where the benefits are more important than pay. People are looking for benefits, and this is a benefit. I like this bill, but what about that \$3.4-million fiscal note?

SENATOR TITUS:

I do not know where they came up with that. I suspect they do not know where it came from because they do not know what companies would take advantage of this. We would like to get the word out so companies would know about it to apply and use the credit for providing health care. At this point, we do not know how many companies may apply.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

Maybe Ms. Vilaro could be asked about the deduction in section 1 for the costs of professional services, labor and materials, construction and maintenance, and on line 22 of page 2, the deduction of the depreciation?

SENATOR TITUS:

That is one of her suggestions to improve the bill. I agree with that and also inclusion of the provision that it cannot equal more than the taxes.

JULIANNA ORMSBY (Nevada Women's Lobby):

We support S.B. 211. It will be great for businesses that want to take advantage of it, and it will also be good for working families.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

Do you have any idea of the number of people who are providing child support presently?

MS. ORMSBY:

I do not, but I have an idea where I can find some information.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

That would be great if you can provide information to the staff tomorrow.

MICHAEL ALONSO (International Game Technology):

International Game Technology (IGT) fully supports S.B. 211 and Senator Titus's efforts in this endeavor.

If you will allow, Mr. Chair, I will give you a little background on what IGT does. They built a building known as Child Garden on the IGT campus in Reno and lease it to a third party that operates the building for \$1 a year. The IGT employees get first priority over nonemployees for that child care. They have the capacity for 211 children; 202 are currently enrolled, and 162 are from IGT employees. The company negotiates a below-market rate with the third-party operator of the child care for IGT employees. As a second part to the benefits, IGT provides a subsidy to their employees based on how they are compensated. The higher compensated the employee, the less of a subsidy they will get, while the lower-compensated employees get a greater subsidy for the program. We support all of what Senator Titus said in terms of the benefits the employer sees, especially with the infants. It provides IGT with many benefits and good

feelings from their employees. Mothers with newborns can go over to the nursery and bond with their babies. All those things you would want to see happening, they can do there because it is right on campus, even though operated by a third party.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Could I have a review on the impact of the fiscal note?

DINO DICIANNO (Executive Director, Department of Taxation):

With respect to the fiscal note, the information we gathered came from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. They provide some statistics with respect to employer assistance for child care. We attempted to extrapolate that information to estimate a fiscal impact with respect to the loss of General Fund revenue on the Modified Business Tax. This is not exact science; this is our best effort to determine that. As Mr. Alonso indicated, we are aware of IGT, and that most places do provide day care at a reduced rate as a benefit. However, because of the way the statutes are currently written, they are not allowed to take that as a deduction; this bill would allow them to do that.

If the bill were to pass, it would provide notification to those businesses so they report correctly, and any computer change we make to our program affects that.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Is that \$1.7 million the first year and \$1.7 million the second year?

MR. DICIANNO:

That is correct.

JESSICA BROWN (President, Nevada Chapter of the National Organization for Women):

For the record, we are in favor of S.B. 211.

MELISSA CLARY (President, Southern Nevada National Organization for Women):

For the record, we are in favor of S.B. 211.

MS. BROWN:

Nevada National Organization for Women (NOW) has 600 dues-paying members and another 1,000 people who subscribe to our e-mail alerts and online

newsletter. I am a volunteer, as are all NOW members in Nevada. We are here today to urge your support for this bill because our members are concerned that working parents, especially working mothers, have the chance to work hard to succeed in their careers and contribute fully to their employers and the Nevada economy. As the director of the National Association of Working Women recently put it, we want to guarantee that being a good family member will not cost you your job. That is why we are asking the state to help employers provide child care for their employees so companies would not suffer from emplaced commitment to their children and working families would not suffer from their commitment to their jobs.

According to Heather Boushey from the Center for Economic and Policy Research, working mothers today are half as likely to leave the workforce because of their children as in 1984. Simply put, most women do not have the option of choosing between work and family. Most women need to be in the workforce to maintain a middle-class standard of living for their families. Though much of the discussion focuses on professional women, over 90 percent of the women in the workforce do not control their own work schedules. Without help from their employers, keeping a balance between work and family becomes an almost impossible goal. In essence, this is a pocketbook issue for working families, especially for working mothers.

I urge you to support this legislation. Now Melissa Clary would like to read a selection of letters sent from members who could not attend today but feel strongly about this legislation.

MS. CLARY:

I have a few excerpts from letters received from our members. Kirsten Brink, a public high school teacher:

Child care expenses are quite difficult for most low-to middle-class families to come by. When my child was young, I went to the government for help to cover the expenses of child care; we quickly found that I would be better off if I quit one of my two jobs in order to get a child care voucher, rather than work two jobs. Not providing incentives for higher-quality child care encourages dependence on government and unemployment. More business-provided child care options will encourage mothers, particularly nursing mothers, to go back to work because her child is in close proximity.

Paula Petruso of Las Vegas writes:

I support the bill to give tax credits to employers who provide child care to their employees. I worked in the Nevada Department of Human Resources in the Welfare Division for nearly 30 years, both as an office manager dealing with my own staff, and as a public assistant supervisor helping low-income families get on their feet; I learned that quality affordable child care is a priority for working parents. I, myself, experienced problems when I went to work after a divorce in 1975. My child-support award was \$100 per month, and my child care cost was \$130 each month. I was in the hole the day I started to work. If our society values children, quality child care must be accessible. If we recognize the need for parents to work, child care must be affordable. Employers are in an excellent position to help provide this essential care. They should be encouraged to do so with tax credits and other support.

And finally, Rita and Edward Ortiz of Las Vegas echo Senator Titus's statement that over half of the states, 28, have enacted employer tax credits. It is time for Nevada to do the same. I hope you vote in support of S.B. 211.

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

I am sure a lot of the supporters coming forward have important things to say, but I think we overlooked something. I appreciate our colleague from Clark County proposing this bill because it brought up some important points.

For those of you who have never visited IGT, I please ask you to do so. It will show you some of the positive things that can be done by business in working hand-in-hand with their employees. The issue brought forward by Mr. Alonso, which is addressed in this bill, is one small portion of what they do that is positive. The gymnasium at IGT, open 20 hours a day, is provided to their employees. They also have a fabulous employee cafeteria with a menu that changes every week, and is partially subsidized. Another impressive thing is their relationship with Truckee Meadows Community College. They are on IGT's site so employees can work a shift and also get college credits.

These companies, and there are more than one, do not get enough acknowledgement of partnering with their employees and how that has improved the employee morale. It contributes to how people want to come to

work and absenteeism drops. They should be commended for what they are doing.

This legislation encourages employers to want to do those kinds of things. They have employee photographs that fill an entire wall. There are photos of employees who have been there for five years, and the ten-year employees take a tiny bit smaller space on the wall. The next is 15 years, and that is not much smaller; it is overwhelming. A lot of it goes back to the original founder who had a commitment to a relationship with his employees. If this encourages that, it will change things.

LESLEY A. PITTMAN (Vice President, Corporate and Government Relations, Station Casinos, Incorporated):

Today, Station Casinos has four on-site child care facilities for the benefit of our 15,000 team members. The genesis of that program was inspired by our vice president of human resources, Valerie Murzl, who arrived ten years ago in Las Vegas to work for Station Casinos. With three small children, she found it difficult to find nontraditional 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week child care facilities to assist her with the long hours put in with the gaming industry.

She started talking with her team members to find out the solutions they were all using. For those who worked swing and graveyard shifts, it was a significant challenge. Together with the needs assessment, Ms. Murzl went to Frank and Lorenzo Fertitta and made the case for developing 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week child care centers for our team members after researching Children's Choice Learning Centers and learning of their high-quality developmental child care program.

We donated approximately two acres for each of the four facilities Children's Choice operates on our behalf. Each center is approximately 19,000-square feet with about 3,000-square feet of playground space. Team members who utilize the centers pay their child care fees through a pretax payroll deduction program.

We became the first Las Vegas gaming company to provide 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week, on-site child care for our team members when we opened our first facility at Palace Station in 2001. We presently operate on-site child care facilities at Texas Station, Boulder Station and Sunset Station, and we provide that service and benefit for our team members in four major quadrants of the valley.

The centers provide services for children ages 6 weeks through 12 years with designated areas for infant, infant-toddler, toddler, preschool and school-age children. Two of the centers are open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year while the other two centers offer extended hours. Capacity is 250 children per 8-hour shift.

This program gives Station Casinos a significant recruitment advantage. The importance of it to our team members, in terms of loyalty and satisfaction, has been instrumental in earning Station Casinos recognition from *Fortune Magazine* as one of the top 100 companies for 3 years in a row. This is a distinction no other gaming company has ever achieved.

When I joined the company seven years ago, my daughter was an infant. I had the benefit of working at Palace Station and having her at the Children's Choice Center adjacent to our hotel/casino property. It was an incredible peace of mind knowing my infant daughter was minutes away in case any issue arose. I was able to visit her on my lunch hour. When she was mildly ill, I was able to visit her throughout the day. It was a personal benefit, and one each of our team members who utilize these facilities continue to enjoy.

While Children's Choice programs were initiated strictly as a benefit for our team members, these facilities are now open for the benefit of the entire community.

National research studies reveal that only 25 percent of employers offer benefits to support the balance between work and family for their employees. We have demonstrated our willingness and ability to be a community leader promoting a work-life balance and family-friendly work environment for our team members. We encourage others to join us in this endeavor.

We support S.B. 211. With the success of this initiative, we are hopeful that Nevada will, for once, find itself on the top of a good list that identifies us in the category of employer-sponsored child care.

VICTOR MCGUIRE (Regional Director, Children's Choice Learning Centers, Incorporated):

Without sounding redundant, I will focus on a couple of areas like recruitment, retention, absenteeism and productivity in regard to the benefits of employer-sponsored child care.

According to a 1997 study conducted by Simons College Graduate School of Management, 93 percent of parents cited work-site child care as an important factor in job change. A recent study conducted at the Children's Health System in Birmingham, Alabama, of the impact of its year-old backup in a child care center found turnover to have gone down from 22 percent the previous year to 12 percent. The new child care center was cited as the main reason for improved job satisfaction in the corresponding employee survey.

A recent retention study by Circadian Technologies, Incorporated in Lexington, Massachusetts, found turnover rates among their extended-hour employees decreased from 7.7 percent to 9.3 percent.

Finally, on the absenteeism issue, a 2003 study by Children's Health System in Birmingham, Alabama, found that 336 parents with child care help out of 2,900 employees saved approximately 4,000 workdays in 2002. Needless to say, Children's Choice supports S.B. 211 and Senator Titus's efforts.

VICENTA MONTOYA (Communications Director, Nevada Hispanic Democratic Caucus):

We acutely recognize that affordable, accessible child care is a primary concern of working parents. This bill provides an avenue for private business to receive a tax cut for providing either on-site child care or compensating for off-site child care to its employees. Due to the necessity of two-family wage earners and the rise of single-parent families, child care is an ever-growing concern. The luxury of stay-at-home parents and an extended family is sadly ever remote in our society. Studies show greater productivity when on-site child care is provided. These parents also exhibit more loyalty to remain with their employer, thereby creating a more stable workforce. Companies that have the ability and foresight to provide on- or off-site child care should be rewarded for their efforts with a tax credit. This is also a powerful incentive for other companies to follow suit. This sane, just proposal provides a win-win solution for employers and employees. We, as citizens of Nevada, also receive the benefits of child care in a safe environment and a stable more-productive workforce. Without a doubt, the Nevada Hispanic Democratic Caucus believes that S.B. 211 should receive your favorable consideration.

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

Mr. DiCianno, I noticed the current businesses that already do this in the fiscal note, what percentage of that is in this \$1,788,000?

MR. DiCIANNO:

We utilized the 3-percent figure provided through the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That was our best information.

SENATOR TITUS:

I would point out that this is often the case when considering programs like this. You consider the absolute cost but do not balance that with what is going to be gained, then have the cost be the difference between the two. We will lose some tax revenue but gain in terms of creation of new child care centers and more productivity of the businesses. We are not talking about a negative net fiscal impact; we are talking about one that is positive. Those kinds of calculations never figure into a fiscal note brought forward like this one.

SENATOR TOWNSEND:

The maximum you would lose are the people already doing this because they think it is the right thing to do. The new people are going to have the effect you mentioned. The only thing you lose is those people who are currently in existence, which is not much, and that is a small price to pay. They should be rewarded because they are already doing the right thing.

The point is, this could be measured by those currently doing it who could take advantage of the way the bill is written, then you exactly know your loss.

JONATHAN LYON, (President, Mesquite Lutheran Church):

The dilemma in Mesquite is rather simple, we have no child care. The congregation recently voted to build a center for approximately 125 children, which is a boon to our booming little town. This bill is a shot in the arm for a long-term survival as a facility. The bill is well written and I urge its passage.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

I have received mail from Councilwoman Holecheck who wrote about day care in Mesquite.

SUSAN HOLECHECK (City Council, City of Mesquite):

Yes, I have written a letter. Mesquite is a budding community with close to 17,000 people, and yet we face the dilemma of no licensed day care. It is difficult for a private enterprise to come to our town knowing we have low average wages. Right now, Mesquite has five casinos; this bill would be a boon

Senate Committee on Taxation
March 20, 2007
Page 16

to our city, because it would excite them to build on-site facilities. I thank Senator Titus and urge support for S.B. 211.

LARRY GHERRING:

I agree with everything the previous speakers have mentioned. Other than health insurance, nothing is more important to families than child care. I applaud those companies that think outside the box to set this up and Senator Titus for her efforts.

CHAIR MCGINNESS:

Hearing no further testimony, I am closing the hearing on S.B. 211.

There being no further comments, the meeting of the Senate Committee on Taxation is adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Laura Adler,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mike McGinness, Chair

DATE: _____