



STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION STAFF LEGISLATIVE BILL ANALYSIS

Date Introduced:	02/22/05	Bill No:	SB 631
Tax:	Sales and Use	Author:	Dutton
Related Bills:	AB 80 (Houston) AB 344 (Villines) AB 845 (Ridley-Thomas) AB 1580 (Torricon) SB 552 (Alquist)		

BILL SUMMARY

This bill would, beginning January 1, 2006, reinstate the state sales and use tax exemption for purchases of qualifying tangible personal property by new trades or businesses engaged in manufacturing, and broaden the exemption to include new electrical generators, as specified.

ANALYSIS

Current Law

Under current law, entities engaged in activities such as manufacturing, research and development, and power generation activities that make purchases of equipment and other supplies 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 these entities.

Proposed Law

This bill would add Section 6377 to the Sales and Use Tax Law to provide an exemption operative January 1, 2006, 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).
- Tangible personal property purchased for use in research and development.
- Tangible personal property purchased by a contractor or a subcontractor for use in a construction contract for a manufacturer for use in manufacturing, processing, refining, fabricating, recycling, or as a research or storage facility.
- Tangible personal property purchased to be used 50 percent or more in maintaining, repairing, measuring, or testing any exempt manufacturing equipment.
- Tangible personal property purchased to be used in the telecommunication industry.

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.

- 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 new trade or business engaged in manufacturing activities, as described in the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Manual Codes 2011 and 3999, and electrical generation activities as described in SIC Code.

The bill would specify that the proposed exemption would *not* include 1) any tangible personal property that is used primarily in administration, general management or marketing, 2) consumables with a normal useful life of less than one year, except for fuels used in the manufacturing process, and 3) furniture, inventory, equipment used in the extraction process, or equipment used to store finished products that have completed the manufacturing process.

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 state 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” (SIC) codes. The exemption provided a state tax portion exemption for sales and purchases of qualifying property, and the income tax credit was equal to 6% 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.”

This sales and use tax exemption and income tax credit had a conditional sunset date. They were to sunset in any year following a year when manufacturing employment (as determined by EDD) 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 by over 10,000), and therefore the MIC and partial sales tax exemption sunsetted at the end of 2003.

The manufacturer’s sales and use tax partial exemption for new manufacturers and the corresponding 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.

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.

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.

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.

- 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.

COMMENTS

1. **Sponsor and purpose.** This bill is sponsored by Senator Dutton. The author’s office has indicated that SB 631 is a two-year bill. It is intended to stimulate California’s economy by reducing the costs of capital investments in manufacturing and power generating equipment purchased by new entities.
2. **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 administered Section 6377 previously. Staff will work with the author’s office in drafting amendments as the bill progresses through the legislative process.
 - Subdivision (g) of proposed Section 6377 (page 7) 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 manufacturers (and electrical generating entities), 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.
 - Another issue relates to the proposed definitions for the types of property included or excluded from the proposed exemption. For example, on page 5, lines 30, and page 6, line 8, the bill refers to the items having a useful life of one year or more (or less). 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.

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.

- The original exemption was added in 1993 and referenced the Standard Industrial Classification Codes for purposes of qualifying entities. This bill would also reference those codes. However, the North American Industry Classification System has replaced the U.S. Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system, and perhaps should be used to reference the activities the author intends to be included within the scope of the exemption.
3. **Related measures.** Other measures that would provide an exemption for manufacturing activities and other related activities include:
- AB 80 (Ridley-Thomas) would, beginning on the first January following the fiscal year in which the state budget deficit for the 2005-06 fiscal year is eliminated, provide a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25%) for purchases of qualifying tangible personal property by qualified persons primarily engaged in manufacturing, telecommunications and electrical generation activities, as specified.
 - AB 344 (Villines) would provide a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25%) for purchases of qualifying tangible personal property by qualified persons primarily engaged in manufacturing, telecommunications and electrical generation activities, as specified. The partial exemption would apply to 25% of the sales or purchases for 2006, 50% for 2007, and 100% thereafter.
 - AB 845 (Ridley-Thomas) would reinstate the manufacturer's exemption but provide a conditional sunset date depending on the growth in employment and limit the exemption based on the manufacturers' aggregate gross assets. AB 845 would also include manufacturers other than new establishments.
 - AB 1580 (Torrico) would provide a state sales and use tax exemption (5.25%) for purchases of qualifying tangible personal property by qualified persons primarily engaged in specified activities, including manufacturing, construction contracting, software production, telecommunications, cable distribution, scientific research and development services, and wholesale distribution of recyclable materials. The bill would postpone the above exemption until after an unspecified date, and would allow qualifying purchasers to claim refunds for the equivalent amount of tax paid during the period of postponement.
 - SB 552 (Alquist) would provide a state and an optional local and district sales and use tax exemption for purchases of materials, supplies, machinery and equipment used by entities engaged in manufacturing, research and development, telecommunications, software production, and printing, and for semiconductor, biotechnology and pharmaceuticals cleanrooms and equipment. The bill would provide that the exemption shall apply to purchases on or after January 1, 2006, but the exemption shall be postponed until the first January 1 following the fiscal year in which the state budget deficit is eliminated. Qualified persons would be allowed to file a claim for refund with the Board equal to the amount of sales or use tax paid on the purchase or purchases of qualifying property, as specified.

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.

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

This measure would, beginning January 1, 2006, provide an exemption from the state sales and use tax for certain equipment purchases by a new trade or business engaged in those lines of business described in SIC Codes 2011 to 3999, inclusive, and Code 4911.

Current purchases of qualified equipment as defined in this measure are represented in the table as equipment expenditures by SIC code.

SIC Codes	Classification	Equipment Expenditures
2011 to 3999	Manufacturing & R&D	\$ 133.1 million
4911	Electricity Generation	\$ 27.4 million
Total		\$ 160.5 million

Revenue Summary

The annual state General Fund revenue loss from exempting \$160.5 in purchases is estimated to be \$8.4 million (\$160.5 million X .0525).

FY 2005-06 (half year)	\$4.2 million
FY 2006-07 and beyond	\$8.4 million

Analysis prepared by:	Sheila T. Sarem	445-6579	05/03/05
Revenue estimate by:	Timothy Wahl	445-0840	
Contact:	Margaret S. Shedd	322-2376	
mcc			0631-1ss.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.