

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

**Eighty-Second Session  
May 18, 2023**

The Committee on Revenue was called to order by Chair Shea Backus at 4:24 p.m. on Thursday, May 18, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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/82nd2023](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Chair  
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant  
Assemblyman Ken Gray  
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II  
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca  
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblyman David Orentlicher  
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Nick Christie, Committee Manager  
Gina Hall, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1151



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Nevada Health and Bioscience Corporation  
Ryan Smith, Director, Economic and Urban Development, City of Las Vegas  
Constance J. Brooks, Vice President, Office of Government and Community  
Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County  
Amber Stidham, Senior Vice President, Chief Strategy Officer, Las Vegas Global  
Economic Alliance

**Chair Backus:**

[Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] As everyone is present right now but throughout the evening we may have members who need to leave for meetings, while we have a quorum we will work session Senate Bill 29 and Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint). After we hear Assembly Bill 490, depending on when people make it up to the meeting, we will work session Senate Bill 181. It is that time of the year when we have to be a little flexible. I will open the work session on S.B. 29 and turn it over to Ms. Powers.

**Senate Bill 29: Revises provisions related to refunds of overpayments of taxes.  
(BDR 32-216)**

**Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

The work session document [[Exhibit C](#)] for Senate Bill 29 is available to the public on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. Senate Bill 29 was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development on behalf of the Department of Taxation. This bill was heard by this Committee on May 2, 2023.

Senate Bill 29 revises provisions governing refunds and interest to be paid on refunds by the Department of Taxation to taxpayers, establishing that no interest on refunds is to be paid by the Department of Taxation to a taxpayer on any tax which was overcollected by the taxpayer in which the taxpayer is required to refund to the person from whom it was collected. There were no amendments proposed to this bill.

**Chair Backus:**

Do the Committee members have any questions regarding the work session document? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 29.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CONSIDINE MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 29.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN 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 Considine. I will close the work session on S.B. 29 and open the work session on Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint). I will turn it over to Ms. Powers.

**Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint): Requires certain new or expanding businesses to provide certain family and medical leave to employees in order to qualify for a partial abatement of certain taxes. (BDR 32-680)**

**Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

The work session document [[Exhibit D](#)] for Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint) is available to the public on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs. This bill was heard by this Committee on May 9, 2023.

Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint) establishes that certain abatements of taxes for new and expanding businesses, which will have 50 or more full-time employees on the payroll of the business in Nevada by the eighth calendar quarter following the calendar quarter in which the abatement becomes effective, can only be approved by the Governor's Office of Economic Development if the applying business provides at least 12 weeks of family and medical leave at a rate of at least 55 percent of the regular wage of an employee who has been employed by the business for at least one year.

Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint) also provides that if the business applying for a certain abatement of taxes has a policy for paid family and medical leave for employees on its payroll in a location outside of Nevada, employees on the payroll of the business in Nevada will be eligible for the same policy provisions for paid family and medical leave or for the provisions detailed above, whichever is greater, at the time an employee seeks paid family and medical leave. There were no amendments proposed to this bill.

**Chair Backus:**

Are there any questions on the work session document? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 429 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Hafen:**

In reviewing the bill and the testimony that was provided, I found a lot of the questions went unanswered, and some of the information and testimony may have been misleading and/or inaccurate, so I will not be supporting this.

**Assemblyman Gray:**

I, too, will not be supporting this. It goes beyond what the federal requirements are and there is no expiration date on it. It extends beyond the expiration of the federal family and medical leave requirements.

**Chair Backus:**

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN GALLANT, GRAY, HAFEN,  
AND O'NEILL VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Nguyen. I will close the work session on S.B. 429 (R1). We are going to take a short recess. We are in recess [at 4:31 p.m.].

[Meeting reconvened at 4:47 p.m.] I will call the Assembly Committee on Revenue back to order. I will open the work session on Senate Bill 181 and turn it over to Ms. Powers.

**Senate Bill 181: Revises provisions relating to economic development. (BDR 18-683)**

**Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

The work session document [[Exhibit E](#)] for Senate Bill 181 is available to the public on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. Senate Bill 181 was sponsored by Senator Pazina. This bill was heard by this Committee on May 4, 2023.

Senate Bill 181 increases the maximum threshold for the projected value of a partial tax abatement to a single entity which the Executive Director may approve on behalf of the Governor's Office of Economic Development from \$250,000 to \$500,000. There were no amendments proposed to this bill.

**Chair Backus:**

Are there any questions regarding the work session document? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 181.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 181.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GALLANT SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUMMERS-  
ARMSTRONG VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Mosca. We will take another quick recess until Assemblyman Yeager is able to get here. We are in recess [at 4:49 p.m.].

[Meeting reconvened at 4:55 p.m.] I will call the Assembly Committee on Revenue back to order. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 490.

**Assembly Bill 490: Authorizes the establishment of academic medical districts.  
(BDR 22-586)**

**Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:**

With me at the table is Mr. Warren Hardy. He is going to do the bulk of the presentation this afternoon. You have in front of you Assembly Bill 490. My apologies that it took a while to get this draft right, and that is why it is coming to the Committee so late. As you can see by the description in the summary, it authorizes the establishment of academic medical districts in the state. Before I hand it over to Mr. Hardy, I will say this is still definitely a work in progress. I believe the bill came out sometime last week, so there are a lot of folks here in the audience that we are still working with to try to get this to a place where everyone feels comfortable. I think there are still some concerns out there, but I did not want to give up the opportunity to have a hearing and get things moving on the bill. I appreciate everyone who is here and has worked hard on trying to get this to this place. We do not have an amendment for this Committee yet, so we will talk about the bill as drafted and perhaps some of the concerns you will hear today. I will hand it over to Mr. Hardy.

**Warren B. Hardy II, representing Nevada Health and Bioscience Corporation:**

I want to thank Assemblyman Yeager for bringing this bill forward. Most of you are aware of what I call a little miracle happening at the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine down in Las Vegas, with everything that is happening there. It has really been a remarkable thing that has happened over the course of the last few years. My client, the Nevada Health and Bioscience Corporation (NHBC), made up of philanthropists, business owners, folks with visions to make medical care better in southern Nevada, and Mr. Kerkorian, whose foundation provided most of the financing for this, along with others, had a vision for that. Mr. Kerkorian promised the employees of the MGM that he was going to fix the medical challenges we have in southern Nevada, and the NHBC is working hard to make that happen. Along with the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, we are undertaking a mental and physical health building on the same campus, built largely with donor money, but also money from the state that Governor Sisolak authorized. Governor Sisolak also asked us to build the pathology lab—Southern Nevada Pathology Lab—on that campus, so we are working on that as well. We have recently begun the process of getting involved in developing a mental health campus that will take on the mental health challenges we have in Nevada.

This is exciting to us. Maureen Schaffer, our chief executive officer, was not able to be here tonight but is with us in spirit. I am hoping any moment Ryan Smith, the economic development director for the City of Las Vegas, appears on Zoom because he is my phone a friend.

What we are doing here in southern Nevada, and in Nevada because the bill contemplates the ability to do this anywhere in the state, is not new. The successes of academic medical districts are well documented. Places like the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

[UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine], Johns Hopkins University [Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine], Boston Medical [Boston University Chobanian & Avedisian School of Medicine], Penn Medical [University of Pennsylvania], Mayo Clinic, and others operate under this model. I would like to show a quick video [\[Exhibit F\]](#) that shows the difference between a medical hospital and a medical district. [A video was shown].

I would submit that there is not a state in the union that does not employ this method in some way, whether it is through an academic medical district or some other mechanism, to intersect these three things. What is happening on the campus of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine right now has drawn national and international attention. There are individuals who are looking to come. The success of that, in one project, we put Las Vegas on the map. We have created a culture of philanthropy there that we want to build on—we need to build on. We need to simply get in the game when it comes to this. Again, I cannot identify a state that is considered to have a top tier medical provider that does not have this process in some way, shape, or form.

The other thing that is interesting to note is every economic development agency I am aware of in the state of Nevada, and probably anywhere in the country, has medical health care as a top priority, yet interestingly enough we have zero tools in our toolbox to address this—to help us go out and attract the types of businesses we are trying to attract. We are trying to ask our economic professionals to do this using Medicaid reimbursements and licensure. That is like having two arms tied behind your back to attract these types of businesses. It is time that we look at this.

Assembly Bill 490 is the first step in that direction, so we do appreciate it coming forward. In reality, our incentive packages in Nevada and our economic development effort at the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED) and elsewhere are geared towards creating jobs and creating exports, geared towards manufacturing jobs. That is appropriate, that is fine, and that is a wonderful mission, but at some point we have got to turn our attention to some incentives for research and development. This bill does not do that, but that should be the next thing we look at. If it is worthwhile to provide the kinds of incentives that this bill provides for business and other things in order to create medical jobs, we ought to at least consider having a package that creates better health outcomes for Nevadans. That is what this bill will do. As I have said before, we have done this with data centers, aviation centers, and others where we have gone and specifically designed individual, unique packages to attract these types of businesses. I believe it is time we do that in the area of mental and physical health, to be able to create these types of incentives. These things all make sense.

What this bill does is allows what is defined as a participating entity to set up an academic medical district, which allows for a tax increment district in the area designated. A lot of the language in the bill ties directly back to the same scheme as a redevelopment area. The second thing it does is it creates a new set of incentives or tax abatements that would be specific to this. Currently under our scheme we do not allow tax abatements on medical equipment. This would allow for certain businesses to have a tax abatement on

medical equipment. The second abatement that is available is the payroll tax—a payroll tax abatement for certain individuals working within the tax increment district. It is important to note that in order to qualify for these you have to be in a very specific business. If I could refer you to section 31, subsection 1 of the bill, with regard to the abatements, "An owner of a business that provides health care or conducts scientific research," those are the only types of businesses that are eligible for the abatements. They have to be in that type of business. This is not for the donut shop, the car wash, and not for McDonald's. Only those involved in this type of activity are eligible for the abatements. The second thing it does is sets up a program for tax increment financing (TIF) that is very specific to the objectives of the board. I believe section 12 sets up the requirements to have a tax district, "Subject to the requirements set forth in this section . . . medical district may be created only in a contiguous area that includes: (a) An academic medical center," which would be the medical school by prior definition; and (b) "A full-service nonprofit hospital with not less than 200 inpatient beds; and (c) At least 50 acres of land," and it has to be contiguous. We are currently working with the county on an amendment to make it clear that the hospital that would qualify for this is University Medical Center (UMC) because we want some residency requirements to be in there, in terms of our medical students.

That is what will be set up, and it is important to know because there was some concern that this board might have powers without having elected officials on the board. That is not the intent. This board will be made up of members appointed by the participating agencies. There is a provision in the bill, currently in section 16 [section 16, subsection 3, paragraphs (a) and (b)] that says the following individuals are not eligible for appointment. Two of those include the elected official from a government entity and an employee of a participating entity. We are proposing to remove those because we do want elected officials on this board. We certainly want people like the directors of UMC and others to be eligible for this.

The important thing to note is, this is not getting around the elected boards. The elected boards are the ones that have to set up the district, that have to make the appointments, and we are talking to the county and others about additional language to make sure that all local governments that are impacted by the tax increment financing district, in particular, have input. It sets up all of the parameters that are typical for redevelopment agencies. It sets up all the parameters that are typical for tax abatements, which is what the majority of the bill is. That is the bill in a nutshell. I will be happy to stand for any questions and have Mr. Smith in Las Vegas to help because tax abatements are not in my wheelhouse.

**Chair Backus:**

Does Mr. Smith have anything to add?

**Ryan Smith, Director, Economic and Urban Development, City of Las Vegas:**

I think you did a great job, Mr. Hardy.

**Chair Backus:**

I will open this up for questions from the Committee.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

I am glad that you have someone on the line from the City of Las Vegas because when I began to read this bill, the first thing that concerned me was section 14, subsection 3, that authorizes a participating entity to amend an ordinance creating a tax increment area pursuant to this section, and in section 14, subsection 3, paragraph (a) it says, "Modify the project by specifying new projects or removing or modifying projects specified in the original ordinance." I could be reading this wrong, but I represent a portion of historic West Las Vegas that about four years ago received the designation for a tax increment financing district—not all of historic West Las Vegas, but a portion of it—and I am concerned that if we have limited areas that can be designated under federal law, could that possibly remove an existing tax increment financing district like historic West Las Vegas, which has not had an opportunity to realize redevelopment yet. Could you remove the designation from that area and then apply it here?

**Warren Hardy:**

Nothing in that section, as I read it, would permit this board that is created for the purpose of the academic medical district to be able to remove any area out of another redevelopment area. I guess technically the governing body or agency could make a decision to do that, but the process by which this is all created requires very robust public input, at least three public hearings, for the creation of the district, and there would be ample opportunity to address that concern. In terms of the question about whether this board, based on that language, can eliminate tax increment districts from another redevelopment district, the answer is no. Mr. Smith.

**Ryan Smith:**

I would agree with that. The intent of this is to create this special district, not to impact the regional development authority (RDA) in totality, if the district were to be created with an RDA, but essentially function as a way to harness that increment within that specific area and then reinvest in that specific area, but again not affecting the total scope of what I would refer to as more like a super TIF of the full RDA.

**Warren Hardy:**

I am trying to find it, but there is a provision in here that that is one of the findings the local government has to make—that it will not impact another effort like that.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

Mr. Smith, do you know if there is a limit on how many areas in a particular community can have this tax increment, or the designation that the previous administration put in place? There were areas that were designated under that, but I know it was limited. There were carve-outs. There were some areas in Reno and some areas down south. It appeared that there was a limit. That is what I am getting at, how that could possibly put our community's designation at risk, not from this board but the federal limits?



**Ryan Smith:**

I am not totally sure. I think in this particular instance it would be looked at as basically this body is allowed to do a TIF within a redevelopment area. It is really not designating a new RDA or anything like that. It is really focusing on a very specific area that has to meet all those requirements. In reality, to have a nonprofit hospital with 200 inpatient beds, to have a medical school or a doctor of osteopathic medicine school, and then to have another ancillary educational component with at least 50 contiguous acres, really limits the ability to do this, I would say anywhere. It is challenging requirements. Really the goal, as Mr. Hardy mentioned, in how these areas develop over the landscape of the United States is to cluster services where you get the academic medicine, the hospital, the clinical service, and the research and development all colocated together, which really enhances care. In southern Nevada's case, at least in the vision for this bill, being able to provide that environment with really the anchors we already had in the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine and UMC as the nonprofit public hospital, I think gives us a really competitive advantage to get some of the services we may be lacking here, but I do not think it has any effect, to my knowledge, on the ability to be constrained in terms of the number of RDAs or tax increment areas in the state.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

I have some questions on the tax increment area as well. On page 4 it lists that it must include an academic medical center, full-service nonprofit hospital, and at least 50 acres of land [section 12]. If we are talking about the area where UMC is, I am trying to visualize at least 50 acres. Considering it is a tax increment district, you would have to have entities in there that are paying that additional tax. Do you have an idea how big 50 acres is? Does that mean it crosses the street into the neighborhood or into businesses? Do you know how big that is and what is enveloped into that area, which will be paying the tax increment?

**Warren Hardy:**

I will allow Mr. Smith to speak to the acreage, but I would indicate that this is the creation of the medical district. There is not a requirement that all of the acreage, or land in the medical district, is part of the tax increment financing. The tax increment financing can be less than the 50 acres, just where that is trying to designate, so I would not look at that and say this is going to be a 50-acre tax increment district. It could be, but the bill allows for smaller increment districts.

**Ryan Smith:**

I think you hit it. Just to put it into context, the City of Las Vegas has a medical district already, which is roughly 200 acres. I think most of the intent of this bill is to identify that academic medical district, codify that through ordinance via the municipality, and then be able to use the tools within this bill. If a business locates somewhere within that 50 to 200 acres, they could be eligible for the incentive if they meet the other requirements of this bill. If there were a project where the board wanted to use tax increment financing, it could pull the power of the tax increment from the district to potentially finance that project. That would then go to the local municipal board for approval because now you are talking about potentially using debt, other than if you were to use that tax increment for some type of

project that is outlined in this bill. Those buckets of money, any increment, would still just be going to the local jurisdiction or the state's buckets. It would only be if there was a specific project within that district that met these requirements that this board decided they wanted to use tax increment financing for, and then again it would have to be approved by the local municipality.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

I have another question, and then you can maybe clarify the way I understand it. The way I understand it is you have a regular tax base and then to pay off any annual repayments on the principal, interest, and bonds that you have to pay off, there would be an additional tax on top of that, and that additional tax in that area would be used to pay off the bonds and all of that within 30 years. I am on page 7 of the bill. I am trying to read this and put this all together.

**Ryan Smith:**

That is typically how it works. Let us say there was a project that needed a source of debt financing, essentially through this approval process that project could get tax increment financing, which you would bond against. Any future tax base that is growing because of that project or others within this district, you use that increment to pay off the bonds over a 30-year period. Again, you are bonding against the future revenue, new taxes come in, the project gets built, taxes keep going up, it takes that baseline assessment, it takes the delta between the new value and the baseline value, and it uses that increment to pay off the debt over a 20- or 30-year period, and this you can bond up to 30 years on a tax increment financing project.

**Warren Hardy:**

There is an important distinction here. It is not a new tax. Tax increment financing, under the scheme we have in statute, which this follows, you establish a baseline of what the tax is there currently. That remains whole. That is held harmless. The new increment, or the delta as Mr. Smith indicated, is what goes, so we are not increasing taxes, it is not a new tax, and it is not a different tax. It is new taxes that are created because of the property being located on the redevelopment site. The current value is held harmless. It is the delta, or the increment, that goes towards paying off the other securities and other mechanisms.

**Assemblywoman Considine:**

That is what I am trying to get set in my mind. The way I am reading this you have 30 years. I do not know if you have to reverse engineer the amount of debt you are going to have, and then figure out how the taxes are going to be paid within those 30 years. Going back to my first question, who is paying that additional? You said there are only the medical health and the research centers, or is it everyone within that area, any business above the baseline, that would be attributable to that growth area? I know it is not necessarily new tax, but for the business that would have to pay that extra tax, that is what I am trying to figure out how that works.

**Warren Hardy:**

I am going to ask Mr. Smith to listen carefully to what I say in case I get it wrong. The way this is set up and the thing that makes it so effective is it is very narrow. It is not every business within the tax increment district, which is what happens in most tax increment districts. You are just trying to revitalize the area. This is not a traditional effort. What we are doing here is not the traditional economic development. That is going to be a by-product of it, but our attempt here is to create incentives to improve health care outcomes for folks. This is only businesses. The only people who can avail themselves to the tax increment credit are those that are receiving the credit and it is that tax that is calculated as the delta, so they are the ones who will pay the bonds. Did I get that right, Mr. Smith?

**Ryan Smith:**

Yes, I think so. Like you mentioned, nobody is paying any extra tax. It is usually very site specific. Normally you get one specific project that meets these requirements and that is a piece of their financing. Most of all the tax increment financing portion of this bill would be for some type of new facility. Most of these districts will either be ground-up development or redevelopment projects. Basically, this is a mechanism to deliver some of that lab space. Why would anybody build lab space if they are in partnership with the university if there were no incentives. That is where we are trying to get to.

It is very site specific. There are no new taxes. It is only the increment, and it goes back into financing a piece of the capital stack of the development of these new facilities.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

I am trying to understand the language in section 16, the makeup of the governing board. I am confused on the requirements. In section 16, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) and (b) it says they have to be appointed by a county or city, and at the same time in section 16, subsection 3, paragraphs (a) and (b) an elected official or an employee are not eligible, but in section 16, subsection 2 it says you must work or reside within the boundary of the participating entity. To me this excludes who can really be appointed. I just want to get clarity in terms of if the county and the city has the appointing power, but it cannot be an elected official and you cannot work for the participating entity, who is eligible?

**Warren Hardy:**

As I indicated earlier, that provision that prohibits an elected official of the government entity or an employee of a participating entity is coming out. I am not sure why they included the language to say they have to live in the supporting or qualifying entity, so if the City of Las Vegas is doing it they have to reside in the City of Las Vegas. I personally feel like that limits it somewhat, if we are really trying to just attract talent we need to be able to do these things. To be honest with you, I am not sure why that was included, but we intend to amend the other restrictions out as it is far too limiting in terms of attracting the type of folks we want to attract.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

It would be great if we could clear that up because I think they cancel each other out and there is a lot of confusion there. I appreciate your saying earlier that this is not a traditional project. This is really something out of the box. This is something that we want to elevate in terms of creating this medical district, in terms of bringing exciting innovation into Nevada.

In section 31, subsection 2, paragraphs (c) and (d) I am a little concerned about the wording. Maybe this is the intent as a base, but having no retail businesses, no fast-food chains, and no entry-level businesses; and the term "average hourly wage" paid by the state, as well as an option for health insurance plan coverage, I do not know if we are going far enough with the intention. If we are going to use taxpayers' dollars and we want to raise the standard of this district, I think we should set the bar a little higher in terms of averages, or just giving an option for health insurance.

**Warren Hardy:**

That is an excellent point. To my knowledge, that language was specifically taken out of current statute, with regard to tax abatements. The intent is the wage that will be demanded by these individuals is far higher than is required. It is significantly higher. These are high-paying professional jobs. Much of that section was taken out of the statute with regard to tax abatements.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

We modernize and evolve our statutes every two years. Hopefully I can work with you in terms of really raising this bar, because if we are going to have the investments into these projects, we should let folks know we are looking for more than average.

**Chair Backus:**

We are going to return back to page 7, under section 14 that we were covering. To clear it up, Mr. Nakamoto did reach out to our Legal staff to try to get a better understanding. I will turn it over to him.

**Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:**

Actually, the friend I phoned was not our Legal staff, but nonetheless I did phone a friend because sometimes Legislative Counsel Bureau staff has to do that as well. The way that tax increment areas work, just in general, and the way this bill is structured, is that there is kind of a baseline that is set with respect to the assessed value of the parcels in the district, and this is all property in the district, both real and personal. That is where you are set as a baseline in terms of the value. You would assess that as you would any other property. The taxes are paid based on that.

As there is development, businesses move in, and you have established this district, the intent of this is that the assessed value will grow. The incremental revenue that is generated from that assessed value, that grows as this district grows, that is the revenue that would then be

used for the financing of the project. It is all the parcels and all the property within the district. It is not limited to any particular parcels or property within the district. The way it is drafted is everything would be included.

**Chair Backus:**

Thank you for that.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

You had said initially that this could be utilized in any of the facilities across the state. The way I read it, Renown Regional Medical Center is separated by a couple of miles from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) School of Medicine. When you say contiguous, nobody would qualify for this opportunity except the UNLV Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine and the UMC in Las Vegas. Is that correct?

**Warren Hardy:**

Because of the contiguous language, I believe that is correct. We reached out to some of your colleagues who represent the Reno area and offered if there was a desire to use this right away we would make adjustments. I also spoke to the folks from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) about this. Our intent is to try to have an instrument available statewide, so if we need to make adjustments to accommodate that, we are more than happy to do it. We think this is a scheme and a process that works marvelously well for the state.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I truly like the idea. When you talked to the UNR School of Medicine and Renown Regional Medical Center, did they want you to change the language? It would be best to change it now instead of waiting until next session, or two sessions down the road, and trying to change statute then.

**Warren Hardy:**

In fairness, I did talk to some legislators from northern Nevada. There did not seem to be an indication they wanted to do it. They wanted to see how this worked and then maybe come back. I just spoke with the folks from NSHE about it tonight and made that offer this evening, so I have not heard back from them.

**Ryan Smith:**

I believe the intent behind the original language was so that Renown Regional Medical Center and UNR School of Medicine could qualify. In the contiguous acres, when the local jurisdiction establishes the district, the district itself must be contiguous, meaning you cannot have five acres in one area, have a gap of five miles or 10 acres, and then do another district and say these are together. I think the intent is when the municipality establishes the district, UNR School of Medicine and Renown Regional Medical Center do not have to touch. There can be properties in between, and all of that would be captured within the district, in the case that a business were to locate and meet the requirements, they could get the incentive, or if there were a specific project that was decided by the board and approved by the local government to use tax increment financing, all of that tax that was just explained could go

towards paying the indebtedness of that bond. I do not know if that is the exact wording that came out, but the intent is even though they are not touching each other, just the district itself that is created has to be a contiguous assemblage of properties.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I appreciate that, but knowing the geography of Reno, the hospital to the medical school, that would be one very large district, with a lot of other sundry businesses that would not be attached to any medical facility. To me contiguous means they all have to be basically touching. I was just bringing that up because I really do like it, and I appreciate this bill.

The UNLV Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine is owned by the state, or is part of the state funding system, and the University Medical Center is a county-owned hospital, is it not? All of this is within the City of Las Vegas. When we are talking about taxing, et cetera, I do not see the county being brought into the conversation here. I can see some disruption and arguments. Do one of you want to take a swing at that?

**Warren Hardy:**

With regard to your first point, I am not a bill drafter, but we are wide open and anxious to make any changes that will make it clear that this can be utilized in northern Nevada or anywhere in the state that can meet the requirement. That was our intent. Secondly, those are exactly the conversations we are having with Clark County right now, with regard to making sure they are informed and they know, because this project would be in Las Vegas. It is also in Clark County. They could certainly do the district as well. We are in conversations with them and have committed to making sure we adopt language that makes them comfortable with regard to notification. We do not want to set up a scenario where one government entity can veto another one on this, but we certainly want to have transparency, which is why it has such a robust public hearing process. We want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity, and as far as notification, consultation with other potentially impacted districts or government agencies, it is fully our intent to put anything we need to into the statute. The issue you brought up is currently an issue with redevelopment districts as well. This will be no different than a redevelopment area in that regard. I am not saying that does not need to be fixed. I am saying that needs to be addressed more globally than just what we are doing with the medical district.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I appreciate that. Please continue the conversation, and if I can be of any assistance please let me know. As I said, I think it is a great opportunity and one that I really would like to expand out. I would even like to talk to you about Carson Tahoe Regional Medical Center here on some of it.

**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

I think any time we talk about tax abatements we really have an opportunity to help our community and our state. In section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (b) it says to provide

employment opportunities for Nevadans. I was wondering what the intent is to really help our community and make sure those in our state have the opportunity to take advantage of these new jobs and are trained up and ready for it?

**Warren Hardy:**

I was not too involved in the drafting of this bill. I came along late in the game. To be brutally honest, had I been involved in the drafting I would not have put as much emphasis on jobs and diversifying the economy as has been put in here. I think that is an attempt to make this fit into what we traditionally do in the space of economic development. My focus would have been on section 10, subsection 1, paragraphs (c) and (d), that we are increasing patient access to clinical trials and improving the health outcomes for our citizens. That, in my mind, is just as worthy an objective as bringing jobs and exporting products out of Nevada. We do believe it will bring high-paying jobs. We do believe it will elevate our community in terms of economic development and in terms of diversification, because the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine is on the cusp of being on the worldwide map in medical education and health. I would submit to you that that is almost peripheral to what this really does, and the good this will really do. That is dramatically, as we see in every instance that uses these academic medical districts, increasing the health outcomes for people, bringing clinical trials, bringing those things to Nevada so we do not have to go to UCLA, we do not have to go to the University of Michigan, but bringing those types of things to Nevada. I do not know if that is directly enough to the question regarding jobs, but I hate for that to be the intent or the focus.

**Assemblywoman Mosca:**

I hope we can focus on making sure we are closing disproportionality and gaps, and really helping the community who needs it the most.

**Warren Hardy:**

You hit a key word, "closing gaps." That is really what this legislation is attempting to do in this regard. It is different. It is a different model than what we currently have, and what it allows and what it provides is tax increment districts. It provides tax abatements which generally are not used together, but it combines those things in this area, which is significant, and it creates a scenario where we will be able to lead the nation in what we are able to offer these businesses to come to Las Vegas and bring the jobs, but the real thing we are trying to bring is the innovation in medicine and the opportunities that presents for patients in Nevada.

**Assemblyman Orentlicher:**

I love the idea of an academic medical center, but I just want to get a better sense of your thinking. I would not have conceptualized it this way if I were doing an academic medical center. One aspect of that is in section 31, subsection 1. If I were doing an academic medical center I would not think of for-profit providers of health care. To me it seems inconsistent with the idea of an academic medical center having for-profit providers of health care. Scientific research is different because so much of that is for-profit, and I understand that.

Why are we encouraging for-profit providers of health care, because they have a checkered history compared to not-for-profits? Why do we really need to give these financial incentives? I would think if I were interested in doing scientific research and I could be next to a medical school, I do not need anything more than that. We are not competing with a limited number of potential businesses, like with a football team or baseball team, where there are a small number. There are an infinite number of companies that could spring up in scientific research and medical research, and we have the great resource in the medical school. Do we really need this?

**Warren Hardy:**

With regard to the for-profit, I will come back to Mr. Smith. I think we do not want to limit it. There is a lot of research and development, and other things, that is for-profit. With regard to your second question, it is the point, but we are competing with UCLA. We are competing with Johns Hopkins. We are competing with University of Southern California (USC), with Boston University, and with the University of Michigan. Yes. There is a strong desirability, which is brand new by the way, for individuals to come and associate themselves with the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine. They also have equal opportunities to associate themselves with Johns Hopkins, Mayo Clinic, and others that have these structures and these types of incentives in place.

Really, we are getting in the game. We are not competing, although compared to all those states, we lag significantly in investment that comes. It is not pretty. Yes, we could give it some time and see if just the draw of the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine is enough. So far it has been, and we have been approached, but this puts us in the ballpark to compete with the likes of USC, UCLA, and those other institutions overnight. It is a great question, but this is cutting the line, I think, and putting us on par, so now they do not have anything else. If it comes down to the Las Vegas Medical School District and being associated with Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine or participating with Johns Hopkins, it makes all things equal.

**Assemblyman Orentlicher:**

Are you saying then if they go to Baltimore to be near Johns Hopkins, Maryland would offer similar incentives, or if they went to Los Angeles to be near UCLA, California would offer similar incentives? Are we just matching what incentives are out there, or are we doing more than what they would get?

**Warren Hardy:**

Unfortunately, I am not sure we are even matching, because we lack research and development incentives. Again, if I had written this, it would have included research and development. We are not entirely matching them, but we are getting in the game. Again, it is a reality that people across the country, across the world, are wanting to associate themselves with the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, and this makes all things equal.



**Ryan Smith:**

I have done a lot of research in terms of what other states offer and yes, we are 1 of 14 states that do not have a research and development tax credit. They will immediately get those if they go to Arizona and Utah. Arizona and Utah also abate all of these taxes normally, on any type of this equipment, and the for-profit aspect is very important because these facilities cost a lot of money—the testing and lab equipment cost a lot of money. On the clinical side, how do we close some of these gaps and some of the services we do not have in the state. This is really a multipronged approach because a lot of it has to do with other issues we have like Medicaid reimbursements, how we keep doctors, how licenses transfer, and all of that. I believe this is a key piece and yes, if they go to any of these other states, they would not pay any taxes on any of the equipment they purchase. They will also get a research and development tax credit, plus I will mention, as part of our research into this bill, Nevada ranks forty-fifth in NIH [National Institutes of Health] funding. To put that in perspective. I think we had roughly \$45 million in 2021. Arizona had \$330 million and Utah had around \$270 million. Those are federal funds coming in for research. We have a lot of work to do, but I think this bill addresses a lot of those things that can help us be extremely competitive with the growing Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine and all the new doctors and researchers we have here.

**Assemblyman Gray:**

There are a lot of things to like about this bill. You just listed off a number of the institutions I had been looking at, some public and some private, but one thing I notice about all these, and the ones I have physically seen, is not only do they attract the high-end paying jobs, they also bring that whole area up with them. They will be bringing everything from service industry jobs to research and development jobs. Whatever the shift on the abatement will be made up in other areas, economies of scale. You will have more hotels, so more room tax revenue. Things along those lines. Correct me if I am wrong, but I think that will happen as this grows, and I would love to see us be in that class with a lot of these institutions, and this addresses two things, economic development, as well as better health care in Nevada. This might be one of my favorite bills so far this session.

**Warren Hardy:**

If I may, I want to make a point, because I think that speaks to Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong's point and Assemblywoman Mosca's point. These incentives are not available to other businesses, like hotels, restaurants, and movie theaters, because those things are going to come. Just the incentive of being next to this development is enough to draw them without incentives. That is why the incentives are focused on getting those people. This is very much an "if you build it, they will come" scenario.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I will stick with the theme we were talking about with Penn, USC, Johns Hopkins, and other places that have the medical districts. Do you know how long their medical districts have been in place and if they have the 30-year limit, the way ours would be?

**Warren Hardy:**

I do not, but perhaps Mr. Smith knows.

**Ryan Smith:**

The 30-year term is really just if we have to use bonding to finance a project. Through the ordinance I think these districts can maintain themselves for a long period of time, and the incentives can too. I am not 100 percent sure if there is sunset language of the abatements per se for the businesses in this law, but I think they may be renewed every 30 years, but in practicality they would continue on in perpetuity. Hopefully, as Mr. Hardy mentioned, we bring some more resources to the table to again just propel this over periods of time—and it takes a long time. I know that places like Grand Rapids, Michigan, I am actually from there, and that started with one hospital. I was a young child. I watched it grow. The University of Michigan came, Michigan State came, Grand Valley State University came, Michigan State Open and Innovation Lab came, they built another hospital, there were more philanthropic dollars, and now it has created a really robust center that people do travel to receive medical care, and frankly all the residents of the surrounding area go to as well to receive care. I know these things take a long time to develop. The 30 years on the bonding is just the debt requirement, and the incentives could be renewed over a period of time.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

On page 19, section 31, subsection 7, paragraph (b)—the clawback section. Can you talk more about how that would work and what possible need there would be for a clawback? How would that come into play?

**Warren Hardy:**

I am going to defer that to Mr. Smith.

**Ryan Smith:**

Traditionally, in GOED and abatements, companies have to commit to those wage requirements and the capital investment requirements. An audit is done every two and five years to make sure that those businesses actually invested that money, hired those people, paid those wages, had their health insurance, and in fact if they were ever to go through the audit the Department of Taxation does and it is found that they did not meet one of those requirements, essentially the Department of Taxation would claw back the value of the incentive to that business. That has happened in this state historically, so that language was just lifted off of the current GOED tax abatements and implemented in this same scenario of if you are going to apply and receive an abatement, you have to meet the requirements and we are going to test you every two to five years to make sure you did.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I do not remember seeing the audit information in the bill itself, but is that covered under something else and I am just not connecting, because you said it is something GOED does anyway, so it does not need to be in the bill?

**Ryan Smith:**

We will double-check that.

**Chair Backus:**

We can have our Fiscal staff answer that.

**Michael Nakamoto:**

It is the changes to section 32 of the bill, on page 20, that gives the Department of Taxation the authority to conduct the periodic audits that are already in existence for these provisions in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 360.755.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I am trying to look at this in the traditional sense of the abatements, but then also remembering that it is being done a little bit differently. My first question has to do with section 31, subsection 1, lines 34 and 35, where there is language around intending to locate or expand such a business. Is this a possibility of current businesses moving into this area, and unfortunately leaving businesses that have helped their other communities? I am going to be completely candid with this. This is directly related to what has happened in Sparks, where we had some bonds that happened and then we had nine stores move. Could this happen as well, where we have research facilities that have worked very closely with their communities and have been wonderful, and then all of a sudden they are going to move to this area because there is a new tax break for them?

**Warren Hardy:**

As I read section 31, subsection 1, the tax abatement is available to new businesses that moved to the district, as well as those that expand within the district. Obviously, that is the abatement portion of the bill, so if they do leave there is no more abatement. I will allow Mr. Smith to add to that, but it would allow both scenarios.

**Ryan Smith:**

I think the intent is not to incentivize a current successful business from leaving one area to another, and even if they were to relocate into this area, because they saw a benefit of being close to UNLV, or being close to UMC, or receiving this incentive, this incentive is really just for new purchases. That company would have to buy all new things and pay all new taxes to receive that. To Mr. Hardy's point, essentially anybody that met these requirements of the jobs, the wages, the cap ex [capital expenditures] that has to do with health care services or clinical research, would be eligible for this incentive, whether they are relocating from another community, another state, starting something new, or expanding within the district.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

Thank you for that clarification as that does have me concerned. I would love it if instead it was businesses that are currently not in our state or not in those county areas, but I understand that is a conversation for another day.

My second question has to do with section 31, subsection 2, paragraph (c), where there is discussion about the average hourly rate. Again, that will be paid by the businesses to employees. I believe that is pretty much a standard language item, but I want to make sure that during this time we are not going to see these companies also appear on the list of Medicaid providers—that the intent is that these individuals will be paying the people that work for them more than what they would actually need to be able to qualify for Medicaid. Is that correct?

**Warren Hardy:**

That is not really a concern for us because of the limitation about the type of businesses we are talking about. We are not talking about the donut shop. We are talking about medical researchers—people who work in the medical field. That is standard language that is in the abatement statutes. We are going to fly by that as far as wage is concerned without any problem. We would be happy to talk about adjustments. I know Assemblyman Nguyen had a similar concern, but we just do not think that is an issue. These are going to be very high-paying jobs.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I appreciate what you are saying about this being the standard language. I believe this is also standard language, on top of page 17, lines 2 and 3, where the Office of Economic Development "shall" approve. There is no wiggle room, if I am understanding this correctly. If all of this information is being stated and will be followed, the Office of Economic Development does not have any wiggle room, and neither does the Legislature. Am I accurate in that assessment based upon the word "shall," or has there been discussion of changing that to "may?"

**Warren Hardy:**

What I will tell you is we are in robust conversations with the Governor's Office of Economic Development about their role in this. There has been some conversation about having a dual approval process, to where this group, this organization, this board makes a recommendation, vets the applicant, then makes recommendations to GOED. I do not want to speak for them, but one of the things GOED expressed to me is whether they have the expertise to know if this is the type of business we are trying to attract. Those conversations are ongoing, and I will make sure as I have those conversations your comments are considered.

**Ryan Smith:**

I think that part of this, and maybe we could get an opinion here, is even though it says the word "shall," typically the process is GOED reviews the application, approves the application, and then brings it to the GOED Board for final approval, which they take a vote on and it has to pass with a majority to actually have that business receive the incentive. I do not know if this is just GOED itself administratively has to say it meets the requirements, and then it goes to the Board, or if they are the final say.

**Chair Backus:**

With that, we will take testimony in support. Is there anyone in Carson City who wishes to give testimony in support of A.B. 490?

**Constance J. Brooks, Vice President, Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:**

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas supports the concept of an academic medical district within the City of Las Vegas, Clark County, and the area surrounding the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine and the University Medical Center. We recognize that the bill requires further modifications, and we look forward to working with Assemblyman Yeager and our partners within the proposed medical district to ensure the district functions properly for all of its key stakeholders.

In particular, we support any amendments that would allow for our sister institution, UNR, to benefit through their affiliation with Renown Regional Medical Center. Thank you Assemblyman O'Neill for posing the question. As public entities, we are all committed to the goal of improving and expanding access to health care for the residents of Nevada, which we believe A.B. 490 will help achieve. We are grateful for Assemblyman Yeager and his commitment towards improving the status of health care and health care outcomes throughout our state.

The Dean of the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, Dr. Marc Kahn, was on the phone waiting to testify and speak on the benefits of A.B. 490 to our School of Medicine. Unfortunately, he had to leave to another appointment, but he looks forward to how this bill is further developed and would like to voice his support at the next opportunity.

**Chair Backus:**

We will move to the phone lines. Is there anyone on the phone lines who wishes to provide testimony in support of A.B. 490? [There was no one.] We will now take testimony in opposition. Is there anyone in Carson City who wishes to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 490?

**Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County:**

I am here, really under the rules, opposed just because we are working with Assemblyman Yeager and Mr. Hardy on further amendments to this bill. We saw this when it dropped, and this is something we have been working diligently on but have been wanting to work with the City of Las Vegas, Assemblyman Yeager, and Mr. Hardy. We are very supportive, like UNLV, with the concept of the academic medical district right adjacent to the Clark County building, because UMC is located in that district. We want to thank Mr. Hardy for making it clear that he intends to include UMC. We are working on a definition to make that clear because they are very committed to partnering with the medical school as a teaching hospital in the state with the largest number of residency slots.

The issue we are struggling with is the one identified by Assemblyman O'Neill, that UMC, located in the district, which is in the city, is a creature of the county, and that comes with some complications in that we have to look at the powers of this board. We are not opposed to tax increment funding. I just want to put that on the record. What we are struggling with is maybe a few guardrails that we would like to put into place, especially if we are contemplating multiple districts across our region, that may be something that we would want to do. There are some precedents previous legislatures have put in place with regard to tourism improvement districts, which does have a system of communication back and forth when the entity, such as the City of Las Vegas, was about to adopt the ordinance. There would be some time and they would give their draft recommendations for why this is a benefit to the county, then we could have our own independent hearing at the county on the potential impact to local government services as it is in the tourism improvement district, and potential and long-term indebtedness or fiscal impact to the county. That is one thing we are looking at. We are in discussions with Mr. Hardy about that, and the purpose is really to ensure we can look at the long-term indebtedness of the county.

We did have some concerns about the language Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong identified about the board, and we are going to take a look at that because the board is allowed to issue local government securities and they were unelected. I know that is not the intent, so we are working on that with some conversations with the county.

We are worried, as we are in these waning days of the legislative session, and I think about the long-term impacts and some of our General Fund, property tax does fund regional services in addition to city services depending on the taxing district in which you are located, so we would like to take a look at that.

This is our commitment to work with the city. We did work with them earlier this session on another bill, which proposed tax increment funding, and ended up in a neutral space working with them on similar guardrails. I have committed to Assemblyman Yeager that we will do that, in the short time we have left, and we will come back with an amendment, hopefully that we can propose to this Committee. Once again, I would like to say we are very supportive of growing the academic medical district in this area. We will report back.

**Chair Backus:**

We are going to go back to the phone lines. Before we take testimony in opposition, we have been notified there was a caller in support of A.B. 490. We will go ahead and take that call, if the person is still on the phone line wanting to give testimony in support to A.B. 490.

**Amber Stidham, Senior Vice President, Chief Strategy Officer, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance:**

As proposed, we believe this enables us to move closer to bridging academics of innovation. We really think it can bolster education and research, attract new diverse and innovative health care services to our state, and create highly skilled jobs. We would like to see there be

an emphasis on increasing the number of jobs that are created through these individual project opportunities, but in general we love these conversations and we encourage your support.

**Chair Backus:**

Is there anyone else we missed on the phone lines wishing to give testimony in support of A.B. 490? [There was no one.] Are there any callers on the phone lines wishing to give testimony in opposition to A.B. 490? [There was no one.] We will now go to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to give testimony neutral to A.B. 490? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines wishing to give testimony neutral to A.B. 490? [There was no one.] I will invite the bill sponsors back to give closing remarks.

**Warren Hardy:**

Thank you, Assemblyman Yeager, for the opportunity to be associated with this measure, to be able to be a copresenter, and to the Committee for your thoughtful questions. It is obvious you all understand this issue, you understand the importance of it, and you understand how to ask the correct questions. I will close by saying tax increment districts, tax increment financing, and abatements are used regularly in this state for economic development to attract restaurants, to attract tire shops, to attract donut shops, and to attract manufacturing. I will just submit that it is time, in Nevada, that we use that tool to dramatically increase medical outcomes for our citizens. I appreciate your considering this opportunity to do just that.

**Chair Backus:**

With that, I will close the hearing on A.B. 490. I will open the hearing for public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to give public comment this evening? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines wishing to give public comment this evening? [There was no one.] This closes our meeting, and we are adjourned [at 6:12 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Gina Hall  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 29, dated May 18, 2023, submitted and presented by Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint), dated May 18, 2023, submitted and presented by Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 181, dated May 18, 2023, submitted and presented by Susanna Powers, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is a video titled "What is an Academic Medical Center?", dated November 10, 2015, submitted and presented by Warren B. Hardy II, representing Nevada Health and Bioscience Corporation.