

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

Recommendations Regarding
New York State's Response to Federal Tax Reform

Table of Contents

Introduction:.....	i
Cover Letter.....	ii
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING.....	1

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

OFFICERS

RICHARD G. COHEN

Chairman
40 Wall Street
24th floor
New York City 10005

DONALD SCHAPIRO

First Vice-Chairman
26 Broadway
New York City 10004

HERBERT L. CAMP

Second Vice-Chairman
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York City 10112

WILLIAM L. BURKE

Secretary
One Wall Street
New York City 10005

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

Alternative Minimum Tax

Eugene L. Vogel, New York City
William H. Weigel, New York City

Bankruptcy

Peter C. Canellos, New York City
Kenneth H. Heitner, New York City

Commodities and Financial Futures

Richard L. Reinhold, New York City
Michelle P. Scott, New York City

Continuing Legal Education

Sydney R. Rubin, Rochester

Corporations

Edward D. Kleinbard, New York City
Michael L. Schler, New York City

Criminal and Civil Penalties

Sherry S. Kraus, Rochester
Sherman F. Levey, Rochester

Depreciation and Investment Credit

Victor Zonana, New York City
Richard J. Bronstein, New York City

Employee Benefits

Laraine S. Rothenberg, New York City
Robert E. Brown, Rochester

Estate and Gift Taxes

Carlyn S. McCaffrey, New York City
Sherwin Kamin, New York City

Exempt Organizations

Henry Christensen III, New York City
Philip S. Winterer, New York City

Financial Institutions

Donald S. Rice, New York City
Michael H. Simonson, New York City

Foreign Activities of U.S. Taxpayers

Alan W. Granwell, Washington, D.C.
Matthew M. McKenna, New York City

Income of Estates and Trusts

Robert F. Baldwin, Jr. Syracuse
Jerome A. Manning, New York City

Income From Real Property

Martin B. Cowan, New York City
Arthur A. Feder, New York City

Insurance Companies

Donald C. Alexander, Washington D.C.
Hugh T. McCormick, New York City

Interstate Commerce

James H. Peters, Basking Ridge, N.J.
William M. Colby, Rochester

Net Operating Losses

James M. Peaslee, New York City
Matthew A. Rosen, New York City

New York State Tax Matters

Paul R. Comeau, Buffalo
Arthur R. Rosen, Morristown, N.J.

Partnerships

William F. Indoe, New York City
Bruce M. Montgomerie, New York City

Personal Income

Steven C. Todrys, New York City
Patricia Geoghegan, New York City

Practice and Procedure

Sterling L. Weaver, Rochester
Michael I. Saltzman, New York City

Problems of the profession

Thomas V. Glynn, New York City
Paul Pineo, Rochester

Reorganizations

Robert A. Jacobs, New York City
Richard O. Loengard, Jr., New York City

Sales, Property and Miscellaneous

E. Parker Brown II, Syracuse
Edward H. Hein, New York City

Tax Accounting Matters

Victor F. Keen, New York City
Richard M. Leder, New York City

Tax Exempt Bonds

Dennis R. Deveney, New York City
Jackson B. Browning, Jr. New York City

Tax Policy

Mark L. McConaghy, Washington, D. C.
James S. Halpern, Washington, D. C.

Unreported Income & Compliance

M. Bernard Aidinoff, New York City
Robert S. Fink, New York City

U.S. Activities of Foreign Taxpayers

Leslie J. Schreyer, New York City
John A. Corry, New York City

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Martin B. Amdur	Morris L. Kramer	Robert J. McDermott	Sidney I. Roberts	R. Donald Turlington
Cynthia G. Beerbower	Robert J. Levinsohn	Ronald A. Morris	Peter J. Rothenberg	David E. Watts
James S. Eustice	James A. Levitan	Stephen M. Piga	Stanley I. Rubinfeld	George E. Zeitlin

Attached letter dated 6/19/86 enclosing report regarding New York State's Response to Federal Reform sent to the following:

The Honorable Mario M. Cuomo
CC: Mr. Brad Johnson

The Honorable Roderick G. W. Chu
New York State Commissioner of Taxation & Finance

The Honorable Warren M. Anderson
Majority Leader
New York State Senate

The Honorable Daniel B. Walsh
Majority Leader
New York State Assembly

The Honorable John J. Marchi
Chairman
Senate Finance Committee

The Honorable Stanley Fink
Speaker
New York State Assembly

The Honorable Arthur J. Kremer
Chairman
Way & Means Committee

Frank Mauro, Esq.
Secretary
Ways & Means Committee

Mr. R. Wayne Diesel
Director of the Budget
New York State Division of the Budget

FORMER CHAIRMEN OF SECTION

Howard O. Colgan	Edwin M. Jones	Richard H. Appert	Gordon D. Henderson
Charles L. Kades	Hon. Hugh R. Jones	Ralph O. Winger	David Sachs
Charles J. Tobin Jr.	Peter Miller	Hewitt A. Conway	Ruth G. Schapiro
Carter T. Louthan	John W. Fager	Martin D. Ginsburg	J. Roger Mentz
Samuel Brodsky	John E. Morrissey Jr.	Peter L. Faber	Willard B. Taylor
Thomas C. Plowden-Wardlaw	Charles E. Heming	Renato Beghe	Richard J. Hiegel
		Alfred D. Youngwood	Dale S. Collinson

OFFICERS
RICHARD G. COHEN
Chairman
40 Wall Street
24th floor
New York City 10005
DONALD SCHAPIRO
First Vice-Chairman
26 Broadway
New York City 1004
HERBERT L. CAMP
Second Vice-Chairman
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York City 10112
WILLIAM L. BURKE
Secretary
One Wall Street
New York City 10005

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES
Alternative Minimum Tax
Eugene L. Vogel, New York City
William H. Weigel, New York City
Bankruptcy
Peter C. Canellos, New York City
Kenneth H. Heitner, New York City
Commodities and Financial Futures
Richard L. Reinhold, New York City
Michelle P. Scott, New York City
Continuing Legal Education
Sydney R. Rubin, Rochester
Corporations
Edward D. Kleinbard, New York City
Michael L. Schler, New York City
Criminal and Civil Penalties
Sherry S. Kraus, Rochester
Sherman F. Levey, Rochester
Depreciation and investment Credit
Victor Zonana, New York City
Richard J. Bronstein, New York City
Employee Benefits
Laraine S. Rothenberg, New York City
Robert E. Brown, Rochester
Estate and Gift Taxes
Carlyn S. McCaffrey, New York City
Sherwin Kamin, New York City
Exempt Organizations
Henry Christensen III, New York City
Philip S. Winterer, New York City
Financial Institutions
Donald S. Rice, New York City
Michael H. Simonson, New York City
Foreign Activities of U.S. Taxpayers
Alan W. Granwell, Washington, D.C.
Matthew M. McKenna, New York City
Income of Estates and Trusts
Robert F. Baldwin, Jr. Syracuse
Jerome A. Manning, New York City
Income From Real Property
Martin B. Cowan, New York City
Arthur A. Feder, New York City
Insurance Companies
Donald C. Alexander, Washington D.C.
Hugh T. McCormick, New York City
Interstate Commerce
James H. Peters, Basking Ridge, N.J.
William M. Colby, Rochester
Net Operating Losses
James M. Peaslee, New York City
Matthew A. Rosen, New York City
New York State Tax Matters
Paul R. Comeau, Buffalo
Arthur R. Rosen, Morristown, N.J.
Partnerships
William F. Indoe, New York City
Bruce M. Montgomerie, New York City
Personal Income
Steven C. Todrys, New York City
Patricia Geoghegan, New York City
Practice and Procedure
Sterling L. Weaver, Rochester
Michael I. Saltzman, New York City
Problems of the profession
Thomas V. Glynn, New York City
Paul Pineo, Rochester
Reorganizations
Robert A. Jacobs, New York City
Richard O. Loengard, Jr., New York City
Sales, Property and Miscellaneous
E. Parker Brown II, Syracuse
Edward H. Hein, New York City
Tax Accounting Matters
Victor F. Keen, New York City
Richard M. Leder, New York City
Tax Exempt Bonds
Dennis R. Deveney, New York City
Jackson B. Browning, Jr. New York City
Tax Policy
Mark L. McConaghy, Washington, D. C.
James S. Halpern, Washington, D. C.
Unreported Income & Compliance
M. Bernard Aidinoff, New York City
Robert S. Fink, New York City
U.S. Activities of Foreign Taxpayers
Leslie J. Schreyer, New York City
John A. Corry, New York City

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Martin B. Amdur Morris L. Kramer Robert J. McDermott Sidney I. Roberts R. Donald Turlington
Cynthia G. Beerbower Robert J. Levinsohn Ronald A. Morris Peter J. Rothenberg David E. Watts
James S. Eustice James A. Levitan Stephen M. Piga Stanley I. Rubenfeld George E. Zeitlin

June 19, 1986

The Honorable Mario M. Cuomo
Executive Chamber
State Capitol
Albany, NY 12224

Dear Governor Cuomo:

Pending Federal tax reform proposals, which now seem highly likely to be enacted, will profoundly affect New York State individual and corporate income taxes. Prompt adjustment of New York income tax laws is necessary to avoid distortion and preserve New York State's competitive position in relation to other states.

I enclose a report prepared by a Special Committee of the New York State Bar Association Tax Section, chaired by Gordon Henderson, that describes the distortion that will result from the enactment of current Federal tax proposals and recommends possible state action.

I hope the report proves useful to you.

Sincerely,

Richard k. Cohen
Chairman

Enclosure
cc: Mr. Brad Johnson (w/enclosure)

FORMER CHAIRMEN OF SECTION

Howard O. Colgan Edwin M. Jones Richard H. Appert Gordon D. Henderson
Charles L. Kades Hon. Hugh R. Jones Ralph O. Winger David Sachs
Charles J. Tobin Jr. Peter Miller Hewitt A. Conway Ruth G. Schapiro
Carter T. Louthan John W. Fager Martin D. Ginsburg J. Roger Mentz
Samuel Brodsky John E. Morrissey Jr. Peter L. Faber Willard B. Taylor
Thomas C. Plowden-Wardlaw Charles E. Heming Renato Beghe Richard J. Hiegel
Alfred D. Youngwood Dale S. Collinson

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

- OFFICERS
RICHARD G. COHEN
Chairman
40 Wall Street
24th floor
New York City 10005
DONALD SCHAPIRO
First Vice-Chairman
26 Broadway
New York City 1004
HERBERT L. CAMP
Second Vice-Chairman
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York City 10112
WILLIAM L. BURKE
Secretary
One Wall Street
New York City 10005

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- Martin B. Amdur Morris L. Kramer Robert J. McDermott Sidney I. Roberts R. Donald Turlington
Cynthia G. Beerbower Robert J. Levinsohn Ronald A. Morris Peter J. Rothenberg David E. Watts
James S. Eustice James A. Levitan Stephen M. Piga Stanley I. Rubinfeld George E. Zeitlin

June 17, 1986

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING
NEW YORK STATE'S RESPONSE
TO FEDERAL TAX REFORM

Because the tax bases for the New York personal income tax and corporate franchise tax largely conform to the Federal income tax base, adoption by the Federal government of the pending tax reform proposals will have a profound effect on New York State's individual and corporate income taxes. New York will need to adjust its income tax laws immediately upon adoption of the Federal reforms if it is not to suffer a serious erosion of its competitive position in relation to other States. The purpose of this report is to recommend an approach for the State to take in choosing what adjustments to make.

We would like to emphasize the importance of prompt action by the State. Should a final Federal bill be sent to the President in late summer or early fall, a special session of the New York Legislature this fall would seem in order. Delay until the regular budget

- CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES
Alternative Minimum Tax
Eugene L. Vogel, New York City
William H. Weigel, New York City
Bankruptcy
Peter C. Canellos, New York City
Kenneth H. Heitner, New York City
Commodities and Financial Futures
Richard L. Reinhold, New York City
Michelle P. Scott, New York City
Continuing Legal Education
Sydney R. Rubin, Rochester
Corporations
Edward D. Kleinbard, New York City
Michael L. Schler, New York City
Criminal and Civil Penalties
Sherry S. Kraus, Rochester
Sherman F. Levey, Rochester
Depreciation and Investment Credit
Victor Zonana, New York City
Richard J. Bronstein, New York City
Employee Benefits
Laraine S. Rothenberg, New York City
Robert E. Brown, Rochester
Estate and Gift Taxes
Carlyn S. McCaffrey, New York City
Sherwin Kamin, New York City
Exempt Organizations
Henry Christensen III, New York City
Philip S. Winterer, New York City
Financial Institutions
Donald S. Rice, New York City
Michael H. Simonson, New York City
Foreign Activities of U.S. Taxpayers
Alan W. Granwell, Washington, D.C.
Matthew M. McKenna, New York City
Income of Estates and Trusts
Robert F. Baldwin, Jr. Syracuse
Jerome A. Manning, New York City
Income From Real Property
Martin B. Cowan, New York City
Arthur A. Feder, New York City
Insurance Companies
Donald C. Alexander, Washington D.C.
Hugh T. McCormick, New York City
Interstate Commerce
James H. Peters, Basking Ridge, N.J.
William M. Colby, Rochester
Net Operating Losses
James M. Peaslee, New York City
Matthew A. Rosen, New York City
New York State Tax Matters
Paul R. Comeau, Buffalo
Arthur R. Rosen, Morristown, N.J.
Partnerships
William F. Indoe, New York City
Bruce M. Montgomerie, New York City
Personal Income
Steven C. Todrys, New York City
Patricia Geoghegan, New York City
Practice and Procedure
Sterling L. Weaver, Rochester
Michael I. Saltzman, New York City
Problems of the Profession
Thomas V. Glynn, New York City
Paul Pineo, Rochester
Reorganizations
Robert A. Jacobs, New York City
Richard O. Loengard, Jr., New York City
Sales, Property and Miscellaneous
E. Parker Brown II, Syracuse
Edward H. Hein, New York City
Tax Accounting Matters
Victor F. Keen, New York City
Richard M. Leder, New York City
Tax Exempt Bonds
Dennis R. Deveney, New York City
Jackson B. Browning, Jr. New York City
Tax Policy
Mark L. McConaghy, Washington, D. C.
James S. Halpern, Washington, D. C.
Unreported Income & Compliance
M. Bernard Aidinoff, New York City
Robert S. Fink, New York City
U.S. Activities of Foreign Taxpayers
Leslie J. Schreyer, New York City
John A. Corry, New York City

FORMER CHAIRMEN OF SECTION

- Howard O. Colgan Edwin M. Jones Richard H. Appert Gordon D. Henderson
Charles L. Kades Hon. Hugh R. Jones Ralph O. Winger David Sachs
Charles J. Tobin Jr. Peter Miller Hewitt A. Conway Ruth G. Schapiro
Carter T. Louthan John W. Fager Martin D. Ginsburg J. Roger Mentz
Samuel Brodsky John E. Morrissey Jr. Peter L. Faber Willard B. Taylor
Thomas C. Plowden-Wardlaw Charles E. Heming Renato Beghe Richard J. Hiegel
Alfred D. Youngwood Dale S. Collinson

1. They reduce the aggregate Federal tax burden on individuals -- by 6.4% in the Senate proposal,¹ 9% in the House proposal, and 7% in the President's proposal. Because they are intended to be revenue neutral, they add the dollar amount of this individual tax reduction to the tax burden on corporations. Since the aggregate tax paid by corporations is less than that paid by individuals, this results in an increase in the aggregate corporate tax burden that is greater than the 6.4% to 9% reduction in the individual income tax burden.

2. In addition to this shift of a portion of the tax burden from individuals to corporations, they make major changes in the Federal tax base and rate structures. The base is broadened and rates are sharply reduced. In the Senate proposal, for example, the number of individual rate brackets is reduced from 15 to 2, and the top individual rate is cut almost in half, from 50% to 27.9. The top corporate rate is reduced to 33% which is roughly three-quarters of the present rate.

3. The Senate proposal would eliminate the special capital gains rate for individuals (though not for cor-

¹ The Senate proposal's 6.4% reduction occurs only in 1988, the peak year in the Senate proposal of the reduction for individuals. The Senate proposal's reduction in the other years in the 1987-1991 period would be less, in most such years considerably less.

Changes in Individual Income Tax Liabilities

	<u>president's Proposal</u>	<u>House Bill</u>
United States	-9.2%	-9.6%
New York	-4.9%	-8.8%
Connecticut	-11.3%	-10.4%
New Jersey	-10.1%	-10.6%
Pennsylvania	-9.9%	-10.4%

This relatively harsh impact on New Yorkers of the changes in Federal tax liabilities will be compounded by the impact of the Federal changes on the State tax liabilities of New Yorkers. The Federal tax-base changes that will be automatically reflected in the New York tax base will result in a sharp increase in the State personal income tax liabilities of New Yorkers -- unless New York takes action to prevent this from happening. The increase for New Yorkers will be greater than for the residents of most states, according to the ACIR numbers. It will also be greater than for residents of most of our neighboring states, as reflected in the following ACIR estimates. The increased after-tax burden of state and local taxes, caused by lower Federal rates, will make such differences particularly noticeable to taxpayers.

Potential Automatic Effect of Federal
Reform on State Personal Income Tax Revenues

	<u>president's Proposal</u>	<u>House Bill</u>
New York	7%	5%
Connecticut	5%	8%
New Jersey	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0

1975 Per Capita Figures

	<u>Tax Capacity</u>	<u>Tax Effort</u>
All U.S.	100%	100%
New York	98%	159.6%
Connecticut	110.3%	98.7%
New Jersey	108.6%	102.8%
Pennsylvania	98.4%	93.0%
California	110%	119.4%

The New York numbers are so significantly out of line with those of other states that adoption of the proposed Federal tax reforms will undoubtedly put pressure on New York not only to adjust its tax structure but also to reduce the level of its expenditures.

Approach Recommended For New York State

The first step that New York State should take is to develop estimates of the revenue increases that will result from the automatic reflection of the Federal base- broadening reforms in the New York tax base. These estimates should be developed separately for (1) individuals and (2) corporations. The second step for New York is to

determine how much of the tax burden on individuals would have to be shifted to corporations if New York were to redistribute from individuals to corporations the same percentage of its overall tax burden that the Federal government proposes to redistribute to corporations.

Next, New York should determine how much the individual and corporate rates could be reduced if (1) all of standard deduction amounts are political questions which we refrain from expressing recommendation.

2. In adjusting its individual income tax rates, New York will have to consider what to do about the present differential between its rates on unearned income and its rates on earned income. The Federal law no longer contains a similar distinction.

3. The Tax Section of the New York State Bar Association has long been a leading advocate of conformity between the New York State and the Federal income tax base. Such conformity serves the important interests of simplicity and efficient administration. In recent years, New York has departed from the conformity principle in several instances. An example is its uncoupling from the Federal depreciation system. We urge that in adjusting to the Federal tax reforms, New York apply conformity as the overriding principle governing its tax base. This would include the computation of depreciation. Conformity does not

extend, however, to tax rates or to the amounts of the personal exemption or standard deduction.

4. The Federal reform proposals would eliminate the investment tax credit. This is one of the items that allows rates to be reduced. New York State has its own investment tax credit. Conformity with the Federal

7. Special attention may also have to be given by New York to capital gains. Depending on where New York sets its regular rates, New York may find for competitive reasons that it will have to retain a preferential rate for capital gains. The argument for doing so (as well as for eliminating the rate differential between investment and earned income) is that taxpayers with substantial capital gains (and investment income) are likely to be particularly mobile. Because they are also more likely than other taxpayers to own or control' business operations, when they leave a state or decide not to enter it they may have a disproportionate impact on the decisions of businesses to leave or enter a state. On the other hand, principles of simplification and conformity would be served if New York were to follow the Federal lead with respect to retention or elimination of the capital gains preference.

8. At present, New York has a minimum tax on tax preferences for individual but not for corporate tax purposes. Less than a third of the states have a minimum tax on tax preferences. The New York individual minimum tax does not conform

with either the present or the proposed Federal minimum tax structure. New York should either conform the structure of its minimum taxes to the Federal models, or it should eliminate them. If

b. Second, as an alternative, New York could adjust to the Federal changes by retaining its present rate and exemption structure and then superimposing a "negative surcharge". The latter would be a percentage reduction in tax computed under the existing rate and exemption structure equal to the percentage by which the Federal base-broadening would otherwise increase the New York tax. Thus, if the Federal base-broadening, would increase the New York personal income tax collections by 108, the "negative surcharge" applied to each taxpayer's tax would be 10% (or, if some of the individual tax burden is to be shifted to corporations, by an appropriately adjusted number in excess of 10%). Such a "negative surcharge" may be more attractive as a short-run expedient than as a final solution, since New York may need to flatten its rates, as the Federal proposals do, more than such a surcharge would permit.

c. Third, as yet another approach, New York might adopt a system like that of Vermont or Rhode Island, whereby the state income tax on individuals is simply computed as a percentage of the individual's Federal tax liability. The argument in favor of such a system is that it can be the simplest and