

MINUTES OF THE  
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE  
ON TAXATION

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION  
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE  
February 5, 1981

The Senate Committee on Taxation was called to order by Chairman Keith Ashworth at 2:05 p.m., Thursday, February 5, 1981, in Room 213 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Keith Ashworth, Chairman  
Senator Norman D. Glaser, Vice Chairman  
Senator Don Ashworth  
Senator Virgil M. Getto  
Senator James N. Kosinski  
Senator William J. Raggio

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Floyd R. Lamb

GUEST LEGISLATOR:

Senator Sue Wagner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ed Shorr, Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Colleen Crum, Committee Secretary

SENATE BILL NO. 15

Senator Wagner stated that she was not speaking on Senate Bill No. 15, but she wanted the committee to know that she had requested a bill similar to Senate Bill No. 15. Her bill, which has not been released by the bill drafter's office, stipulates different threshold level criteria. The threshold level criteria she has proposed is based upon an increase in each of the income categories by an amount approximately equivalent to the increase in social security benefits since the 1979 legislative session. This would prevent those persons

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

receiving social security from moving into a smaller rebate bracket or from becoming ineligible for the program because of an increase in their social security benefits.

The threshold criteria Senator Wagner has proposed are as follows:

<u>Income Range</u>	<u>Percent Tax</u>
\$0 - 3,699	90
3,700 - 6,199	75
6,200 - 8,699	50
8,700 - 12,399	25
12,400 - 13,700	10

Senator Wagner stated that the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau indicated to her that this proposal would not require a major increase in appropriation. Many elderly people have not applied for the program and all of the money funded in the last biennium has not been used.

She stated she has proposed this legislation for the purposes of affecting some change to help the elderly and to provide a rational explanation as to why the threshold level criteria was selected.

Senator Glaser indicated that he was amenable to amending Senate Bill No. 15. He introduced the bill because he felt something must be done to help the senior citizen. He presented for study a similar bill, Assembly Bill No. 97. (See Exhibit C.)

SENATE BILL NO. 16

Senator Glaser explained that Senate Bill No. 16 resulted from a problem encountered by the tax assessor and county commissioners in Elko County. People who own mobile homes and slide-in campers are moving into Elko County from other states where they have paid the yearly personal property tax on these items. This bill proposes to give a credit of one-twelfth the tax due for every calendar month the taxes have been paid in another state.

Senate Taxation Committee  
February 5, 1981

The chairman asked for an explanation on the tax. Mr. Ed Shorr, Deputy Fiscal Analyst, explained that there is a different method of valuing mobile homes than stick homes. The price established for the mobile home is depreciated over time like an automobile.

Senator Getto asked why the fiscal impact of Senate Bill No. 16 would be greatest in Churchill County. Mr. Shorr stated the figures used in the fiscal note were based on a poll of each county assessor. The assessors were not questioned as to how they determined the figures.

Senator Don Ashworth stated he was interpreting that the credit would be based on one-twelfth of the amount of the tax paid in another state. Mr. Shorr said he interpreted the language as saying that one-twelfth of the Nevada tax would be the rate of credit, not one-twelfth of the former state's tax.

Senator Getto indicated he didn't feel the bill clearly stated that the credit was based on Nevada's tax rate. The chairman suggested amending the bill to clarify the question.

Senator Kosinski questioned whether the movement of mobile homes across the state's lines would be affected by the proposal to cut property taxes and increase sales taxes. Senator Glaser stated that he felt it would accelerate the number of mobile homes moved from another state into Nevada. It would be advantageous for people moving to Nevada to bring their old mobile homes with them rather than have to purchase one in Nevada and pay an increased sales tax.

Senator Kosinski said he was very concerned that this bill would encourage Nevada residents to purchase their mobile homes out of state to escape paying a higher sales tax.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4 AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6

The chairman stated both bills would be considered together because they deal with the same subject.

Mr. Orvis Reil, representing the NRTA/AARP, read from a prepared statement which detailed the increase assessment valua-

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

tion when a residential property was rezoned to commercial property, even though that property was actually being put to residential use. (See Exhibit D.) He supported allowing the legislature to classify residential property differently from other types of property.

Senator Raggio questioned whether there should be a provision to allow for the recapturing of property tax similar to what was done in the Green Belt amendment. He explained property may become more valuable because of zoning. If the classification and valuation didn't consider this situation, a person would have the advantage of paying a lower tax as well as profiting greatly when the property was sold at a higher rate.

Senator Getto stated that speculators would be aided in this situation. They could put property to residential use and pay lower taxes when their actual intentions for the property were purely speculative.

Mr. Ernest Newton, representing the Nevada Taxpayers Association, stated he was opposed to any proposal to classify land for tax purposes. Classification would create a political problem because every type of user would ask the legislature for a different classification. Other states which classify property for taxation purposes have been plagued by demands for additional classifications. For example, Arizona has 41 classifications while Montana has 19.

Mr. Newton said the present statutes deal with the problem Mr. Reil mentioned. NRS 361.227 instructs the assessor to determine value in accordance with the value of the property for the use to which it was actually put during the fiscal year of assessment. There is nothing in the statutes about making assessments on the basis of zoning.

Senator Raggio asked how an unimproved lot would be assessed. Mr. Newton stated that NRS 361.227 provides for the separate assessment of the land and the improvement on the land. The land is assessed at its market value, based on a per foot value, regardless of its use. The improvements are to be valued by the price at which the property was sold to the present

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

owner, or comparable sales in the vicinity, or the value of the property for the use to which it was actually put during the fiscal year of assessment.

Mr. Newton pointed out that if the state replaces the property tax burden with a sales tax burden, property taxes would be reduced to the extent where there would be no need for classifications. He presented statistics which showed the impact of the proposed property tax reforms on each county. (See Exhibit F.)

Senator Raggio agreed that the proposed tax reforms may negate the necessity for classification at the present time. He noted that classification may be required in the future. Starting the constitutional process now would enable the legislature to be prepared if classification is required at a later date.

Senator Raggio asked Mr. Newton which measure he would prefer if he was forced to choose between the two. Mr. Newton stated he would prefer Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 with the deletion of the words on line six, "in one or more classes." He felt residential property should have only one classification, regardless of the type of residential property. He stated the question, "Is an apartment house a residential or commercial property?" would have to be addressed. If an apartment is not classified as residential property, the renter will not benefit from the law.

The chairman stated that one or more classifications would be needed to solve this problem.

Mr. Newton said he would prefer the use of frank, outright grants to aid people rather than alteration of tax statutes. Getting away from equal and uniform methods of taxation to accomplish socially or politically desirable purposes creates a tax situation which is neither equitable nor adequate.

Mr. Newton explained that the tax bill is made up of two elements--the assessed valuation and the tax rate. A general increase in assessed valuation should have a corresponding impact on the reduction of the tax rate to the point where the total tax revenue does not exceed the rate of inflation.

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

Mr. Bill Cozart, representing the Nevada Association of Realtors, stated that the association opposes both bills because the classification process will not provide fair and equal taxation. He stated the association feels Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 is the lesser of two evils because property could be classified for assessment purposes into commercial, industrial, vacant land and residential. He stated that these bills address the symptom, not the cause, of the problem. The problem is in the assessing process.

The chairman stated that people whose property is zoned commercial have the ability to recapture their increased taxes through the sale of their products or the return on their building. The residential property owner cannot recapture the increased taxes. That is the real problem facing the State of Nevada.

Senator Getto questioned the methods used by assessors in determining the fair market value. The chairman stated a bill has been introduced which would change the assessment methods.

Mr. Ray Knisley, private citizen, stated he agreed that classifying property would be a dangerous precedent. He disagreed with the proposal to strike the clause "one or more classes" in Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 because it would force classifying income residential and home residential properties in the same class. Deleting the clause would also block the proposal to adopt a homestead exemption.

Mr. Knisley also pointed out that he felt Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 strikes out the Green Belt provision. The chairman stated the Green Belt Provision didn't need to be included in this bill because it was already written into the constitution.

Mr. Shorr explained that the statutory law applies to the Green Belt provision, but Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 would take out the specific classification of green belt. The general classification provided by law would remain. Senator Raggio observed the difference would be that the right would no longer exist to compel the retroactive assessment of green belt lands.

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

Mr. John Eck, representing the Southern Pacific Transportation Company, opposed both bills. He stated that classification of property represents a form of discrimination to railroad companies. He urged the committee to explore the pitfalls and ramifications of classification.

Mr. Chuck King, representing Central Telephone Company of Southern Nevada, stated that the company opposes legislation providing separate classification. The main concern is that utilities and businesses will suffer from a higher rate of taxation to make up for revenues lost from residential taxation. He also noted that the utilities would pass increased taxes onto the rate payers.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6 of the 60th SESSION

Mr. Knisley stated he was opposed to this bill because, after it is passed, the legislature could possibly enact a provision freezing bank accounts and locking safety deposit boxes. Enforcement will require a full police effort. The only reason the federal government allows the exemption for states on this tax is to make the state the policeman for the federal government; and it is impossible to police without freezing bank accounts and locking safety deposit boxes. He questioned line 12, reading, "Any lien for the estate tax attaches no sooner than the time when the tax is due and payable." He stated the lien would be attached at the instant of death. He also questioned the wording, "The State of Nevada shall accept the determination of the United States of the taxable estate without further audit." He said the United States never closes the federal file. He asked how the values would be determined when there is no closing of the federal file.

Senators Don Ashworth and Raggio disagreed that this bill would impose the freezing of bank accounts and the locking of safety deposit boxes or that taxes were due and payable upon death. They stated that legislation was drafted specifically to prevent this from occurring.

Mr. Knisley advised the committee that he had consulted the bill drafter, who told him a mistake was made and the language

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

does not forbid frozen bank accounts and locked boxes. The drafter also indicated that the tax, indeed, becomes due and payable upon death.

Senator Raggio explained that this resolution proposes to collect a "pick-up" tax. Every state is allowed a credit for estate taxes paid to the federal government. Nevada is the only state which does not presently collect the tax. He referred to the fiscal note which showed how much revenue Nevada had lost because it didn't have a pick-up tax. He also noted the fiscal note shows that the administrative costs for this program are low. (See Exhibit G.) He said he didn't feel the state could ignore potential revenue sources, especially in view of the present economic situation in Nevada.

Senator Don Ashworth requested that his remarks be entered in the record: "In 1977 when I was a tax attorney and was not a member of this august body, I came up on my own time and testified against a bill on inheritance tax in this state. The reason I did it was two fold. I had dealt with accounts in California and had a problem. Everyone thought for some unknown reason that the federal government was attaching and sealing all of these accounts. It wasn't. It was the state of California. The federal government does not come in and do that. I was concerned that upon the death of a joint tenant the bank accounts would be closed until application for an inheritance tax waiver was filed and approved. That is exactly why we had the language put into this bill which would prevent the sealing of bank accounts. I was opposed to the wording 'due and payable', also. If it doesn't mean what I think it means, then I have some problem with it, also. But I believe it says what I think it means. That is exactly why it was drafted that way--so the State of Nevada would have no authority to go in and lock up a joint tenancy account. The second point deals with taxation in another state. Why was that put in? That was put in at my insistence because there was a possibility for a situation I had encountered in representing a client where he was construed under Colorado law to be a resident of the state of Colorado and, at the same time, was construed to be a resident of California. Under the Campbell case, which is a United States Supreme



Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

Court case, that is allowed. You can be a resident for inheritance tax purposes in more than one state. That means a pick-up tax could be assessed in two states. An individual would, consequently, be paying more estate tax because he would only get one credit under the Federal 706 Estate Tax return. That is exactly why the language is in there stating that if another state taxes that under its state law, Nevada will not impose a pick-up tax on it."

The chairman stated his main objection to this resolution is that there is nothing to prevent future legislatures to disallow the credit if the tax was assessed in another state as well as to initiate strict policing policies by freezing bank accounts and locking safety deposit boxes after the state gets an initial taste of the revenue the pick-up tax would bring to Nevada.

The chairman closed the hearings and asked for committee discussion on Senate Bill No. 15.

Senator Kosinski suggested holding Senate Bill No. 15 until the tax reform package is adopted. The chairman stated that unless there were any objections Senate Bill No. 15 would be held for future consideration. There were no objections and the bill was held.

The chairman asked for consideration on Senate Bill No. 16.

The language indicating which state's tax rate would be the base for the credit was discussed. It was decided that the language was sufficiently clear in indicating that Nevada's tax rate was the basis for the credit, and an amendment would not be needed.

Senator Glaser moved that Senate Bill No. 16 be approved.

Senator Raggio seconded the motion.

The motion carried. (Senators Don Ashworth, Getto and Lamb were absent for the vote.)

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

The chairman asked for consideration on Senate Joint Resolutions No. 4 and No. 6.

The committee discussed whether to hold both bills, or to indefinitely postpone Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 while holding Senate Joint Resolution No. 6.

Senator Raggio suggested holding both bills because the committee might want to distinguish between residential property and property rented for residential use. He was not certain Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 could be amended to include this distinction.

Senator Kosinski pointed out that the Assembly Taxation Committee killed a similar measure last session which limited the issue entirely to real property or a portion of real property which the owner occupied as his residence.

Senator Glaser moved that Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 be indefinitely postponed.

Senator Kosinski seconded the motion.

The motion carried. (Senators Getto and Lamb were absent for the vote.)

The chairman stated that unless there were any objections, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 would be held for future consideration. There were no objections and the bill was held.

The chairman asked for consideration on Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the 60th Session.

Senator Glaser moved that Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the 60th Session be approved.

Senator Don Ashworth seconded the motion.

The motion carried. (Senator Keith Ashworth voted "No"; Senators Getto and Lamb were absent for the vote.)

Senate Committee on Taxation  
February 5, 1981

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at  
4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Colleen Crum  
Colleen Crum, Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Keith Ashworth  
Senator Keith Ashworth, Chairman

DATE:

Feb 11, 1981

SENATE AGENDA

EXHIBIT A

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

FIRST REVISION

Committee on TAXATION, Room 213.

Day Thursday, Date February 5, Time 2 p.m.

S. B. No. 15--Increases homeowner's and renter's allowances for elderly.

S. B. No. 16--Allows credit for personal property tax paid in another state on certain property.

S.J.R. No. 4--Proposes to amend Nevada constitution to permit legislature to provide separately for assessment of taxes on different classes of real property.

S.J.R. No. 6--Permits separate classification of residential property for taxation.

S.J.R. No. 6 of the 60th Session--Proposes to amend Nevada constitution to allow imposition of estate tax not greater than credit allowable under federal law.

ATTENDANCE ROSTER FORM

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

EXHIBIT B

DATE: February 5, 1981

PLEASE PRINT NAME	PLEASE PRINT ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	PLEASE PRINT TELEPHONE
WERNER HEHN	5632 SALK CC	882-3900
Werner Hehn	5632 SALK RD CC	882-3900
Bill Cozart	RENTONS P.O. Box 7338 Reno NV 89510	321-6115
SHARON BERRY	REACTOR	
Jim Lien	LU Metro	
MARVIN LEVITT	CITY OF LAS VEGAS	
JOHN ECK	SOUTHERN PACIFIC CO.	329-2492
GEORGE TICKET	NEVADA BELL	787-8496
STEVE WILLIAMS	NEVADA BELL	781-6440
COLE E. BELL	NRTA/NARP - Nevada Joint State Legislature Comp. Div.	824-1615

A. B. 97

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 97—ASSEMBLYMEN COULTER, VER-  
GIELS, SCHOFIELD, BANNER, HAM, RUSK, ROBINSON,  
CAFFERATA, HORN, HAYES, THOMPSON, MARVEL,  
BEYER, JEFFREY, BRADY, STEWART, BARENGO,  
KOVACS, POLISH, NICHOLAS, GLOVER, WESTALL, PRICE,  
PRENGAMAN, MELLO, BERGEVIN AND FOLEY

FEBRUARY 3, 1981

Referred to Committee on Taxation

SUMMARY—Increases assistance to elderly for property taxes. (BDR 32-521)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No.  
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: Yes.

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [ ] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to the property tax; increasing assistance to the elderly;  
and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

*The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly,  
do enact as follows:*

1 SECTION 1. NRS 361.830 is hereby amended to read as follows:  
2 361.830 "Rent deemed to constitute accrued property tax" is [17]  
3 25 percent of the total rent which a claimant has paid in cash.  
4 SEC. 2. NRS 361.833 is hereby amended to read as follows:  
5 361.833 1. A senior citizen whose home is placed upon the secured  
6 or unsecured tax roll, who has owned and maintained as his primary resi-  
7 dence the home for at least 6 months immediately preceding the filing of  
8 his claim and whose household income is not over [~~\$11,000~~] \$13,000  
9 is entitled to an allowance against the property tax accrued against his  
10 home to the extent determined by the percentage shown opposite his  
11 household income range on the schedule below:

INCOME RANGE		PERCENT TAX			
If the Amount of		Percent of Claimant's			
Applicant's Household		Property Tax			
Income Is Over		Accrued Allowable			
		as Assistance Is			
\$0	—	[\$2,999]	\$5,000	90	
[3,000]	5,000	—	[4,999]	8,000	75
[5,000]	8,000	—	[6,999]	10,000	50
[7,000]	10,000	—	[9,999]	12,000	25
[10,000]	12,000	—	[11,000]	13,000	10

A. B. 97 (cont'd)

— 2 —

- 1       2. The amount of the allowance must not exceed the amount of the
- 2 accrued property tax paid by the claimant or \$500, whichever is less.
- 3       Sec. 3. NRS 361.835 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 4       361.835 A senior citizen who has rented and maintained his pri-
- 5 mary residence in a home or on a mobile home lot for at least 6 months
- 6 of the preceding calendar year and whose household income is not over
- 7 ~~[\$11,000]~~ \$13,000 is entitled to a refund as determined in accordance
- 8 with the schedule in NRS 361.833, but only with respect to that portion
- 9 of his rent which is rent deemed to constitute accrued property tax.
- 10       Sec. 4. NRS 361.845 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 11       361.845 No claim ~~[shall]~~ may be accepted by the department if the
- 12 claimant or the claimant's spouse owns real property in the State of
- 13 Nevada, other than that claimed as a home, having an assessed value in
- 14 excess of ~~[\$30,000.]~~ \$50,000.

EXHIBIT D

The five properties I have used in my Comparison were selected because I knew they were owned the entire time by the same owner and have been occupied by the owner for the entire time. All five of the properties are used as single family dwelling. Three have always, since zoning was established, been zoned R-1, <sup>the fourth</sup> one was rezoned from R-1 to R-2 and the fifth was rezoned three times R-1 to R-2 - R-2 to R-3 and last from R-3 to R-0. Each time the assessed value has been increased. In the 2 blocks in the Northeast part of Carson City where the properties have been rezoned, there is a structure with 4 apartments that was built prior to zoning. There are no offices however 8 lots were rezoned <sup>3 times and are now zoned R-0</sup> against the wishes of the owners of the property. One of the properties <sup>zoned R-0</sup> may have been sold recently, the owner has been in a hospital and a nursing home since August 1971. I believe the law should be changed that the assessment under these circumstances should be based on use and not the new zoning at least as long as the home stays in the same ownership. In the case of R-0 (Residence-Office) it should remain assessed as a Residence. My property which is bought back in 1939 - one lot for \$75 and the other lot for \$85 is now appraised at \$53,481.00



334 times what I paid for it. The assessed value  
is 117 times what I paid for it now getting  
to the change in values of the five properties  
during the past 25 years the average increase  
has been 133.6 percent a year. The average increase  
per year, <sup>in assessed value</sup> during the entire time I have owned the  
property has been 288.4 percent

Year District 1  
Parcel Number  
02-112-02

57-58  
56-57 670 = 1.20  
560

59-60  
56-57 800 = 1.43  
560

61-62  
56-57 960 = 17.1  
560

63-64  
56-57 1120 = 2.00  
560

67-68  
56-57 1400 = 2.50  
560

71-72  
56-57 3970 = 7.10  
560

77-78  
56-57 8170 = 14.59  
560

80-81  
56-57 18720 = 33.4  
560

RO

District - 1  
Parcel Number  
02-113-09

335 = 1.20  
280

340 = 1.21  
280

410 = 1.46  
280

700 = 2.50  
280

700 = 2.50  
280

1750 = 6.25  
280

4000 = 14.28  
280

8220 = 29.56  
280

R-2

District - 1  
Parcel Number  
01-041-13

1260 = 1.20  
1050

1275 = 1.21  
1050

1530 = 1.46  
1050

3710 = 3.53  
1,050

3710 = 3.53  
1,050

3840 = 3.66  
1,050

12,250 = 11.67  
1,050

12,250 = 11.67  
1,050

R-1

District 1  
Parcel Number  
01-354-3

515 = 1.20  
430

710 = 1.65  
430

850 = 1.98  
430

990 = 2.30  
430

990 = 2.30  
430

1390 = 3.23  
430

3500 = 8.14  
430

8400 = 19.53  
430

R-1

leaf

District 01  
Parcel Number  
1-102-15

57-58  
56-57      490 = 1.20  
              410

59-60  
56-57      740 = 1.80  
              410

61-62  
6-57        890 = 2.17  
              410

63-64  
6-57        1040 = 2.54  
              410

67-68  
56-57        1040 = 2.54  
              410

71-72  
56-57        1370 = 3.34  
              410

77-78  
56-57        2450 = 5.98  
              410

80-81  
56-57        5400 = 13.17  
              410



1 ASSESSED VALUATION:  
(Factored to 1/1/82)

2 FY 78-79  
Ad Valorem  
Dollars

3 FY 1981-82  
Ad Valorem  
Dollar CAP

4 ADDED CCRT  
Receipts  
Forecast

5 Excess  
Col. 3 Less  
Col. 4

6 Shortfall  
Col. 3 Less  
Col. 4

7 Local Gov't  
Tax Rate

8 Local Gov't.  
Debt Rate

9 Total Local  
Gov't. Rate

10 Special Dist.  
Combined Rate

11 SCHOOL  
Combined Rate

12 County  
Combined Rate

13 TOTAL RATE  
1981-82

DOUGLAS

Douglas Co.	550,000,000	932,815	1,241,577	2,289,099	1,047,522		.0395	.0395		.7576		.7971
Gardnerville	17,857,966	57,710	76,812	141,568	64,756		.0204	.0204	.2916	.7576	.0395	1.1091
Genoa	1,750,960	2,387	3,177	5,899	2,722				.378	.7576	.0395	.8349
Minden	15,979,702	65,545	89,902	165,584	75,682				.2916	.7576	.0395	1.0887
Carson-Truckee WC	523,074,086					.0022		.0022		.7576	.0395	.7973
Carson Water Sub-C	175,786,792					.0127		.0127	.0251 <sup>a</sup>	.7576	.0395	.8349
Cave Rock Est. GID	5,441,845					.2056		.2056	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.1304
Douglas Co. Sew.#1	186,231,475						.4080	.4080	.0022 <sup>d</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.2073
Elk Pnt. San. Dist.	5,416,742					.1874	.2113	.3987	.0022 <sup>c</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.1980
Grdnvl. Rnch. GID	32,073,925					.3651	.0262	.3913	.0378 <sup>b</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.2262
Indian Hills GID	8,180,176								.5378 <sup>g</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.3249
Kingsbury GID	73,687,242					.2024		.2024	.0022 <sup>c</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.0017
Lakeridge GID	5,829,967					.1513		.1513	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.0821
Logan Creek GID	1,524,658					.1775		.1775	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.1083
Marla Bay GID	7,454,658					.2856		.2856	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.2164
Oliver Park GID	8,517,304					.1774		.1774	.1317 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.1082
Round Hill GID	33,090,429					.3686	2.4721	3.1021	.0022 <sup>c</sup>	.7576	.0395	3.6400*
Sierra Est. GID	N/A								.5378 <sup>g</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.3349
Sierra Frst. FPD	165,814,823					.5000		.5000	.0378 <sup>b</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.3349
Skyland GID	19,266,050					.1503		.1503	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.0811
Tahoe Douglas SD	142,873,113					.1315		.1315	.0022 <sup>c</sup>	.7576	.0395	.9308
Tahoe Reg. Pln.Agy.										.7576	.0395	.7971
Topaz Rnch. ID	15,836,179					.2144		.2144		.7576	.0395	1.0115
Zephyr Heights GID	1,558,587					.1985		.1985	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	1.1293
Zephyr Knolls GID	3,231,888					.0360		.0360	.1337 <sup>e</sup>	.7576	.0395	.9668
Douq. Magto Aht.	175,786,792					.0229		.0229				
Tahoe-Doug. Fire	469,090,093						.0019	.0039				
Mndn-Grdv. San.	32,974,498					.1992	.0546	.2538				
Douq. Co. Schl.	550,000,000					.5000	.2576	.7576				

(\*) Delinquent Bonds

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
ASSESSED VALUATION: (Factor: 1/1/81)	FY 78-79 Ad Valorem Dollars	FY 1981-82 Ad Valorem Dollar CAP	ADDED CCRT Receipts Forecast	Excess Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Shortfall Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Local Gov't Tax Rate	Local Gov't. Debt Rate	Total Local Gov't. Rate	Special Dist. Combined Rate	SCHOOL Combined Rate	County Combined Rate	TOTAL RATE 1981-82		
<b>ELKO</b>														
Elko County	250,000,000	1,043,872	1,389,394	1,594,444	205,050		.1723	.1723		.6905		.8628		
Carlin	5,770,000	69,410	92,385	106,476	14,091		.2675	.2675		.6905	.1723	1.1303		
Elko	92,210,000	591,233	653,831	750,438	96,607		.0185	.0185	.2184	.6905	.1723	1.0997		
Wells	9,040,000									.6905	.1723	.8628		
Jackpot	7,250,800	41,191	57,753	64,262	6,509		2.1713	2.1713		.6905	.1723	3.0341		
Montello	691,300	2,220	2,955	4,033	1,078					.6905	.1723	.8628		
Mountain City	503,600	4,160	5,537	6,991	1,454					.6905	.1723	.8628		
West Wendover	7,059,300	22,037	29,331	32,803	3,472		.2101	.2101		.6905	.1723	1.0729		
Carlin TV Dist.	5,770,000													
Elko City/Co CA	128,861,400						.0216	.1738	.1954					
(Cty/Elko) (A)	92,210,000						.0216	.1738	.1954	.0415	.6905	.1723	1.0997	
(Elko TV) (B)	36,651,400						.0216	.1738	.1954	.0230	.6905	.1723	1.0812	
Elko TV	165,403,800									.0230				
(Cty/Elko) (A)	92,210,000									.0230	.2139	.6905	.1723	1.0997
(Elko CCC A)B)	128,861,400						.0230	.0230	.1954	.6905	.1723	1.0812		
(Elko TV) (C)	55,667,600						.0230	.0230		.6905	.1723	.8858		
No. East FPD														
Elko Co. School	250,000,000						.5000	.1905	.6905					
<b>ESHERALDA Co.</b>														
Goldfield	25,000,000	255,870	340,563	53,356	287,207	1.1480		1.1480		.5000	1.1480	1.6480		
Silver Peak	1,309,708	8,155	10,854	1,700	9,154	.6989		.6989		.5000	1.1480	2.3469		
	586,823	5,020	6,682	1,049	5,633	.9599		.9599		.5000	1.1480	2.6079		
<b>TOTAL.</b>		269,045	358,099	56,105	301,994									

	ASSESSED VALUATION: (Factored to 1/1/81)												
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
	FY 78-79 Ad Valorem Dollars	FY 1981-82 Ad Valorem Dollar CAP	ADDED CCRT Receipts Forecast	Excess Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Shortfall Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Local Gov't Tax Rate	Local Gov't. Debt Rate	Total Local Gov't. Rate	Special Dist. Combined Rate	SCHOOL Combined Rate	County Combined Rate	TOTAL RATE 1981-82	
<b>EUREKA Co.</b>													
Eureka	63,000,000	525,420	699,346	180,067									
Crescent V.	769,989	2,390	3,181	821	519,279	.8243		.8243	.0589	.5863		1.4695	
Eureka	1,498,364	4,640	6,176	1,588	2,360	.3065		.3065	.0589	.5863	.8243	1.7760	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>532,459</b>	<b>708,703</b>	<b>182,476</b>	<b>526,227</b>	<b>.3062</b>		<b>.3062</b>	<b>.0589</b>	<b>.5863</b>	<b>.8243</b>	<b>1.7757</b>	
<b>HUMBOLDT</b>													
Humboldt Co.	150,000,000	698,369	929,529	1,144,620	215,091		.0551	.0551		.6581		.7132	
Winnemucca	52,580,000	304,512	405,305	499,014	93,709					.6581	.0551	.7132	
Golconda Fire P.	10,747,400	11,235	14,954	18,390	3,436					.6581	.0551	.7132	
Humboldt Fire D.	1,398,800	1,115	1,485	1,945	460					.6581	.0551	.7132	
Humboldt TV D.	N/A												
McDermitt FPD	6,027,200	11,776	15,674	19,274	3,600		.1875	.1875		.6581	.0551	.9007	
Orovada Cmtry Dist.	8,783,000					.0687		.0687		.6581	.0551	.7819	
Orovada FPD	8,783,000	10,153	13,514	16,622	3,108		.0238	.0238		.6581	.0551	.7170	
Prise. Val. FPD	9,566,800	6,362	8,468	10,433	1,965					.6581	.0551	.7132	
Pueblo FPD	4,139,500	3,427	4,561	5,659	1,098					.6581	.0551	.7132	
Wmca. Rural FPD	24,635,100	31,953	42,529	52,342	9,813		.0496	.0496		.6581	.0551	.7628	
Schools	150,000,000					.5000	.1581	.6581					

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	ASSESSED VALUATION (Factored to 1/1/79)	FY 78-79 Ad Valorem Dollars	FY 1981-82 Ad Valorem Dollar CAP	ADDED COURT Receipts Forecast	Excess Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Shortfall Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Local Gov't Tax Rate	Local Gov't. Debt Rate	Total Local Gov't. Rate	Special Dist. Combined Rate	SCHOOL Combined Rate	County Combined Rate	TOTAL RATE 1981-82
<b>LANDER Co.</b>	69,000,000	632,400	841,724	797,054		44,670	.0647	.0391	.1038		.9055		1.0093
Austin	1,987,900	4,600	6,123	5,816		307	.0154		.0154	.4599	.9055	.1038	1.4199
Battle Mt.	12,443,000	42,700	56,834	53,820		3,014	.0242				.9055	.1038	1.0335
Kingston	1,946,000	9,048	12,043	11,372		671	.0345		.0345		.9055	.1038	1.0403
<b>TOTAL</b>		688,748	916,724	868,062		48,662							
<b>LINCOLN Co.</b>	50,000,000	319,100	424,722	216,194		208,528	.4171	.0149	.4320		.8853		1.3173
Caliente	3,350,000	19,917	26,510	13,499		13,011	.3884		.3884		.8853	.4320	1.7057
Alamo	2,091,400	5,810	7,733	3,919		3,794	.1814		.1814		.8853	.4320	1.4987
Panaca	2,325,500	10,310	13,723	6,986		6,737	.2897	.0972	.3869		.8853	.4320	1.7042
Pioche	2,683,200	10,248	13,629	6,933		6,696	.2496		.2496		.8853	.4320	1.5669
Pahrnagat Fire	2,648,200	14,200	18,900	9,612		9,288	.3507		.3507		.8853	.4320	1.6680
Pioche Fire	2,619,800	8,075	10,748	5,463		5,285	.2017		.2017		.8853	.4320	1.5190
Schools	50,000,000						.5000	.3853	.8853				
<b>Total</b>		387,652	515,965	262,626		253,339							
<b>LYON Co.</b>	171,000,000	1,391,260	1,851,767	1,010,990		840,777	.4917	.0030	.4947		1.0966		1.5913
Yerington	14,880,000	81,601	108,611	59,255		49,356	.3317		.3317		1.0966	.4947	1.9230
Fernley	45,104,000	31,972	42,555	23,253		19,302	.0428	.0343	.0771	.0410	1.0966	.4947	1.7094
Penrose GID	376,659						1.1026		1.1026	.1015	1.0966	.4947	2.7954
Car-Truck Water C.	101,995,634						.0022		.0022				
(Car.Wtr. Sub-C) A	56,522,774						.0022		.0022	.0127	1.0966	.4947	1.6062
Cent Lyon Fire B	368,860						.0022		.0022	.0144	1.0966	.4947	1.6072
Fern-NL Fire C	45,104,000						.0022		.0022	.1156	1.0966	.4947	1.7091
Central L. FIRE	48,685,260	56,602	75,137	41,078		34,259	.0704	.0144	.0848				
(CTWC) A	368,860						.0704	.0144	.0848	.0022	1.0966	.4947	1.6783
(CW Sub-C) A	48,316,400						.0704	.0144	.0848	.0127	1.0966	.4947	1.6888
Hason Val. FIRE	23,856,800	36,043	47,973	26,204		21,769	.1098	.1098	.0108	.0108	1.0966	.4947	1.7119
N. Lyon Fire	45,104,000	17,622	23,455	12,866		10,589	.0235	.0155	.0390	.0354	1.0966	.4947	1.6657
Smith V. Fire	12,467,800	9,219	12,270	6,728		5,542	.0445		.0445	.0180	1.0966	.4947	1.6538
Schools	171,000,000						.5000	.5966	1.0966				
<b>TOTAL</b>		1,624,319	2,161,968	1,180,374		981,574							



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	ASSESSED VALUATION: (Factored to 1/1/82)	FY 78-79 Ad Valorem Dollars	FY 1981-82 Ad Valorem Dollar CAP	ADDED COURT Receipts Forecast	Excess Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Shortfall Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Local Gov't Tax Rate	Local Gov't. Debt Rate	Total Local Gov't. Rate	Special Dist. Combined Rate	SCHOOL Combined Rate	County Combined Rate	TOTAL RATE 1981-82
<b>MINERAL Co.</b>	40,000,000	803,219	1,069,084	623,298		445,786	1.1145	.0194	1.1339		.7435		2.1687
<b>NYE COUNTY</b>	199,999,900	1,304,560	1,736,369	1,369,608		306,544	.1533	.1201	.2734		.6290		.9024
Gibbs	3,976,000	73,684	98,073	80,726		17,347	.4643		.4643		.6290	.2734	1.3667
Beatty	3,295,500	10,270	13,669	11,363		2,306	.0670	.2397	.3067		.6290	.2734	1.2091
Manhattan	1,530,500	5,300	7,054	5,766		1,288	.0842		.0842		.6290	.2734	.9866
Pahrump	51,421,000	84,950	113,068	93,106		19,962	.0388	.0178	.0566	.0407	.6290	.2734	.9997
Round Mtn.	12,741,500	8,610	11,460	9,497		1,963	.0154		.0154		.6290	.2734	.9178
Tonopah	16,473,000	59,910	79,740	65,632		14,108	.0856	.1527	.2383		.6290	.2734	1.1407
Schools							.5000	.1290	.6290				
TOTAL		1,547,284	2,059,433	1,695,915		363,518							
<b>PERSHING Co.</b>	60,000,000	496,650	661,041	348,086		312,955	.5216		.5216		.9563		1.7911
Lovelock	5,258,000	59,157	78,738	41,446		37,292	.7092	.3132	1.0224		.9563	.5216	2.5003
TOTAL		555,807	739,779	389,532		350,247							
<b>STOREY COUNTY</b>	49,000,000	261,891	348,577	235,616		112,961	.2305	.0215	.2520		.6816		.9136
Gold Hill	1,742,000	817	1,087	746		341	.0196		.0196		.6816	.2520	.9532
Virginia Cty	7,104,000	4,570	6,083	4,112		1,971	.0277		.0277		.6816	.2520	.9613
TOTAL		267,278	355,747	240,474		115,273							
<b>WHITE PINE Co.</b>	65,000,000	848,516	1,129,375	650,664		478,711	.7365	.0308	.7673		.5000		1.2673
Ely	30,780,000	252,000	335,412	193,215		142,197	.4620	.1092	.5712		.5000	.7673	1.8345
Lund	632,400	6,690	8,904	5,162		3,742	.5917		.5917		.5000	.7673	1.8590
McGill	4,222,000	43,400	57,765	33,285		24,480	.5798		.5798		.5000	.7673	1.8471
Ruth	735,000	10,016	13,331	7,654		5,677	.7723		.7723		.5000	.7673	2.0396
TOTAL		1,160,622	1,544,787	889,980		654,807							

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	ASSESSED VALUATION (Factored to 1/1/81)	FY 78-79 Ad Valorem Dollars	FY 1981-82 Ad Valorem Dollar CAP	ACCEN CCRT Receipts Forecast	Excess Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Shortfall Col. 3 Less Col. 4	Local Gov't Tax Rate	Local Gov't. Debt Rate	Total Local Gov't. Rate	Specia. Dist. Combined Rate	SCHOOL Combined Rate	County Combined Rate	TOTAL RATE 1981-82
<b>WASHOE</b>													
Washoe Co.	\$2,986,799,101	20,669,738	42,055,750	24,483,706		3,027,715	.1914	.0644	.1658	.0022	.6729		.8409
Reno	2,331,296,791	6,437,312	8,568,062	7,623,557		944,505	.0405	.0563	.0968	.0022	.6729	.1658	.9377
Sparks	439,992,310	2,720,968	3,621,608	3,222,328		399,280	.0907	.0676	.1583	.0022	.6729	.1658	.9992
Black Sp. GID	603,998									.0270	.6729	.1658	.8657
Carson-Trk WC	2,986,799,101						.0022		.0022				
Crstl Bay GID	6,639,085						.5934		.5934	.0093	.6729	.1658	1.4414
Gerlach GID	268,431									.0022	.6729	.1658	.8409
Hrzn. Hls. GID	3,057,113						.2177		.2177	.5022	.6729	.1658	1.5586
Incln Vlg. GID	276,083,369						.2640		.2640	.0093	.6729	.1658	1.1120
Lmn. Val. UWB	74,583,368						.0248		.0248	.0022	.6729	.1658	.8657
N. Lk. Tah. PD	284,509,907							.0071	.0071				
(NLT FPD) (A)	1,787,453							.0071	.0071	.0022	.6729	.1658	.8480
(In.Vl.GID) (B)	276,083,369							.0071	.0071	.2662	.6729	.1658	1.1120
(Cr.BayGID) (C)	6,639,085							.0071	.0071	.5956	.6729	.1658	1.4414
Palmno. Val. GID	16,080,774						.2129		.2129	.0022	.6729	.1658	1.0538
Redvlpmt Agy Spks.	76,007,690						.8071		.8071				.8071
Reno Incrmnt D.	137,193,209						.7958		.7958				.7958
Sierra Frst.FPD	102,660,380						.5000		.5000	.0022	.6729	.1658	1.3409
Sun Val. W&SD	32,671,479									.0022	.6729	.1658	.8409
Tahoe RPA													
Truckee Hdvs.FPD	464,074,958												
(TrkHdw FPD)(A)	340,135,339									.0022	.6729	.1658	.8409
(SunVal SD) (B)	32,671,479									.0022	.6729	.1658	.8409
(Lmn.Val.WB)(C)	74,583,368									.0270	.6729	.1658	.8657
(Pal.Va.GID)(D)	16,080,774									.2201	.6729	.1658	1.0588
(Plk.Spg.GID)(E)	603,998									.0270	.6729	.1658	.8657
Verdj TV Dist.	42,571,115						.0375		.0375	.5022	.6729	.1658	1.3784
Schools	2,986,799,101						.5000	.1729	.6729				
<b>TOTALS</b>		31,597,108	42,055,750	37,425,414		4,630,336							

EXHIBIT G

FISCAL NOTE

BOR \_\_\_\_\_  
 A.B. \_\_\_\_\_  
 S.B. \_\_\_\_\_  
 S.J.R. 6 of 1979 Session

• STATE AGENCY ESTIMATES Date Prepared January 30, 1981

Agency Submitting DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Revenue and/or Expense Items	Fiscal Year 1980-81	Fiscal Year 1981-82	Fiscal Year 1982-83	Continuing
Estate Tax Pick-up Revenue	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	\$6,313,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$6,313,000</b>

Explanation (Use Continuation Sheets If Required)  
 The estimate is based upon the pick-up being 8% of federal estate tax before credits in Nevada for 1976, inflated by 10% per year to 1982, and reduced by 20% in an effort to account for death taxes collected by other states.

Estate tax before credits in Nevada, 1976	\$55,688,000
X 10% per year to 1982	98,654,000
X 8% for gross Nevada pick-up	7,892,000
Less 20% for amounts due other states	6,313,000*

\*Estimated net Nevada pick-up tax

Local Government Impact YES  NO   
 (Attach Explanation)

Signature Howard E. Barrett  
 Title Director of Administration

• DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

• LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL IMPACT Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Legislative Counsel Bureau Use Only)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

S. B. 16

---

SENATE BILL NO. 16—SENATORS GLASER  
AND KEITH ASHWORTH

JANUARY 20, 1981

Referred to Committee on Taxation

SUMMARY—Allows credit for personal property tax paid in another state on certain property. (BDR 32-470)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: Yes.  
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: No.

---

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [ ] is material to be omitted.

---

AN ACT relating to property tax; allowing a credit for tax paid in another state on a mobile home or a slide-in camper; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

*The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:*

- 1 SECTION 1. NRS 361.5641 is hereby amended to read as follows:  
2 361.5641 Whenever any person [who] :  
3 1. *Who* has purchased a mobile home or slide-in camper on which he  
4 is required to pay a personal property tax under the provisions of NRS  
5 361.562 or 361.563, establishes to the satisfaction of the county assessor  
6 that he has paid the personal property tax for the current fiscal year on  
7 another mobile home or slide-in camper which he has sold or exchanged,  
8 the county assessor shall allow as a credit [against the personal property  
9 tax required to be paid an amount equal to one-twelfth of the personal  
10 property] *1/12 of the tax previously paid multiplied by the number of full*  
11 *months remaining in the current fiscal year after the sale or exchange of*  
12 *the mobile home or slide-in camper on which [such] the tax was paid.*  
13 2. *Has paid a personal property tax on a mobile home or slide-in*  
14 *camper to the state of his prior residence, the county assessor shall allow*  
15 *a 1/12 reduction in the tax for the current fiscal year for each calendar*  
16 *month that the person has paid the tax in the other state.*

S. J. R. 4

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4—SENATORS NEAL, DON ASHWORTH, KEITH ASHWORTH, BILBRAY, BLAKEMORE, CLOSE, ECHOLS, FAISS, FORD, GETTO, GIBSON, GLASER, JACOBSEN, KOSINSKI, McCORKLE, RAGGIO, WAGNER AND WILSON

JANUARY 20, 1981

Referred to Committee on Taxation

SUMMARY—Proposes to amend Nevada constitution to permit legislature to provide separately for assessment of taxes on different classes of real property. (BDR C-480)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No.  
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: No.

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [ ] is material to be omitted.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION—Proposing an amendment to section 1 of article 10 of the constitution of the State of Nevada, relating to property taxation, to permit the legislature to provide separately for the assessment or valuation of different classes of real property.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly,*  
2 That section 1 of article 10 of the constitution of the State of Nevada be  
3 amended to read as follows:  
4 Section 1. *1.* The legislature shall provide by law for a uniform and  
5 equal rate of [assessment and] taxation, *but may provide separately for*  
6 *the assessment or valuation of different classes of real property,* and shall  
7 prescribe such regulations as shall secure a just valuation for taxation of  
8 all property, real, personal and possessory, except mines and mining  
9 claims, when not patented, the proceeds alone of which shall be assessed  
10 and taxed, and when patented, each patented mine shall be assessed at  
11 not less than five hundred dollars (\$500), except when one hundred dol-  
12 lars (\$100) in labor has been actually performed on such patented mine  
13 during the year, in addition to the tax upon the net proceeds. [; shares]  
14 2. *Shares* of stock (except shares of stock in banking corporations),  
15 bonds, mortgages, notes, bank deposits, book accounts and credits, and  
16 securities and choses in action of like character are deemed to represent  
17 interest in property already assessed and taxed, either in Nevada or  
18 elsewhere, and shall be exempt. [Notwithstanding the provisions of this  
19 section, the legislature may constitute agricultural and open-space real  
20 property having a greater value for another use than that for which it is

S. J. R. No. 4 (cont'd)

— 2 —

1 being used, as a separate class for taxation purposes and may provide a  
2 separate uniform plan for appraisal and valuation of such property for  
3 assessment purposes. If such plan is provided, the legislature shall also  
4 provide for retroactive assessment for a period of not less than 7 years  
5 when agricultural and open-space real property is converted to a higher  
6 use conforming to the use for which other nearby property is used.]

7 3. Personal property which is moving in interstate commerce through  
8 or over the territory of the State of Nevada, or which was consigned to a  
9 warehouse, public or private, within the State of Nevada from outside the  
10 State of Nevada for storage in transit to a final destination outside the  
11 State of Nevada, whether specified when transportation begins or after-  
12 ward, shall be deemed to have acquired no situs in Nevada for purposes  
13 of taxation and shall be exempt from taxation. Such property shall not be  
14 deprived of such exemption because while in the warehouse the property  
15 is assembled, bound, joined, processed, disassembled, divided, cut, broken  
16 in bulk, relabeled or repackaged.

17 4. The legislature may exempt motor vehicles from the provisions of  
18 the tax required by this section, and in lieu thereof, if such exemption is  
19 granted, shall provide for a uniform and equal rate of assessment and  
20 taxation of motor vehicles, which rate shall not exceed five cents on one  
21 dollar of assessed valuation.

22 5. The legislature shall provide by law for a progressive reduction in  
23 the tax upon business inventories by 20 percent in each year following  
24 the adoption of this provision, and after the expiration of the 4th year  
25 such inventories are exempt from taxation. The legislature may exempt  
26 any other personal property, including livestock.

27 6. No inheritance or estate tax shall ever be levied. [, and there shall  
28 also be excepted such property as may be exempted by law]

29 7. The legislature may exempt by law property used for municipal,  
30 educational, literary, scientific or other charitable purposes.

**S. J. R. 6 of the 60th Session**

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6—SENATORS GLASER,  
DODGE, RAGGIO, SLOAN, KOSINSKI AND GIBSON**

JANUARY 19, 1979

Referred to Committee on Taxation

**SUMMARY**—Proposes to amend Nevada constitution to allow imposition of estate tax not greater than credit allowable under federal law. (BDR C-724)

**EXPLANATION**—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [ ] is material to be omitted.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION**—Proposing to amend article 10 of the constitution of the State of Nevada, relating to taxation, by authorizing the imposition of an estate tax not greater than the credit allowable for such a tax against the federal estate tax, reduced by the amount paid to any other state.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly,*  
2 That article 10 of the constitution of the State of Nevada be amended by  
3 adding thereto a new section which shall read as follows:  
4 *The legislature may provide by law for the taxation of estates taxed by*  
5 *the United States, but only to the extent of any credit allowed by federal*  
6 *law for the payment of such a state tax. The combined amount of these*  
7 *federal and state taxes may not exceed the estate tax which would be*  
8 *imposed by federal law alone. If another state of the United States*  
9 *imposes and collects death taxes against an estate which is taxable by the*  
10 *State of Nevada under this section, the amount of estate tax to be col-*  
11 *lected by the State of Nevada must be reduced by the amount of the death*  
12 *taxes collected by the other state. Any lien for the estate tax attaches no*  
13 *sooner than the time when the tax is due and payable, and no restriction*  
14 *on possession or use of a decedent's property may be imposed by law*  
15 *before the time when the tax is due and payable. The State of Nevada*  
16 *shall accept the determination of the United States of the taxable estate*  
17 *without further audit.*  
18 and be it further  
19 *Resolved,* That section 1 of article 10 of the constitution of the State of  
20 Nevada be amended to read as follows:  
21 Section 1. The legislature shall provide by law for a uniform and  
22 equal rate of assessment and taxation, and shall prescribe such regula-  
23 tions as shall secure a just valuation for taxation of all property, real,  
24 personal and possessory, except mines and mining claims, when not  
25 patented, the proceeds alone of which shall be assessed and taxed, and  
26 when patented, each patented mine shall be assessed at not less than

S. J. R. No. 6 of the 60th Session (cont'd)

— 2 —

1 five hundred dollars (\$500), except when one hundred dollars (\$100)  
2 in labor has been actually performed on such patented mine during the  
3 year, in addition to the tax upon the net proceeds; shares of stock  
4 (except shares of stock in banking corporations), bonds, mortgages,  
5 notes, bank deposits, book accounts and credits, and securities and  
6 choses in action of like character are deemed to represent interest in  
7 property already assessed and taxed, either in Nevada or elsewhere, and  
8 shall be exempt. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the legis-  
9 lature may constitute agricultural and open-space real property having a  
10 greater value for another use than that for which it is being used, as  
11 a separate class for taxation purposes and may provide a separate uni-  
12 form plan for appraisal and valuation of such property for assessment  
13 purposes. If such plan is provided, the legislature shall also provide for  
14 retroactive assessment for a period of not less than 7 years when agri-  
15 cultural and open-space real property is converted to a higher use con-  
16 forming to the use for which other nearby property is used. Personal  
17 property which is moving in interstate commerce through or over the  
18 territory of the State of Nevada, or which was consigned to a warehouse,  
19 public or private, within the State of Nevada from outside the State of  
20 Nevada for storage in transit to a final destination outside the State of  
21 Nevada, whether specified when transportation begins or afterward,  
22 shall be deemed to have acquired no situs in Nevada for purposes of tax-  
23 ation and shall be exempt from taxation. Such property shall not be  
24 deprived of such exemption because while in the warehouse the property  
25 is assembled, bound, joined, processed, disassembled, divided, cut, broken  
26 in bulk, relabeled- or repackaged. The legislature may exempt motor  
27 vehicles from the provisions of the tax required by this section, and in  
28 lieu thereof, if such exemption is granted, shall provide for a uniform  
29 and equal rate of assessment and taxation of motor vehicles, which rate  
30 shall not exceed five cents on one dollar of assessed valuation. The legis-  
31 lature shall provide by law for a progressive reduction in the tax upon  
32 business inventories by 20 percent in each year following the adoption  
33 of this provision, and after the expiration of the 4th year such inventories  
34 are exempt from taxation. The legislature may exempt any other personal  
35 property, including livestock. No inheritance [or estate] tax shall ever  
36 be levied, and there shall also be excepted such property as may be  
37 exempted by law for municipal, educational, literary, scientific or other  
38 charitable purposes.

39 and be it further,

40 *Resolved*, That the secretary of state shall assign the next consecutive  
41 section number in article 10 of the constitution of the State of Nevada  
42 to the new section set forth in this resolution upon its approval and rati-  
43 fication by the people.

⊙