

TAX FOUNDATION OF HAWAII

126 Queen Street, Suite 304

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Tel. 536-4587

SUBJECT: CONVEYANCE, INCOME, Earmark Conveyance Tax to Feed Rental Assistance Revolving Fund, Make EITC Refundable, Increase Low-Income Household Renters Credit

BILL NUMBER: HB 2703, HD-1

INTRODUCED BY: House Committee on Housing

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: (1) Allocates a portion of the conveyance tax revenues to the rental assistance revolving fund to be used to subsidize rents for persons who meet certain income requirements; (2) Increases the income tax credit for low-income household renters to an unspecified amount; and (3) Makes the state earned income tax credit refundable and changes the amount of the credit to an unspecified percentage of the federal earned income tax credit.

SYNOPSIS: Amends sections 201H-123 and 247-7, HRS, to allocate the lesser of ___% or \$___ from the conveyance tax to the rental assistance revolving fund.

Amends section 235-55.7, HRS, to change the amount of the low-income household renters' credit from \$50 to \$___.

Amends section 235-55.75, HRS, to change the earned income tax credit from nonrefundable to refundable.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This Act shall take effect on January 1, 2050; provided that: (1) Part II shall take effect on January 1, 2050; and (2) Parts III and IV shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Conveyance Tax

The conveyance tax was enacted by the 1966 legislature after the repeal of the federal law requiring stamps for transfers of real property. It was enacted for the sole purpose of providing the department of taxation (which at the time also administered the real property tax) with additional data for the determination of market value of properties transferred. This information was also to assist the department in establishing real property assessed values and at that time the department stated that the conveyance tax was not intended to be a revenue raising device.

Prior to 1993, the conveyance tax was imposed at the rate of 5 cents per \$100 of actual and full consideration paid for a transfer of property. At the time all revenues from the tax went to the general fund. The legislature by Act 195, SLH 1993, increased the conveyance tax to 10 cents per \$100 and earmarked 25% of the tax to the rental housing trust fund and another 25% to the natural area reserve fund. As a result of legislation in 2005 and in 2009, the conveyance tax rates were substantially increased and bifurcated between nonowner-occupied residential properties and all other properties. Tax brackets were based on the amount of the value transferred. Until

2005, 50% of the receipts went into the general fund and the other half was split with the affordable rental housing program and the natural area reserve program. Beginning in 2005, another 10% was taken for the land conservation fund. In 2009, legislators reduced the amount of conveyance tax revenues earmarked to the rental housing trust fund from 30% to 25% until June 30, 2012 in an effort to generate additional revenues for the state general fund. Act 164, SLH 2014, increased the earmark to 50% as of July 1, 2014, and Act 84, SLH 2015, imposed the \$38 million cap on the earmark.

This bill adds an additional earmark on the conveyance tax to feed the rental assistance revolving fund.

As with any earmarking of revenues, the legislature will be preapproving each of the programs fed by the fund into which the tax monies are diverted, expenses from the funds largely avoid legislative scrutiny, and the effectiveness of the programs funded becomes harder to ascertain. It is also difficult to determine whether the fund has too little or too much revenue.

If the legislature deems the programs and purposes funded by this special fund to be a high priority, then it should maintain the accountability for these funds by appropriating the funds as it does with other programs. Earmarking revenues merely absolves elected officials from setting priorities. If the money were appropriated, lawmakers could then evaluate the real or actual needs of each program.

Income Tax Credit for Low-Income Household Renters

The 1970 legislature adopted a system of tax credits for household renters which was intended to partially offset the higher tax burden on renters resulting from the lack of tax relief like the home exemption for homeowners and the 4% general excise tax levied on rental income. The current renter credit was established by the 1977 legislature at \$20 per exemption for those taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$20,000 who paid more than \$1,000 in rent during the tax year. Act 230, SLH 1981, increased the credit amount to \$50. Act 239, SLH 1989, increased the adjusted gross income (AGI) limit to \$30,000 to claim the credit. The proposed measure would increase the amount of the credit from \$50 to \$150. It does not increase the rent qualification amount – the taxpayer still will need to pay \$1,000 in rent during a taxable year to qualify for the credit.

There are some issues to consider with refundable credits targeted at low-income and homeless people generally.

First, a tax return is one of the most complicated documents for government agencies to process. The administrative costs associated with each one can quickly make heads spin. Furthermore, as the U.S. Treasury has experienced with the Earned Income Tax Credit, the combination of complexity and a refundable credit result in a certain percentage of improper payouts, some due to mistake or misunderstanding, and some due to bad actors.

Second, the low-income household renters' credit does nothing for most of the homeless; the credit requires payment of more than \$1000 in rent. And even for those in the target population who do qualify for this credit, the relief that the credit provides comes in a tax refund which is

paid, at the earliest, in the early part of the year after the tax return filer needs the relief. A person who qualifies for the credit in 2017, for example, won't get a check until early 2018.

Third, as a policy matter, lawmakers might prefer that the recipient of the refund not use the money obtained on such things as cigarettes, alcohol, or illegal drugs. But the tax system contains no way of restricting the uses of a refund check; other departments do have systems in place to give some assurance that the payment will go toward legitimate living expenses such as groceries (EBT, for example).

The better solution is to get such people out of the tax system entirely. They receive peace of mind because they don't have to worry about tax returns, and the department doesn't have to worry about processing those returns. If additional relief to such people is considered desirable, it can be delivered through the agencies that are better equipped to do so.

Earned Income Tax Credit

In Act 107, SLH 2017, the earned income tax credit (EITC), was adopted. Its supporters maintained it's the best solution to lift families out of poverty since sliced bread. At the Department of Taxation's urging, however, the EITC was made nonrefundable. Advocates clearly didn't like that, and are pressing to make the credit refundable.

Well, what's the difference? Let's start with a nonrefundable credit, which is current law. Suppose you either have lots of credits or not very much income, so you have more credits than tax liability. If you have made tax payments throughout the year, through wage withholding perhaps, you still can get all your payments back. But once the tax liability hits zero, there's no more. The state does not cut you a check, but you get a credit carryover which can be used against next year's tax liability.

In contrast, a refundable credit is just as good as cash. Not only can this type of credit reduce the amount of tax owed, but if the tax liability is less than the credit the State will cut the taxpayer a check for the difference.

Why is the State concerned about issuing refundable credits? There are several reasons.

First, issuing a refund is administratively expensive. In most businesses, the internal process necessary to send money to someone goes through several checks and balances to make sure that no mistakes are made. In our state government, we need to do those processes twice. At the Department of Taxation, staff can ask for a refund to be issued but no one can issue a check. Instead, a document called a "refund voucher" is sent to a different department altogether, the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS). Once DAGS gets the refund voucher, it goes through its own processes, checking to see if the recipient doesn't owe another agency for example, and then issues the check.

Second, a refund can become a target for bad actors. We earlier pointed to reports from the U.S. Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration estimating that more than 20% of all federal EITC payouts were improper. Other studies estimated that about half of these so-called improper payments were paid out because someone made a mistake. Perhaps the taxpayer was

confused by the tax form, which is admittedly complex. The other half were paid out because of bad actors. Maybe a taxpayer claimed credits for kids they don't have. Maybe an unethical tax preparation service filled in data claiming credits for people who exist but aren't part of the taxpayer's family. Once the cash goes out, however, it's tough to get back. In Hawaii, our credit is 20% of the federal credit so a smaller check would go out, and because the number is smaller the Department of Taxation might not be motivated to chase down the improper payments given the number and severity of other items on their plate.

Indeed, the Department recently estimated that changing the Hawaii EITC to a refundable one would cost the State \$32 million more than a nonrefundable credit. It's not clear how they came up with that number. But that amount of money definitely could cool a few sweltering classrooms, or perhaps fix a few plumbing facilities at the airport. In this situation, what are our priorities? Where is the need greatest?

Digested 2/21/2018

LATE

HB-2703-HD-1

Submitted on: 3/12/2018 5:51:29 PM

Testimony for HOU on 3/13/2018 2:45:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Lea Minton	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

I strongly support HB2703HD1 as the EITC is important for women and children, whom I serve. EITC helps single women raising children, helps women who generally earn less than men (yes this happens in Hawaii!), and helps women who have not obtained college education and beyond by improving their overall health and reducing homelessness.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify on this important community matter.