

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

**Eightieth Session
April 11, 2019**

The Committee on Taxation was called to order by Chair Dina Neal at 4:19 p.m. on Thursday, April 11, 2019, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Assembly District No. 6

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Russell Guindon, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Dylan Keith, Committee Manager
Gina Hall, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Shani J. Coleman, Deputy Director, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas
Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson
Brian McAnallen, representing City of North Las Vegas
Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
Wes Henderson, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas
Metropolitan Police Department
Emily Paulsen, Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance, Las Vegas, Nevada
Felipe A. Silva, Organizer, Make the Road Nevada, North Las Vegas, Nevada
Arash Ghafoori, Executive Director, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, Las Vegas,
Nevada

Chair Neal:

[Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Members, we are going to do the work session first and then have one bill presentation on Assembly Bill 73. We are not going to take the work session in order. We will start with Assembly Bill 400 and Assembly Bill 385 last. Everyone should have their work session documents in front of them. I will open the work session on A.B. 400.

Assembly Bill 400: Revises provisions governing economic development. (BDR 18-803)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The first bill on the work session today is Assembly Bill 400. This bill was heard in this Committee on April 2, 2019, and was sponsored by Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson. In its original form it makes various changes to economic development incentives offered by the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED), including:

- Requiring that the State Plan for Economic Development not include provisions allowing the granting of an abatement, partial abatement, or exemption from taxes or any other economic development incentive for a person who is already receiving an abatement or partial abatement; and
- Removing references to Chapter 374 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) for certain economic development incentives, which removes or limits the ability of GOED to award abatements for local sales and use taxes.

There is a conceptual amendment [page 3, ([Exhibit C](#))] attached to the work session document. There are two changes that would be made to economic development incentives in Nevada under the bill as amended:

1. The ability for GOED to approve abatements for the local school support tax (LSST), and the LSST only, would prospectively be removed from the following incentive programs:

- Businesses locating within certain economic development zones (NRS 274.310);
- Businesses expanding within certain economic development zones (NRS 274.320);
- Businesses locating within an enterprise community (NRS 274.330);
- Persons who wish to locate or expand a business in Nevada and who meet certain capital investment and job requirements (NRS 360.750);
- Businesses that own, operate, manufacture, service, maintain, test, repair, overhaul, or assemble an aircraft or any component of an aircraft that locate or expand in Nevada (NRS 360.753);
- Businesses locating a new data center or expanding an existing data center in Nevada (NRS 360.754);
- Projects with at least \$1 billion in collective capital investment in Nevada (NRS 360.880 through 360.896); and
- Projects with at least \$3.5 billion in collective capital investment in Nevada (NRS 360.900 through 360.980).

These provisions would become effective upon passage and approval. This particular amendment would not affect the ability for abatements to be granted for other local sales and use tax rates, property tax, or the modified business tax where applicable. The amendment would also not affect any businesses that are currently receiving abatements that have already been approved by GOED.

The second change proposed in this amendment by Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson would be:

2. For the general abatements that can be issued to new and expanding businesses in NRS 360.750, a business locating within a county can only receive the abatements provided in this section once as a new business and once as an expanding business.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 400 with the changes in the conceptual amendment discussed in the work session document.

ASSEMBLYMAN KRAMER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 400.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I will be voting this out of Committee today; however, I would like to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor as there are a number of other bills that go right along with this and, therefore, I would just like to see how everything works out.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I am continuing to have conversations with GOED to ensure we get the right balance in the intent of the legislation. This is just an acknowledgement that there is still reflection at this time. This is the best version of the language, but I am still having conversations to ensure we get something that strikes the right balance for the state of Nevada.

Chair Neal:

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson. I will close the work session on A.B. 400 and open the work session on Assembly Bill 443.

Assembly Bill 443: Removes the prospective expiration of the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005. (BDR S-1128)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The next bill on today's work session is Assembly Bill 443, which was heard in this Committee on April 9, 2019, and was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Taxation. As background, with Assembly Bill 418 of the 73rd Session, the Legislature approved the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005 [More Cops], which authorized the board of county commissioners in Clark County to impose additional sales and use tax rates for the purpose of employing and equipping additional police officers for the Boulder City Police Department, Henderson Police Department, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Mesquite Police Department, and North Las Vegas Police Department. As approved by the Legislature, the board of county commissioners was authorized to impose a sales tax rate of 0.25 percent in Clark County on October 1, 2005, and up to an additional rate of 0.25 percent if the additional rate were to take effect on or after October 1, 2009, and the Legislature first approves the additional rate.

The current rate imposed in Clark County under the authority of the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005 is 0.30 percent. Under the provisions of the act as originally adopted by the Legislature, the authorization to impose this rate in Clark County expires by limitation on October 1, 2025. Assembly Bill 443 amends the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005 to remove the prospective October 1, 2025, expiration date for this act.

There is an amendment attached to the work session document [page 3, ([Exhibit D](#))]. The conceptual amendment is based on the amendment discussed by Assemblywoman Neal at the hearing, with minor modifications that were suggested by the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and makes several changes to the bill:

1. In section 13.5, which requires periodic reporting by the police departments relating to revenues and expenses received from this sales tax rate, additional information is to be provided. This additional information includes the following:
 - A description of the equipment purchased with proceeds of the tax, including, without limitation, any laptops, radios, firearms, holsters, and any other equipment for additional positions funded with the More Cops sales tax; and
 - For each academy, the expenditures from the proceeds of the tax must be disaggregated based on persons in the academy, persons who dropped out of the academy, new hires who completed the academy, and any equipment purchased for those officers.
2. The conceptual amendment brought forward by Assemblywoman Neal will also make it a crime to provide false or misleading information to the entity that is required to submit the report, or to knowingly include false or misleading information in the report. A person who commits this crime will be subject to the punishment for a category D felony, which provides for a term of imprisonment in state prison for 1 to 4 years and a fine of not more than \$5,000.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 443 with the changes in the conceptual amendment discussed in the work session document.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 443.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I really like the conceptual amendment. It goes very far to address concerns I have, but because of the problems we have had, I am not quite there yet to move forward to remove the sunset. If we had had an extension of the sunset for, say, ten years, I would be perfectly comfortable. I will vote yes to move it out of Committee but I may change my mind.

Chair Neal:

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Backus. I will close the work session on A.B. 443 and open the work session on Assembly Bill 445.

Assembly Bill 445: Revises provisions governing sales and use taxes. (BDR 32-797)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The next bill on today's work session is Assembly Bill 445. This bill was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Taxation and was heard in this Committee on April 4, 2019. Assembly Bill 445 requires a marketplace facilitator, defined as a person who directly or indirectly facilitates retail sales to customers in Nevada, to collect and remit sales and use taxes if the facilitator, in a calendar year or in the immediately preceding calendar year, had cumulative gross receipts from retail sales made to customers in Nevada, on its own behalf or on behalf of a marketplace seller, which exceeded \$100,000, or made or facilitated 200 or more separate retail sales transactions, on its own behalf or on behalf of a marketplace seller. The bill specifies that a marketplace facilitator is not required to collect and remit sales and use taxes if the facilitator has entered into a written agreement with a seller indicating that the seller assumes the responsibility to collect and remit the sales taxes on sales made by the seller through the marketplace facilitator.

The bill additionally requires a referrer, defined as a person who receives a fee in exchange for listing or advertising a product for a seller, but who does not collect money or other consideration from the customer, to collect and remit sales and use taxes if 200 or more retail sales to customers in Nevada result from referrals made by the referrer, or the cumulative gross receipts of sales resulting from such referrals exceed \$100,000 in a calendar year. The referrer is not required to collect and remit sales and use taxes if the referrer complies with certain notice requirements and makes a monthly report to the Department of Taxation containing specific information relating to those notice requirements.

There are a couple of amendments that are discussed on page 2 ([Exhibit E](#)) of the work session document. There are changes to section 6, subsections 4 and 5; and section 14, subsections 4 and 5, changing the word "seller" to "facilitator." The changes were made to keep both chapters consistent. There was also an amendment during the hearing that would move the effective date of the bill to October 1, 2019. I would be glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] I need to make a statement about this because this bill is eligible for exemption and is going to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means after it leaves this Committee. There are still discussions taking place with stakeholders and issues that need to be worked out with the potential amendments. I will accept a motion without recommendation and rerefer to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means so these conversations can continue. Are there any questions on that motion? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO REREFER ASSEMBLY BILL 445 TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will close the work session on A.B. 445 and open the work session on Assembly Bill 446.

Assembly Bill 446: Revises the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act. (BDR 18-1100)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The next bill on today's work session is Assembly Bill 446, which was heard in this Committee on April 9, 2019, and was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Taxation. As background, the Legislature, in Senate Bill 357 of the 77th Session, approved the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act, which allowed insurance companies to receive a credit against the tax imposed on insurance premiums in exchange for making a qualified equity investment in a community development entity, particularly those that are local and minority-owned. A community development entity that received such an investment was required to provide capital or equity investments in or loans to certain qualified low-income community businesses, and at least 30 percent of the total qualified equity investment amount must be provided to such businesses located in severely distressed census tracts.

The bill required the Department of Business and Industry to certify a total of \$200 million in qualified equity investments, and prohibited the certification of any single qualified equity investment of less than \$5 million or the certification of more than \$50 million in qualified equity investments to any single applicant, including all affiliates and partners of the applicant which are qualified community development entities. In exchange for making a qualified equity investment in a community development entity, insurance companies were entitled to receive a credit against the taxes imposed on insurance premiums in an amount equal to 58 percent of the total qualified equity investment that is certified by the Department of Business and Industry.

Assembly Bill 446 amends the provisions of the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act as follows:

- Allows a qualified community development entity to make a qualified low-income community investment jointly with one or more other qualified community development entities; and
- Specifies that businesses that receive certain economic development incentives from the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED), that are currently disqualified from becoming qualified active low-income community businesses, may become qualified by electing to waive the abatements provided by GOED.

There are several amendments to this bill that are discussed in the work session document beginning on page 2 ([Exhibit F](#)). The first set of amendments came from Advantage Capital Partners, and they proposed two changes as part of their amendment:

- In NRS 231A.230, they are proposing to increase the minimum threshold for certification by the Department of Business and Industry of a single qualified equity investment from \$5 million to \$20 million. There will be a change to that which I will discuss shortly.
- They are proposing to add language renewing the authority for the Department of Business and Industry to certify \$200 million in qualified equity investments. Additionally, this amendment would renew tax credits that could be awarded against the insurance premium tax under this program, in the amount of \$116 million.

The document submitted by Advantage Capital Partners additionally requested a section allowing the Department of Business and Industry to retain the application fee collected under this program. This amendment was withdrawn by Advantage Capital Partners, so it is referenced in the proposed amendment that they brought forward, but they ended up withdrawing that.

The second set of conceptual changes were submitted by Assemblywoman Neal:

- The first is to add language ensuring the credits earned under the federal New Markets Jobs Act and the state program can be stacked.
- Secondly, to add language allowing the Department of Business and Industry to set up refinancing plans for businesses receiving loans after a period of four years.

The document submitted by Assemblywoman Neal requested the addition of \$200 million in additional qualified equity investments, but that is also requested in the proposed amendments from Advantage Capital Partners, so those are identical.

Subsequent to the hearing there was another amendment submitted by Assemblywoman Neal specifying that with respect to that additional \$200 million in qualified equity investments that the Department of Business and Industry may certify under the proposed amendments, no tax credits could be taken against the insurance premium tax until the quarter beginning July 1, 2021, therefore pushing the fiscal effect off until fiscal year 2022.

That is all I have for what is in the work session document. I did make a note about a change to one of the amendments that was submitted by Advantage Capital Partners, with changing the minimum threshold from \$5 million to \$20 million. It has come to my attention from Assemblywoman Neal that the desire, instead of making that minimum threshold \$20 million, that it would actually become \$8 million under the amendments that are up for consideration by this body this afternoon. I would be glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 446, with all of the amendments discussed in the work session document, with the further change from the \$20 million to \$8 million discussed by Mr. Nakamoto.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 446.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN EDWARDS, HAFEN, AND
KRAMER VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Flores. I will close the work session on A.B. 446 and open the work session on Assembly Bill 447.

**Assembly Bill 447: Imposes a tax on the retail sale of certain digital products.
(BDR 32-1101)**

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The next bill on today's work session agenda is Assembly Bill 447. It was sponsored by this Committee and was heard on April 4, 2019. Assembly Bill 447 provides for the imposition of excise taxes on the retail sale or use of specified digital products, which includes digital audio works, digital audio-visual works, digital books, digital code, and other digital products, at a rate equal to the sales and use tax rate in the county where the specified digital product is purchased or used. The proceeds from the taxes are to be distributed in the same proportion and manner as the sales and use tax. There are no amendments to the bill. This one is pretty straightforward with respect to the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)), but I would be glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] The digital-goods bill is in the same boat as the marketplace facilitator bill. It is eligible for exemption and we are still working through issues brought up during the hearing and by stakeholders. These conversations will continue as the bill moves through the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. We want to keep the conversations going and work through the issues brought forward by the Committee and other interested parties. I will entertain a motion to rerefer without recommendation to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO REREFER ASSEMBLY BILL 447 TO THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will close the work session on A.B. 447 and open the work session on Assembly Bill 466.

Assembly Bill 466: Requires the creation of a pilot program to facilitate certain financial transactions relating to marijuana. (BDR 18-870)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The next bill on the work session today is Assembly Bill 466, which was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure and was heard in this Committee on April 2, 2019. Assembly Bill 466 requires the State Treasurer to create a pilot program for the establishment of one or more closed-loop payment-processing systems that enable marijuana establishments, medical marijuana establishments, consumers, and holders of registry identification cards or letters of approval to engage in financial transactions in a safe and efficient manner. The bill requires that at least one closed-loop payment-processing system established under the pilot program begin operating no later than July 1, 2020.

There are several amendments to the bill that are attached to the work session document, beginning on page 4 ([Exhibit H](#)). The first amendment was presented by Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno and State Treasurer Zach Conine at the hearing that would change the initial date by which the State Treasurer must provide a report to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau in section 1, subsection 6 of the bill. The amendment would change this date from on or before February 1, 2021, to on or before December 1, 2020.

There is a note on this particular amendment that there was an additional change to section 1, subsection 7 of the bill, changing the date by which a closed-loop system must be operating under the pilot program; however, this amendment was withdrawn at the time of the hearing by Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

There were three additional sets of amendments submitted after the hearing, beginning on page 6 ([Exhibit H](#)):

1. The first one was submitted by the Department of Taxation. Their amendment would clarify the role of the closed-loop system in section 1, subsection 3, relating to the collection of taxes through the system. As amended, the bill would remove the requirement that the system provide real-time tax collection and would instead require that the system provide a method allowing the state or a local government to collect tax revenue associated with a transaction made utilizing the closed-loop system.
2. The second amendment [page 7, ([Exhibit H](#))] submitted after the hearing was from the State Treasurer's Office, which suggested two changes to the bill:
 - The first one is the date change in section 1, subsection 6, that I previously described, which is an identical amendment to the change proposed by Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno and Treasurer Conine at the hearing.
 - The second change would be to add language to allow the State Treasurer, prior to establishing a closed-loop system, to determine the practicality of the pilot program, taking into account any federal laws or any other absence of the need for such a system. If the State Treasurer were to make such a finding, he or she would be required to submit for approval to the Legislative Commission a recommendation not to proceed in establishing the closed-loop system, as well as a report outlining the reasoning, including any impracticalities that exist in establishing the system under the program.
3. The last amendment can be found on page 9 ([Exhibit H](#)), and was submitted by Assemblywoman Neal. There are two particular changes in this amendment.
 - The first is that the State Treasurer would be required to present the plan and the vendor for the pilot program to the Interim Finance Committee, in addition to the periodic reports to the Legislature updating the progress of the pilot program that are already required in the bill. The Interim Finance Committee would be required to approve the plan and vendor before the State Treasurer could proceed with implementing the closed-loop system.
 - The second change has to do with respect to the collection of taxes through the pilot program. There would be provisions added imposing a penalty for misuse or release of confidential data by the vendor or another party.

I am glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

This is just for the record, for legislative intent. When we talk about presenting this program to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for approval before the State Treasurer could proceed, do we mean proceed with going forward with a selected vendor to the State Board of Examiners, or do we mean before they proceed with a request for proposals, or both? I was not sure.

Chair Neal:

I really just wanted them to present the plan to IFC so people knew what was intended going forward, if there was any process where they could go back and possibly check in, in the interim, to see how it was going. I wanted IFC to see the plan, not for it to be in the absence of the Legislature. It is a new concept. I think we should see the plan, have a discussion around that plan, and see who the vendors are, not the request for proposal, but at least know who the vendors are and what the potential ideas are that are being presented for the Legislature to consider, being that it will affect our Department of Taxation. Members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 466 with all the amendments discussed in the work session document except for the State Treasurer's amendment.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 466.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno. I will close the work session on A.B. 466 and open the work session on Assembly Bill 385.

Assembly Bill 385: Enacts the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Economic Development Act. (BDR S-865)

Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

The last bill on today's work session is Assembly Bill 385, which was sponsored by Assemblyman McCurdy and was heard in this Committee on April 9, 2019. As drafted, Assembly Bill 385 enacts the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Economic Development Act and creates the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Advisory Council, consisting of nine members. The Council is designed to advise and collaborate with certain governmental entities on projects and proposed projects to be located in the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community in Clark County and to coordinate with the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED) in an effort to recruit businesses engaged in an emerging industry to locate in the community.

Assembly Bill 385 additionally authorizes GOED to issue a total of \$38 million in transferable tax credits to qualifying businesses from emerging industries that locate within the boundaries of the community, that will assist in the development of the community's workforce, and that meet other requirements.

There are a couple of amendments to the bill. The first is the amendment brought forward by Assemblyman McCurdy at the hearing [pages 4 through 32, ([Exhibit I](#))], which was the proposed amendment he discussed and testified to with respect to the bill. There were a total of five significant changes made to the bill with respect to that amendment:

1. The definition of "business" in section 3 is deleted.
2. The definition of "emerging industry" in section 7 is expanded to include industries consistent with the State Plan for Economic Development that is required to be produced by GOED.
3. In section 11 of the bill, the following changes are made:
 - Subsection 1 is clarified to specify that only businesses in emerging industries located within the geographic boundaries of the community may apply for transferable tax credits.
 - The approval of the application must be consistent with the plan adopted by the community board and approved by the Economic Development Administration of the United States Department of Commerce.
 - The business must provide documentation showing that it will meet the minimum job, wage, and capital investment thresholds set forth by GOED in section 11.5.
 - The business must continue in operation for a period to be specified by GOED.
4. In section 11.5 there is language added to require GOED to establish regulations prescribing the minimum capital investment, jobs, and average hourly wages that must be met by qualifying businesses to become eligible for transferable tax credits. These regulations must also be approved by the Council created pursuant to section 9.
5. Section 13 is amended to require GOED to establish regulations specifying how tax credits may be awarded, based on the number of qualifying employees and/or the capital investment of the qualifying business. For the purposes of awarding the credits, the qualifying employees are those who are employed full-time, for an average of 30 hours per week, at the location of the business within the community, who are offered a plan of health insurance, meet the minimum wage thresholds established by GOED, and are employed for at least the last three consecutive months of the fiscal year.

The second amendment [page 33, ([Exhibit I](#))] to the bill is a conceptual amendment submitted by Assemblywoman Neal that would make three changes to the bill:

1. The first would be to delete the provisions of the bill in their entirety.
2. The second would be to amend Chapter 231 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), which governs GOED, to require the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Board, which was created pursuant to Senate Bill 352 of the 74th Session, and the Executive Director of GOED to collaborate and meet at least once per quarter to discuss ways to develop the economy within the community and its surrounding areas, projects that could be eligible to obtain incentives in the area, and other ways to encourage businesses to locate in the area.
3. The last change would be to authorize the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Board to recommend projects for incentives to be provided by GOED within existing resources available, and for legislative changes governing economic development incentives that would enable these incentives to be provided to businesses within the community and surrounding areas.

I am glad to answer any questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any questions?

Assemblywoman Backus:

Will the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Board be able to access—which I know is probably not the proper word to call them—the Faraday funds? Would that now no longer be applicable as originally intended?

Chair Neal:

They are still out there as authorized credits through GOED, unless some other piece of legislation changes that action. However, the way the bill is structured, it is within existing incentives that they can come to an agreement around the projects, or a single project, that will advance the economic interests of that area in development. I cannot say that it is a no, but they are authorized tax credits for a particular purpose. They may or may not be available, but not in the form of this bill, the original version of the bill, or the amended version. That is not anticipated. What is anticipated is that existing credits and incentives, they will work together to find a way to help with the economic development of this area, and the board will then have a stronger relationship to recommend projects for incentives. The Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor is onboard. They agree and understand that the intent of Assemblyman McCurdy is he wants development in this community and they will work to that effort to produce that.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I think the conceptual amendment by Assemblywoman Neal is the amendment we probably should proceed with. It looks like we are encouraging a spirit of collaboration, which I think is really important. I know in talking with the bill sponsor we are talking about the needs of communities that still have high unemployment rates despite what is happening with the rest of the economy in the state, and indeed, that is why we have established an office like GOED. I think this will help us target in on those communities that have been left behind in the economy, to help raise them up. With that intent, I think the second set of amendments is good.

Assemblyman Kramer:

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson said much of what I was going to say, so I will keep it short. Until a time when we have a list of criteria that we judge different zones—however you define that zone in Nevada—to allocate resources to them on a priority basis, I do not think we should be taking projects like Faraday and stripping it of one part of the asset and directing it to a particular area—until we have done that on a statewide basis. I think this is now done in different development authorities throughout the state. There are situations when a community will really need something for their area. This has been done before. What we are asking for in this case—with this particular segment and GOED—is not that unusual. It might be unusual for GOED, but it is not unusual for the different development authorities throughout the state. I also am in favor of your conceptual amendment and I think it is the right way to go.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I would like to echo the comments made by my colleagues. I do not think we should be prioritizing one area over any other area of the state without having some sort of definitive proof or data that shows that one area deserves more attention than another. I think we would be better off evaluating all areas that are currently underserved and trying to address it from that angle. Also, with regard to the tax credits, I believe those have been removed. Today I will be voting no on this.

Chair Neal:

Members, are there any additional comments? [There were none.] I do want to make one final comment around the conceptual amendment [page 33, ([Exhibit I](#))]. If you look at the third one, allowing for the board to work with GOED to create legislative changes meets some of the comments that have been brought up today, meaning that there is a prime opportunity for the sponsor of this bill to really develop criteria and incentives that would enable incentives to be provided to businesses within the SNEC [Southern Nevada Enterprise Community] area and surrounding areas. It came up during the hearing that people wanted this bill to extend to Bonanza. The surrounding area language takes care of that. He also wanted to have the capacity to collaborate and discuss projects, and I think, knowing and having numerous discussions with GOED, that they are in favor and they will keep their word in supporting Assemblyman McCurdy in his efforts. They will find a way to manifest his dream of economic development and sustainable economic development for his area. I just wanted to put that on the record.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I will be abstaining from this vote. The nonprofit business that employs me as its Executive Director is located in this area, so out of an abundance of caution I will be abstaining.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I am hearing Assemblyman Hafen's comments and Assemblyman Kramer's comments, and I think there is merit to them. We are not a city council, so when we talk about streets and parsing things out by streets, we know as a state legislature all of our law is applicable in general law. This law talks specifically in reference to Chapter 407, the Southern Nevada Enterprise Community Infrastructure Improvement Act that we put in place in 2007 [S.B. 352 of the 74th Session]. I did not know if there might be an appetite to consider we add the general language that the focus would be that GOED work with SNEC. It is important to prioritize our areas with high unemployment because it might have more of a general applicability statewide into some of the districts other members represent.

Chair Neal:

I would agree with you. The amendment I provided on this bill shifted the special and local act that was brought up in 2007 and because of that federal designation allowed a focus around one area. Once I shifted and created this amendment, it then made it statutory law. We can ask the bill sponsor to come to the table. High unemployment need is another factor that would not only potentially drive it to your area but also engage the rural areas that may find themselves in high unemployment data.

Assemblyman William McCurdy II, Assembly District No. 6:

I did have an opportunity to speak with Assemblyman Hafen and talk about the needs in his area. The goal for me, with bringing this legislation, is to address the problem that has been in existence for decades. While I am more than aware this is not just something that is an issue in my area, I am more than open to Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson's amendment. I think that is a good idea. My goal is if Assembly District No. 6 does well, the state does well, and if we can extend that to other areas of high unemployment, I believe that would ultimately help increase the productivity of the residents in our state. I think that is what we all want to get to. I am open to that and would urge your support. I am available for additional questions.

Chair Neal:

Members, do you have any additional questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 385 with the changes in the second conceptual amendment and the third conceptual amendment that was brought up by Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson, and that those changes be included in the proposed amendment. We will not include the changes to the bill that were submitted by Assemblyman McCurdy.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 385.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Kramer:

To recap, I see your conceptual amendment and what we are adding to that is GOED will be asked to have an emphasis on areas of the state that have high unemployment.

Chair Neal:

Correct.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I appreciate the amendment and therefore I will vote to get this out of Committee today, but would reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Chair Neal:

Is there any further discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman McCurdy. I will close the work session on A.B. 385 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 73.

[Assemblywoman Spiegel assumed the Chair.]

Assembly Bill 73: Provides for additional sources of funding for services and affordable housing for persons who are homeless or indigent. (BDR 32-461)

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 73, a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)). This original bill was the City of Las Vegas's bill. I am presenting A.B. 73. We have come to an agreement around what is good public policy for the state of Nevada.

The original bill focused on homelessness and trying to find new revenue streams in order to reduce homelessness and enable the city to be able to deal with problems that were in the core. The amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) creates a public policy statement that it is an urgent need to reduce homelessness in the state of Nevada; however, it cannot be done alone.

The idea is that the Legislature finds that counties and cities should work together in a shared and cooperative way around funding strategies because the problem is not isolated to a single city or unincorporated area. It is a social problem that affects all citizens of the state and therefore requires that entities work together and create regional strategies and potential funding sources for programs to reduce homelessness in Nevada. The public policy statement is there [1(a), ([Exhibit J](#))] because I strongly believe we are not going to make a dent in reducing homelessness. We will probably never cure it, but we can reduce it by working together, with all entities coming together to solve this problem.

Under 1(b) in the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)), it establishes that the governing body of the county and the governing body of each incorporated city in the county must create a working group that consists of members appointed by each governing body and other groups that address homelessness. The working group appointed by the governing bodies, in conjunction with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) designated Continuum of Care (CoC), must consider strategies to reduce homelessness in the county and look for additional funding sources for programs to reduce homelessness in the county.

Under 1(c) ([Exhibit J](#)), it says that not later than one year after the creation of the working group, the working group must prepare recommendations for strategies to reduce homelessness and for the potential additional funding sources to implement those strategies. The recommendations must be submitted to the governing body of the county and the governing body of each incorporated city. The governing bodies must hold a public hearing on the recommendations and may accept, modify, or reject the recommendations. If the governing body intends to reject the recommendations, the governing body must set forth its reasons for rejecting the recommendations.

I felt this was a good public policy move around homelessness, and I will apologize on the record for taking over the City of Las Vegas's bill. I really wanted to move a different policy forward. I thank them for agreeing to work with me on this change. I will open myself up for any questions.

Assemblyman Kramer:

In looking at this bill, to begin with I did not even know it was for Clark County. I just did not see how I could support the way it was written. Instead of asking for the money and then making a plan, you have put together the plan first which goes in with what money it takes to get there. That seems like a step in the right direction and the right way to proceed on something like this. Therefore, I am a yes vote on this.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Is this going to be in competition with any other working groups in Clark County that are trying to tackle this issue?

Assemblywoman Neal:

The Committee should be aware of the Nevada Interagency Council on Homelessness. It is the idea that [Assembly Bill 73](#) is the companion piece to Assemblyman Thompson's bill, [Assembly Bill 174](#), which works in conjunction with the regional strategies he is trying to move. This bill is trying to move the funding strategies because his bill did not speak to that. They will work together. I am not seeking to duplicate. I am trying to strengthen another measure by having the funding piece brought in so there is at least conversation and collaboration around the funding that will go with the strategies.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I want to ensure we get intent on the record. It would be a collaboration of the county and the cities within the county, correct? Who do you imagine being the lead and who would host it? Would it be the county, using their facilities, starting off chairing and initiating, their staff pulling it together, or would you leave that for them to decide? Sometimes cities and counties do not always agree.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I am hoping that when the counties and cities come to the table, they can address that. I know it was mentioned that the county might want to take that lead, but I do think that is a discussion point for them. We had lots of discussion, but I would like them to address that and state that on the record. I do want to make mention that even with this language there was the anticipated concept if there were other state agencies such as the Department of Health and Human Services that had money, they might be able to cover services that may be covered under Medicaid that cross over with the homeless population, that that entity would also like to participate. This does not exclude those individuals from being able to participate and ensure there is a braided funding strategy around this. I will let them say who will take the lead, if they have decided, but I can tell you the county considered it.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

I was trying to get a sense of what this would mean for the average Nevadan. Do you have a sense of what the average assessed value on a home is, so we could figure out what kind of impact this would be on the homeowners who would be paying for this?

Assemblywoman Neal:

The real estate transfer tax amendment is no longer in the bill.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

How is this calculated?

Assemblywoman Neal:

How will the funding be developed?

Vice Chair Spiegel:

Correct. And how can we figure out what the impact would be for our constituents?

Assemblywoman Neal:

The cities and counties have come to an agreement that they will identify sources that are shared between them—grants, federal dollars, or other things that they can use—in order to make this work. Most of the time I held onto this bill was about what is the revenue source, where is it going to come from, and who has it. We are now at a place where we will deeply think about and identify the sources. I will let the entities speak to what they have agreed on because this conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) represents an agreement. Hopefully you have lots of questions for the entities.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I have questions for the entities as well. I think what you are getting at is that it is not that the entities are not trying, but it is about braiding and leveraging dollars to enhance what might be happening. Within county services you have the indigent services or adult services that kind of land there, but a lot of times we have seen cities kind of tackle homelessness, and they are working just in silos and not necessarily together. Something I saw pleasantly happen in Washoe County was different entities coming together and saying we are going to braid our systems and our efforts, and shift things around a bit because we have realized if you have a pot of money and you fold some nonprofits in, then really cool stuff can start to happen. Yes to the state playing a role in that because the state has some kind of resource that can enhance and help, then that is useful too. I understand what you are driving towards—bringing everyone together to see how they can leverage funds.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will open the hearing for testimony in support of A.B. 73.

Shani J. Coleman, Deputy Director, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas:

I want to thank Assemblywoman Neal for her leadership in bringing the southern region entities together to work on this bill. Homelessness is an issue that each of our respective entities deals with on a daily basis. Currently there are approximately 6,500 homeless people in the southern Nevada region. Sixty-seven percent of those people are living out on the street and, unfortunately, those numbers are climbing.

The homeless people, like many southern Nevadans, easily flow between the many jurisdictions in the south. Homelessness has no boundaries and has an impact on all of the entities within southern Nevada. We agree with Assemblywoman Neal, that the most effective way to address this issue is for us to work together to develop a regional strategy.

While some of the southern entities already work together regularly communicating around homelessness, A.B. 73 as amended will formally establish a framework for the regional approach by providing high-level guidelines of when and how we work together. The City of Las Vegas supports this bill as amended. We look forward to working with our regional partners on the homelessness issue. I am happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

How do you imagine this looking for the City of North Las Vegas and the participation?

Shani Coleman:

I think the goal is for all of us to get in a room, identify the many challenges that are occurring regionally, and identify a strategy that best addresses those challenges. Once we are able to identify that strategy, we need to try to figure out what funding is needed to implement those strategies and then look at different revenue sources to do that. It could be federal dollars—community development block grants—the city and a number of the entities already use some

of that. There may be new grants. There may also be an opportunity, which Assemblywoman Neal spoke about, to identify and create a new revenue stream. The bill originally looked at creating new revenue streams. There were two in there. We are open and flexible in looking for opportunities to address the issue.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

At some point, after you talk about what kind of collaboration could work, the real point of this is if there could be leverage among the entities among funds. If some folks are getting federal dollars and others have some general fund dollars either from the city or county flowing in, I imagine at some point there will be a discussion on memorandums of understanding about how those could potentially work together, or am I making an incorrect assumption? I did not know if that was already happening or if it is starting to trend in that direction.

Shani Coleman:

Yes, we have had some conversations around this already. The City of Las Vegas and Clark County have had communication. I think this just formalizes that. So to your question, yes, we are moving in that direction.

Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, Finance Department, City of Henderson:

The City of Henderson is supportive of the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) for A.B. 73 and we thank Assemblywoman Neal for working with us on this all the way up until this afternoon. We look forward to being part of the working group and, hopefully, this will lead to some solutions to a problem that affects all communities in southern Nevada.

As far as the four entities sitting here working together, we have done that many times. We have worked on several regional-type projects such as Southern Nevada Strong. We have worked together on things in the business license area. I think we will be able to sit down and decide who is going to lead the effort—what facilities we will use as far as meetings. That is something we do quite regularly.

Brian McAnallen, representing City of North Las Vegas:

I want to echo the other comments that have been made about Assemblywoman Neal and her pulling this together, working with the City of Las Vegas, which used a bill draft request to bring this issue to the forefront. Having worked there in the past, I know this has been a problem and a concern for the City of Las Vegas for many years. Mr. Cathcart mentioned the collaborations we have had in the past that have been very successful, and I think that model is something our cities and our county will look to, to get us there.

Part of the challenge with homelessness is there is no silver bullet to this problem. There is no one solution that will work. It is going to require a number of solutions and all of us moving in the right direction. Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson was on the right track in trying to understand how each one of us may leverage a different piece to get to the solution, and I think we are all interested in being part of that. As we may have been dealing with this on a daily basis, through either law enforcement mechanisms or code enforcement, it has been kind of siloed, and I think that is exactly what Assemblywoman Neal is trying to help us break down

and get to. It is also a funding problem, so for us to identify those resources and try as a community to leverage the federal dollars, that is very difficult. I think our community is ripe for being able to draw that support down.

I want to put on the record that our delegation is extremely interested in helping resolve this and would be an equal partner in getting us there. I think the one entity that we have not driven home—and I think we would be remiss if we did not—is the nonprofit sectors that are operating down in what we would call the "corridor of hope" right now, entities that are dealing with this on an hourly basis. Just to name one, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada, they have to be an equal partner there as well. I would suggest that our final piece is working with all of you, as the Legislature—that other partner in resolving this issue. So as we huddle over the next year and a half before the interim and try to come up with some solutions, I know we will be back in front of you looking for help and support.

Alex Ortiz, Assistant Director, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:

I am in support of A.B. 73 as amended. We want to thank the sponsor, the City of Las Vegas, Assemblywoman Neal, and the others involved in including us in this discussion and having us participate in the development of this amendment ([Exhibit J](#)).

First of all, I concur with all the comments that have been made before me here, and I do not want to reiterate some of those because you have heard them already, but we did consider to be in the lead. As part of our Department of Social Services, we do take that as part of our responsibility. We have been working on this issue for a long time and, therefore, we may probably be in a good position to take the lead. We will work with the working group and, as this develops, continue to determine who would take the lead, and, moving forward, what we need to all do to work together.

One of the things I do want to mention is that in southern Nevada there is the Southern Nevada Homeless Continuum of Care Board. It is a group that is responsible for overseeing the Help Hope Home plan, which is southern Nevada's plan to end homelessness. This is a group that works together. It is a group of local government community providers, faith-based organizations, local businesses, and other committed individuals to help recognize and address the issues of homelessness. I think the working group we are establishing through A.B. 73 will be able to work together with that group also, and hopefully we can get to a point where homelessness is reduced as much as it can be, hopefully to zero, but we will definitely strive to get there.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

I have been getting numerous calls from my constituents about increased homelessness in the Clark County part of my district. It seems like it just keeps getting larger and larger as a problem. I am very encouraged that the county and municipalities are going to be working together to try to eliminate homelessness. I would say something that would probably be

helpful for the group to be thinking about are ways to prevent homelessness. I know a number of us have constituents who are so constrained financially that they are one emergency away from becoming homeless themselves. I encourage your working together and looking for solutions. I also appreciate Assemblywoman Neal bringing this forward.

Wes Henderson, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:

Those of you who have been here for a few years know we do not normally weigh in on measures that only apply to some of our members, but homelessness is a critical issue, not only statewide but nationwide. We appreciate the creation of this new collaborative effort to develop solutions that hopefully in the future can be exported to incorporated cities in other counties to help reduce homelessness across the state. We thank Assemblywoman Neal for the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) and we are fully in support.

Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department is here in support.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wishes to testify in support of [A.B. 73](#)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in opposition of [A.B. 73](#)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify neutral on [A.B. 73](#)?

Emily Paulsen, Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am disappointed to see the amendment that has been put forth ([Exhibit J](#)). I think it is a huge missed opportunity. Homelessness in our state is a humanitarian crisis and we know what solutions there are. We have a statewide strategic plan. We have a regional plan that was referenced—the Help Hope Home regional plan. Our cities and county work together, and most important, our homeless service agencies are already braiding funding resources. The problem is not that they do not know how to do that. The problem is that there are not enough resources to meet the demand. I just want to go on the record that we are really disappointed today in the amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) that has been put forth. We would have fully supported the bill as it existed prior.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

Your testimony did not really sound very neutral. Do you want to clarify your position, or what makes you neutral about this?

Emily Paulsen:

I am not comfortable opposing the amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) and do not support it either. That is why I feel it is appropriate to be neutral.

Felipe A. Silva, Organizer, Make the Road Nevada, North Las Vegas, Nevada:

Just like Ms. Paulsen, I would like to declare that we are neutral on A.B. 73. It is fair to mention that a couple of people who showed up today were not aware of the amendment, so there were a couple of people who signed in in support and I just wanted to state our neutrality on the bill.

Arash Ghafoori, Executive Director, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am up here in neutral because the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)) is really new, so we have to reflect on it. Although I do not disagree with Assemblywoman Neal and others who think that our different jurisdictions and municipalities, and specifically counties and cities, need to be thinking of new approaches to further our work, I want to stress that we have already been working together. We have already been developing plans. We have been refining plans—the county, the city, and others—already working. They sit together on the CoC. Although I think we could put more attention and create even new pathways and avenues to keep discussing this and driving strategies, I would be remiss if I did not mention the fact that the issue of homelessness is in a dire state throughout our state. It is a crisis. It is an epidemic. As Ms. Paulsen said, it is also a humanitarian crisis. So while we are exploring ways to further engage between the different entities, cities, and geographies within our state, we need to be bringing more resources to the table now. As this bill was originally proposed, it would do exactly that. We do not have many more resources to go around and braid, leverage, et cetera. Creating a new stream would allow more conversations to occur because there are very promising strategies and emerging practices that are clearly outlined in many different plans at a regional level, all the way to the state level. However, the fact is quite simply that there is a significant gap around dedicated resources to combat this issue effectively. We, as a state, are reacting to homelessness. We need to start being proactive about it, and that involves bringing more resources to bear around this issue. As A.B. 73 was originally proposed, it could have done that. Although I am not opposed to having conversations, I do not think the conversations should be at the sacrifice of bringing more resources to bear now because there are people, including homeless youth, who are suffering on the streets today.

Vice Chair Spiegel:

Are there any questions from the Committee members? [There were none.] Do we have anyone else who wishes to testify neutral on A.B. 73? [There was no one.] Assemblywoman Neal, would you like to give closing remarks?

Assemblywoman Neal:

I understand the individuals who spoke in neutral, and that this is a new amendment. I understand that there is a need to find funding sources. However, I feel this bill strengthens the ability to find it—in a cohesive way and cooperative way—to strategize to reduce homelessness. The provisions that were in the original bill had a lot of angst, and for the record, the original bill had sewer surcharges and a real estate transfer tax. The reason it

could not go forward in the way it was written is the real estate transfer tax triggered a CTX [consolidated tax distribution] implication, which in terms of tax policy and policy for the state was not a good mechanism. There was consternation and lack of agreement around that mechanism.

We applaud the City of Las Vegas for being brave to find the sources and taking that lead. Because they took that lead in finding those sources, we were able to have a conversation about how entities could move together to work around common funding strategies. The reason why the sewer surcharge was not a workable piece in the bill, although people believed that it is something we can increase upon individuals and will not have any kind of burden or nexus, is because there were entities who, if it had become a charge they could put into effect because it had enabling language for all jurisdictions, it would have potentially increased sewer rates that were already on the high end for certain entities. So there was a reason why I did not agree with those particular provisions in the bill.

I understand that there is a great need, but I also feel this is also a great opportunity. It is a great opportunity to break down silos. There is a great opportunity to break down silos that may exist within nonprofits, and you may disagree with that statement. I have seen the plans. There have been many plans. What I do know is that a consistent, constant effort of all entities working together has not happened. You may have worked together for five years, but fell off for three. Now we are at a space where we want to move the needle to work together in a cohesive way, around a strategy that deals with the funding everyone can agree on, or at least come to the table with what they can leverage in all facets, not just charges and fees but federal money, grants, and other additional resources and other parties.

That is my closing statement. I hope you will have some faith and believe that there may be a potential great opportunity that arises from this because you will actually see cohesion, which is a good thing.

[Assemblywoman Neal reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Neal:

The rules have been suspended [Rule No. 57, subsection 4, of the Assembly Standing Rules]. We may have another bill to hear tomorrow but we are going to work session A.B. 73 as amended with the conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)). Does the Committee have any questions?

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I wanted to acknowledge the comments made from southern Nevada that they felt a level of frustration. The bill as introduced was problematic. Those types of taxes are problematic. It probably was not going to happen, so I think the amendment language is good. I do think it is meaningful to have in statute the mandate that there has to be that collaboration so entities cannot walk away. You will have a tool now in statute that says they have to be at the table. I do hope that is meaningful.

Chair Neal:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 73.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 73.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will do the floor statement. I will close the hearing on A.B. 73. Is there anyone here for public comment, in Las Vegas or Carson City? [There was no one.] We are adjourned [at 5:43 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Gina Hall
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 400](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 443](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 445](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 446](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 447](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 466](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 385](#), dated April 11, 2019, presented by Michael Nakamoto, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 73](#), presented by Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Assembly District No. 7.