

Corporate Income Tax Reform

Prepared by Craig Bolio

VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF TAXES

Corporate Income Tax Reform

- ▶ S.53 Summary:
 - Single sales factor (Section 5)
 - Joyce to Finnigan (Section 6)
 - Repeal exemption for 80/20 companies (Section 3)
 - Repeal throwback rule (Section 5)

Additional Provisions in S.53

- ~~Increase minimum corporate income tax (Section 4)~~
- ~~Cloud tax (Sections 9-12)~~
- ~~Mutual fund fee increase~~

- Not what I'm talking about today

- Exempting menstrual products from sales tax – became law in Act 73
- Exempting \$10,000 in military retirement pay

Who is Impacted?

- C-Corporations, NOT pass-through entities (S-Corp, partnership)
- Big C-Corps that do business in multiple states or countries
- These 4 main elements of corporate reform **do not** generally affect small businesses in Vermont

Why Care About this Reform?

- Better structure for corporate *income* tax to reflect where companies avail themselves of the market
 - This is really a restructuring, not a tax cut or increase
- Remove potential barriers to expansion/relocation of workforce/property footprints in Vermont
- Impacts generally reduce taxes for companies with Vermont workforces and Vermont property while enhancing revenues from companies who sell to Vermonters without a Vermont workforce or property
- Protect Vermont companies from “losing” twice to our neighboring states who already enacted these reforms!

What are Other States Doing?

- All New England states and New York use single sales factor
- Massachusetts has enacted single sales factor for favored domestic industries (manufacturing, defense contractors, financial services)
- In the past 10 years, 18 states have moved to single sales factor
- Not aware of any who moved from single sales factor to 3 factor
- There are 18 Finnigan states, 13 Joyce states
- In the past 10 years, 7 states have moved from Joyce to Finnigan
- Not aware of states moving from Finnigan to Joyce

Key Concepts

Apportionment: The methodology by which states determine how much of a company's income should be reported to a state for income taxation, when a company operates in more than one state.

Unitary Reporting: Current law in Vermont since tax year 2006, which requires related businesses with common ownership to file as a unitary group. The income of the group is apportioned in one tax return.

Single Sales Factor

- Vermont currently uses three factors to determine the share of total income apportioned to Vermont:
 - Sales into Vermont
 - Payroll in Vermont
 - Property in Vermont
- Single sales factor looks at only sales
- Who wins? Companies with more payroll/property in the state than sales
- Who loses? Companies selling into Vermont with no/lower payroll or property
- Full Vermont company? No impact

Joyce to Finnigan

Joyce and Finnigan are names of court cases that led to two different methodologies for determining sales apportionment factors for unitary groups.

- Joyce → Tax jurisdiction for each company is evaluated individually within the group
- Finnigan → Tax jurisdiction for the group is evaluated as a whole
- Note: Both of these methodologies still require unitary filing
- Why does this matter? Public law 86-272
- Finnigan is a natural pairing with SSF, if you rely on sales for apportionment, you want to ensure that those with sales into the state are paying tax.

Throwback Rule

Companies must report sales of tangible personal property made to the Federal government, or in states where they are not taxable (or claim PL 86-272), back to Vermont (IE the “throwback” to the home state).

- There is a natural tension between the policy goals of the throwback rule and single sales factor.
- If we believe the best reflection of income is where you’re availing yourself of the market, why should companies be required to throwback sales when they were not Vermont sales?
- For complicated reasons, the change from Joyce to Finnigan makes the impact small

80/20 Companies

An 80/20 company is a US company that has more than 80% of its property and payroll overseas.

- The original vision for these companies were legitimate overseas subsidiaries of US companies. Consider a soft drink company with a European distribution network.
- Companies may have one employee for an entire subsidiary, stationed in Europe, where the entirety of a company's intellectual property revenue comes into, thereby avoiding state taxation.
- Because of this potential for abuse, the United States repealed their recognition of 80/20 companies in 2010.
- Only 1/3 of states that have unitary reporting allowance an 80/20 exclusion
- This is **not** opening Vermont up to worldwide reporting because these are US companies



VERMONT

DEPARTMENT OF TAXES