

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TAXATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
June 1, 2013**

The Committee on Taxation was called to order by Chairwoman Irene Bustamante Adams at 2:36 p.m. on Saturday, June 1, 2013, 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 nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblyman William C. Horne
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Randy Kirner
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Crescent Hardy (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Pat Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1
Senator Debbie Smith, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 13

Minutes ID: 1351



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Russell Guindon, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Bryan Fernley-Gonzalez, Committee Counsel
Gina Hall, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Paul McKenzie, representing the Building and Construction Trades Council
of Northern Nevada, AFL-CIO
Steve Polikalas, representing the Northern Nevada Urban Development
Company, LLC
Bryan Wachter, representing the Retail Association of Nevada
Nicole Rourke, representing the Clark County School District
Lindsay Anderson, representing the Washoe County School District
Dotty Merrill, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards
Ted J. Olivas, Director, Office of Administrative Services, City of
Las Vegas
Wes Henderson, representing the Nevada League of Cities and
Municipalities
Randi Thompson, representing the National Federation of Independent
Businesses

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

[Roll was taken.] We are going to start our work session. We do not have a work session document available for Assembly Bill 506, as we just heard this bill in our joint meeting. Mr. Nakamoto will review the bill.

Assembly Bill 506: Revises provisions governing taxation. (BDR 32-1246)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 506 was sponsored by this Committee and heard approximately 40 minutes ago. The bill makes various changes to Chapters 372 and 374 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, dealing with the state 2 percent sales tax and the Local School Support Tax. The bill provides that consideration is not received for the complimentary portion of any food, meals, or nonalcoholic drinks, provided on a complimentary basis in whole or in part, to employees, patrons, or guests, of a retailer and thus the sales tax would not apply to the complimentary portion of such food, meals, or nonalcoholic drinks. This bill further provides that the complimentary portion of any food, meals, or nonalcoholic drinks provided on a complimentary basis, in whole or in part, to

the employees, patrons, or guests, of a retailer does not lose its status as food for human consumption and thus is exempt from the use tax. The testimony in support of the bill was given by Ms. Martin from the Governor's Office, Mr. Nielsen from the Department of Taxation, Mr. Ernaut on behalf of the Nevada Resort Association, and Mr. Moradkhan on behalf of the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce. There was no testimony in opposition and there are no amendments. If there are any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any questions on the verbal overview provided by Mr. Nakamoto? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to do pass on A.B. 506.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 506.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HARDY, KIRNER, AND
STEWART WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I do not see Senator Smith but Senator Spearman is here. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 308 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 308 (1st Reprint): Clarifying provisions governing certain tax exemptions for veterans. (BDR 32-644)

Senator Pat Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1:

I come before you today to introduce Senate Bill 308 (1st Reprint). This is a fairly simple bill. In law right now, in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 361.090, there are certain tax exemptions available for veterans; however, the language was not clear that it would also include veterans of the two most recent wars. What this bill does is clarify that those veterans are indeed eligible for the \$2,000 property tax exemption. There is no fiscal note to it because they are already authorized, even though they are not receiving the exemption as they are not aware that they qualify. This clarifies the language and notes that they served on active duty in conjunction with a campaign or expedition in which a medal had been authorized by the government, regardless of the number of days served on active duty, and received an honorable discharge.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any questions for Senator Spearman? I know it is the two most recent wars, but for those individuals that do not know the wars you are referencing, can you state them by name for the record?

Senator Spearman:

The Iraq War and the Afghanistan War. The medals that were authorized by the government were the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal for those who actually served in the combat zone, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal for those who served in support of the combat zone.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. Do you have an estimation of how many veterans would actually fit in this category that are currently not aware they are eligible for this?

Senator Spearman:

I am not sure. A constituent actually brought this to my attention back in December. The Research Division was trying to get more information in order to address the fiscal note, and that is when they were able to determine that the veterans were already eligible for the exemption. I know that the initial fiscal note included a 14 percent increase, but I am not sure if that is correct either.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? Seeing none, I will move to hear from those in support. Are there any individuals in support of S.B. 308 (R1)? [There were none.] Any in the neutral position? [There were none.] In opposition? Seeing none, Senator, if you have any closing remarks.

Senator Spearman:

This bill brings into symmetry the benefits that are available to all veterans, particularly those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan. Having been in asymmetric wars, many of them have suffered more extensively than some of our Vietnam veterans. Being able to clarify this language so they know that this is a benefit they are eligible for is indeed another way to honor them.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

With that we will close the hearing on S.B. 308 (R1). We are waiting for Senator Smith to arrive to present Senate Bill 406 (2nd Reprint). I do want to let the Committee know that we will have a hearing tomorrow, Sunday, June 2, 2013, at 1 p.m. The Committee will meet upon adjournment of the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor meeting, which takes place in this same room. Many of us are on that committee as well.

I am told that Senator Smith is not available to come to the meeting at this time. I will now open the meeting to any public comment. Seeing none, I will recess this meeting of the Assembly Committee on Taxation to the call of the Chair [at 2:49 p.m.].

[Meeting was reconvened at 7:54 p.m. on June 2, 2013.]

There is a quorum present. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 406 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 406 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing tourism improvement districts. (BDR 21-139)

Senator Debbie Smith, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 13:

I am here to discuss Senate Bill 406 (2nd Reprint), which deals with Sales Tax Anticipated Revenue (STAR) bonds. For those of you who have been here for a while, this seems to be the never ending story.

We have tried as a body over the last couple of sessions to do some accountability and clarifying for these STAR bond districts, which are tourism improvement districts (TID), and this is in regard to the anticipated sales tax revenue. I am happy that we have agreement from all parties that for STAR bond projects going forward, the Local School Support Tax (LSST) will be removed from the amount of the sales tax dollars that a project could pledge toward their bonds. That means the schools in our communities will be kept whole. This also means that there would not be an impact to the state, because, as you know, if the LSST falls below what we project in our budget, the state must make up the difference. These are local government decisions and I have always believed that if the local governments want to give up their revenue in exchange for redevelopment projects, that is great. We have discovered that these projects also tend to affect the state because of the LSST. That is actually the biggest piece of this bill.

The other thing the bill does is clarify requirements for the reporting requirement that the Department of Taxation has to meet twice a year for the Legislature and the Legislative Commission. These reports provide information separately for each TID in a municipality, unless this would disclose information about an individual business. I have made a commitment to the businesses that the Legislature understands the proprietary nature of their sales tax reporting and in no way wants to infringe upon that. The language in this bill clarifies that. In this case, if the report would reveal any information about a business, it will be done in the aggregate, which is what they have been doing so that there would be no information disclosed. Furthermore, the Department of Taxation,

under this bill, is not required to prepare and submit any report that would disclose information about an individual business. This specific language can be found in section 2, on page 8, beginning on line 24.

This bill also clarifies that the prevailing wage will apply to all work done on these projects, whether the work is completed by the owner of the development or it is done under a lease situation. You will find that text on page 13, line 34. If you look at the TID in downtown Reno, where the Apple project is projected to be built so they may receive the benefits of this district, it now looks that they will not be the actual owners of the building, but will simply lease the space. I wanted to take this opportunity to clarify that if tax dollars are being used to supplement this development, it does not matter if they are leasing or owning the property. The construction would still fall under the original intent of this language. That is again in agreement with those who are involved with this type of development. It was a nuance that maybe we never thought of in the past, that you may have a lease situation and not a building owner situation.

Now we do have a suggestion from one of the developers with the TID, and I welcome them to the table to make their recommendation for a slight amendment. Finally, the bill says that future projects cannot receive both STAR bonds and regular redevelopment bonds; they can have one or the other. It clarifies that this is not retroactive for TIDs that were created before 2009, nor are the provisions on the LSST retroactive. It is important to know that in these districts they have bonded these projects and you cannot impair those bonds. The LSST provisions, for example, are prospective and for those of you who have been here a while, you might remember that we passed legislation a couple of sessions ago saying that as of October 1, 2009, you could not double dip. You could not have multiple forms of tax abatements or incentives in the same district. This says you can be in the district and you can choose one or the other, but it grandfathers in those old TIDs created before October 1, 2009.

I have not encountered any opposition from those involved. In fact, the City of Las Vegas actually mirrored my legislation in their own legislation. They were in complete agreement.

Assemblyman Grady:

I know this is a bit different than the regular bills we have been hearing where we have been doing abatements. I have been on the soapbox through the whole session that you are taking school money out, which I have no problem with, but on so many of our abatements we are taking local government money out of it and not the state's. I do not think this would fit into that mold,

because, if I understand right, these are approved in redevelopment areas by the local government, so it is their choice if they want to give away their money.

Senator Smith:

That is my point exactly. These are projects of the local governments, they are instigated by the local governments and they are the ones making the decision to forgo some of their revenue to incentivize this development. If they make those decisions to do so, that is fine, but I do not believe the state or the schools should be impacted by them, so I agree with you completely.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any other questions for the Senator? Seeing none, I appreciate the explanation of the evolution of the bill and the clarity that you bring, because you find out through the process that things need to be changed, and that is what this is.

Senator Smith:

Thank you. I will say that this is a very complicated issue. It is also ever changing and evolving and we have had many learning experiences. There have been court cases over STAR bonds, so we have clarified language to take care of that. We have had several experiences regarding relocation. I tried to take care of that. It is a constant, evolving process. I think as long as we have this funding mechanism in place, it is important that we keep looking at it, because we should learn from our experiences and act accordingly.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I appreciate your bringing this forward, Senator Smith. I understand that you stated this was prospective, and I understand what that means. My question is, should Apple or Legends decide to expand, I do not know enough about STAR bonds to know whether or not that is included in what they have or would it be a new thing?

Senator Smith:

I have learned that it is all one project and you cannot impair the bond. That has been the frustration in trying to do something about this relocation issue. You are probably aware that one of the concerns I have is that we have businesses that will close outside the TID and then move into the TID. We lose the tax revenue from the first store completely and then we receive only 25 percent of the tax revenue from the new store. I have not been able to effect change on that issue because even if it is a new building being built, everything is looked at by the bond community as impairing the project. It all has to be looked at as the standing TID, so you can only really effect change on newly created TIDs. I think it is important for us on all projects going forward

because I believe that once the economy is in full bloom again, certainly in southern Nevada, we are going to see more of these projects come about. That is why I have stayed the course and keep working on this, because I think we will see more projects in the future.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I have more of a comment because I have worked on this issue with Ms. Smith since 2005. We have made a lot of progress over time on this issue. Ms. Smith has reevaluated the process as needed and determined that a policy decision was needed to keep our schools whole through this process. Because education is one piece that we are always trying to make up, I think it is a good policy for us to make sure that when we are gone, others can hopefully understand why we did that.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

We will transition then to those in support of S.B. 406 (R2), if anyone would like to come forward.

Senator Smith:

Our usual group of people may not be here, but I also need to let Mr. Polikalas and Mr. McKenzie offer their small technical amendment on this lease issue, if you do not mind, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Not at all. Mr. McKenzie you may go first.

Paul McKenzie, representing the Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada, AFL-CIO:

I have seen a lot of changes come to the STAR bond legislation since 2005. I have said that I often regret the support I gave to this back then, but over the years I have seen this evolve into something that we can almost live with. We have lost a lot of redevelopment revenue in the STAR bond districts, which is taken care of with this piece of legislation. We have had the relocation of stores out of redevelopment districts into STAR bond districts, which the Senator tried to take care of, but was unsuccessful. The latest issue that came up concerns a developer constructing a building when they are not the entity receiving the STAR bond. The occupant of the building will receive the STAR bond and the tax revenues. The question is now whether that construction was actually covered. That is the provision that Ms. Smith spoke to with the last amendment to this bill.

Another question goes back to work we did on this legislation in 2009, based on the experience we had with Cabela's and the Sparks Marina projects when

out-of-state contractors came in and brought their subcontractors with them and did not give our local contractors an opportunity to bid on the work. A provision was put into the STAR bond legislation that required advertisement of the projects and established a process developers must follow in selecting subcontractors. Developers must have at least three bidders on a project. It has come to our attention that there is some specialty work that you cannot get three bidders for. Mr. Polikalas and I came together at the request of Senator Smith to see if we could come up with a solution to this issue and we think we did just that. I will let Mr. Polikalas present that to you.

Steve Polikalas, representing Northern Nevada Urban Development, LLC:

We are the developers of the Tessera project in downtown Reno. The project's goal is the redevelopment of a long blighted area, which will reconnect to the University of Nevada, Reno, and hopefully make Reno a college town with gaming rather than a gaming town with a college. As part of our efforts, we are trying to relocate knowledge-based industries here, as well as other ancillary companies that can come and support not just downtown, but our region and our state as a whole. As part of that, we are attempting to attract Apple downtown to be a tenant in a purchasing and receiving facility for computer equipment, and that is what has given rise to the little clarification we now need. Mr. McKenzie and I have always been able to work in concert on the issues that have arisen, and I appreciate the ability to do so again today. The language we would like to amend in S.B. 406 (R2) occurs at line 43 of the bill.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

What page are you on in the bill?

Steve Polikalas:

It is on page 14, line 43, and states "receiving at least three timely and responsive bids." I think we would then put in the phrase "or if there is not received three timely and responsive bids, then there will be a readvertisement pursuant to this section." Then after that, the contractor can select any subcontractor from those timely and responsive bids. The issue, as Mr. McKenzie identified, is that in certain specialty work there simply may not be three bids, and we want to create jobs in all of our legislation. We do not want to have some arbitrary number, particularly when it comes to specialized bids, create an impediment to those contractors and other trades that are able, ready, and willing to go to work, especially when it is just the lack of a specialty bidder. We think this is a solution to that potential issue so that any project can move forward without some potential arbitrary impediment.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Thank you. I will have my fiscal person repeat what I think you said, to make sure that I understand your intent.

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

This is to make sure that what Mr. Polikalas said is what we actually end up drafting, if this amendment is approved. In that particular section on page 14, line 43, the intent is to specify that if there are not three bids received, there is required to be a readvertisement. If, after the readvertisement, three bids are again not received, then there can be a selection from any of the bids that were received.

Steve Polikalas:

That is what I tried to say.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Okay, I thought so. Are there any other comments on the amendment you are proposing?

Steve Polikalas:

I would like to thank Senator Smith for her ongoing diligence to make this a better bill. Through her efforts, the STAR bonds can be made more efficient and kept intact as an economic development tool we can use during this economic downturn to bring jobs to Nevada. We have always supported her in that effort and we do so again.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

I know we do not have that amendment in front of us, but I appreciate your clarifying the intent. Are there any others in support?

Bryan Wachter, representing the Retail Association of Nevada:

We also thank the Senator for her leadership on this. We think removing the LSST is not only a smart move, but something that should have been considered at the beginning. We think it is appropriate to hold them harmless. We do not see any problem with the conceptual amendment. In fact, we share the frustration on STAR bonds and we should get rid of them.

Nicole Rourke, representing the Clark County School District:

We too are here to thank Senator Smith for her protection of the school revenue by removing the LSST, and we thank the folks she worked with who also support that.

Lindsay Anderson, representing the Washoe County School District:

Obviously, the Local School Support Tax is a major part of our revenue stream, and we appreciate it being kept out of this.

Dotty Merrill, representing the Nevada Association of School Boards:

We are in support of Senate Bill 406 (R2). From the policy perspective of Nevada school boards, section 1 on page 3, as has been mentioned several times, is really important so that the LSST no longer is pledged to finance a project within a TID after July 1, 2013. When *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 271A was adopted, and it has been almost a decade ago now, a number of steps were inserted into the statutes to attempt to protect school districts from harm due to loss of the Local School Support Tax. Several sections of Senate Bill 406 (R2) eliminate those safeguard steps because if the LSST is no longer going to be used for that purpose, those sections are not going to be needed. Those sections that appear for deletion are on pages 5, 6, 7, 9, and 16. We just wanted to be sure that you are aware why those sections are no longer needed. As others have remarked, I would like to say that Senator Smith has brought an incredible focus and energy to improving NRS Chapter 271A and to redirecting the LSST to the purpose for which the dollars were originally intended: improving instruction and achievement for the boys and girls in our schools in this state. We appreciate all that she has done to improve this, especially the changes proposed here. Thank you for the opportunity to support this proposal, and 17 school boards encourage you to pass it.

Ted J. Olivas, Director, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas:

We are in support of this legislation. We want to thank Senator Smith for working with us. As some of you may know, we had a bill with similar language on TIDs and we wanted to make sure that the language was consistent with this bill. It is, so we are here in support of this bill.

Wes Henderson, representing the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:

We also would like to go on record in support of the bill and thank Senator Smith for her efforts.

Randi Thompson, representing the National Federation of Independent Businesses:

I am doing a "me too" on this bill. The small business community appreciates Ms. Smith's efforts.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Thank you for the brevity. Are there any in opposition to S.B. 406 (R2)? [There was no one.] Any in neutral? [There was no one.] Senator Smith, do you have any closing remarks?

Senator Smith:

I apologize that I did not make it to yesterday's hearing, which slowed down the process. I do think this is an important issue we need to get cleaned up for this session. I appreciate your consideration of moving this on.

Assemblyman Kirner:

Did you hear the proposed amendment and do you have any thoughts?

Senator Smith:

I did and I am fine with it. The greater the clarity we can bring, the better.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

I appreciate you confirming that on the record. With that, we will close the hearing on S.B. 406 (R2), and we will move into a work session. We have two bills to consider. I will ask Mr. Nakamoto to first review S.B. 406 (R2).

Senate Bill 406 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing tourism improvement districts. (BDR 21-139)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 406 (2nd Reprint), if memory serves me correctly, was just heard. The only thing I will go through is to restate the amendment. It is to section 3.4 of the bill, which would amend NRS 271A.140 to specify the process by which a developer/contractor issues bids for subcontractors. It would specify that if the required "three timely and responsive bids" are not received, the developer or contractor would be required to readvertise the solicitation of bids and if that readvertisement does not produce "three timely and responsive bids," the developer or contractor may choose from any of the bids that were received below that minimum. If there are any questions, and I am not suffering too much short-term memory loss, I will be glad to answer them at this time.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any questions on the overview of the bill? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN HICKEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 406 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions on the motion? [There were none.]

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

The next bill we will consider is Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint): Provides for transferable tax credits to attract film and other productions to Nevada. (BDR 32-781)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint) was heard by this Committee on May 30, 2013 and was sponsored by Senator Ford, et al. There are work session documents available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) ([Exhibit C](#)). Senate Bill 165, in its second reprint, provides for a transferable tax credit to be administered by the Governor's Office of Economic Development and granted to a producer of certain qualified productions, if the production is in the economic interest of the state, at least 60 percent of the total qualified expenditures and production costs for the production will be incurred in Nevada, and the production costs of the qualified production exceed \$500,000. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Not attached to the work session document, but provided for the members of the Committee and on NELIS, is a mock-up that contains proposed amendments that were submitted by Senator Ford ([Exhibit D](#)). The amendments in this mock-up clarify that the alternative calculation for the credits contained within this section apply specifically to wages and salaries paid to above-the-line and below-the-line personnel who are not Nevada residents. The amendment also reduces the percentage for these expenses to below the 15 percent threshold that applies to other eligible expenses in section 10 of the bill as follows:

- Wages and salaries paid to above-the-line personnel who are not Nevada residents are included in the calculation at a rate of 12 percent.
- Wages and salaries paid to below-the-line personnel who are not Nevada residents are included in the calculation at the following rates:
 - a. Between January 1, 2014, and December 31, 2015, the rate is 12 percent.
 - b. For calendar year 2016, the rate is 10 percent.
 - c. For calendar year 2017, the rate is 8 percent.

With that, I can answer any questions.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any questions from the Committee members on the work session document?

Assemblyman Stewart:

I just want to make sure that the abatement applies to just one of those taxes and not all three of them. Is that correct? The modified business tax, the gross gaming tax, and the insurance premium tax, they can take only one of the three and not all three, correct?

Michael Nakamoto:

When the abatement is actually granted the producer would need to choose which one or multiples of the taxes that the credit could be applied against. It could be one of the taxes, it could be all three of the taxes.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any other questions on the work session document? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO
PASS SENATE BILL 165 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions on the motion?

Assemblyman Stewart:

I am going to vote yes, but I want to reserve my right to change my vote on the Assembly floor.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Thank you Mr. Stewart. Same for Mr. Grady.

Assemblyman Hickey:

I reserve the right to change my mind and I have, because of sleep fatigue, and I am now voting for this bill.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

Are there any further questions or comments on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN KIRNER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMEN HARDY AND PIERCE WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assemblyman Kirner:

I reserve the right to change my vote on the Assembly floor.

Chairwoman Bustamante Adams:

I will assign the floor statement on S.B. 406 (R2) to Ms. Benitez-Thompson. The floor statement for S.B. 165 (R2) will be assigned to Mrs. Neal.

Is there any public comment? Seeing none, I will recess this meeting of the Assembly Committee on Taxation to the call of the Chair [at 2:49 p.m.].

[The meeting was reconvened at 12:33 p.m. on June 3, 2013, for the purpose of adjourning the June 1, 2013, meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Gina Hall
Committee Secretary

Karen Pugh
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Chairwoman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Taxation

Date: June 1, 2013

Time of Meeting: 2:36 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 165 (R2)	C	Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst	Work session document
S.B. 165 (R2)	D	Michael Nakamoto	Mock-up of proposed amendments submitted by Senator Ford