



The Voice of Oregon Banking • Since 1905

March 30, 2017

Via Email: Iro.exhibits@oregonlegislature.gov

The Oregon Legislature
House Committee on Revenue
900 Court Street N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97301

RE: Vote No on House Bill 2274

Chair Barnhart and Members of the House Revenue Committee:

On behalf of the Oregon Bankers Association we would urge a no vote on House Bill 2274 which, as drafted would, for purposes of corporate tax apportionment calculations, replace the sales factor with a receipts factor and makes alterations to the definition of "receipts." The bill also contains a "throwout" provision.

As drafted, the narrow receipts definition appears to exclude security transactions and, possibly interest, which could represent a meaningful part of a financial institution's business.

With respect to the "throwout" provision, COST's written testimony dated February 6, 2017, a copy of which is attached, summarizes a variety of concerns with this provision.

We would urge the committee to vote no on House Bill 2274. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin T. Christiansen". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Kevin T. Christiansen
Government Affairs Director
Oregon Bankers Association &
Independent Community Banks of Oregon



Officers, 2016-2017

Amy Thomas Laub
Chair
Nationwide Insurance Company

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

John J. Pydyszewski
Past Chair
Johnson & Johnson

Bobby L. Burgner
Past Chair
General Electric Company

Robert F. Montellione
Past Chair
Prudential Financial

Douglas L. Lindholm
President
Council on State Taxation

Directors

Barbara Barton Weiszhaar
HP Inc.

Deborah R. Bierbaum
AT&T

Paul A. Broman
BP America Inc.

Michael F. Carchia
Capital One Services, LLC

Tony J. Chirico
Medtronic, Inc.

Susan Courson-Smith
Pfizer Inc.

Meredith H. Garwood
Charter Communications

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
North America

Rebecca J. Paulsen
U.S. Bancorp

John H. Paraskevas
Exxon Mobil Corporation

Frances B. Sewell
NextEra Energy, Inc.

Warren D. Townsend
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

Frank A. Yanover
GE Capital Americas

Nikki E. Dobay
Senior Tax Counsel
(202) 484-5221
ndobay@cost.org

February 6, 2017

Oregon State Legislature
House Committee on Revenue

Via E-mail

Re: COST Opposes the “Throwout” Provision in Amendment to H.B. 2274

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. 2274. This legislation 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 versus market-based sourcing, COST is opposed to the throwout provision in this legislation.

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. 2274

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. 2274, 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; under throwback, a sale to a “destination” state in which the taxpayer is not taxable is thrown back to the “origin” state’s sales factor numerator. A throwout provision is used with sales of services and/or intangibles; 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 service 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” for purposes of the U.S. Constitution’s Commerce Clause, 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’s position that it can impose the State’s income tax against businesses

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), review denied, N.J. (June 17, 2016). 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).

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 throwout provisions be excluded from any Oregon market-based sourcing proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nikki E. Dobay". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Nikki" being the most prominent part.

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.