

Peter Franchot Comptroller

**David Roose** Director Bureau of Revenue Estimates

March 1, 2011

Honorable Martin O'Malley Governor of Maryland State House Annapolis, Maryland 21404

Honorable Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr. President of the Senate State House Annapolis, Maryland 21404

Honorable Michael E. Busch Speaker of the House State House Annapolis, Maryland 21404

Dear Governor, President and Speaker:

This report is the third in a series of five annual reports required by Chapter 3 of the 2007 Special Session of the General Assembly, as modified by Chapter 177 of the 2008 Session, on Maryland's corporate income tax and the revenue effects of possible corporate income tax changes. Included in this report is the initial estimate of the impact of combined reporting for tax year 2008, as well as estimates for two other possible corporate income tax changes.

The estimates for the revenue changes from combined reporting are subject to the same caveats contained in the October 1, 2009 report from the Comptroller:

- these are estimates of the revenue impact for tax year 2008 only, not for future years;
- certain assumptions were made regarding the structure and details of the combined reporting—different assumptions could lead to different results;
- it is assumed that the introduction of combined reporting will not affect taxpayer behavior.

Tax year 2008 data show that under the Joyce method of apportionment, the tax liability of corporations in the utility, finance and insurance, and management of companies industries would have been \$89.1 million lower, greater than the \$53.3 million overall decrease (6.8% of tax year 2008 collections). The three industries that would have seen the largest increases in their net tax liabilities, those companies in the wholesale, retail, and professional, scientific, and technical service industries, would have seen a total liability increase of \$36.6 million. For those whose taxes would have been higher under Joyce, they would have seen their liabilities increase by more that \$178,000 on average. For those whose taxes would have been lower, they would have saved over \$132,000 on average. The same general pattern holds under the Finnigan method of apportionment,

Letter to Honorable Martin O'Malley Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr., and Michael E. Busch March 1, 2011 Page 2

which would have resulted in a \$15.4 million revenue decline (1.9% of tax year 2008 collections). The attached tables provide detail by both size of corporate group and by industry, for tax year 2008.

The corporate information reporting also allows the estimation of two other potential changes to the corporate income tax—adoption of the throwback rule and 100% allocation of nonoperational income to Maryland. Corporate income is typically apportioned to the states in which a corporation does business, as measured by some combination of receipts, property and payroll. However, income can be earned in states in which a corporation does not have nexus (generally a state in which sales are made but in which the corporation has no payroll or property), and which is therefore not taxed by that state. The throwback rule brings this "nowhere income" back to the state in which the goods were produced or from which they were shipped.

The tax year 2008 corporate reporting data indicate that 216 entities would have had \$5.2 billion of income from sales made into states in which they do not have nexus thrown back to Maryland. After apportioning that income and accounting for losses, corporate income tax revenues would have been \$32.8 million higher, with 121 entities paying higher tax. If sales to the federal government were also thrown back to Maryland, an additional \$5.8 billion would have been thrown back, and corporate income tax revenues would have increased a further \$28.6 million. The actual revenue increase had the throwback rule been in effect would have been greater, barring behavioral changes, as single-entity corporations and non-corporate entities were exempt from these reporting requirements.

Generally, income from the regular course of business is apportionable. Certain nonbusiness income, however, is only taxable by the state in which the income-producing assets are managed, usually the state of domicile. This income cannot be taxed by other states. Maryland law, however, apportions away much of this type of non-business income which no other state has the authority to tax. If 100% of nonoperational income were allocated to Maryland, corporate income tax revenues would have increased at least \$84.7 million. Again, this increase is probably understated due to the fact that single-entity corporations and non-corporate entities did not fall under these reporting requirements. As nonoperational income results from extraordinary transactions, by definition, it can be expected to be volatile. The estimate for 100% allocation of nonoperational income for tax years 2006 and 2007 was \$21.5 million and \$6.4 million, respectively, demonstrating the volatility. Letter to Honorable Martin O'Malley Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr., and Michael E. Busch March 1, 2011 Page 3

Further information on combined reporting can be found at the Maryland Business Tax Reform Commission's website, <u>http://btrc.maryland.gov/</u>. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 410-260-7450.

Sincerely,

Dauthon

David. F. Roose Director, Bureau of Revenue Estimates

cc. Comptroller Peter Franchot Len Foxwell Linda Tanton

## Tax Year 2008 Estimated Impact of Combined Reporting

Joyce Method of Apportionment

By Group Maryland Modified Income

Group Maryland		Winners			Losers		No Change		Total
Modified Income	#	\$	Average	#	\$	Average	#	#	\$
Non-Taxable	747	(92,643,970)	(124,021)	0	0	0	1,309	2,056	(92,643,970)
Under \$500,000	198	(1,441,641)	(7,281)	180	231,747	1,287	87	465	(1,209,894)
\$500,000 to \$999,999	66	(807,689)	(12,238)	41	304,741	7,433	14	121	(502,948)
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999	219	(4,385,288)	(20,024)	142	1,404,244	9,889	42	403	(2,981,044)
\$5,000,000 to \$9,999,999	112	(3,920,266)	(35,002)	79	2,068,955	26,189	15	206	(1,851,311)
\$10,000,000 to \$24,999,999	175	(8,715,826)	(49,805)	156	5,663,412	36,304	21	352	(3,052,414)
\$25,000,000 to \$99,999,999	250	(22,850,837)	(91,403)	214	15,343,208	71,697	28	492	(7,507,629)
\$100,000,000 to \$249,999,999	96	(15,773,615)	(164,308)	127	24,776,858	195,093	7	230	9,003,243
\$250,000,000 to \$499,999,999	38	(17,141,991)	(451,105)	87	19,836,531	228,006	4	129	2,694,540
\$500,000,000 to \$999,999,999	24	(45,619,555)	(1,900,815)	52	35,954,823	691,439	] _	] 202	(9,664,732)
\$1,000,000,000 and Over	45	(47,155,808)	(1,047,907)	77	100,958,854	1,311,154	} 5	} 203	53,803,045
Total	1,970	(260,456,487)	(132,211)	1,155	206,543,373	178,825	1,532	4,657	(53,913,114)

### Tax Year 2008 Estimated Impact of Combined Reporting

Finnigan Method of Apportionment

By Group Maryland Modified Income

Group Maryland		Winners			Losers		No Change		Total
Modified Income	#	\$	Average	#	\$	Average	#	#	\$
Non-Taxable	747	(92,643,970)	(124,021)	0	0	0	1,309	2,056	(92,643,970)
Under \$500,000	196	(1,440,441)	(7,349)	187	235,290	1,258	82	465	(1,205,151)
\$500,000 to \$999,999	65	(796,012)	(12,246)	46	331,643	7,210	10	121	(464,369)
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999	211	(4,142,374)	(19,632)	154	1,477,563	9,595	38	403	(2,664,811)
\$5,000,000 to \$9,999,999	103	(3,888,853)	(37,756)	90	2,209,668	24,552	13	206	(1,679,185)
\$10,000,000 to \$24,999,999	163	(8,523,367)	(52,291)	175	6,081,763	34,753	14	352	(2,441,604)
\$25,000,000 to \$99,999,999	220	(22,187,014)	(100,850)	256	18,036,533	70,455	16	492	(4,150,481)
\$100,000,000 to \$249,999,999	90	(14,774,655)	(164,163)	135	27,709,322	205,254	5	230	12,934,667
\$250,000,000 to \$499,999,999	33	(16,818,270)	(509,645)	94	23,783,609	253,017	)	)	6,965,340
\$500,000,000 to \$999,999,999	22	(44,772,034)	(2,035,092)	55	40,340,444	733,463	5	332	(4,431,590)
\$1,000,000,000 and Over	41	(44,528,321)	(1,086,057)	82	118,895,640	1,449,947	J	J	74,367,319
Total	1,891	(254,515,311)	(134,593)	1,274	239,101,475	187,678	1,492	4,657	(15,413,835)

# Tax Year 2008 Estimated Impact of Combined Reporting Joyce Method of Apportionment By Predominant Industry, Measured by Payroll, of Group

	Winners			Losers		No Change Total		Total	
Industry	#	\$	Average	#	\$	Average		#	\$
Agriculture	5	(51,178)	(10,236)	3	143,874	47,958	5	13	92,696
Mining	11	(199,343)	(18,122)	9	534,824	59,425	4	24	335,481
Utilities	29	(27,123,130)	(935,280)	12	1,156,459	96,372	15	56	(25,966,671)
Construction	82	(1,581,779)	(19,290)	43	1,811,225	42,122	62	187	229,446
Manufacturing	488	(40,207,934)	(82,393)	277	44,955,025	162,293	330	1,095	4,747,091
Wholesale Trade	141	(7,129,772)	(50,566)	112	18,499,024	165,170	82	335	11,369,252
Retail Trade	116	(12,132,568)	(104,591)	84	31,468,183	374,621	91	291	19,335,615
Transportation and Warehousing	93	(6,949,450)	(74,725)	45	1,358,095	30,180	44	182	(5,591,355)
Information	114	(19,896,229)	(174,528)	68	20,220,815	297,365	76	258	324,587
Finance and Insurance	189	(44,368,265)	(234,753)	98	18,921,466	193,076	183	470	(25,446,799)
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	97	(9,336,477)	(96,252)	54	4,893,397	90,618	174	325	(4,443,080)
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	267	(26,020,577)	(97,455)	153	31,877,434	208,349	216	636	5,856,857
Management of Companies	107	(46,523,737)	(434,801)	63	8,863,034	140,683	83	253	(37,660,703)
Admin. Support, Waste Mgmt., and Remediation Svcs.	77	(2,913,476)	(37,837)	41	6,849,646	167,065	32	150	3,936,170
Educational Services	16	(2,908,844)	(181,803)	9	352,232	39,137	7	32	(2,556,612)
Health Care and Social Assistance	52	(6,444,816)	(123,939)	26	4,900,001	188,462	46	124	(1,544,815)
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	11	(129,539)	(11,776)	7	83,457	11,922	13	31	(46,082)
Accommodation and Food Services	37	(5,556,604)	(150,178)	28	7,200,039	257,144	32	97	1,643,435
Other Services	29	(812,249)	(28,009)	20	2,042,808	102,140	29	78	1,230,559
Misreported	9	(170,521)	(18,947)	3	412,336	137,445	8	20	241,815
Total	1,970	(260,456,487)	(132,211)	1,155	206,543,373	178,825	1,532	4,657	(53,913,114)

#### Tax Year 2008 Estimated Distributional Impact of Combined Reporting Joyce Method of Apportionment

By Predominant Industry, Measured by Payroll, of Group

	Winn	ers	Lose	ers	No Change	Total		
Industry	#	\$	#	\$	#	#	\$ Change	
Agriculture	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	26.2%	
Mining	0.6%	0.1%	0.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	87.3%	
Utilities	1.5%	10.4%	1.0%	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%	-87.9%	
Construction	4.2%	0.6%	3.7%	0.9%	4.0%	4.0%	2.1%	
Manufacturing	24.8%	15.4%	24.0%	21.8%	21.5%	23.5%	3.2%	
Wholesale Trade	7.2%	2.7%	9.7%	9.0%	5.4%	7.2%	37.1%	
Retail Trade	5.9%	4.7%	7.3%	15.2%	5.9%	6.2%	34.5%	
Transportation and Warehousing	4.7%	2.7%	3.9%	0.7%	2.9%	3.9%	-31.1%	
Information	5.8%	7.6%	5.9%	9.8%	5.0%	5.5%	0.8%	
Finance and Insurance	9.6%	17.0%	8.5%	9.2%	11.9%	10.1%	-20.5%	
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	4.9%	3.6%	4.7%	2.4%	11.4%	7.0%	-26.5%	
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	13.6%	10.0%	13.2%	15.4%	14.1%	13.7%	7.6%	
Management of Companies	5.4%	17.9%	5.5%	4.3%	5.4%	5.4%	-57.1%	
Admin. Support, Waste Mgmt., and Remediation Svcs.	3.9%	1.1%	3.5%	3.3%	2.1%	3.2%	44.2%	
Educational Services	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	-38.7%	
Health Care and Social Assistance	2.6%	2.5%	2.3%	2.4%	3.0%	2.7%	-13.5%	
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	-17.1%	
Accommodation and Food Services	1.9%	2.1%	2.4%	3.5%	2.1%	2.1%	15.1%	
Other Services	1.5%	0.3%	1.7%	1.0%	1.9%	1.7%	44.9%	
Misreported	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	14.5%	
Total	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-8.2%	

\* All percentages are a share of that respective column's total, except the Total \$ Change column which is the estimated change in that industry's total liability

# Tax Year 2008 Estimated Impact of Combined Reporting Finnigan Method of Apportionment

By Predominant Industry, Measured by Payroll, of Group

		Winners			Losers		No Change		Total	
Industry	#	\$	Average	#	\$	Average	#	#	\$	
Agriculture	5	(51,178)	(10,236)	3	143,896	47,965	5	13	92,718	
Mining	10	(198,760)	(19,876)	9	863,460	95,940	5	24	664,700	
Utilities	29	(27,088,183)	(934,075)	12	1,156,459	96,372	15	56	(25,931,724)	
Construction	79	(1,531,021)	(19,380)	47	1,858,976	39,553	61	187	327,955	
Manufacturing	448	(37,781,148)	(84,333)	333	62,089,279	186,454	314	1,095	24,308,131	
Wholesale Trade	134	(6,684,253)	(49,882)	120	20,022,842	166,857	81	335	13,338,589	
Retail Trade	114	(12,064,447)	(105,828)	90	32,316,890	359,077	87	291	20,252,444	
Transportation and Warehousing	90	(6,911,992)	(76,800)	49	1,454,539	29,684	43	182	(5,457,453)	
Information	111	(18,790,790)	(169,286)	72	23,819,003	330,819	75	258	5,028,213	
Finance and Insurance	186	(43,899,569)	(236,019)	107	21,559,650	201,492	177	470	(22,339,918)	
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	96	(9,326,874)	(97,155)	58	4,918,506	84,802	171	325	(4,408,368)	
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	263	(25,826,822)	(98,201)	160	35,811,841	223,824	213	636	9,985,019	
Management of Companies	97	(45,940,102)	(473,609)	75	10,361,865	138,158	81	253	(35,578,237)	
Admin. Support, Waste Mgmt., and Remediation Svcs.	76	(2,900,641)	(38,166)	42	7,455,134	177,503	32	150	4,554,493	
Educational Services	15	(2,903,379)	(193,559)	10	354,933	35,493	7	32	(2,548,446)	
Health Care and Social Assistance	52	(6,397,958)	(123,038)	26	5,030,696	193,488	46	124	(1,367,262)	
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	11	(128,786)	(11,708)	8	83,500	10,438	12	31	(45,286)	
Accommodation and Food Services	37	(5,547,568)	(149,934)	28	7,214,861	257,674	32	97	1,667,293	
Other Services	29	(397,979)	(13,723)	22	2,172,563	98,753	27	78	1,774,584	
Misreported	9	(143,862)	(15,985)	3	412,582	137,527	8	20	268,720	
Total	1,891	(254,515,311)	(134,593)	1,274	239,101,475	187,678	1,492	4,657	(15,413,835)	

#### Tax Year 2008 Estimated Distributional Impact of Combined Reporting Finnigan Method of Apportionment

By Predominant Industry, Measured by Payroll, of Group

	Winn	ers	Lose	rs	No Change	Total		
Industry	#	\$	#	\$	#	#	\$	
Agriculture	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	26.2%	
Mining	0.5%	0.1%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	172.9%	
Utilities	1.5%	10.6%	0.9%	0.5%	1.0%	1.2%	-87.7%	
Construction	4.2%	0.6%	3.7%	0.8%	4.1%	4.0%	3.0%	
Manufacturing	23.7%	14.8%	26.1%	26.0%	21.0%	23.5%	16.4%	
Wholesale Trade	7.1%	2.6%	9.4%	8.4%	5.4%	7.2%	43.5%	
Retail Trade	6.0%	4.7%	7.1%	13.5%	5.8%	6.2%	36.1%	
Transportation and Warehousing	4.8%	2.7%	3.8%	0.6%	2.9%	3.9%	-30.4%	
Information	5.9%	7.4%	5.7%	10.0%	5.0%	5.5%	12.4%	
Finance and Insurance	9.8%	17.2%	8.4%	9.0%	11.9%	10.1%	-18.0%	
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	5.1%	3.7%	4.6%	2.1%	11.5%	7.0%	-26.3%	
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	13.9%	10.1%	12.6%	15.0%	14.3%	13.7%	12.9%	
Management of Companies	5.1%	18.1%	5.9%	4.3%	5.4%	5.4%	-54.0%	
Admin. Support, Waste Mgmt., and Remediation Svcs.	4.0%	1.1%	3.3%	3.1%	2.1%	3.2%	51.1%	
Educational Services	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	-38.6%	
Health Care and Social Assistance	2.7%	2.5%	2.0%	2.1%	3.1%	2.7%	-12.0%	
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	0.6%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	-16.8%	
Accommodation and Food Services	2.0%	2.2%	2.2%	3.0%	2.1%	2.1%	15.4%	
Other Services	1.5%	0.2%	1.7%	0.9%	1.8%	1.7%	64.7%	
Misreported	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	16.1%	
Total	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-2.3%	

\* All percentages are a share of that respective column's total, except the Total \$ Change column which is the estimated change in that industry's total liability