



Officers, 2015-2016

Jeffrey L. Hyde
Chair
IBM Corporation

Amy Thomas Laub
Vice Chair
Tempur Sealy International Inc.

Arthur J. Parham, Jr.
Treasurer
Entergy Services, Inc.

Robert J. Tuinstra, Jr.
Secretary
E.I. DuPont De Nemours and Company

Theodore H. Ghiz, Jr.
Immediate Past Chair
The Coca-Cola Company

Terrence D. Frederick
Past Chair
Sprint

John J. Pydzyszewski
Past Chair
Johnson & Johnson

Bobby L. Burgner
Past Chair
General Electric Company

Stephen P. Olivier
Past Chair
Chevron Corporation

Robert F. Montellione
Past Chair
Prudential Financial

Douglas L. Lindholm
President
Council On State Taxation

Directors

Barbara Barton Weiszhaar
Hewlett-Packard Company

Deborah R. Bierbaum
AT&T

Michael F. Carchia
Capital One Services, LLC

Tony J. Chirico
Medtronic, Inc.

Susan Courson-Smith
Pfizer Inc.

Meredith H. Garwood
Time Warner Cable Inc.

Denise J. Helmken
General Mills

Frank G. Julian
Macy's Inc.

Beth Ann Kendzierski
Apria Healthcare, Inc.

Kurt Lamp
Amazon.Com

Mollie L. Miller
Fresenius Medical Care

Rebecca J. Paulsen
U.S. Bancorp

Richard Prem
Expedia.Com

Frances B. Sewell
Tyco International

Warren D. Townsend
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

James R. Williams
Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Frank A. Yanover
GE Capital Americas

Nikki E. Dobay
West Coast Tax Counsel
(202) 484-5229
ndobay@cost.org

February 10, 2016

Oregon State Legislature
House Committee on Revenue

Via E-mail

Re: COST Opposes the “Throwout” Provision in Amendment to H.B. 4026

Dear Chairman Barnhart and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Council On State Taxation (COST), I am writing to oppose the “throwout” provision in H.B. 4026-1. The proposed amendment to H.B. 4026 would repeal Oregon’s current cost-of-performance method for sourcing of services and intangibles and adopt market-based sourcing for such sales. Although COST does not take a position regarding cost-of-performance v. market-based sourcing, COST is opposed to the throwout provision.

COST is a nonprofit trade association consisting of approximately 600 multistate corporations engaged in interstate and international business. COST's objective is to preserve and promote equitable and nondiscriminatory state and local taxation of multijurisdictional business entities.

The “Throwout” Provision Should Be Removed from H.B. 4026-1.

The COST Board of Directors has adopted a formal policy statement against both throwback and throwout provisions.¹ That policy statement position is:

Throwback and throwout laws seek to require companies to pay tax in one state on income that another state has chosen not to tax or is legally unable to tax. A company’s tax liability in one state should not be measured by its tax in another state. Throwback and throwout rules also discourage investment in a state. Such rules must not be adopted and must be repealed where they presently exist.

Subpart (6) of Section 2 of H.B. 4026-1, which contains the throwout provision COST opposes, states the following:

¹ COST’s Policy Statements are available at: <http://cost.org/Page.aspx?id=3140>. In general, a throwback provision is used for sales of tangible personal property and a sale to a “destination” state which the taxpayer is not taxable is thrown back to the “origin” state. A throwout provision is used with sales of services and/or intangibles for sales which cannot be sourced to a specific location; those sales are excluded from both the numerator and denominator of the sales factor.

If the taxpayer is not taxable in a state to which a receipt is assigned under subsections (1) to (5) of this section, or if the state of assignment cannot be determined under subsections (1) to (4) of this section or reasonably approximated under subsection (5) of this section, the receipt shall be excluded from the denominator of the sales factor.

“Throwout” Provision Contradicts Move to Market-Based Sourcing

Many states have moved to market-based sourcing to export their tax burden. In other words, instead of receipts being sourced to the location where the cost to perform a service occurred (origin location), receipts are sourced to the location of the customer (market location). Thus, in general, the tax liability of a service provider in Oregon with the majority of its customers located outside of the State will be reduced if the State switches to market-based sourcing. In contrast, there is an increase in tax liability for an out-of-state business with the majority of its income producing activities outside of Oregon but its customers in the State. By including a throwout provision in a market-based sourcing statute, sales not taxable in another state or which cannot be assigned are excluded or “thrown out” of both the numerator and the denominator. Although COST does not take a position on whether a state should use cost-of-performance sourcing or market-based sourcing, sales that are “thrown out” will likely increase an Oregon based business’s sales factor to the State. Accordingly, by including a throwout provision, Oregon would essentially be negating the general rationale behind adopting market-based sourcing.

“Throwout” Provision Is Constitutionally Suspect

As noted above, the proposed throwout provision will generally require a business, when calculating its tax in Oregon, to exclude sales made to customers in another state if the other state chooses not to tax that income or is prohibited from taxing that income by the U.S. Constitution or by a federal law. This goes against good tax policy. A business’s correct measure of tax in a state should be determined without reference to the taxes a business pays in other states. It is also inconsistent with the basic premise of fair apportionment.² Throwout must be limited to survive a constitutional challenge. Two cases in New Jersey that addressed New Jersey’s throwout provision, which was subsequently repealed, held: (1) only receipts where another state lacks the legal authority to impose an income tax can be subject to throwout and (2) to be internally consistent, the taxing state’s position on what constitutes “substantial nexus” must be used to determine the legal authority to impose a tax, not the other states’ legal positions.³ Thus, based on the Oregon Department of Revenue position that it can impose the State’s income tax

² See COST’s Policy Statements are available at: <http://cost.org/Page.aspx?id=3140>, citing Final Report, New Jersey Corporation Business Tax Study Commission, June 29, 2004, pp. 8-9.

³ See *Whirlpool Properties, Inc. v. Director, Div. of Taxation*, 208 N.J. 141 (N.J. 2011) and *Lorillard Licensing Co., LLC v. Director, Div. of Taxation*, Superior Court, App. Div. (Dec. 4, 2015). The New Jersey legislature repealed its throwout provision effective July 1, 2010. To be internally consistent, a state’s tax, if theoretically imposed by every other state, would not result in duplicative taxation. See *Comptroller of the Treasury of Maryland v. Wynne*, 135 S. Ct. 1787, 1802 (2015).

against businesses with no physical presence in the State (*i.e.*, merely having an economic presence in the State) the Department will be hard pressed to throw out any sales.⁴

Conclusion

COST strongly encourages this Committee to recommend that the throwout provision be excluded from Oregon market-based sourcing statute.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nikki E. Dobay". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Nikki E. Dobay

cc: COST Board of Directors
Douglas L. Lindholm, President & Executive Director, COST

⁴ See Or. Admin. R. 150-317.010(2) stating substantial nexus may be established through a significant economic presence in the State.