



**STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
STAFF LEGISLATIVE BILL ANALYSIS**

Date Introduced:	02/23/07	Bill No:	<u>AB 1152</u>
Tax:	Sales and Use	Author:	Niello
Related Bills:	AB 1206 (Smyth) AB 1681 (Houston) SB 359 (Runner & Dutton)		

BILL SUMMARY

This bill would, beginning January 1, 2008, provide a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25%) for purchases of qualifying tangible personal property by persons engaged in manufacturing and software production, as specified and defined.

ANALYSIS

CURRENT LAW

Under current law, entities engaged in activities such as manufacturing, research and development, and software producing that purchase equipment and other items for use in the conduct of their activities are required to pay tax on their purchases to the same extent as any other person either engaged in business in California or not so engaged. Current law does not provide special tax treatment for purchases of equipment used by these entities.

The statewide sales and use tax rate (7.25%) imposed on taxable sales and purchases of tangible personal property is made up of the following components (additional district taxes are levied among various local jurisdictions and are not reflected in this chart):

Rate	Jurisdiction	R & T Code
5.0%	State (General Fund)	6051, 6201, 6051.3, 6201.3
0.25%	State (Fiscal Recovery Fund)	6051.5, 6201.5
0.50%	Local Revenue Fund	6051.2, 6201.2
0.50%	Local Public Safety Fund	§35 Art XIII St. Constitution
1.00%	Local (0.25% County transportation funds 0.75% City and county operations)	7203.1

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.

PROPOSED LAW

This bill would add Section 6377 to the Sales and Use Tax Law to provide a partial exemption (5.25%) from the statewide sales and use tax rate operative January 1, 2008 for the following purchases by a “qualified person”:

- Tangible personal property to be used 50 percent or more in any stage of manufacturing, processing, refining, fabricating, or recycling of property (i.e., machinery, equipment belts, shafts, computers, software, pollution control equipment, buildings and foundations), as specified.
- Tangible personal property purchased for use by a contractor, as specified, for use in the performance of a construction contract for the qualified person who will use that property as an integral part of the manufacturing process, as described.

The bill would define a “qualified person” as any person engaged in manufacturing activities, as described in the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes 3111 and 3399, and software production activities as described in NAICS codes 5112, or an affiliate of a qualified person, as defined.

The bill would specify that the proposed exemption would *not* include 1) consumables with a normal useful life of less than one year, except for fuels used or consumed in the manufacturing process, and 2) furniture, inventory, equipment used in the extraction process, or equipment used to store finished products that have completed the manufacturing process.

The bill would define the terms, “manufacturing,” “primarily,” “process,” “processing,” “refining,” and “tangible personal property.”

As a tax levy, the bill would become effective immediately upon enactment.

BACKGROUND

For a ten-year period ending December 31, 2003, the law provided a partial sales and use tax exemption for purchases of equipment and machinery by new manufacturers, and income and corporation tax credits for existing manufacturers' investments (MIC) in equipment. Manufacturers were defined in terms of specific federal Standard Industrial Classification codes. The exemption applied to the state tax portion of the statewide rate for sales and purchases of qualifying property, and the in lieu income tax credit was equal to six percent of the amount paid for qualified property placed in service in California. Qualified property essentially was depreciable equipment used primarily for manufacturing, refining, processing, fabricating or recycling; for research and development; for maintenance, repair, measurement or testing of qualified property; and for pollution control meeting state or federal standards. Certain special purpose buildings were included as "qualified property." New manufacturers could receive either the benefit of the exemption, or claim the income tax credit. However, existing manufacturers could only receive the benefit of the income tax credit.

This partial sales and use tax exemption and income tax credit had a conditional sunset date. The sunset was to occur in any year following a year when manufacturing employment (as determined by the Employment Development Department) did not exceed January 1, 1994 manufacturing employment by more than 100,000. On January 1, 2003, manufacturing employment (less aerospace) did not exceed the 1994 employment number by more than 100,000 (indeed, it was *less* than the 1994 number

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.

by over 10,000), and therefore the MIC and partial sales tax exemption sunsetted at the end of 2003.

The sales and use tax partial exemption for new manufacturers and the income tax credit for existing manufacturers were added in 1994 by SB 671 (Stats. 1993, Ch. 881). The purpose of that legislation was to enable California to become competitive with the 42 other states that exempted manufacturing equipment and were luring manufacturers away from California with promises of lower taxes. SB 671 was designed to provide California companies with an immediate incentive to expand their facilities and to create new jobs.

Since the expiration of these tax incentives, numerous measures have been introduced to either reinstate or to expand or modify the incentives. Listed below are similar measures considered during the 2005/06 Legislative Session:

- AB 2218 (Torrico) - would have, for a 10-year period beginning January 1, 2007, provided a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25 percent) for purchases of qualifying tangible personal property by trades or businesses and their affiliates, as specified and defined. The bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
- AB 2395 (Villines) - would have provided, for calendar years beginning on or after January 1, 2006, a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25 percent) for tangible personal property, as defined, purchased for use by manufacturers that have "gross aggregate gross assets" used in the manufacturing activity not exceeding \$5 million. The bill would also have provided a corresponding 6 percent income tax credit on purchases of similar property. The bill was held in the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee.
- AB 2595 (Arambula) - would have, among other things, required the Board to grant a "small size manufacturer," as defined, a "sales and use tax offset," as defined, against that manufacturer's tax liability, as specified. The bill was gutted and amended to become a proposed training initiative to increase workers' skills in manufacturing and goods movement and was ultimately vetoed by the Governor.
- SB 1291 (Alquist) - would have provided a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25 percent) for purchases on or after January 1, 2006, of materials, supplies, machinery and equipment used by entities engaged in manufacturing, research and development, software production, and newspaper printing, and for semiconductor, biotechnology and pharmaceutical clean rooms and equipment. This measure died in the Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee.

In an October 2002 report put out by the Legislative Analyst's Office, *An Overview of California's Manufacturers' Investment Credit*, the following arguments against and in support of these tax incentives were presented:

Arguments Supporting the MIC

- Investment Incentive—The MIC effectively reduces the price of new capital, and leads to greater investment. Adherents of this view suggest that a firm considering a capital investment is much more likely to undertake such investment with the MIC in place. Proponents argue that this marginal cost reduction can have a significant positive impact on investment decisions.

- Relocation Incentive—California has become a more attractive place relative to other states for business since the credit has been in place. The argument here is that tax credits do influence corporate location decisions and dissuade businesses from moving their activities out of California. Manufacturing industry representatives stated and continue to state that the MIC plays an important role in both expansion and business location decisions.
- Efficient Job Allocator—Competition for business among states is an efficient job allocator. This argument holds that the nation benefits from the redistribution of jobs that may occur due to the use of investment tax credits. This is based on the notion that jobs are worth more in areas with higher unemployment, and that such areas are likely to have relatively aggressive tax credit programs. These areas will be able to attract businesses away from regions that do not value the jobs as highly.
- Other Arguments. Advocates of the MIC also emphasize that the MIC offers significant indirect benefits to the state in terms of investment and job growth that result in additional state revenues. They also point out the importance of manufacturing to the overall state economy in terms of economic stability and the high value-added nature of the employment in this sector.

Arguments Against the MIC

- Inequitable Taxation—The MIC results in giving a tax advantage to manufacturing over other business activities, as well as providing an advantage to capital investment over labor. This view holds that since only one type of industry (and production factor) benefits from the tax credit, the remaining industries face relatively higher costs, and are therefore at a competitive disadvantage. Such preferential treatment can also result in inefficient resource allocation according to this view.
- Relocation Rather Than Creation—The MIC results in few new jobs, but rather pits states against each other in competing for jobs. The argument here is that corporate tax breaks are no more than a transfer of government funds to private businesses, and in the end, the national economy is unaffected. In this view the competition among states in offering various tax incentives represents a form of “prisoners’ dilemma”—in which each state would be better off if none offered such incentives. If one state does offer them, however, it is in the interest of other states to do the same.
- Inefficient Development Policy—Tax incentives have a negligible impact on economic growth, and any job creation that does occur does so at a substantial cost per job. Proponents of this view also hold that some of the tax credits will go to companies which would have made the same investments, regardless of the tax incentive. That is, the tax credit did not induce the investment, yet the company receives “windfall benefits” in the form of reduced taxes.
- Ineffective Development Policy—Taxes are a very small percentage of overall business costs and thus have little effect on business decisions. Labor, transportation, land, and other factors typically constitute much more significant proportions of total costs than do taxes. Therefore, according to those who hold this view, tinkering with this particular cost is unlikely to result in a large shift or expansion of business compared to the adverse fiscal effects that such measures can have on the state.

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board’s formal position.

COMMENTS

1. **Sponsor and purpose.** This bill is sponsored by the California Manufacturers and Technology Association. It is intended to stimulate job growth in California's manufacturing industry and to attract additional manufacturing entities to California.
2. **What types of entities do Codes 3111 to 3399 and 5112 include?** Codes 3111 to 3399 include all establishments primarily engaged in manufacturing activities. This includes manufacturers in the aerospace sector, textiles, pharmaceuticals, printing, food, and more.

Code 5112 is comprised of establishments primarily engaged in computer software publishing or publishing and reproduction. Software publishing establishments carry out the functions necessary for producing and distributing computer software, such as designing, providing documentation, assisting in installation, and providing support services to software purchasers. The software publishing industry produces and distributes information, but usually it "publishes" or distributes its information by methods, such as by CD-ROM's, the sale of new computers already preloaded with software, or through distribution over the Internet, rather than in printed form.

3. Technical issues:

- In defining "qualified person," it is recommended that the bill require that the qualifying entity be *primarily* engaged in the activities described in the referenced codes. This is an important issue and one that generated a lot of disputes when the Board previously administered Section 6377. Under the current wording of the bill, persons engaged in any of the activities listed – even minimally – could argue that they qualify for the proposed partial exemption.
- Another issue relates to the proposed definition for the types of property included and excluded from the proposed exemption. Specifically, on page 4, lines 1 and 15, whether or not the sale of an item is exempt or taxable is dependent on its useful life. In order to lessen potential audit disputes, the bill should contain some mechanism for determining the useful life. Perhaps some reference to the provision in the California income tax laws for depreciating assets should be incorporated into the bill.
- On page 4, line 2, "(10)" should be replaced with "(9)" to correctly reference the appropriate paragraph.
- Subdivision (g) of proposed Section 6377 (page 5, line 25) provides for an exemption from tax for specified leases of qualified property and limits this exemption for a six-year period. This limitation is modeled after a provision in former Section 6377 that provided a state tax exemption solely to new manufacturers' leases of equipment. Since this bill would provide the exemption for all qualifying persons, it appears the limitation in subdivision (g) is unnecessary and should be stricken. Otherwise, long-term leases of qualifying property would not enjoy the same tax privileges that the bill would provide to actual purchases of the same property.

4. **Related measures.** Other measures that would provide a state sales and use tax exemption for manufacturing and other related activities include:

- AB 1206 (Smyth), which is also sponsored by the California Manufacturers and Technology Association, would provide a 5.25 percent exemption for sales and purchases of machinery and equipment used in research and development activities.
- AB 1681 (Houston) would provide a 5.25 percent exemption for purchases of tangible personal property, as defined, for use by qualified persons engaged in manufacturing, telecommunications, and electrical generation activities.
- SB 359 (Runner and Dutton) would, among other things, provide from January 1, 2008 until January 1, 2018, a 5.25 percent exemption for tangible personal property, as specified, purchased by new manufacturers and software producers, as defined.

COST ESTIMATE

The Board would incur costs to administer this measure. These costs would be attributable to, among other things, identifying and notifying qualifying entities, auditing claimed amounts, revising sales tax returns, and programming. An estimate of these costs is pending.

REVENUE ESTIMATE

BACKGROUND, METHODOLOGY, AND ASSUMPTIONS

The Annual Survey of Manufacturers, Geographic Area Statistics 2005, Table 3, a U.S. Census Bureau publication, provided that for NAICS 31-33 for California, machinery and equipment expenditures were \$11.2 billion. This bill also includes tangible personal property purchased in the performance of a construction contract for a qualified person who will use the tangible personal property as an integral part of the manufacturing process. Expenditures for construction for these structures were about \$2 billion. We estimate that about half of the expenditures would amount to exempt installation labor charges. This bill includes fuel used or consumed in the manufacturing process. The survey reported \$3.2 billion for purchases of fuels.

The Annual Capital Expenditures 2005, Table 4a, a U.S. Census Bureau publication, provided U.S. expenditure data for the other codes. For NAICS 5112, U.S. equipment expenditures were \$2.5 billion. Based on California’s population, we estimate California expenditures to be \$300 million ($\$2.5 \text{ billion} \times 12\% = \300 million).

California Expenditures - Year 2005

Classification	Expenditures
NAICS 3111-3399 Machinery & equipment	\$ 11.2 billion
NAICS 3111-3399 Building & other structures	\$ 1.0 billion
NAICS 3111-3399 Fuel purchases	\$ 3.2 billion
NAICS 5112 Software publishers	\$ 0.3 billion

Total expenditures \$ 15.7 billion

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board’s formal position.

REVENUE SUMMARY

The annual revenue loss from exempting from the state sales and use tax equipment purchased by manufacturing businesses and software publishers would result in an estimated annual loss of \$824 million (\$15.7 billion x 5.25% = \$824 million).

	<u>Revenue Loss</u>
General Fund (5%)	\$785 million
<u>Fiscal Recovery Fund (.25%)</u>	<u>39 million</u>
Total	<u>\$824 million</u>

Analysis prepared by:	Sheila T. Waters	(916) 445-6579	04/16/07
Revenue estimate by:	Vanessa Shum	(916) 445-0840	
Contact:	Margaret S. Shedd	(916) 322-2376	

1152-1sw.doc

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.