



Tax Triggers and Phase-ins

Nicole Kaeding, Director of Federal Projects

Putting Reforms Together

- Last month, I presented a number of options, including what I described as “package #4.”
- Package #4 includes a variety of reforms:
 - Adopting the first part of the DFA plan.
 - Moving to SSF/Repealing the throwback rule.
 - Expanding NOLs
 - Lowering the corporate income tax rate
 - Adopting available revenue increases
 - Adopting the second part of the DFA plan.

Package #4 Costs

Package #4	
2/4/5.9/6.5 Phase One	(\$94,827,469)
Throwback/SSF Combined	(\$57,221,479)
Net Operating Losses	\$0
Corporate Rate Cut	(\$38,700,000)
Total	(\$190,748,948)
Revenue Increases	\$31,779,634
Net Cost	(\$158,969,314)
Phase Two	(\$96,907,004)
Net Cost	(\$255,876,318)

Package #4 Improves the State's Tax Climate

2019 State Business Tax Climate Index			
	2019	Package 4	Change
Overall	46	42	4
Corporate	40	28	12
Individual	40	36	4
Sales	44	44	0
UI	34	34	0
Property	26	26	0

Managing Revenue Losses

- Package #4, however, exceeds the task force's stated goal of \$200 million in net tax cuts.
- The task force can consider a phase-in or tax trigger to mitigate the revenue loss.

Managing Revenue Losses

- Benefits of a phase-in approach compared to tax trigger:
 - Predictable
 - No additional changes are required
- Downside of a phase-in approach compared to a tax trigger:
 - Lose some flexibility during an economic downturn

Managing Revenue Losses

- In general, I prefer tax triggers.
- However, given that only one change needs to be implemented, a phase-in approach is sufficient.
- I would decrease the 6.5 percent rate to 5.9 percent in tranches over the next several budgets, in \$50 million changes.
 - In 2019, enact everything in package #3
 - In 2021, cut the 6.5 percent rate by \$50 million (~6.25%)
 - In 2023, cut the rate to the final 5.9 percent.