

HOUSE BILL REPORT

HB 1677

As Reported By House Committee On:

Finance

Title: An act relating to prohibiting separate reporting and valuation of intangible personal property.

Brief Description: Prohibiting separate reporting and valuation of intangible personal property.

Sponsors: Representatives B. Thomas, Buck, Dunshee, Appelwick, Wensman, Ogden, O'Brien, Robertson, Sullivan, Anderson and Carrell.

Brief History:

Committee Activity:

Finance: 2/25/97, 3/7/97 [DP].

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Majority Report: Do pass. Signed by 14 members: Representatives B. Thomas, Chairman; Carrell, Vice Chairman; Mulliken, Vice Chairman; Dunshee, Ranking Minority Member; Dickerson, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Boldt; Butler; Conway; Kastama; Mason; Morris; Pennington; Schoesler and Van Luven.

Staff: Bob Longman (786-7139).

Background: All property in this state is subject to property tax each year based on the value of the property, unless a specific exemption is provided by law. The state constitution requires that a taxing district apply taxes uniformly to each class of property within the district, and that all real estate be treated as one class. The constitution also allows the Legislature to exempt types of property from taxation.

Intangible property is property that has no physical substance and is not susceptible to being perceived by the senses. Some types of intangible property are exempt from taxation: money, mortgages, notes, accounts, certificates of deposit, tax certificates, judgments, government bonds and warrants, stocks and shares of private corporations, private non-governmental personal service contracts, and private non-governmental athletic or sports franchises.

Other types of intangible property are taxable, such as trademarks, trade names, brand names, patents, copyrights, trade secrets, franchise agreements, licenses, permits, agreements to not compete, customer lists, and business goodwill.

Factors that affect the market value of real property or tangible personal property, such as location, zoning, or view, are sometimes referred to as "intangibles." However, these factors are not intangible property. These are merely items that buyers and sellers take into account in determining the market value of property. In contrast, intangible property can be bought and sold completely independently of other property.

Intangible assets are often difficult to identify, locate, and value. The correct treatment of intangible assets for property tax purposes is a matter of some controversy. Recent events have sparked a new level of interest in this issue.

In the late 1980's, the Department of Revenue was sued by Burlington Northern on the grounds that the company was being discriminated against. The taxpayer believed that assessed values established by the department tend to include the value of intangible assets held by the taxpayer, while assessed values established by county assessors did not include the value of intangible assets. This complex litigation was eventually resolved in the department's favor.

Recently, Congress allowed the cost of some intangible assets to be amortized over a 15-year period for federal income tax purposes. This made it more likely that businesses would show intangible value on their books and that assessors would tend to tax it. Businesses began to complain about the assessment and taxation of previously untaxed property. Businesses also expressed concern that assessors would begin to further tax these and other intangible assets.

The department responded with a letter in January 1996, advising county assessors not to list and separately value intangible assets. In 1996, bills were introduced in the Legislature to exempt all intangibles from taxation, but none of these bills were enacted.

Summary of Bill: In valuing property, intangible personal property is not valued separately, and the assessor must not require a taxpayer to report intangible personal property.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Testimony For: This bill is an attempt to maintain the status quo. Intangibles should not be listed separately. Businesses have been concerned over the separate listing of intangibles and this bill addresses those concerns. The bill eliminates the possibility that the value of an intangible will be taxed twice: once in the value of the real property with which it is associated, and again as a separate item.

Testimony Against: The status quo is unacceptable and unattainable. The status quo may be unconstitutional, because the property tax would not be uniformly applied. We need to either tax all intangibles or exempt them all. It is not possible to correctly value and tax intangibles, so only the easily valued intangibles will be taxed. The bill does not exempt intangibles, so the value of business franchises can be taxed.

Testified: (Pro): Representative Brian Thomas, prime sponsor; Scott Noble and Paul Easter, Washington State Association of County Assessors; Rachael Myers, Washington Citizen Action; Terri Hotvedt, Washington Association of Realtors; and Dave Wood, People for Fair Taxes. (Con): Jim Irish, Irish & Associates/Appraisal Institute, Washington Chapters.