

**STATE QUESTION NO. 4**  
Amendment to the *Nevada Constitution*

**CONDENSATION (Ballot Question)**

Shall Article 10 of the *Nevada Constitution* be amended to require the Legislature to provide by law for the exemption of durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment, and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for use by a licensed health care provider from any tax upon the sale, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property?

Yes  No

**EXPLANATION & DIGEST**

**EXPLANATION**—This ballot measure proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to require the Legislature to pass a law that allows for the exemption of durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment, and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for human use by a licensed health care provider acting within his or her scope of practice from any tax on the sale, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property. The proposed amendment does not create an exemption of durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment, and mobility enhancing equipment from these taxes, but rather requires the Legislature to establish by law for such an exemption. Pursuant to Article 19, Section 2, of the *Nevada Constitution*, approval of this measure is required at two consecutive general elections before taking effect.

**A “Yes” vote would amend Article 10 of the *Nevada Constitution* so that the Legislature would be required to pass a law exempting durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment, and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for human use by a licensed health care provider from taxation related to the sale, storage, use, or consumption of the equipment.**

**A “No” vote would retain the provisions of Article 10 of the *Nevada Constitution* in their current form. These provisions do not require the Legislature to pass a law exempting durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment, and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for human use by a licensed health care provider from taxation related to the sale, storage, use, or consumption of the equipment.**

**DIGEST**—Article 10 of the *Nevada Constitution* contains provisions relating to taxation. Approval of this question would add a new section to Article 10 of the *Nevada Constitution* to require the Legislature to pass a law that allows for the exemption of durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment, and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for human use by a licensed health care provider acting within his or her scope of practice from any tax on the sale, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property. This tax exemption would decrease public revenue as this equipment is currently subject to sales and use tax.

**ARGUMENTS FOR PASSAGE**

*Medical Patient Tax Relief Act*

A YES vote on Question 4 helps sick, injured, and dying patients and their families. It stops the Department of Taxation from imposing unnecessary sales taxes on medical equipment prescribed by physicians, such as wheelchairs, infant apnea monitors, and oxygen delivery devices. It will bring Nevada in line with the vast majority of states which do not tax this type of equipment for home use.<sup>1</sup>

A YES vote would relieve the sales tax burden on medical equipment used by patients who require oxygen devices to live, such as those with cancer, asthma, and cardiac disease; babies who need protection from Sudden Infant Death Syndrome; children with cystic fibrosis on home ventilators; and hospice patients in their last weeks of life. Current Nevada law already exempts medicine and prosthetics because we have recognized how vital this relief is for our most vulnerable populations.<sup>2</sup> Question 4 simply seeks to extend this protection to critical medical equipment.

For insured Nevadans, this tax is contributing to the increasing copays, deductibles, and premium costs that are crippling family finances across the state. For uninsured Nevadans the impact is even worse: Sales tax on medical equipment can reach thousands of dollars for severely disabled patients, and it forces people to forego essential equipment prescribed by their doctors because they simply cannot afford to pay.

Fortunately, while this would have a significant impact on the patients and their families, there would be *very little impact to state tax revenue*. The Department of Taxation, itself, has estimated that a tax exemption on this medical equipment represents approximately 0.025% of the annual state budget.<sup>3</sup>

Almost all people will need some sort of medical equipment in their lifetimes. Voting YES on Question 4 is the compassionate, and eventually prudent, thing to do. Join over 100,000 Nevadans who signed the petition calling for the end to this tax. It will help hundreds of families today and may help yours tomorrow.

*The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Josh Hicks (Chair), Alliance to Stop Taxes on the Sick and Dying PAC; Doug Bennett, Alliance to Stop Taxes on the Sick and Dying PAC; and Dr. Joseph Kenneth Romeo, private citizen. Pursuant to NRS 293.252(5)(f), the Committee does not believe the measure will have any environmental impact or impact on the public health, safety, and welfare. This argument, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at [www.nvsos.gov](http://www.nvsos.gov).*

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015/ExhibitDocument/OpenExhibitDocument?exhibitId=12642&fileDownloadName=Streamlined%20Sales%20Tax%20Comparison.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> NRS 372.283.

<sup>3</sup> This percentage was reached by calculating the annual fiscal impact of Senate Bill 334 (2015) – \$931,714 – as a percentage of the State’s fiscal year 2017 budget revenues of approximately \$3,700,000,000. See <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/78th2015/FiscalNotes/5266.pdf> and <http://openbudget.nv.gov/OpenGov/ViewBudgetSummary.aep?amountView=Year2&budgetVersionId=13&version=Leg&type=Rev&view=ObjectType>.

#### **REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENTS FOR PASSAGE**

The proponents of Question 4 argue that sales tax on durable medical equipment is “unnecessary.” Sales tax funds services such as schools, police, and fire departments, to name a few. Are these services “unnecessary?” If that is true, why are voters in Washoe County being asked to increase their sales tax rate from 7.725% to 8.265% for additional school funding?<sup>1</sup>

The proponents say Question 4, “simply seeks to extend this protection to critical medical equipment.” We do not know what this truly means because the language is vaguely worded, and the definitions and exemptions are left to be determined by the Legislature.

The proponents say, “The Department of Taxation, itself, has estimated that a tax exemption on this medical equipment represents approximately 0.025% of the annual state budget.” This begs the question, on what “medical equipment?” Until the relevant Legislative session, how is it possible to estimate the impact of this unknown quantity?

The argument in support states, “Almost all people will need some sort of medical equipment.” What does that have to do with the question before us? Again, you need to question what medical equipment are we talking about and what is the cost to everyday taxpayers?

*The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee member: Ann O’Connell (Chair), private citizen. Pursuant to NRS 293.252(5)(f), the Committee does not believe the measure will have any environmental impact or impact on the public health, safety, and welfare. This rebuttal, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at [www.nvsos.gov](http://www.nvsos.gov).*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Sales tax increase on ballot this fall in Washoe County*, News 4 on Your Side, February 15, 2016, <http://mynews4.com/news/local/sales-tax-increase-on-ballot-this-fall-in-washoe-county>.

#### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST PASSAGE**

VOTE NO ON QUESTION 4!

Basic budget principles state that when expenses exceed revenues, debt is created. When the law requires state or local government agencies such as schools to be funded, the law expects a set amount of revenue to fund that agency. When a tax exemption reduces the amount of revenue expected, the agency has no choice but to request a replacement of the lost funding. To do that the agency must depend on the Governor and the Legislature to include the lost funding in the budget.

Sales taxes pay for a myriad of services Nevadans rely on including schools, police, fire departments, libraries, and parks, to name a few.

Question 4 seeks to exempt durable medical equipment from sales tax. On the surface, this exemption seems like a good thing, providing tax relief to those in need. However, this exemption is really a wolf in sheep’s clothing:

1. It is vaguely worded without clear definitions of what specific devices will be exempt and who will benefit, leaving such determination to the Legislature;
2. It decreases an unknown amount of revenue from an already strained budget, creating the need for higher taxes in the future; and
3. It uses the law to provide special privileges to a special-interest group at the expense of everyday taxpayers.

Tax exemptions have consequences for the taxpayer; the same consequences as tax subsidies, tax breaks, tax abatements, and tax incentives. The Nevada Department of Taxation’s *2013-2014 Tax Expenditure Report* states that Nevada has 243 such tax expenditures that cost taxpayers over \$3.7 BILLION a biennium.<sup>1</sup>

Who is footing the bill for all those exemptions? You, the local taxpayer.

You should be mindful of the most recent government “giveaways,” such as the approval of \$1.3 BILLION in subsidies to Tesla<sup>2</sup>, \$215 MILLION in tax incentives to Faraday<sup>3</sup>, and \$7.8 Million in tax abatements to six different companies relocating to Nevada<sup>4</sup>.

Ask yourself, is Question 4 just another “giveaway,” and is there any follow-up to see if promises made for these “giveaways” are promises kept?

The question also needs to be asked, isn’t this just another burden on Nevada taxpayers? If it isn’t, why in 2003 and again in 2015 did our governors go after a BILLION-plus dollars in tax increases<sup>5</sup>?

When the wolf comes huffing and puffing at your door, reject it. Vote NO on Question 4!

*The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee member: Ann O’Connell (Chair), private citizen. Pursuant to NRS 293.252(5)(f), the Committee does not believe the measure will have any environmental impact or impact on the public health, safety, and welfare. This argument, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at [www.nvsos.gov](http://www.nvsos.gov).*

---

<sup>1</sup> Nevada Department of Taxation, 2013-2014 Tax Expenditure Report, [http://tax.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/taxnvgov/Content/TaxLibrary/Tax\\_Expenditure\\_Report\\_2013-2014.pdf](http://tax.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/taxnvgov/Content/TaxLibrary/Tax_Expenditure_Report_2013-2014.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Editorial: Tesla in the News, Las Vegas Review Journal, July 26, 2016, <http://www.reviewjournal.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-tesla-the-news>.

<sup>3</sup> Faraday Future gets OK to begin grading at North Las Vegas site, Las Vegas Review Journal, July 28, 2016, <http://www.reviewjournal.com/business/economic-development/faraday-future-gets-ok-begin-grading-north-las-vegas-site>.

<sup>4</sup> More tech companies moving to Nevada, Las Vegas Review Journal, July 25, 2016, <http://www.reviewjournal.com/business/more-tech-companies-moving-nevada>.

<sup>5</sup> Assembly Bill 4, Senate Bill 2, and Senate Bill 8: 20th (2003) Special Session; Senate Bill 483: 78th (2015) Session.

### **REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PASSAGE**

This is taxation at its worst, targeting the most vulnerable Nevadans. These aren’t wealthy people paying sales tax for new cars. These are sick people required to pay taxes on the machines that keep them alive.

The real “wolf in sheep’s clothing” is the pro-tax argument, which is misleading in three ways:

1. The proposal is not vague. Durable medical equipment is already defined in Nevada law.
2. The budget won’t be hurt. The cities of Las Vegas and Reno both assessed the proposal, concluding that the impact will be immaterial. And, comparing this to the billions in tax breaks for Tesla is irresponsible – the annual impact of Question 4 will be less than one one-thousandth of that amount.
3. Lastly, this only benefits “special-interest groups?” How many of our neighbors need oxygen or a CPAP to breathe, a wheelchair to move, or a nebulizer to treat their child’s asthma? How many babies need the protection of apnea monitors in their first weeks of life? Most Nevadans, or their families, will be impacted in their lifetimes.

Vote YES on Question 4 because there are better ways to fund the state than on the backs of our sick, injured, and dying.

*The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Josh Hicks (Chair), Alliance to Stop Taxes on the Sick and Dying PAC; Doug Bennett, Alliance to Stop Taxes on the Sick and Dying PAC; and Dr. Joseph Kenneth Romeo, private citizen. Pursuant to NRS 293.252(5)(f), the Committee does not believe the measure will have any environmental impact or impact on the public health, safety, and welfare. This rebuttal, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at [www.nvsos.gov](http://www.nvsos.gov).*

#### **FISCAL NOTE**

#### **FINANCIAL IMPACT – CANNOT BE DETERMINED**

##### OVERVIEW

Question 4 proposes to amend Article 10 of the *Nevada Constitution* by adding a new section, designated Section 7, that would require the Legislature to provide by law for an exemption from the sales and use tax for durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for human use by a licensed provider of health care acting within his or her scope of practice.

##### FINANCIAL IMPACT OF QUESTION 4

Under current law, the statewide sales and use tax rate is 6.85 percent. Four separate tax rates make up this combined rate:

- The State rate (2 percent), which is deposited in the State General Fund;
- The Local School Support Tax rate (2.6 percent), which is distributed among the state's school districts and to the State Distributive School Account;
- The Basic City-County Relief Tax rate (0.5 percent), which is distributed among counties, cities, and other local government entities through the Consolidated Tax Distribution (CTX) mechanism; and
- The Supplemental City-County Relief Tax rate (1.75 percent), which is distributed among counties, cities, and other local government entities through the CTX mechanism.

In addition, in thirteen of Nevada's seventeen counties (Carson City, Churchill, Clark, Douglas, Elko, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Pershing, Storey, Washoe, and White Pine), additional local sales and use tax rates are levied for specific purposes through legislative authority or by voter approval. The revenue from these tax rates is distributed to the entity or for the purpose for which the rate is levied.

If voters approve Question 4 at the November 2018 General Election, the Legislature and Governor would need to approve legislation to implement the sales and use tax exemptions specified within the question before these exemptions could become effective. The legislation providing an exemption from the sales and use tax for durable medical equipment, oxygen delivery equipment and mobility enhancing equipment prescribed for human use by a licensed provider of health care acting within his or her scope of practice will reduce the amount of sales and use tax revenue that is received by the state and local governments, including school districts, currently entitled to receive sales and use tax revenue from any of the rates imposed, beginning on the effective date of the legislation.

However, the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine when the Legislature and Governor will approve the legislation necessary to enact these exemptions or the effective date of the legislation that is approved. Additionally, the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine how the terms specified within Question 4 would be defined in the legislation, nor can it estimate the amount of sales that would be subject to the exemption. Thus, the revenue loss to the affected state and local governments cannot be determined by the Fiscal Analysis Division with any reasonable degree of certainty.

The Department of Taxation has indicated that the implementation and administration of the exemptions specified within Question 4 can be performed using current resources, resulting in no additional financial impact upon state government.

*Prepared by the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau – August 2, 2018*

---