## MINUTES

## MONTANA SENATE 53rd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

## COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

## Call to Order: By Chairman Mike Halligan, on February 18, 1993, at 8:00 a.m.

## ROLL CALL

## Members Present:

Sen. Mike Halligan, Chair (D)
Sen. Dorothy Eck, Vice Chair (D)
Sen. Bob Brown (R)
Sen. Steve Doherty (D)
Sen. Delwyn Gage (R)
Sen. Lorents Grosfield (R)
Sen. John Harp (R)
Sen. Spook Stang (D)
Sen. Tom Towe (D)
Sen. Fred Van Valkenburg (D)
Sen. Bill Yellowtail (D)
Members Excused: None.
Members Absent: None.
Staff Present: Jeff Martin, Legislative Council Bonnie Stark, Committee Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:
Hearing: None.
Executive Action: None. Discussion: SB 191, SB 235, SB 283

Senator Tom Keating presented a tax reform proposal which he believes will stimulate industrial growth, equalize education funding and taxation, and reduce general fund spending by adjusting the state tax structure. Copies of this information are attached to these minutes.

## DISCUSSION ON SB 191

Mick Robinson, Director of the Department of Revenue (DOR), presented the Fiscal Note for SB 191, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. Mr. Robinson reviewed this information which allows certain persons 62 years of age or older to defer
increases in the market value of their primary residences. This information was requested in a previous meeting and is in relationship to an approach offered in a previous legislative session by John Vincent. Mr. Robinson said a $20 \%$ factor is used for the average percent of assessed value deferred, and the average taxable value deferred is $\$ 335$. Mr. Robinson explained how this amount is derived.

The DOR used a relationship of 6,599 actual residential sales in the state during 1991. Of those sales, 3,767 houses actually had sales amounts above the property's assessed value. The remaining sales, 2,832, had sales below the property's assessed value. The average number of residences where the DOR would expect to see an increase in appraised value would be 57\%, and the average increase for each of those residences equalled 20 percent.

Forty-three percent of the sales were below the assessed value, and the average decrease, or percent below the assessed value, was $14 \%$. Mr. Robinson said when the Department talks about $20 \%$, they are trying to get a relationship in terms of how many pieces of property owned by people in this age group will have an increase in value, which is where the deferral would be. There would be some properties statewide which would have a decrease in value. Using all of those values, there is a 5\% overall state increase in sales above assessed value. Mr. Robinson said $20 \%$ is not the average increase expected statewide; it is going to be approximately 5\%.

Relating this in terms of a fiscal impact and tax revenue, the DOR is estimating that $57 \%$ of the 64,100 households, or 36,537, will have a deferral; 20\% times $\$ 43,368$ (the average assessed value) gives the average deferred assessed value of $\$ 8,674$; times a tax rate of 0.0386 , gives the average deferred taxable value of $\$ 335$. Mr. Robinson said the $20 \%$ is applied only to residences where there is an expected increase in value. Other residences, statewide, will have a decrease in value, but they would not opt for a present value, they would opt for the appraised, decreased value.

Averages on all units, statewide, would have an assessed value change of $5 \%$, average deferred taxable value of $\$ 84$, which becomes a $\$ 28$ increase in taxes.

Senator Towe asked Mr. Robinson if the $\$ 28$ average increase in taxes is enough to make an adjustment in the 0.0386 tax rate. Mr. Robinson said the DOR does not have the statewide total data completed, and would like to defer answering this question until all their information is complete.

No executive action was taken on SB 191, which will be discussed further at a future committee meeting.

## DISCOSSION ON SB 235

In response to previous questions by Senator Eck, Mick Robinson, Director of the Department of Revenue (DOR), said SB 235 provides for an exemption of $\$ 15,000$ for qualified pension benefits. The cost of providing that level of exemption is almost $\$ 14$ million, as shown on a DOR Memorandum dated February 17, 1993, regarding Cost of Alternative Retirement Exclusions in SB 235, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. This is a move from the present $\$ 3,600$ per taxpayer to the $\$ 15,000$ level per taxpayer. The memorandum also shows related figures if a lower figure is allowed for qualified pension benefits.

In response to questions by Senator Halligan and Senator Towe, Mr. Robinson said when the $\$ 15,000$ qualified pension benefit was originally presented, it was $\$ 15,000$ per household, then was changed to $\$ 15,000$ per individual over 65 years of age. Senator Bruce Crippen, sponsor of SB 235, said the figures of $\$ 12,000$ to $\$ 18,000$ have been used in various bills in past legislative sessions, with a thought towards keeping retirees as residents of Montana. Senator Crippen said we must dovetail Montana's pension benefit with what the Federal government is doing.

Senator Eck said a retirement exemption figure of $\$ 12,000$ has been considered in the past, and there already is a $\$ 5,000$ to $\$ 6,000$ exemption by law. She would like the committee to look at exempting $\$ 8,000$ retirement income and add on the additional current exemption. Senator Eck asked if the increases in retirement pay to make up what a retiree pays in taxes would continue to be allowed, and if that amount is figured in SB 235. Jeff Martin, Legislative Council Staff, said that 2 1/2\% figure would be out if SB 235 passes.

Senator Gage asked if the DOR could furnish information on cost figures involved for a pensioner with above $\$ 30,000$ income where the pensioner would lose $\$ 1$ for every $\$ 2$ over $\$ 30,000$.

Mick Robinson discussed the DOR Amendments to SB 235, dated February 18, 1993, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. These proposed amendments are as follows:

1. The purpose of this amendment is to exempt intrastate transportation services from the sales and use tax. SB 235 presently provides an exemption for interstate transportation. Surrounding states do not tax intrastate transportation and the DOR does not want to present anything in the sales tax that is not comparable to surrounding states and which would make the business environment in Montana noncompetitive. This item was included in the $\$ 313$ million estimate, and approval of this amendment would have a decrease in revenue of approximately $\$ 5.5$ million.
2. This amendment provides that a purchaser of property or services remains liable for the sales tax if the sales tax was not paid or collected on that transaction previously. This will further strengthen the language already in SB 235 regarding Indian Reservation sales. Mr. Robinson said this would mostly be handled through negotiated agreements with the Tribes. If the sales tax is not collected on the Reservation, this gives the DOR the opportunity to collect the tax by holding the purchaser liable for payment. This amendment will also affect out-of-state purchases when people bring those purchases into Montana. For instance, if a sales tax is paid in another state, there would be a credit allowed in Montana for the sales tax paid in that state. The DOR has not put a fiscal amount on this amendment.
3. The purpose of this amendment removes the exemption for minerals used or integrated into jewelry, which will be taxed when the final product is sold, and clarifies that exempt sales of minerals are sales by the producer and does not include minerals used to produce energy. Dave Woodgerd, Chief Legal Counsel, DOR, explained that natural gas, for instance, would be taxed when used as a utility, but not when it is sold as a mineral. This amendment has no revenue impact.
4. This amendment is to clarify that only irrigation water used for the production of agricultural products produced in quantities sufficient for commercial purposes is exempt from sales tax.
5. This amendment is to exempt from sales and use tax construction services used in the construction of residential and commercial buildings. The materials used in residential and commercial construction would still be taxed; but the services would not be subject to a sales tax. The revenue estimate is not available, but there will a downward impact.
6. This amendment is to clarify that electricity used in the reduction or refinement of ores shall be considered a component part of the product. The electricity that becomes part of the final component part would be exempt. There is no dollar amount included in the DOR estimate.
7. This amendment clarifies that the sale of property to a person engaged in the business of leasing to the ultimate consumer is a nontaxable transaction. In a leasing business, the DOR would levy the tax on the use of that product, or the lease payment that is made. The purchase of a car by a leasing company is exempt, but the lease to the consumer is taxable. There is no cost associated.
8. This amendment is to conform the collection of delinquent sales tax owed by corporations to the collection of delinquent withholding tax owed by corporations.
9. This amendment is to remove the term "gross receipts" from the section concerning fraternal organizations.
10. This amendment is to delete the amendment exempting unprocessed products of livestock. No revenue impact is involved.
11. This amendment is to clarify that new and used vehicles purchased for the purpose of being placed in a fleet of vehicles used for rental car purposes are exempt from tax. The sales tax will not be levied on the purchase of that vehicle, but the sales tax will be levied on the lease.
12. This amendment deletes the requirement that increases in property tax classification rate are subject to $2 / 3$ vote of the Legislature and a vote of the public.

Mr. Robinson said the DOR is studying more amendments; one will deal with exemption of tuition for private schools, and another will deal with prescription medical devices.

Mr. Robinson reviewed the DOR Memorandum dated February 8, 1993, entitled Estimated Sales Tax Revenue Losses from Proposed Amendments to SB 235, a copy of which is attached to these minutes, and explained the DOR recommendations regarding the amendment requests.

National Association of Theater Owners (NATO): The bill presently provides an exemption for the leasing of motion pictures because of the sale/resale situation. The Department of Revenue does not support any changes in this request from NATO.

Montana Power Company (MPC): Mr. Robinson said the DOR needs to do more research on MPC's requests for amendments, and hasn't finalized its recommendations.

Montana Building Industry Association: The DOR has tried to address this in terms of compression services. The revenue loss estimate is approximately $\$ 6,300,000$.

Montana Motor Carriers Association: To exempt intra-state freight charges, the DOR estimates revenue loss of $\$ 3-\$ 5$ million.

Montana Solid Waste Contractors: This would increase revenue of approximately $\$ 40,000$.

Montana Retail Association (MRA): The MRA is proposing a change from $\$ 50$ per month to $\$ 150$ per month ( $\$ 1,800$ per year) or $1.5 \%$ of the tax payable, whichever is lower, to reimburse vendors allowances. Mr. Robinson said this amendment would not impact the DOR's previous estimate in terms of net sales tax revenue. The DOR does look favorably towards this amendment.

Montana Petroleum Association (MPA): Mr. Robinson said the DOR needs to do more research on the exemption request where the affiliated entities are involved. The DOR does not support the other amendment requests of MPA for exemption of purchased property used exclusively for exploration/production/processing of oil and gas, or for exemption of all pollution control devices.

## DISCUSSION ON SB 283

Larry Finch, Department of Revenue, reviewed the DOR Memorandum dated February 16, 1993, on Overall Tax Burdens, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. Mr. Finch said these same income groups were used in the SB 235 presentations, and show comparisons between the current taxes and proposed taxes under SB 283. These overall tax burdens include income taxes, property taxes, and sales tax. The sales tax information is the same under SB 235 and SB 283; there is a difference between the two bills in the income tax impacts and property tax impacts.

Mr. Finch said the overall burdens on property taxes don't drop as much under SB 283 as they do under SB 235; one of the reasons is SB 283 does not have the $\$ 200$ refundable renter credit. SB 235 provided for a flat $\$ 20,000$ exclusion in the market value of all property; SB 283 provides for $65 \%$ of market value up to $\$ 50,000$. Under SB 235, a $\$ 20,000$ house, in the low income groups, would all be excluded; under SB 283, 65\% would be excluded.

Senator Eck asked why Class 7, under SB 283, is even with the current law figures. For explanation, Mr. Finch compared Class 7 with Class 6 , which shows an increase under the proposed law, and said for people involved in Class 7, their sales tax would go up approximately $\$ 75$, but their income tax relief is approximately $\$ 65$ more, and because their home has a higher market value, they have a larger property tax break, of approximately $\$ 110$. When all these are combined, the overall tax rate for class 7 is approximately the same as it is under the current law.

In response to questions by Senator Towe, Mr. Finch said the income tax proposal in SB 283 provides for a retirees credit of the first $\$ 3600$ in retirement benefits.

Senator Eck asked if there is information available on low income and elderly credit programs that are now in place, the impacts, and which households are taking advantage of those credits now.

Mick Robinson reviewed the Impact of Reducing the Tax Rate for Class 8 Personal Property to the Top Ten Valued Class 8 Property Industries, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. Mr. Robinson said these figures show reductions from 9\%
to $3.86 \%$ in personal property tax rates for these businesses. Each of these businesses will pay an increase in taxes under a sales tax proposal, but the DOR doesn't have estimates on what that sales tax is because they do not have the data available based on the spending patterns for the businesses.

Senator Eck asked if the revenue from the sales tax will be more than is expected, in light of the sales tax revenues from businesses. Mr. Robinson said the DOR has a reasonable estimate of anticipated sales tax revenue based on national information developed into Montana's economic model and refined over the past two years.

Senator Gage asked if the Legislative Fiscal Analysts Office agrees with the figures furnished by the DOR. Terry Johnson responded that their office hasn't done any independent analysis of the sales tax revenue potential.

Russ Ritter, Public Affairs Division, Montana Resources, Inc. (MRI), said the biggest hit MRI would take would be on utilities, and their increased net additional tax would be $\$ 461,000$. If the utilities portion was dropped from the sales tax, it would be about a wash-out.

John Lahr, Montana Power Company, said the net cost to utility customers under SB 235 is $\$ 23$ million additional taxes, and a net increase under SB 283 is $\$ 13$ million. The difference is in the treatment of the property tax. Mr. Lahr said the direct add-on to the customers is $\$ 16.8$ million. In addition, the tax for purchases made by the utility company is about $\$ 6.6$ million.

No executive action was taken; both SB 235 and SB 283 will be discussed further in future meetings.

## ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.
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## ROLL CALL

SENATE COMmItTEE
TAXATION
DATE 2-18.93

| NAME | PRESENT ABSENT EXCUSED |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sen. Halligan, Chair | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Eck, Vice Chair | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Brown | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Doherty | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Gage | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Grosfield | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Harp | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Stang | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Towe | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Van Valkenburg | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Sen. Yellowtail |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

FC,
Attach to each day's minutes

## TAX REFORM

## GOALS: --STIMULATE INDUSTRIAL GROWTH <br> --EQUALIZE EDUCATION FUNDING AND TAXATION <br> --REDUCE GENERAL FUND SPENDING

## CURRENT REVENUES:

PERSONAL PROPERTY REAL PROPERTY PROCEEDS

CURRENT ALLOCATION:
COUNTIES 117
CITIES 48
SCHOOL DISTRICTS 195 FOUNDATION PROGRAM 155 UNIVERSITY 10

## PROPOSED

## PROPERTY TAXES:

REPEAL PERSONAL 117
REDUCE REAL
100
BALANCE-REAL PROPERTY REV 308

## DISTRIBUTION:

COUNTIES 117
CITIES 48
FOUNDATION PROGRAM 135
UNIVERSITY - 8
308
SALES TAX REVENUE:
FOUNDATION PROGRAM 300
BALANCE-GENERAL FUND ..... NA

## Breakdown of Estimated Taxes Levied TY 1992

Based on Tax Year 1992 Taxable Values and Tax Year 1992 Mill Levies (Estimated taxes levied for State, County, School, and City/Town purposes.)

| County | Real Property | Personal Property | Proceeds | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beaverhead | 3,371,406 | 1,667,211 | 109,872 | 5,148,489 |
| Big Horn | 3,017,500 | 2,581,331 |  | - 5,598,831 |
| Blaine | 2,825,419 | 1,041,630 | 0 | 3,867,049 |
| Broadwater | 1,784,174 | 597,847 | 621,023 | 3,003,044. |
| Carbon | 4,315,524 | 1,170,583 | 21,148 | - 5, 507,254 |
| Carter | 875,155 | 487,710 | 700,290 | 2,063,155 |
| Cascade | 34,526,249 | 5,916,646 | 0 | 40,442,895 |
| Chouteau | 5,931,291 | 1,757,344 | 0 | 7,688,634 |
| Custer | 4,873,945 | 1,539,048 | 0 | 6,412,993 |
| Daniels | 1,746,985 | 579,188 | 0 | 2,326,173. |
| Dawson | 4,904,476 | 2,044,501 | 0 | \% 6,948:977 |
| Deer Lodge | 2,769,165 | 601,082 | 0 | 3,370:247 |
| Fallon | 1,369,099 | 1,079,712 | 0 | 2,448,811 |
| Fergus | 5,560,533 | 2,277,286 | 201,826 | 8:039,645, |
| Flathead | 32,210,003 | 5,998,184 | 0 | 38,208,187/ |
| Gallatin | 23,003,507 | 5,366,358 | 80,584 | 28,450,448 |
| Garfield | 1,086,096 | 467,552 | 0 | \%. $1,553,648$ |
| Glacier | 4,059,738 | 1,056,371 | 0 | 5,116,109 |
| Golden Valley | 1,153,917 | 224,448 | 0 | 1,378,366 |
| Granite | 1,425,608 | 450,782 | 8 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Hill | 7,241,156 | 2,053,354 | 0 | 9,294,509 |
| Jefferson | 3,009,837 | 2,268,682 | 531,606 | \#\#\#5;810,125. |
| Judith Basin | 1,981,182 | 601,410 | 0 | 2,582,592. |
| Lake | 8,575,724 | 1,173,759 | 0 | 9,749,483 |
| Lewis And Clark | 22,109,318 | 5,973,397 | 34,041 | C. 281116,757 |
| Liberty | 1,934,242 | 588,692 | 14,024 | 2,536,957 |
| Lincoln | 5,274,179 | 1,951,583 | 319,126 | 7,544,889 |
| Madison | 3,806,056 | 1,427,490 | 533,187 | 5;766;733 |
| Mccone | 1,698,323 | 711,522 | 0 | 2,409;845 |
| Meagher | 1,790,037 | 417,169 | 872 | 2,208,077. |
| Mineral | 2,142,355 | 476,038 | 0 | - 2,618,393 |
| Missoula | 42,412,373 | 12,093,330 | 369 | 54,506,071 |
| Musselshell | 1,602,737 | 617,832 | 0 | 2,220,589 |
| Park | 6,148,680 | 1,760,379 | 121,951 | 8,031,009 |
| Petroleum | 400,804 | 246,459 | 0 | . C . 647,263 |
| Phillips | 2,931,982 | 1,473,776 | 333,408 | 4739,165 |
| Pondera | 3,602,094 | 1,226,688 | 0 | 4,828,782 |
| Powder River | 1,353,203 | 1,033,746 | 0 | 2,386,949 |
| Powell | 2,795,073 | 827,162 | 0 | 3,622,235 |
| Prairie | 856,004 | 364,650 | 0 | 1,220,654 |
| Ravalli | 8,411,454 | 1,663,175 | 0 | 10,074,629 |
| Richland | 3,850,559 | 2,542,218 | 0 | \%." 6,392777 |
| Roosevelt | 5,166,824 | 1,094,903 | 0 | ).. $6 ; 2617728$ |
| Rosebud | 21,842,254 | 3,498,145 | 0 | 25,340,399 |
| Sanders | 5,261,621 | 1,692,093 | 0 | 6,953,714 |
| Sheridan | 2,274,120 | 1,171,813 | 0 | 3,445,933 |
| Silver Bow | 14,719,990 | 7,131,769 | 1,703,149 | 23,554,908 |
| Stillwater | 3,895,657 | 1,536,053 | 357,646 | $\cdots$ 5,789,358. |
| Sweet Grass | 2,036,978 | 624,337 | 0 | 2,661,315 |
| Teton | 3,978,102 | 1,385,944 | 0 | - 5 , 364,046. |
| Toole | 3,739,415 | 1,160,954 | 0 | 4,900,369 |
| Treasure | 1,098,022 | 252,722 | 0 | 1,350,744 |
| Valley | 6,898,376 | 1,639,882 | 0 | 8,538,258 |
| Wheatland | 1,794,685 | 411,633 | 0 | 2,206;318 |
| Wibaux | 724,410 | 377,558 | 0 | 1,101,968 |
| Yellowstone | 53,658,441 | 16,038,021 | 0 | 69,696,462 |


Compiled from date submitted to the Departrront of Revenue by County Assessors.
Estimated taxes levied for tax year 1992 based on tax year 1992 taxable values and tax year 1992 mills levied for state, county, local school, and city 19 own purposes.



SCHOOL EQUALIZATION:
SEA FROM STATE ..... 390
SEA FROM SALES TAX ..... 300
TOTAL ..... 690
(154,000 STUDENTS ..... $\$ 4,500 \mathrm{PER})$
LOCAL SCHOOLS: RETAIN:LT VEHICLE TAXPROCEEDS/LGST
REDUCE GENERAL FUND: ELIMINATE GUARANTEED TX BASE ..... 46
PROPERTY RE-IMBURSEMENT ..... 20
PERSONAL PROPERTY ADM ..... 5
CENTRAL APPRAISAL ..... 1081
OTHER:
REPEAL ASSUMED COUNTIES ..... 10
DOWNSIZE GALEN ..... $\frac{5}{15}$
REPEAL I-105


- 100,000 House


## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION:

An act allowing certain persons 62 years of age or older to defer increases in the market value of their primary residences; establishing eligibility requirements; granting rule making authority to the Department of Revenue; and providing effective dates and an applicability date.

## ASSUMPTIONS:

FISCAL IMPACT:
The proposal results in a total net reduction in property tax revenue of $\$ 4,466,951$ in $F Y$ as and subsequent fiscal years. The results are summarized in tables below:
Estimated Property Tax Revenue Loss Due to the Proposal

EFFEGT ON COUNTY OR OTHER LOCAL REVENUES OR EXPENDITURES:

DAVID LEWIS, BUDGET DIRECTOR DATE Office of Budget and Program Planning

## SB 191

************* Units with an Increase

| Total Number of Sales | 6,599 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Number with deferrment | 3,767 |
| Percent with with deferrment | $57 \%$ |
| Average Percent of TY 92 |  |
| Assessed Value Deferred | $20 \%$ |


| Number of 62 and older | 64,100 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number with Deferment | 36,537 |


| Avg AV TY 1992 | $\$ 43,368$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Avg Deferred AV | $\$ 8,674$ |
| Tax rate | 0.0386 |
| - |  |
| Avg deferred TV | $\$ 335$ |
| Total deferred tv | $\$ 12,232,491$ |


| Avg Mills for Residential Property |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| University | 6 | $\$ 73,395$ |
| SFP | 95 | $\$ 1,162,087$ |
|  | Subtotal | $\$ 1,235,482$ |
|  | 78.66 | $\$ 962,208$ |
| Counties | 140.97 | $\$ 1,724,414$ |
| Schools | $45 \%$ |  |
| \% in city/town | 98.98 | $\$ 544,847$ |
| City/Town | Subtotal | $\$ 3,231,469$ |
|  | TOTAL | $\$ 4,466,951$ |


| Total Number of Sales | 6,59 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Number with decrease | 2,832 |
| Percent with decrease | 43\% |
| Average Percent of TY 92 | -14\% |


| Number of 62 and older | 64,100 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Number with Decrease | 27,563 |

Avg AV TY $1992 \quad \$ 43,368$
Avg Deferred AV $\quad(\$ 6,071)$

| Tax rate | 0.0386 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Avg deferred TV | $(\$ 234)$ |
| Total deferred tv | $(\$ 6,459,614)$ |

Avg Mills for Residential Property

| University SFP | 6 95 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Tax } \\ (\$ 38,758) \\ (\$ 613,663) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Subtotal | $(\$ 652,421)$ |
| Counties | 78.66 | (\$508,113 |
| Schools | 140.97 | (\$910,612) |
| \% in city/town | 45\% |  |
| City/Town | 98.98 | (\$287,718) |
|  | Subtotal | (\$1,706,443) |
|  | TOTAL | (\$2,358,864 |

Based on the calander year 1991 sales data used in the TY 1992 sales assessment ratio study. The unit sale value was used as an estimated TY 1993 reappraisal value.


| Number of 62 and older | 64,100 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number with a change | 64,100 |


| Avg AV TY 1992 | $\$ 43,368$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Avg Deferred AV | $\$ 2,168$ |


| Tax rate | 0.0386 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Avg deferred TV | $\$ 84$ |
| Total deferred tv | $\$ 5,365,128$ |


| Avg Mills for-Residential Property |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| University | 6 | $\$ 32,191$ |
| SFP | 95 | $\$ 509,687$ |
|  | Subtotal | $\$ 541,878$ |
|  | 78.66 | $\$ 422,021$ |
| Counties | 140.97 | $\$ 756,322$ |
| Schools | $45 \%$ |  |
| \% in city/town | 98.98 | $\$ 238,968$ |
| City/Town | Subtotal | $\$ 1,417,311$ |
|  |  | TOTAL |
|  | $\$ 1,959,189$ |  |

Based on the calander year 1991 sales data used in the TY 1992 sales assessment ratio study. The unit sale value was used as an estimated TY 1993 reappraisal value.

# State of Montana <br> Stan Stephens, Governor 

Department of Revenue

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mick Robinson
Director
FROM: Larry Finch, Program Manager
Office of Research and Information
RE: Overall Tax Burdens - SB283
Attached are two graphs showing the shift in overall tax burden under the comprehensive tax reform proposal contained in SB283. These graphs reflect the following overall tax burdens:

SB283 - Change in Overall Tax Burden (\%)

| INCOME GROUP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{2}{3}$ | $\frac{3}{4}$ | $\frac{4}{3.75}$ | $\frac{5}{4.40}$ | $\frac{6}{5.04}$ | $\frac{7}{5.45}$ | $\frac{8}{7.01}$ |
| Current | $\frac{8.18}{3.05}$ | 3.24 | 3.3 | 4.36 | 4.87 | 5.30 | 5.41 | 8.03 |

Overall tax burdens are lower under the proposal for income groups 1,2 , and 7 . Burdens increase for all other income groups.

Also attached is the spreadsheet that calculates these burdens. Let me know if you have questions.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { cc: } & \text { Judy Rippingale } \\
& \text { Jeff Miller }
\end{array}
$$








$$
\begin{array}{llll}
0 & 0 & 0 & N \\
\text { N } & \text { N } & \infty \\
0 & \infty & \infty \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$








 Less
Than
$\$ 5,000$
$======$ ZSG＇11
OZがて

－$\frac{m}{N}$
色
$88=$ 은웅


| All <br> Consumers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 5,000 \end{aligned}$ |  | \$10,000 to \$14,999 | \$15,000 to \$19,999 |  |  |  | \$50,000 and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} ===== \\ 0 \end{array}$ | ==== | $=$ | = $=$ | ===== | ===== | ===== | ===== | $==$ |
| 429 | 90 | 139 | 178 | 257 | 352 | 474 | 640 | 1,197 |
| 135 | 28 | 44 | 56 | 81 | 111 | 149 | 204 | 706 |
| (294) | (62) | (95) | (122) | (176) | (241) | (325) | (435) | (491) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (294) | (62) | (95) | (122) | (176) | (241) | (325) | (435) | (491) |
| 1,576 | 101 | 229 | 400 | 650 | 1,079 | 1,736 | 2,426 | 5,548 |
| 1,701 | 89 | 142 | 416 | 757 | 1,197 | 1,827 | 2,410 | 6,359 |
| 125 | (12) | (87) | 16 | 107 | 118 | 91 | (15) | 811 |
| 5.03\% | 4.18\% | 3.05\% | 3.24\% | 3.75\% | 4.40\% | 5.04\% | 5.45\% | 7.01\% |
| 5.43\% | 3.69\% | 1.89\% | 3.37\% | 4.36\% | 4.87\% | 5.30\% | 5.41\% | 8.03\% |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 40,291 | 16,800 | 18,697 | 20,561 | 24,964 | 30,447 | 38,173 | 50,399 | 94,307 |

C. PROPERTY TAX

- Average Property Tax, CL
- Average Property Tax, PL
- Change in Tax
- Average Renter's Credit, CL
- Average Renter's Credit, PL
- Change in Tax
- Net Change in Property Tax/Rent
- Average Tax Rate, CL
- Average Tax Rate, PL
Market Value of Home


## State of Montana <br> Stan Stephens, Governor

February 17, 1993

## MEMORANDUM

| TO: | Mick Robinson <br> Director |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Larry Finch f, Program Manager <br> Office of Research and Information |
| RE: | Cost of Alternative Retirement Exclusions in SB235 |

The following schedule shows the estimated cost of providing alternative retirement blanket exclusion amounts for all qualified pension benefits, for the income tax proposal in SB235:

| Exclusion Level | Cost of Exclusion |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$ 5,000$ |
| $\$ 6,000$ | $\$ 5,361,000$ |
| $\$ 8,000$ | $\$ 6,585,000$ |
| $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 8,736,000$ |
| $\$ 12,000$ | $\$ 10,567,000$ |
| $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 12,136,000$ |
|  | $\$ 13,988,000$ |

Let me know if you have further questions regarding these costs.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { cc: } & \text { Judy Rippingale } \\
\text { Jeff Miller }
\end{array}
$$

## Impact of Reducing the Tax Rate for Class 8 Personal Property to the Top Ten Valued Class 8 Property Industries



* Totals for Champion International include values from sites in Libby and Bonner.

Impact to Railroads

Data compiled by the Office of Research and Information, Montana Department of Revenue, Feb 1993.
Market values provided by the Industrial Property Bureau, Property Assessment Division, MDOR Consolidate mill levies provided by the local County Assessors.

## AMENDMENTS

## DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

February 18, 1993
Prepared by Bruce McGinnis and Dave Woodgerd

1. The purpose of this amendment is to exempt intrastate transportation services from sales and use tax.

Page 8
Line 7
Insert: "(l5) "Transportation services" means the transportation of persons or property by air, ground, or water from a point within this state to a another point within this state or a point without this state, along with any reasonably necessary associated services."

Renumber: Subsequent subsections
Page 24,
Line 7
Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 28. Exemption -transportation services. The sale or use of transportation services is exempt from the sales and use tax."

Renumber: Subsequent sections
Page 27.
Line 11
Strike: Section 35 in its entirety
Renumber: Subsequent sections
2. This amendment specifically provides that a purchaser of property or services remains liable for the sales tax if for any reason the sales tax was not paid or collected on a transaction subject to tax. This section already applied to the use tax. The amendment makes it applicable to the sales tax.

```
Page ll, line 15.
Following: "of"
Insert: "sales and"
Line 15.
Following: "in this state who"
Insert: "buys or"
Following: "property"
Insert: "Or services"
Line 16
Following: "payment of the"
Insert: "sales or"
Following: "tax if"
Strike: "the"
```

```
Insert: "a"
Line 17
Following: "payable on the"
Insert: "sale's price or"
Following: "property"
Insert: "or services"
Line 19
Following: "has paid the"
Insert: "sales or"
```

3. The purpose of this amendment is twofold. First it removes the exemption for minerals used or integrated into jewelry. As a practical matter, these minerals should be exempt as a sale for resale. The jewelry itself will be taxable.

This section also clarifies that exempt sales of minerals are sales by the producer and does not include minerals which will be used to produce energy unless they are converted for resale. In other words, the intent is to make sales of coal and natural gas taxable when they are sold to the final consumer of the energy they produce. This is consistent with the fact that utilities are taxable.

Page 21, line 22 through 23.
Following "minerals" on line 22
Strike: " -- exception for jewelry" on line 23
Line 23
Following: "(1)"
Strike "The"
Insert: "Except as provided in subsection (2), the"
Following: "sale or use"
Insert: "by the miner, or the producer of the mineral or by a broker acting upon behalf of the miner or producer"

Line 23.
Following: "mineral"
Strike: ","
Page 22, line 1
Strike: Subsection (2) in its entirety.
Insert: "(2) Minerals used for the purpose of producing energy or conversion into energy are subject to the sales and use tax unless converted for subsequent resale as a form of energy."
4. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify that only irrigation water used for the production of agricultural products produced in quantities sufficient for commercial purposes is exempt from sales tax.

Page 23, line 13.
Following: "herbicides; or"
Insert: "irrigation"
Page 23, line 14.

Following: "for"
Strike: "commercial irrigation"
Insert: "production of agricultural products in commercial quantities"
5. The purpose of this amendment is to exempt from sales and use tax construction services used in the construction of residential and commercial buildings.

Page 24
Line 7
Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 28. Exemption -- Construction services. The sale and use of construction services for the construction, fabrication, or remodeling of residential and commercial buildings are exempt from sales and use tax."

Renumber: Subsequent sections
6. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify that electricity used in the reduction or refinement of ores shall be considered a component part of the product.

Page 25, line 5.
Following: "(2)"
Insert: "(a)"
Page 25
Line 8
Insert: subsection "(b) Electrical energy or electricity used or consumed by electrolytic deposition used in the reduction or refinement of ores shall be considered a component part of the product for purposes of this section.
7. This amendment clarifies that the sale of property to a person engaged in the business of leasing to the ultimate consumer is a nontaxable transaction.

```
Page 25, line 8.
Following: "sale"
Insert: "or use"
Lines lo through ll.
Following: "property," on line l0
Strike: "other than furniture and appliances, and the
rental or lease of property,"
Line 12.
Following: "and mobile homes"
Insert: "purchased in this state"
Line 17.
Following: "leasing"
Strike: "or selling"
Line 18.
Following: "type"
Strike: "leased"
```

Insert: "sold"
8. The purpose of this amendment is conform the collection of delinquent sales tax owed by corporations to the collection of delinquent withholding tax owed by corporations.

Page 48, lines 22 through 25.
Strike: Subsection (a) in its entirety.
9. The purpose of this amendment is to remove the term "gross receipts" form the section concerning fraternal organizations. This term is not meaningful since the tax is imposed on sales and use, not gross receipts.

Page 73, line 15.
Following: "that"
Strike: "the receipts"
Insert: "sales"
Lines 16 and 17.
Following: "society, the"
Strike: "gross receipts"
Insert: "sales"
Line 21.
Following: "(b)"
Strike: "Receipts from dues"
Insert: "Dues"
Line 22.
Following: "and"
Strike: "from"
10. The purpose of this amendment is to delete the amendment to $\mathbb{S}$ 15-6-207 which exempts unprocessed products of livestock. These products are already exempt under subsection (l)(a) which exempts agricultural products in farm storage and owned by the producer.

Page 114, line 20
Strike: subsection (h) in its entirety.
Renumber: subsequent sections
11. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify that new and used vehicles purchased for the purpose of being placed in a fleet of vehicles used for rental car purposes are exempt from tax. This exemption is similar to nontaxable transaction for property purchased for the purpose of lease or rental contained in $\$ 31$.

Page 136 , line 1.
Following: "in interstate commerce,"
Insert: "vehicles registered as part of a fleet as defined in 61-3-318(2),"

Page 139, line 10.
Following: "in interstate commerce,"

Insert: "vehicles registered as part of a fleet as defined in 61-3-318(2),"

Page 143, line 8. Following: "interstate commerce," Insert: "and vehicles registered as part of a fleet as defined in 61-3-318(2)"
12. The purpose of this amendment is to delete the requirement that increases in property tax classification rate are subject to two-thirds vote of the legislature and a vote of the public. It is not the intent of this bill to limit the tax rate for property taxes.

Page 188,
Line 13
Strike: Section 166 in its entirety Renumber: subsequent sections

Page 189 and 190
Line (25)
Strike: Subsection (6) in its entirety

# State of Montana <br> Marc Racicot, Governor 

## Department of Revenue



February 8, 1993

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Halligan, Chair
Senate Taxation Committee
FROM: Mick Robinson, Director
Department of Revenue

## SUBJECT: Estimated Sales Tax Revenue Losses from Proposed Amendments to SB 235

This memo summarizes the results of the estimation of the revenue impact of various proposed amendments to SB 235. In a few cases the estimate was derived directly from the Department of Revenue's detailed sales tax projection model. However in most cases, estimates had to be constructed from data available from other sources, with varying levels of precision.

## National Association of Theatre Owners

Exempt motion picture admissions
This estimate came directly from the Department's sales tax projection model. The FY 1995 estimate is:

$$
\$ 600,000
$$

Exempt the leasing of motion pictures

$$
\$ 100,000-\$ 200,000
$$

## Montana Power Company

Sale of personal property that is leased back
The Department does not have a revenue loss estimate at this time. Real property is already exempt under SB 235.

Purchases of goods and services from affiliated corporations
Data for this estimate came primarily from a small sample of audit reports from the 20 largest corporate license taxpayers. These data were inflated to the population of the top 100 taxpayers, with the assumption that smaller corporations do not have these purchases from affiliated corporations. Because the sample was small, the interval estimate is wide. The best estimate at this time is:

$$
\$ 3,000,000-\$ 15,000,000
$$

## Purchases of minerals for resale and for in-plant energy use

It appears that the interpretation that the Department has been using for taxing natural gas sales by a utility is incorrect, given the current language of SB 235 . The revenue associated with this interpretation of taxing natural gas sales by utilities is about $\$ 5$ million. The new exemption would decrease the present revenue estimate by:
$\$ 500,000$ (assuming only industrial energy use); $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ (if commerical energy use is included)

## Excluding bad debts expense

Using national data on bad debts expenses by industry, Montana information on taxable sales, and assuming all businesses are on an accrual basis, the revenue loss would be about:

$$
\$ 2,000,000
$$

## Montana Building Industry Association

Exempt purchased materials and construction services (sub-contracting) for single/multi-family housing

The Department's revenue loss estimate, which is similar to the association's estimate, is approximately:
$\$ 6,300,000$

## Montana Motor Carriers Association

## Exempt intra-state freight charges

The Department's revenue loss estimate is as follows:

$$
\$ 3,000,000-\$ 5,000,000
$$

## Montana Solid Waste Contractors

Add refuse disposal to taxable government services
This amendment adds revenue of maybe $\$ 40,000$.

## Montana Retail Assaciation

Increase the vendor allowance to the lesser of $\$ 150$ per month ( $\$ 1,800$ per year) or $1.5 \%$ of the tax payable

SB 235 presently defines a vendor allowance as the lesser of $\$ 50$ per month or $1.5 \%$ of tax payable. Estimating the revenue loss from this proposed amendment is fairly complicated
because of the necessity of estimating the number of establishments by size of sales, on a monthly basis. If all establishments kept $1.5 \%$ as a vendor allowance, the lost revenue would be about $\$ 4.7$ million. This amendment will result in additional lost revenue over the current SB 235 vendor allowance scheme. How much additional revenue will be lost is currently unknown.

## Montana Petroleum Association

## Exempt service transactions among affiliated entities as defined by Title 26, Section 1504, U.S.C.

The same small sample of audit reports of corporate license taxpayers used for the related Montana Power Company proposed exemption for both property and services, was used in part for this estimate. Also used was U.S. Bureau of the Census information for Montana on auxiliary establishments that administratively support other establishments of a corporation or a group of corporations. The estimate for this amendment is:

$$
\$ 2,000,000-\$ 10,000,000
$$

Exempt purchased property used exclusively for the exploration/production/processing of oil and gas
Using national non-depreciable property purchasing percentages for the oil/gas mining industry and the petroleum refining industry, and applying the percentages to Montana sales for these industries yields an estimate of $\$ 1.4$ million. Adding in a rough estimate for depreciable property yields:

$$
\$ 2,000,000--\$ 5,000,000
$$

## Exempt all pollution control devices

Scaling to Montana U.S. data of household and business expenditures on pollution abatement yields:

$$
\$ 7,000,000
$$

These estimates were as thoughfully constructed as possible, given the time and data constraints. Let me know if you have questions.

