

SB750

Establishes an income tax credit for qualified media infrastructure projects.

TAXBILLSERVICE

126 Queen Street, Suite 304

TAX FOUNDATION OF HAWAII

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Tel. 536-4587

SUBJECT: INCOME, Expand motion picture, digital media and film production credit

BILL NUMBER: SB 750; HB 566 (Identical)

INTRODUCED BY: SB by Dela Cruz and Espero; HB by Har, Cabanilla, Cullen, Hashem, Ichiyama, Ito, Kawakami, Say, Takayama, Tsuji, Yamane and 2 Democrats

BRIEF SUMMARY: Amends HRS section 235-17 to allow taxpayers, between July 1, 2013 and December 31, 2015, to claim a credit of 25% of the qualified costs incurred for qualified media infrastructure projects. To qualify for the credit: (1) the base investment for a qualified media infrastructure project shall be in excess of \$ _____; (2) the qualified media infrastructure project tax credit shall be non-refundable so any tax credit that exceeds the tax liability of the taxpayer may be carried forward to offset net income tax liability in subsequent tax years for up to ten years or until exhausted, whichever occurs first. The director of taxation may require the tax credits to be taken or assigned in the tax period in which the credit is earned or may structure the tax credit in the initial certification of the project to provide that only a portion of the tax credit be taken over the course of two or more years; (3) the total qualified media infrastructure project tax credit allowed for any state-certified infrastructure project shall not exceed \$ _____; (4) if any portion of an infrastructure project is a facility that may be used for other purposes unrelated to production or post production activities, then the project shall be approved only if a determination is made that the multiple use facility will support and will be necessary to secure production or post production activity for the production and post production facility; provided that no tax credits shall be earned on such multiple use facilities until the production or post production facility is complete; (5) tax credits for infrastructure projects shall be earned only if: (a) construction of the infrastructure project begins within six months of the initial certification and shall be ___% completed within a ___ year time frame; (b) expenditures shall be certified by the director of taxation and credits shall not be earned until certification is received; (c) the tax credits shall be deemed earned at the time the expenditures are made, provided that all requirements of this subsection have been met and the tax credits have been certified; (6) for state-certified infrastructure projects, the application for a qualified media infrastructure project tax credit shall include: (a) a detailed description of the infrastructure project; (b) a preliminary budget; (c) a complete detailed business plan and market analysis; (d) estimated start and completion dates; and (e) if the application is incomplete, additional information may be requested prior to further action by the director of taxation; (7) an application fee of ___% times the estimated total incentive tax credits shall be submitted with the application for a qualified media infrastructure project tax credit; (8) prior to any final certification of a tax credit for a state-certified infrastructure project, the applicant for the infrastructure project tax credit shall submit to the director of taxation an audit of the expenditures certified by an independent certified public accountant as determined by rule. Upon approval of the audit, the director of taxation shall issue a final tax credit certification letter indicating the amount of tax credits certified for the state-certified infrastructure project to the investors. Bank loan finance fees applicable to the qualified media infrastructure project expenditures, as certified by the director of taxation, and any general excise taxes that have been paid on the bank loan finance fees and remitted to the state may be included as part of the tax credit.

Further requires the taxpayer claiming the credit to file a progress report of a qualified media project with DBEDT, deliver a performance bond in a form prescribed by DBEDT in an amount equal to 100% of total projected expenditures determined upon initial certification; and either: (1) pledge of a lien on the qualified media infrastructure project in favor of the state; or (2) collateral security.

Also requires any taxpayer eligible to claim a qualified media infrastructure project tax credit to file with DBEDT an annual report by March 1 following each taxable year for which the credit is claimed delineating: (1) the amount of general excise tax paid; (2) the amount of transient accommodations tax paid; (3) the amount of tax credits claimed under this section; (4) gross proceeds of each project; (5) number of full-time employees, part-time employees employed on each qualified media infrastructure project; (6) number of independent contractors contracted to work on each qualified media infrastructure project; (7) amount disbursed as payroll on each qualified media infrastructure project; and (8) list of job classifications with average wage level.

Defines "qualified media infrastructure project" as the development, construction, renovation, or operation of a film, video, television, or media production or post-production facility and the immovable property and equipment related thereto, or any other facility that supports and is a necessary component of the proposed infrastructure project, that is located in the state; provided that the facility may include a movie theater or other commercial exhibition facility to assist in offsetting operating costs of the production or post-production facility, but shall not include a facility used to produce pornographic matter or a pornographic performance.

A taxpayer may claim the media infrastructure project tax credit for investments made on a qualified media infrastructure project prior to January 1, 2016 if construction of the media infrastructure project commenced prior to January 1, 2016.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Tax years beginning after December 31, 2012

STAFF COMMENTS: The legislature by Act 107, SLH 1997, enacted an income tax credit of 4% for costs incurred as a result of producing a motion picture or television film in the state and 7.25% for transient accommodations rented in connection with such activity. The credit was adopted largely to address the impost of the state's general excise tax on goods and services used by film producers.

The legislature by Act 88, SLH 2006, increased the 4% credit to 15% in a county with a population over 700,000 and to 20% in a county with a population of 700,000 or less. Act 88 also repealed the income tax credit for transient accommodations and expanded the credit to include commercials and digital media productions, and limited the credit to \$8 million per qualified production. The proposed measure expands the existing motion picture, digital media and film production income tax credits to media infrastructure projects.

These motion picture credits have been morphing and expanding into full-blown tax credits since they "got their foot in the door" in 1997. It should be remembered that the perpetuation and expansion of the motion picture credits are a drain on the state treasury. It is incredulous how lawmakers can bemoan the fact that there are insufficient resources to catch up on the backlog of school repairs and maintenance, to fund social programs and not being able to provide tax relief to residents and yet they are willing to throw additional public resources at a subsidy of film production and media infrastructure. Taxpayers

should be insulted that lawmakers can provide breaks for film productions but refuse to provide tax relief for residents, many of whom work two or three jobs just to keep a roof over their head and food on the table.

There is absolutely no rational basis for expanding these tax credits other than that other states are offering similar tax credits. Then again those states can't offer paradise, year-round good weather during which to film. Instead of utilizing back door subsidies through tax credits, film industry advocates need to promote the beauty that is synonymous with Hawaii.

Income tax credits are designed to reduce the tax burden by providing relief for taxes paid. Tax credits are justified on the basis that taxpayers with a lesser ability to pay should be granted relief for state taxes imposed. While the sponsors try to make an argument that Hawaii needs to enact such an incentive to compete for this type of business, one has to ask "at what price?" Promoters of the film industry obviously don't give much credit to Hawaii's natural beauty and more recently its relative security. Just ask the actors of "Lost" or "Hawaii 5-0" who have bought homes here if they would like to work elsewhere. While film producers may moan that they will lose money without the proposed tax credits, is there any offer to share the wealth when a film makes millions of dollars? If promoters of the film industry would just do their job in outlining the advantages of doing this type of work in Hawaii and address some of the costly barriers by correcting them, such tax incentives would not be necessary. From permitting to skilled labor to facilitating transportation of equipment, there are ways that could reduce the cost of filming in Hawaii. Unless these intrinsic elements are addressed, movie makers will probably demand subsidies, such as this incentive. Unfortunately, they come at the expense of all taxpayers and industries struggling to survive in Hawaii. While lawmakers look like a ship of fools, movie producers and promoters are laughing all the way to the bank and the real losers in this scenario are the poor taxpayers who continue to struggle to make ends meet.

So while there may be the promise of a new industry and increased career opportunities, lawmakers must return to the cold hard reality of solving the problems at hand. The long and short of it is that due in large part to the irresponsibility of handling state finances in the past, taxpayers cannot afford proposals like this. Thanks to the gushing generosity of those lawmakers who gave the state's bank away in all sorts of tax incentive schemes in recent years, taxpayers cannot afford what looks like a promising opportunity.

Robert Tannenwald, a senior fellow at the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, drew the following conclusions in a report entitled "State Film Subsidies Offer 'Little Bang for the Buck'," published in State Tax Notes Magazine, December 13, 2010:

"State film subsidies are a wasteful, ineffective, and unfair instrument of economic development. While they appear to be a 'quick fix' that provides jobs and businesses to state residents with only a short lag, in reality they benefit mostly nonresidents, especially well-paid nonresident film and TV professionals. Some residents benefit from these subsidies, but most end up paying for them in the form of fewer services - such as education, healthcare and police and fire protection - or higher taxes elsewhere. The

benefits to the few are highly visible; the costs to the majority are hidden because they are spread so widely and detached from the subsidies.

State governments cannot afford to fritter away scarce public funds on film subsidies, or, for that matter, any other wasteful tax break. Instead, policymakers should broaden the base of their taxes to create a fairer and more neutral tax system. Economic development funds should be targeted on programs that are much more likely to be effective in the long run, such as support of education and training, enhancement of public safety, and maintenance and improvement of public infrastructure. Effective public support of economic development may not be glamorous, but at its best, it creates lasting benefits for residents from all walks of life.”

Finally, given all of the other proposals by the administration to exact this or that fee or tax out of the economy and from Hawaii’s residents, one must ask just how much can we afford? At the very time, Hawaii residents are being asked to chip in another dime for a single-use bag, or another dollar on their vehicle registration fee for a parking program for the disabled, or a penny per ounce on sugary drinks, can taxpayers really afford to hand \$8 million or \$12 million to a film production in the promise that it will bring more jobs. Let’s see, we are going to put people out of business by raising taxes and fees to create jobs for people who will have no where to go to buy their plate lunch. Instead of handing out tax credits for which lawmakers have no clue of the overall drain on state tax dollars, subsidies for these film productions, if that is what lawmakers believe is needed, should be subject to legislative review and appropriation like any other expenditure of state tax dollars.

Instead of handing out a tax credit to build the film infrastructure, be it a studio or a sound stage, lawmakers should appropriate a specific sum of money and put a request for proposals to build such a project and see which bidder would come forward with the best proposal and offer to match the state’s share. This way, each bidder could be evaluated as to what they have to offer and what benefit the state would get. Inasmuch as the state would probably be able to offer the land for such a facility, it could also offer a streamlined permitting process which would also be an in-kind contribution. Based on the responses to the request, a careful review done by experts in the field could be made and the best proposal selected. The persons responsible for making the final selection would then be held accountable for their selection and provide the justification for the selection. This lends far more transparency to the process than the proposed tax credit.

Digested 2/6/13

Dane Wicker

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2013 10:35 PM
To: EGHTestimony
Cc: econnell1@hawaii.rr.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for SB750 on Feb 8, 2013 15:15PM

SB750

Submitted on: 2/3/2013

Testimony for EGH/TEC on Feb 8, 2013 15:15PM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Emmons Connell	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: Granting tax credits to the Media industry is Government picking winners and losers. A fair tax to all industries and the open market does a better job of making winners and losers. Please vote no on this bill.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Dane Wicker

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 9:47 AM
To: EGHTestimony
Cc: kathleenLcampbell@gmail.com
Subject: *Submitted testimony for SB750 on Feb 8, 2013 15:15PM*

SB750

Submitted on: 2/7/2013

Testimony for EGH/TEC on Feb 8, 2013 15:15PM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
kathleen campbell	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov