MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TAXATION
AND THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON REVENUE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Eightieth Session
February 7, 2019

The joint meeting of the Assembly Committee on Taxation and the Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development was called to order by Chair Dina Neal at 4:08 p.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2019, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda (Exhibit A), the Attendance Roster (Exhibit B), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Chair
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shea Backus
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Chris Edwards
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank

SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair
Senator Julia Ratti, Vice Chair
Senator David R. Parks
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Russell Guindon, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Joe Reel, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Gina Hall, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dawn Lietz, Administrator, Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
Terry J. Reynolds, Deputy Director of Administration, Department of Business and Industry
Karen Schnog, Management Analyst, Department of Business and Industry
Richard Lassiter, Manager, Power Gen Components, LLC, Las Vegas, Nevada; and Co-Owner, Vegas Fastener Manufacturing, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ed Cebulko, Manager, Power Gen Components, LLC, Las Vegas, Nevada; and Co-Owner, Vegas Fastener Manufacturing, Las Vegas, Nevada
Nic Steele, Owner, Eclipse Theaters, Las Vegas, Nevada
Nick Vassiliadis, representing Advantage Capital Partners
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chair Neal:
[Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Today we are going to hear two presentations. The first presentation will be from the Department of Motor Vehicles on the overview of state and local fuel taxes. Would those who are presenting please come to the table? For the Committee members, these presentations are for educational purposes. This presentation will give you a foundation for some of the fuel indexing bills or diesel tax bills that will be coming our way.

Dawn Lietz, Administrator, Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:
With me today is Debbie Martinez. She is the Management Analyst for the Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles. She will be running the PowerPoint (Exhibit C), and may be answering questions that I might not be able to answer.

The Motor Carrier Division (MCD) of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) consists of five teams [page 2]. There is the administration team, which is myself, Ms. Martinez, and an administrative assistant. We do most of the fiscal work and the statistical performance measures, bill draft requests, et cetera. Next is the fuel industry team, and that is where the focus of today's presentation will be. There are four tax examiners, an administrative assistant, and a supervised tax program supervisor for that team. Next we have the fuel tax, licensing, and compliance team. They handle our International Registration Plan and International Fuel Tax Agreement. We have a revenue team that handles our delinquent accounts and an audit team that audits all of the motor carrier programs.

Our role in the industry is to administer, collect, and distribute the motor fuel and special fuel taxes that are due in accordance with the *Nevada Revised Statutes* and the *Nevada Administrative Code*. The chapters that govern that are listed on page 3 of the PowerPoint (Exhibit C). We license and regulate the fuel suppliers, transporters, exporters, and dealers in Nevada.

The fuel suppliers are companies like Exxon, Chevron, and Shell—companies that take the product from the pipeline to the retail stations. These are the companies we are talking about when we talk about suppliers. The transporters are the independent trucking companies. Some of the larger companies have their own trucking companies, while others contract that out, to deliver the fuel from the terminal to the stations. The exporters remove the product from the terminal and take it across state lines. Sometimes border cities will require fuel to come out of either Las Vegas or Reno and go into neighboring states. The dealers primarily deal with alternative fuels—compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG). They have a different regulatory process because those fuels are not transported and fueled into vehicles in the same manner as gasoline and diesel. We track all movement of the fuel into, within, and out of the state. We process the gas tax refunds for the farmers and the ranchers, and other users who consume fuel in an off-road manner.

In fiscal year (FY) 2018 we collected $735,791,475.69 [page 4]. The entire MCD budget is only $4,232,408.88. This gives you an idea of what the return on investment is—$173.85 for every dollar invested.

I want to give you an overview of some of the chapters that govern fuel [page 5] so you know where to look if you need specific questions answered. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 365 is the chapter that governs the motor vehicle fuels. Motor vehicle fuels are primarily gasoline, methanol or ethanol—anything that can be blended with gasoline and any other combustible liquid that can be used to propel a gasoline type of vehicle. Gasoline and gasohol are the primary components, and there is no provision for taxation of electric vehicles. It is strictly for fossil fuels.

Chapter 366 of NRS is the special fuels chapter. Diesel falls under special fuels, but so do all the alternative fuels such as propane, CNG, and LNG. In Chapter 373 of NRS you will find the county taxes on fuel, which is the special provisions for the indexing tax, the county taxes, and how those taxes can be used by the counties or the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Chapters 445C and 590 of NRS are where the cleanup and the inspection fees reside. That is basically the State Department of Agriculture and the Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, where those fees go.

Who pays fuel taxes in Nevada? Earlier I talked about the suppliers—the main fueling companies that are licensed to bring the product into the state and deliver it to the retail stations. Once it is delivered or sold into a tax-paid or to a nonsupplier, the tax is due to that supplier. That supplier is responsible for reporting and remitting that tax on a monthly basis to us. They must also sell tax-exempt fuel to other licensed suppliers [page 6]. For example, if Chevron has a load and they are selling it to Exxon Mobil, they would sell it to them non-taxed, but then if Exxon Mobil delivers it to the retail station, Exxon Mobil would be responsible for the tax. We track all that activity.

Active duty military is exempt from paying the excise tax. All other federal, state, and local government entities must pay the excise tax. For a point of clarification on the military, it is strictly active duty military and for military use. Active duty military persons cannot purchase gasoline exempt from taxes for personal use. They have to pay the tax.

Special fuels are handled the same as gasoline. The licensed suppliers will pay the tax when the fuel is either delivered to the retailer for sale to the customer or delivered directly to a consumer in a bulk tank. Licensed suppliers must also sell tax-exempt to other licensed suppliers and exporters. All federal, state, and local government entities are exempt from paying the excise tax. Again, private consumers and federal employees do not get to purchase the fuel with the excise tax exemption. It is strictly for use by those governmental entities and local entities, and it is only the special fuel, the diesel. For example, fuel for school buses is not subject to the excise tax.

How are the taxes collected? On page 7 [(Exhibit C)] the motor fuel and special fuel taxes are collected by the DMV on a monthly basis. The fuel suppliers and dealers are required to use our online fuel reporting system to report and pay all their taxes monthly. They provide us individual load detail, which is sent to our system. It is uploaded, fees are calculated, and then they remit those fees to us. The fuel suppliers and the dealers are allowed to retain a 2 percent collection allowance for collecting and remitting the tax to the DMV, when they are done in a timely manner. If their tax report is late, they lose that 2 percent and are subject to penalties and interest. The DMV also has contracts within the counties to retain one-half of 1 percent on the general county taxes and 1 percent on the index taxes. That is where another fee comes in.

This next slide [page 8] is a breakdown of the federal and state fuel tax rates on the various fuel types. The first line is the federal tax rate and the second line is the state tax rate for each of those fuel types.

The next slides are the county option fuel tax rates [pages 9 and 10]. You can see in the gasoline/gasohol column there is a county option tax that is implemented on all gasoline/gasohol. It is a minimum of 4 cents and goes to a maximum of 9 cents. The amount in the second column, next to the particular county, will indicate the current rate. It also shows if the county has a jet fuel tax and an aviation fuel tax. You can see there are five of the seventeen counties still at the minimum 4-cent county option rate. There is also a county mandatory tax of 1 cent that gets added to every county [page 10], and it has a specific use by the Department of Transportation (NDOT) within that county.

There is a county option fuel tax on the fuel for the indexing [page 11]. The current gasoline/gasohol tax rate for Clark County is $0.1136127. That is in addition to the state tax of 23 cents per gallon, the county tax of 9 cents per gallon for regional transportation projects, and the 1-cent mandatory county tax for road repair. On the special fuels you can see there is a $0.1134930 tax on diesel, $0.0855278 tax on CNG, and $0.0877041 tax on LPG. The special fuel, A-55, is still in the law but nobody sells it. It is a water-based emulsion fuel. It is still in the books so there is a rate for it, but no product is ever sold.

In the 2017 Session when the vote went to Clark County residents on whether to continue indexing the fuel, part of the bill that passed in response to the voter's approval, was that a portion of the index tax would go to NDOT. You can see on that next line [page 11], the portion of the increase that occurred between 2017 and 2019 that is now going directly to NDOT for indexed fuels.

Clark County has a consumer price index (CPI) that originally started in 2005 and was replaced in the 2009 Session. In January 2010 they moved from the CPI to the producer price index (PPI), but the rate that was in effect for the CPI is locked in. That rate, in addition to the Washoe PPI, is charged to the customer at the pumps. The appropriate index rate for the special fuels [diesel, CNG, LPG, and A-55] is in that next column.

Chair Neal:
Can you explain PPI and CPI for the members of the Committee?

Dawn Lietz:
The CPI is a different type of indexing from the PPI. When the indexing was first approved in Washoe County, the CPI is what they had first asked for. The CPI, however, does not take into account the cost of the commercial side of infrastructure, so they went back to the Legislature in 2009 and asked that the indexing be based off of the PPI, which is more for the cost of goods sold, the commodities, and things like that. It allows a higher index rate than the CPI, which is basically consumer spending. One is more in line with construction and costs of replacement. The other is more in line with consumer inflation.

On the county indexed taxes [page 12], the 2009 Legislature enacted Senate Bill 201 of the 75th Session that went into effect on January 1, 2010. It changed from the CPI to the PPI, and at the same time also included diesel fuel in the Washoe County indexing. Prior to that it was strictly on gasoline. With the passage of S.B. 201 of the 75th Session, all fuel types, including the special fuels, are subject to the indexed tax. It is not just the state rate that is indexed, it is all of the taxes. It takes the factor of the federal tax, the county tax, and a factor that gets added in to determine what the new rate will be for the next year. Those rates are calculated by the RTC and they provide us with that figure based off of the consumer average for the 10-year period.

Chair Dondero Loop:
Why is aviation excluded? I noticed earlier in your presentation that the tax rates were also very low.

Dawn Lietz:
The aviation fuel is slowly going away. As planes become more modernized, they are not using aviation fuel the way they used to. It goes strictly to the Civil Air Patrol, so we do not keep anything. The state does not keep any money on that whatsoever. The same is true with the jet fuel tax. The jet fuel tax goes directly to the airports. We collect the tax on it because we are collecting on all the other fuel types, but the state does not keep any money on the jet or aviation fuel; therefore, it is not included in the index.

Continuing on page 12, the county index taxes are collected and remitted to Clark County and Washoe County on a monthly basis. The tax returns are due the last day of the month, and we make a distribution around the 10th of the following month. It takes us about 10 days to turn that money and get it out to the entities. It is a pretty quick turnaround.

Each year the rate of the PPI will increase by the amount of the overall PPI increase [page 13]. That is a 10-year average. We are just getting into the tail end of the recession we had back in 2007 to 2008. Now we are going to start seeing that index increase again. It was really low—the percentage that had a really big impact on the percentage for the 10-year average—but now we will start seeing bigger growth again on those indexed rates. The following statutes allow for the CPI and the PPI: NRS 373.0663 is where the Clark County authority lies; NRS 373.065 is for Washoe County; and NRS 373.066 is where they changed it to go from the CPI to the PPI.

Nevada Revised Statutes 373.080 also has a provision in it that allows for the refund of the indexed to special fuel users that fall into the International Fuel Tax Agreement [page 14]. When the Clark County indexing was put into place, there was no provision for IFTA. I will talk about that more at the end of my presentation, but I want to give you a quick overview.

The International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) is basically a reciprocity agreement between the contiguous United States and ten Canadian provinces. Fuel that is purchased in Nevada but consumed outside of Nevada is averaged based on how many miles driven and total miles per gallon (MPG). Nevada keeps the portion of the consumption that belongs in Nevada, and the other states get the portion of the fuel that was consumed in those states regardless of where the tax was paid. It nets it out, so everyone gets some fuel tax dollars for the commerce use of the truck travel. Under IFTA, the only thing you can account for on your IFTA tax return is the state tax, which is our 27-cent tax, which is why we do not have any local taxes on diesel currently. When we started looking at the indexing, and when they moved the indexing in 2010 to include diesel—the special fuel—they did not put any kind of a refund mechanism in there. For the truck drivers who are purchasing fuel in Washoe County, they are essentially paying about 33 cents per gallon more for their fuel in taxes and cannot get any refund for that. If they fuel up in Reno and drive into California, they do not get any refund for that, which creates a bit of an inequity when you are talking about interstate commerce. The only people who have to pay that are the people who fuel up in Washoe County.

When Clark County was doing its indexing in 2013, the Nevada Trucking Association worked with Clark County to get a refund provision put into place, so that those trucking companies that buy their fuel in Clark County can actually submit to the DMV for a refund of the indexed tax that is consumed outside of Nevada. That is what this section of the law provides for. Any future indexing or county option taxes that go on diesel will have some type of a refund provision for the IFTA users.

Chapter 373 of the *Nevada Administrative Code* and *Nevada Revised Statutes* sets forth the process on how that has to be done [pages 15 and 16]. There is a reimbursement process that is required. They keep track of all their fuel receipts for an entire year, from January through December, and then they have to submit their request to us by April 1 in order to be considered. We then take all the refunds that were received—there is a 20 percent withholding on the special fuel indexing that the DMV holds until the end of the year—and then we process the refunds out of that. As long as the refunds do not exceed the 20 percent, the difference goes back to Clark County. If the amount of the refunds was to exceed the 20 percent, then the refunds would be prorated based on the amount of the money that is available [paragraphs (d) and (e) of subsection 2 of NRS 373.083]. So 20 percent of the index on special fuel is the maximum that can be refunded. I do not foresee that we will ever hit that, at least not in my lifetime.

In FY 2018 the total taxable gasoline gallons were only 13,618,337 gallons [page 17]. Very few stations sell straight gasoline anymore. Most of them are selling a gasohol blend, so there is some amount of ethanol—usually a minimum of 7.5 percent, but it can be as high as E85 for some of the alternative vehicles. All gasohol is included in that if there is ethanol in the blend. We had 1,215,401,570 gallons of gasohol sold in Nevada in FY 2018, with a combined total of 1,229,019,907 gallons of gasoline sold in Nevada. The total collections on that were $580,470,766. The state total that went to the State Highway Fund was $227,613,244. The county total was $336,676,663, which included $93,714,850 to Clark County for its PPI index. On the PPI portion for NDOT, the agency received $3,894,950. The CPI portion for Washoe County was $4,717,549 and the PPI portion was $58,845,757.

On the jet fuel, we collected a total of $16,128,634, including the Clark and White Pine Counties optional tax. On the aviation fuel, which is the Civil Air Patrol and other aviation option which also goes to the airports, the total was $52,225. It is a very small amount of the total fuel that is sold.

With regard to the taxable special fuels for FY 2018 [page 18], we sold 406,367,869 gallons of diesel fuel. The special fuels taxable gallons were 414,088,946 gallons, with diesel revenue of $107,349,694 and special fuel revenues, including diesel, of $108,500,142. The indexed tax on that was an additional $35,582,533, with Washoe County receiving $16,119,253 on the PPI for special fuel, Clark County receiving $19,463,280, and NDOT receiving $967,809 for the indexed portion, bringing the total special fuel collections in FY 2018 to $144,082,675.

I know there will be a couple of bills you are going to be hearing this session dealing with additional taxes on the special fuel, on the diesel, so on pages 19 and 20 (Exhibit C) we have included statistical information on the breakdown of gallons sold by the counties.

One question you had [page 21], and it came up on the low rates for jet and aviation fuel, is why do all the fuel types have different tax rates? All state tax rates are determined by the Legislature. The county tax rates, as I stated, were originally legislated with the minimum of a 4-cent county option and a maximum of 9 cents. The counties with ordinances have the authority—or in some cases a vote of the people—to charge that optional tax, anywhere from 4 cents to 9 cents. They also can charge it on indexing, with the vote of the people, which was part of the 2017 legislation. All the counties turned it down except for Clark County, currently the only county that has an index outside of Washoe County. Our state fuel tax rates have not changed since 1992, and that is the primary push behind the index tax and now some of the local taxes, as there is the gap on the cost of infrastructure.

On the motor fuel and special fuel taxes, of the state 23-cent tax, 12.65 cents goes directly back to the State Highway Fund. It is used primarily for the construction, maintenance, and repair of the highways throughout the state. There is a 5-cent State Highway Fund tax that is allocated specifically for new construction of highways. The statutes that govern that are here for your reference [page 22]. On the 5.35-cent county portion tax the state collects, it goes back to the construction, maintenance, repair, and purchase of equipment, but it is for use in the counties the tax is collected for. There are specific statutory requirements on how that money gets spent.

On the 4- to 9-cent county tax [page 23] we have been speaking of, it is for the service and redemption of revenue bonds, construction, maintenance, and repair of public highways, and the purchase of equipment. That is done at the county level. It is given back to the counties for use there. On the 1-cent county tax, it is solely used for the repair and restoration of paved roads, streets, and alleys in those counties. The index tax goes back to the RTC for use in that county.

On the motor fuel and special fuel taxes [page 24], the 27-cent diesel tax goes straight to the State Highway Fund. The jet fuel tax revenue goes back to the governmental entity which operates the airport, the governmental entity which owns the airport, or the county in which the airport is located. There is a federal mandate that the fuel tax revenue goes back to the airport. Our previous method was just to send it back to the counties. Last session that changed and now we make the distribution directly to the airport if it is privately owned or outside of the county [Senate Bill 64 of the 79th Session]. The aviation fuel tax is distributed quarterly and it goes to the governmental entity which operates the airport, the governmental entity which owns the airport, the county in which the airport is located, and the Civil Air Patrol.

When DMV makes its monthly distribution [page 25], money pretty much gets diverted all over the state based on where the allocations of the funds need to go. It goes to the counties and is distributed to incorporated cities, towns with town boards, the State Highway Fund, and the Civil Air Patrol. The wildlife and parks divisions get some for boats and other recreational things they manage. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency gets some of that back for cleanup fees. It is used to fund cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks. Weights and Measures gets some of it, and there are the administrative fees that go to the State Highway Fund that basically fund some of the DMV expenses.

We also receive pipeline reports [page 26]. How we track the amount of fuel that is coming into the state and how much tax is due on that fuel is done through these pipeline reports. We have a major pipeline in Las Vegas, the CALNEV Pipeline, and the Kinder Morgan Pipeline here in the north, and a small independent pipeline called Holly Frontier, which is north of the Sparks area. Most of our fuel comes in from California. California has the California Reformulated Gasoline Program (CaRFG) which our fuel does not have. Very little fuel ever gets exported back into California. It would be more on an emergency provision, because our fuel does not have the CaRFG requirements, but we can export to Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and Arizona, and we do export there quite frequently.

We basically rely on those third-party reports to let us know how much fuel comes into the state to make sure the supplier has reported all of those loads. They come in, in bulk transactions of 200,000 to 300,000 gallons at a time. We monitor that, and then we monitor the outflow with each individual truckload as it is removed from the pipeline. That report provides us with details on where that fuel went based on the driver pulling it, which company it was for, the intended destination, et cetera. That is essentially what we use when we audit. When we do audit the suppliers, we audit 100 percent of their fuel. They have to account for everything. If they cannot account for it, they have to pay the tax on it.

Chair Dondero Loop:
How are the taxes regulated so you know how much they are supposed to pay?

Dawn Lietz:
Going back to the pipeline reports, those are our third-party verification, so 100 percent of the fuel that is either produced or imported into Nevada runs through those pipelines. There is a little bit of truck export, but again we receive export reports from any state that occurs in. The bulk of the fuel comes in through the pipeline. We utilize those reports, and then we get export reports from our neighboring states that tell us how much fuel was picked up in their state and reportedly delivered in Nevada. When we go out and audit, we use those pipeline reports and the suppliers' tax returns. We match those line for line. It is done manually; we do not have an audit program. It is done on spreadsheets. It is done with a lot of reconciliation. We do have online filing for the suppliers, so all of their data goes into our database, and then we extract it from that onto an Excel spreadsheet. We then compare it to the pipeline reports to make sure the companies reported it properly.

Senator Kieckhefer:
I am trying to find the cross reference in statute relating to the county portion you described on page 22, the 5.35 cents. How is that administered? I assume it goes to pay for state roads in the counties of origin, but do you coordinate with local RTCs and local governments in deciding which roads get addressed? How is the deployment of those resources handled?

Dawn Lietz:
There are three elements that make up 5.35 cents. Those three are governed by statute on how that money gets spent. We take each one of the statutory requirements and the breakdown that is associated with it, and we take the fuel taxes that were received. We break it down and cut them a check for that dollar amount. We send it to whatever entity is supposed to receive it, whether it is the counties, the township, the RTC, whoever. We cut them a check and the responsibility of spending it, according to statute, is up to them.

Assemblywoman Cohen:
Are we keeping data about Nevada businesses or Nevadans driving into other states to purchase their fuel for personal use?

Dawn Lietz:
No. We do not keep any of those types of statistics. I would imagine NDOT probably has some highway statistics on how much highway traffic or how many miles are driven on our highways. But as far as where people are purchasing their fuel at retail stations, we do not collect that type of information.

Assemblyman Kramer:
My question is about the biodiesel that is produced. I believe Washoe County or TRIC [Tahoe Reno Industrial Center] has a biodiesel facility. I understand how you can audit what comes in by pipeline, but for the biodiesel, where is it manufactured and sold here, I presume we have a good way of capturing the amount of biodiesel tax on that.

Dawn Lietz:
When biodiesel first came into the market, we really did not. Until it is blended with the fuel, it is not a taxable product. We applied the cleanup fee, which is done upon importation. All the other fuel types are done when it is sold into the retail market. Anything that is imported or produced in the state, the cleanup fee is due upon production or upon importation. We started doing that with the biodiesel. We got the law changed so a person who is producing biodiesel, to blend with product—the same with ethanol if it is coming in to be blended with a product—they have to pay that cleanup fee, which gives us a reporting tool to use.

Assemblyman Kramer:
If a biodiesel facility were producing diesel that was used to run a generation plant for power instead of being used on the highways, these fuel taxes would not apply. Do you have a way of delineating which ones go to roads use and which ones do not as you calculate this?

Dawn Lietz:
Yes. We have a schedule they would report the nontaxable use on. When we audit, we audit the nontaxable product, too, to make sure they can validate that it was truly used appropriately.

Assemblyman Kramer:
This follows on what Assemblywoman Cohen talked about. We had a tour of Laughlin last year and if you look at the gas stations in Laughlin, Nevada, versus the gas stations in Bullhead City, Arizona, you would understand that most people in Laughlin go across the river to buy gasoline. I am not sure if the same thing occurs in South Lake Tahoe, or Wendover, but I can see where people are going to go where gas is cheapest. I realize we do not currently have any way of adjusting for that. It is just what it is, but it seems there might be an appetite for something that would ease the burden on gas tax in those areas where the market is multistate.

Dawn Lietz:
I just wanted to touch briefly on the International Registration Plan and the International Fuel Tax Agreement [page 27]. I mentioned IFTA briefly with the refunds for the Clark County index. The IRP is sort of a sister program. It also includes the 48 contiguous U.S. states, ten Canadian provinces, and the District of Columbia. It is a similar program to the fuel tax, only there is reciprocity on the truck registrations. Vehicles that are over 26,000 pounds and travel in two or more jurisdictions are able to register in their base state. They track their mileage and based on the percentage of travel in each state, they pay that state's percentage of the registration fee. We do have a budget enhancement. The main reason I bring this up is, it is in our bill [Senate Bill 71]. We do have a budget enhancement to have that system replaced. You will hear more about that. I wanted to briefly touch on what that system does.

The International Fuel Tax Agreement is like the registration, only it provides a single point of paying the fuel taxes [page 27]. Companies that are domiciled in Nevada but travel interstate may have a bulk tank on their property in Nevada and fuel primarily from there but travel all over. They still have to pay the tax in the states they are traveling in. It is basically a netting process where we identify how many miles were traveled, how much fuel was purchased and where, then come up with an average MPG [miles per gallon] and apply that MPG to the miles in each state to determine how much tax is due. Again, like the IRP, it is a based jurisdictional thing. We have about 1,800 carriers in Nevada that operate under IFTA and about 2,500 under IRP. It does provide for easier travel across the state lines.

We became a member of IFTA and IRP in 1991 [page 28] under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. We have been in it a long time. There are specific reciprocity agreements that are in the plan and agreement. It is important for you to understand that those are mandates we have at the state level that impact some of what we do in the Motor Carrier Division.

The Innovative Technology Deployment Program is a key component to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA) drive to improve commercial motor vehicle safety. Part of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2015, and the more recent Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, is that those are driving for vehicle safety. Part of FMCSA's push is under a performance registration information systems management tool. It basically tracks the safety, but there are requirements that Nevada is going to be required to meet by October 2020, and our current IRP system does not cover that. We do not have those capabilities, so that is why we have the enhancement in for that. That will be coming before your Committee. We have also received some grants from public safety that will offset the cost of replacing that system. It is about $1.2 million and we are going to get about $800,000 in grant money for it. They are covering about two-thirds of it to get us in compliance.

That concludes the overview of the Motor Carrier Division, the IRP, and the IFTA program. If you have any additional questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Chair Neal:
You brought up that we are on the tail end of the producer price index (PPI), and then we are going to see the rate increase. How does the PPI average rate tie into the payments for the revenue bond? We could potentially see excess money flow into the counties where they may not have to bond. They may actually be able to use cash to pay for some projects.

Dawn Lietz:
Because it is done over the 10-year period, they may have forecasted higher in early years that they did not reach. The 10-year average is supposed to average out those bonds. What they have done is more of an RTC question because they provide us with the rates. What we see right now is, it increases about 3 cents per year in Washoe County. It may go a little bit higher than that in the next couple of years because that percentage is going to increase.

Clark County has a restriction on theirs so it cannot go up by more than 4 cents per year. Even if the PPI would allow for a greater than 4-cent increase, they are restricted to that by the vote of the people. That was part of the initial legislation that went in last session: it can only be collected through 2026 and increase no more than 4 cents per year. That is what the voters authorized.

Chair Neal:
I will save my questions for the RTC. I have a few questions about the payment structure of the bonds are trying to get an idea of how they are projecting and how they are using the analysis that is out there. Do the members have any further questions? [There were none.]

Next, we will hear an overview of the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act's (NMJA) Tax Credit Program. The reason for this presentation is this program originated in 2013 [Senate Bill 357 of the 77th Session] and is coming to an end. We want to know how well it did and find out more about the program.

Terry J. Reynolds, Deputy Director of Administration, Department of Business and Industry:
With me today is Karen Schnog. She is a Management Analyst with our Director's office in Las Vegas. Karen has done the heavy lifting on this program. She has done the analysis and soft audits by going out to all the businesses.

We will give you the background on how this program started and then would like to get into the programs and the businesses that have been instituted within Nevada. We are proud to say we have successes with the businesses that have been invested in through this program.

The purpose of this program was to provide community development and economic stimulation, particularly in distressed areas [page 2, (Exhibit D)]. It was modeled after the federal New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) program—tax credit allocation to generate funds to invest into severely distressed communities defined by U.S. Census data. They used census tracts to determine whether money could be invested in those communities. They looked at high-poverty areas, where 30 percent of the area was in poverty status. They looked at low income, 60 percent below state median household income, and high unemployment rates at 150 percent of the national average. Those are the federal criteria but were placed and looked at as an overview in the census tracts.

We have a saying in this program, "If not for." If not for the NMJA coming in and investing in some of these areas and businesses in the community, those businesses would not have existed at all. That says a lot when we go through and look at some of the businesses that were funded here. We actually had businesses that were going out of business and actually closed. Through the support of the NMJA, they were able to reopen and in some cases had the employees reopen them through an employee stock ownership plan—own the business—and are very successful today. We have some very good success stories to report.

I would like to go into the timeline [page 3]. As Chair Neal stated, S.B. 357 of the 77th Session was enacted in 2013. There were $200 million worth of insurance premium tax credits allocated for this program. We had seven community development entities (CDEs) certified in 2014 to be able to administer and do business with this program. By the end of 2014, we had 31 investments in 22 companies through these CDEs. By 2016 all the businesses were up and operating.

I will go back through some information, as it gets confusing and I want people to understand the numbers part of this audit. There were $200 million worth of insurance premium tax credits allocated for this. The CDEs could get credit for 58 percent of those tax credits, meaning they could only use and get tax credits for 58 percent of that, but they had to invest 150 percent of the proceeds of those tax credits. With that said, each year for the first three years, they could only take 12 percent of their tax credits and in the last two years could only take 11 percent. That adds up to 58 percent they were allowed to use. Each one of those CDEs, with the exception of one, was allocated approximately $32 million. One of them was allocated $8 million. That was Clearinghouse, which typically does smaller-type loans for businesses. So, $200 million of premium tax credits were allocated, they could only get credit for $116 million of tax credits on that, and they had to take those over a 5-year period of time, spread out 12 percent for 3 years and 11 percent for 2 years, which adds up to the 58 percent.

By 2020 all the final tax credits will be taken [page 4]. Running through the numbers on the tax credits, $92,202,903 in tax credits have been taken to date. There is still $23,797,097 of remaining tax credits to be taken through the second quarter of fiscal year 2020.

We had 20 businesses operating in the program [page 5]. Reinvestments are now starting to take place. As those businesses pay back their loans, they are reinvesting that money. We have had four new businesses added because of that reinvestment. We had four businesses close, two of which the CDE recovered the money and was able to reinvest it. We have 11 multi-CDE investments. Each CDE can invest in multiple businesses. They are not just required to invest in one business. They can partner and go in with other CDEs to invest in a business. To date there has been $193 million invested.

Previous to this, for the prior 10 years Nevada only had about $25 million in federal tax credits coming into the state. The federal NMTC program was rarely used. With the NMJA, they are allowed to stack. You can take advantage of the state program and the federal program. A lot of our CDEs have been able to get both state and federal money to their investments for their businesses. Because of that, we have had another $74 million of tax proceeds invested in our businesses within Nevada on top of the $193 million. That speaks a lot to what this has done to stimulate investment within our communities.

There is a lot of social aspect in this. When you hear from some of the businesses, you will understand that this has been very good for our communities. I would now like Ms. Schnog to go through the numbers, in terms of the direct jobs and indirect jobs that have been stimulated by this program.

Karen Schnog, Management Analyst, Department of Business and Industry:
I will go over three different types of impact and then tell you about several of the different businesses. I have visited all the businesses, so if you have any questions, feel free to ask.

There are jobs created, economic impact, and social and community impact. As you can see, the total jobs created by this program is 929 [page 6]. Those are new jobs—2016 to current. The economic impact is $1.29 billion. The social and community impact is sometimes the hardest to express. I think hearing about some of the businesses will help you understand that.

There are 1,444 full-time-equivalent jobs sustained [page 7, (Exhibit D)], with 50 percent being minority jobs. Of the 929 newly created jobs, 53 percent of those are minority, so it is pulling in a greater percentage of minorities. Over 300 jobs would have been lost at the tail end of the recession if not for the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act's Tax Credit Program. The average hourly pay is $21.71, which is a good pay, particularly in these communities. It ranges from $10 per hour up to $50 per hour for the high-tech firms.

Through 2020, 249 jobs are projected to be added and created, and the businesses are on track for that projection [page 8]. There are also estimates that are produced, as far as indirect jobs and induced jobs. Indirect jobs are the suppliers and the companies that work with the business. As one business hires more, other businesses hire more, and the induced jobs are consumer jobs. The people who are paid go out and eat and buy groceries and gas, so those jobs increase. There are 778 additional jobs projected as indirect and induced over the five-year period. I apologize; at the end of that sentence it says 2018 when it should be 2020. That means almost 2,000 jobs will be created through the five-year period, and over 4,000 Nevadans and 1,500 households will be supported.

The gross local impact, which is similar to the gross domestic product for the nation, is $1,255,406,789. The construction impact, as many of these businesses had new construction, is $110,040,517. There is also an addition of $41,108,383 in tax revenues that comes back to the state. Take out the cost of the tax credits of this program at $116,000,000, and it equals $1,290,555,689 of positive economic impact over the five-year period [there are errors on page 9, per the presenter]. That results in $11.13 per each dollar of tax credit. That is higher than the federal program. The state is faring well and the community development entities (CDEs) are faring well in the investment and the impact.

Social and community impact is much harder to monetize and evaluate [page 10]. It is based on the communities. The point of this program is to affect those communities and help bring the people who are left behind out of their negative economic status. An example of one of these businesses would be a federally qualified health center. Research has been done by the National Health Information Center and it has been found that those centers result in shorter hospital stays, decreased emergency room visits, and decreased arrests. Those services go to veterans, those with disabilities, and people who may not have health insurance. There is also a dental service in the program that provides similar outcomes.

An additional $5 million around the Eclipse Theaters in Las Vegas was added from the City of Las Vegas to enhance that area—to enhance the streets and make them more walkable that as the Eclipse Theaters comes in, there is more traffic among the community. That is an additional enhancement. There is a tribal business in the program. Even though there are not tax revenues that come to the state, there are medical services, housing services, and school services that go directly to the Washoe Tribe. I will talk more later about the organ donor resource that is kept in the state and the 240 jobs that were saved in North Las Vegas.

The data is coming on the actual hard dollars of people who were hired in these communities, and who came off of unemployment or welfare assistance programs [page 11]. One of the CDEs has commissioned studies in other states and is commissioning a study in this state that will show us the results that come directly from their investments in this program. An example is one of the businesses with 17 of their newly hired employees who came off of unemployment and government assistance.

Assemblywoman Cohen:
Can we go back to the claw-back provisions, with the four businesses that closed and two of them you were able to get the money back. How was that possible? When I think of a business closing, it closes and there is nothing left.

Karen Schnog:
The first business had a large contract and had moved an office into Nevada. The casino they had the contract with went through bankruptcy, so they lost that contract. They never actually hired within the state. They had an office but it was never filled. As soon as the CDE found out, they went back to that business and were able to retrieve the funds in full because it was within six months of the investment period. They retrieved $2.5 million and were able to reinvestment it within six months, which is the cure period.

There was a $1 million investment in the other business. This was interesting because the people who were working for that business did not know what was happening. They were a major supplier for a company that supplied the whole western region, and that company decided to move the distribution center down the street from them. They ended up closing down, but because it was within a year and the owners had known within a few months after the investment, they were able to retrieve that full investment back and reinvest it. Of the other two that closed, one went through bankruptcy and one pretty much disappeared, which is common in a portfolio of business investments.

Terry Reynolds:
When you look at the national level of business failure for startup businesses, we are probably at the average. If you look at the recovery, reinstitution, and reinvestment of those funds, we are doing much better than the national average. As we profile ten businesses for you, you will see the benefits and what these businesses have done in a short period of time. As you follow the timeline, these businesses have only been operating since the end of 2015 into 2016. They have been able to accomplish a lot during that short period of time.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:
I remember talking in another committee about the federal New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) program and those tax credits, which had some very different outcomes than what was happening with our state tax credits. The success rate with this program was better than what we saw happening with some of the federal ones. When people are submitting for use of these dollars, how much of an investment threshold is typically going into these projects, or does it vary depending on what the project is?

Chair Neal:
Make sure you add in how some businesses were able to stack—take federal tax credits, take state tax credits, and build their capital that way. I am super familiar with this because it was my bill.

Karen Schnog:
There are a couple of different structures that the CDEs use. One is a typical debt structure. That would look like any debt, except that normally these businesses would not be able to attract that debt to finance their business, or they would not be able to get it at a reasonable rate. It would come in as any typical business debt and I think it would probably depend on the situation of each business.

The others tend to fund about 20 percent to 30 percent of the business, so the other capital would need to come from either additional debt or equity investment; or with the nonprofits, it is donations and funds like that.

Originally the stacking seemed questionable because we were new to the program. But actually the stacking is the whole point of the program, which is to be able to attract federal funds—the NMTC program at the federal level. It is actually considered an incredibly successful program. When we started in Nevada, it was a very sketchy time because there were some major lawsuits that were happening across the country. But ultimately this program is considered one of the most successful for a tax credit—kind of public-private partnerships. I do not see those issues coming up as much anymore in the industry. I believe it is currently being considered to be made a permanent program. Going forward there will be an additional $7 billion over the next two years allocated by the federal government. As those funds go out, there is the ability to stack them with new investment here in Nevada. Stacking just means you layer it on top. If you had $2 million, you could match it with $4 million, or even in some cases there were $10 million of federal funds stacked with $8 million of state funds. It has enhanced it. As Terry Reynolds mentioned previously, there was $25 million invested in Nevada ten years before these state programs. We are extremely underserved, but in the short period of time of this program it has tripled to $74 million.

Chair Neal:
I know with some of the early investments the CDEs took a risk. Some of them had higher rates. Is there any conversation about trying to refinance some of that debt now that they have proven their positions? There could be a conversation about how to refinance the higher interest rates that they have.

Karen Schnog:
As the funds are paid back, the model that does the debt structure reinvests out into the different businesses. Some bring in new businesses and some add to existing businesses, so they can get past that next phase, refinance, or get to the next phase of growth. If that is an intent of the program, then I think it can be expanded.

Terry Reynolds:
That is a very good question because with the reinvestments we are now seeing companies go in and refinance that debt. It allows them to expand their facilities, buy new equipment, or add to their facilities. Shelby American, Inc., is one that has done that with a reinvestment just recently. It is a good example of what can happen with the rates as they are today versus where they were.

Karen Schnog:
I met with two businesses yesterday, one new and one existing. Both of them were very interested in the program and having additional financing as they get to capacity and want to continue to grow.

Chair Neal:
I know you have some businesses in Las Vegas that wanted to give us that real feel. Rather than going through the slides, could we hear from them?

Richard Lassiter, Manager, Power Gen Components, LLC, Las Vegas, Nevada; and Co-Owner, Vegas Fastener Manufacturing, Las Vegas, Nevada:
With me today is my friend and business partner, Ed Cebulko. Ed and I have been manufacturing in Las Vegas for the last four decades. We have had various manufacturing companies—metal fabrication and metal manufacturing. Currently we own two manufacturing businesses in Las Vegas. One is called Power Gen Components. It is the No. 1 bolt supplier for General Electric's industry gas turbines, which burn natural gas and produce electricity worldwide. The other business we have is called Vegas Fastener Manufacturing. It is also a nut and bolt manufacturing company with a more diverse

customer base. Both companies make critical fasteners. Vegas Fastener Manufacturing sells to distributors, to original equipment manufacturers, and directly to the United States Navy. I will turn it over to my partner, Ed Cebulko, for a little more detail.

Ed Cebulko, Manager, Power Gen Components, LLC, Las Vegas, Nevada; and Co-Owner, Vegas Fastener Manufacturing, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a partner of Power Gen Components and Vegas Fastener Manufacturing. Thank you for the opportunity to promote the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act program. In July 2018 we were contacted by the private equity firm that purchased us back in 2012. They were planning to close the factory and eliminate 100 jobs here in Las Vegas. We pursued conventional financing but were unable to secure it in a timely manner and acceptable structure to close the deal. We contacted Advantage Capital and they, along with the New Markets Jobs Act program, were able to structure financing that allowed us to close the sale on October 6, 2018. We currently employ 140 and plan to add a minimum of 50 employees over the next two years. If not for the New Markets Jobs Act program, this would not have happened. We highly recommend that you renew this program, which helps create jobs in Nevada.

Chair Neal:
Do the members have any questions for these businesses? [There were none.]

Nic Steele, Owner, Eclipse Theaters, Las Vegas, Nevada:
We are the No. 1 luxury movie theater in Las Vegas. When the New Markets Jobs Act (NMJA) program was first being considered, we were thinking about different structures and different pathways to open up the business. We are very excited about what is going on in Las Vegas, and the tremendous growth in Nevada as a whole.

At the time, we were looking at different structures and traditional financing was unavailable, partly because of the area in which we were looking to start our business and partly because we were a startup in nature. After several conversations with a number of CDEs, the NMJA program was increasingly attractive as a structure for us. After working over a year to obtain financing, we were able to successfully close on more traditional financing in conjunction with the NMJA program and attract even more equity into our project. Without the NMJA structure, the business would not have opened and it would not have opened in Las Vegas. During construction we hired over 300 workers. We are currently hiring 45 employees. We are looking at a possible expansion in other areas of Nevada, and there have been a number of investments centered around our project since opening. It is pretty impressive to see the growth of the downtown area, and I think Eclipse Theaters and the NMJA program had a lot to do with that.

As Karen Schnog mentioned earlier, the city has invested $5 million in a roadside improvement plan that would not have happened in the downtown area without the Eclipse Theaters and without the NMJA program. There have been a number of developments in the last couple of years just one or two blocks away from Eclipse Theaters. A new hotel property is going up. There are three residential buildings going up, and a number of other developments that would not have happened in this time frame. I am grateful for the NMJA program and grateful to the Department of Business and Industry and the Legislature for having the foresight to bring this program to Nevada, helping a number of businesses in the process.

Chair Neal:
Members of the Committee, do you have any questions? [There were none.] I thought you were going to mention you benefited from stacking, but you did not. We understand. It is layered.

Nic Steele:
I can mention it.

Chair Neal:
I would like the Department of Business and Industry to wrap up their presentation for final comments.

Terry Reynolds:
We have provided you with the comprehensive report we prepared for the Legislative Counsel Bureau (Exhibit E) and the updated figures (Exhibit F). You can read those later.

We have some businesses here that have developed with this program that are special, such as the Nevada Donor Network [page 13, (Exhibit D)]. They are the No. 1 donor network facility in the world, which is amazing. They do an incredible job. They took a piece of property that was an old car dealership on East Flamingo Road, re-did the property, and bought additional property around there to expand.

We have the sports facility and hotel [pages 20 and 21, (Exhibit D)] in Mesquite. When the owners came to us, we were surprised they wanted to do this. They felt there was a market for this type of activity and sure enough, there was. They have done very well with the construction of that facility and the associated sports facilities that go along with it.

We have Project Hopes [Northern Nevada HOPES Federally Qualified Health Center] which is a medical facility in downtown Reno. That has been a true success. They serve over 10,000 patients in need with that facility and they are going to expand the facility to meet the demands of the people using it. It is a health care facility where you pay if you can but they will still treat you if you cannot. They also have a housing locator office there to help people with housing. There is a tremendous medical and social aspect to that.

Karen and I have been able to tour the NevadaNano technology facility [page 22]. They make small sensors that can actually be put into clothing. They can monitor different types of harmful chemicals that could be in a house, in a mine, or whatever the case may be, for safety. So when a miner goes into a mine, he has that technology located within the clothing he is wearing that can sense if there are harmful gases within that mine. They are outgrowing their facility and need to expand. There have been discussions about that, to be able to enlarge their facility because their technology has taken off. We are seeing some real state-of-the-art facilities being developed under this program that we are very proud of.

Chair Neal:
When that bill [S.B. 357 of the 77th Session] was moving, I was haggling over census tracts and really battling over the language to make sure it fit the right component, helped the right people, and was going to serve areas where we were going to actually see benefit. It was a big deal to get that out. I am happy we were able to make a difference.

I would like to open the meeting for public comment.

Nick Vassiliadis, representing Advantage Capital Partners:
Back in 2013, Chair Neal took a bit of a gamble because there was a lot of heat, and politics almost got in the way. It became a fight, but she dug in. If I recall, the projections back then were $1.50 for every dollar we invested, and now we are looking at $11.13 for every dollar invested. I know it was a tough fight for you personally. I want to extend my thanks and from Advantage Capital Partners. We believe the numbers stand for themselves and believe it has brought a great benefit to the state.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
First of all, I would appreciate it if you had public comment at the beginning of the meeting. One of the things I wanted to talk about, this presentation was about gasoline prices and taxes. I think you guys should all investigate and report to the Attorney General. Perhaps we should reduce gasoline taxes because according to Gasbuddy.com, our state average is 50 cents higher than the national average. This means that while we are paying on average $2.50 per gallon, there are some states in the United States who are paying $1.60 to $1.70 per gallon. How do you explain that? The price gap between now and the national average has widened. Exactly 365 days ago it used to be 10 cents. Now it is 50 cents, and guess what, states like Utah, Arizona, and especially California are also overpaying. I just filed a report to the Attorney General. Why is this happening? In the presentation about an hour ago they talked about how people are paying less in Laughlin, Nevada, than they are paying in Bullhead City, Arizona. This is largely due to refinery capacity and manipulation. Our gasoline is supplied from California. They are ripping us off. They are gouging the prices. We must do an investigation because that is where a lot of our gasoline comes from. We should not have to pay a lot more. If Oklahoma is paying $1.65 per gallon, we should not pay any different from that value.

I also wanted to talk about if we want additional funding, perhaps we should impose a tax on foreign money transfers. We have a large immigrant population. If you want to raise money, we can do that. Oklahoma does that as well.

Regarding your presentation on business tax credits, I do not know how this works. If you have a high number of minorities you are hiring, I think you are eligible for business tax credits. This is a pretty high number [page 14, (Exhibit D)] considering about half the population is white. This, to me, sounds like you are promoting favoritism. You are promoting discrimination—reverse discrimination, believe it or not. What does this mean? The more minorities, the better. That is not diverse, that is just favoritism. What if a business hired 100 percent white people? There would be massive outrage. This state had a larger demographic change than any other state has experienced in the last 30 years, since 1990, two years before I was born, maybe because a lot of these employers are having more preferences over minorities. This is why we are seeing a lot of these concerns and issues. We talk about education, all these changes. To me this is favoritism. This is not diversity. If this was the opposite of what was happening, 100 percent white, there would be massive outrage.

I would strongly stay away from the race card. It sounds like you are promoting tax credits. Stay away from it. You guys should be surprised, the fact that I am the son of two Iranian immigrants. Do Iranian people qualify as a minority or do they qualify as white? Under the United States Census Bureau, they do qualify as white. Where do we draw the line between who is the majority and who is not? Please, stay away from the race card and just put everybody first.

Chair Neal:
Is there anyone else in Las Vegas for public comment? [There was no one.] We are adjourned [at 5:33 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

____
Gina Hall
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

____
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Chair

DATE: ________________________________

____
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: ________________________________

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A is the Agenda.

Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

Exhibit C a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles: Commercial Vehicle Registration, Motor Fuel and Special Fuel Taxes," dated February 7, 2019, presented by Dawn Lietz, Administrator, Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles.

Exhibit D is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada New Markets Jobs Act (NMJA) Tax Credit Program," dated February 7, 2019, presented by Terry J. Reynolds, Deputy Director of Administration, Department of Business and Industry.

Exhibit E is a document titled "The Nevada New Market Jobs Act (NMJA) Tax Credit Program, State of Nevada Department of Business and Industry," presented by Terry J. Reynolds, Deputy Director of Administration, Department of Business and Industry.

Exhibit F is the updated figures to Exhibit E titled "The Nevada New Market Jobs Act (NMJA) Tax Credit Program, State of Nevada Department of Business and Industry," presented by Terry J. Reynolds, Deputy Director of Administration, Department of Business and Industry.