

2001 SENATE FINANCE AND TAXATION SB 2060

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2060

Senate Finance and Taxation Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 1/15/01

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #	
		X		0.1
/16/01 - 1	unigi iskugi isga nja profesoganskim had misistrik zizzer i Mid Kadi Iski 24. (1867.) (1917.) (1919.) (1	X	34-end	
/16/01 - 2	X /		0-4.7	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Minutes:

Senator Urlacher: Called the hearing on SB 2060, relating to penalties for income tax and sales or use tax purposes.

Gary Anderson: Director of Sales & Special Taxes for State Tax Department, testified in support of the bill. Written testimony attached.

Senator Stenehjem: If I had 15 employees and I don't turn in any of the income tax withholdings, does that put me in the 15 or more categories right right away or is that one instance?

Gary Anderson: It does not put you in that category right away. In the current system, it's based on your actual number of returns that are delinquent. That's one return that they file, regardless of the number of employees.

Senator Stenehjem: If I'm a retailer selling in many different cities, and I'm not paying the monies back, then I'm in violation for the state, plus every city?

Page 2
Senate Finance and Taxation Committee
Bill/Resolution Number 2060
Hearing Date 1/15/01

Gary Anderson: Each city stands alone. We don't total this group and say we have 15 different taxing authorities so you've got 15 delinquencies at one time.

Senator Stenehiem: Continues to ask questions of Gary Anderson to clarify delinquencies.

Through meter number 14.1.

Senator Nichols: How would this affect a farmer/rancher?

Gary Anderson: For a few exceptions, the same would apply if they were annual filers.

<u>Dan Rouse</u>: Legal Counsel for the Tax Department, made a comment to clear up the questions that Senator Stenehjem had. The bill would be applied retroactively.

Bill put aside for further discussion to add an emergency clause.

Senator Urlacher: Closed the hearing. Action delayed.

Discussion held 1/16/01 meter number 34-end on Tape 1, Side B, 0-4.7, Tape 2, Side A. Dan Rouse appeared to answer questions and clarify some things-penalties, percents, and the retroactive application. Introduced amendment.

AMENDMENT ACTION:

Motion made by <u>Senator Stenehjem</u>, Seconded by <u>Senator Wardner</u>, to move amendment numbered 1080.0100. Voice Vote taken. All in favor, amendment adopted.

COMMITTEE ACTION: 1/16/01

Motion made by <u>Senator Stenehjem</u> for DO PASS AS AMENDED, Seconded by <u>Senator Christmann</u>. Vote was 6 yeas, 0 nay, and 0 absent or not voting. Bill carrier was <u>Senator Stenehjem</u>.

FISCAL NOTE

Requested by Legislative Council 12/18/2000

Bill/Resolution No.:

SB 2060

Amendment to:

1A. State fiscal effect: Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.

	1999-200	1 Blennium	2001-	2003	3 Biennium	2003-2001	3 Biennium
	General Fund	Other Funds	Germal F	und	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	**************************************						Profit Call and it has also hid out as increase agreement according to a pro-
Expenditures			<u></u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Appropriations		**************************************	<u> </u>		to Print Medical Science of the Print State on		to mercing products and a production of the control

1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect: Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.

199	9-2001 Bleni	nlum	200	1-2003 Blen	nlum	200	3-2005 Blen	nlum
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Countles	Cities	School Districts	Countles	Cities	School Districts
					The state of the s	**************************************	Comments on the second of the	

2. Narrative: Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.

SB 2060 changes the penalty provisions for delinquent sales and withholding returns to one that is more administratively workable and fair. There are positive and negative fiscal effects associated with this bill, but the exact fiscal impact cannot be determined.

- 3. State fiscal effect detail: For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:
 - A. Revenues: Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.
 - B. Expenditures: Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.
 - C. Appropriations: Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.

Name:	Kathryn L. Strombeck	Agency:	Tax Department
Phone Number:		Date Prepared:	01/12/2001

Prepared by the Office of State Tax Commissioner January 16, 2001

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL NO. 2060

Page 5, remove lines 7 through 8

Renumber accordingly

Date: 11/0/01
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2000

Senate Finance and Taxation	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			_ Com	mittee
Subcommittee on	rank belik gar gwalair di winnellinin liter				
or Conference Committee					
Legislative Council Amendment Nun	nber _	1808	D.0160		
Action Taken Move Ame	ndn	ent	- (Voice Vote)		
Motion Made By Stenehjer					urge ere til skutske elemente skutske
Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Senator Urlacher-Chairman Senator Wardner-Vice Chairman Senator Christmann Senator Stenehjem Senator Kroeplin Senator Nichols					
			D		

Date: 1110/0(
Roll Call Vote #: 2

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES BILL/RESOLUTION NO. $\operatorname{BLL}()$

Senate Finance and Taxation				Com	mittee
Subcommittee on or Conference Committee					en videlink Granderstein vord d
Legislative Council Amendment Nun Action Taken DUSS	No (mer	diel		y gas deregging ministrative baret.
Action Taken 10 Pass Motion Made By Stanchill	<u> </u>	See By	conded Christma	411	
Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Senator Urlacher-Chairman Senator Wardner-Vice Chairman Senator Christmann Senator Stenehjem Senator Kroeplin Senator Nichols					
Total (Yes) Absent Floor Assignment Stenehje	M	No			

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410) January 16, 2001 4:00 p.in.

Module No: SR-06-1083 Carrier: Stenehjem

Insert LC: 18080.0101 Title: .0200

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2060: Finance and Taxation Committee (Sen. Urlacher, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS and when so amended, recommends DO PASS (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2060 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 3, after the first semicolon insert "and" and replace "; and to" with a period

Page 1, remove line 4

Page 5, remove lines 7 and 8

Renumber accordingly

2001 HOUSE FINANCE AND TAXATION

SB 2060

2001 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2060

House Finance and Taxation Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date March 7, 2001

Side A	Side B	Meter#
	X	99
: Janie	e Dein	
	Side A Fanie	X

Minutes:

REP. AL CARLSON, CHAIRMAN Opened the hearing and read the fiscal note.

GARY L. ANDERSON, DIRECTOR OF SALES & SPECIAL TAXES, STATE TAX

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, Testified in support of the bill. See attached written testimony.

REP. CARLSON What did you collect last year?

GARY ANDERSON Stated he didn't have that figure.

REP. CARLSON I see the Senate took out the date where you had it effective December 31, 2000.

GARY ANDERSON When the bill was drafted, I am not sure, how the numbers were put in there, I think in our legal work on the bill, it was put in there. When the Senate looked at that, they were wondering if that was an important feature, and it certainly wasn't, so we agreed that it should come out and take place August 1, without the extended effective date.

Page 2
House Finance and Taxation Committee
Bill/Resolution Number SB 2060
Hearing Date March 7, 2001

REP. CARLSON The penalties will be the same for both, in the end, is there really going to be very much difference, you are using different methodology, but will the actual fine be that much different?

GARY ANDERSON It is our belief, that it will not. What happened in our case, we have run into situations frequently, where somebody will have failed to file a return and if they are filing in several cities, they have all of these penalties for each city, obviously, you can understand that if somebody has a two hundred dollar tax liability, they end up with a thousand dollar penalty interest billing because of all of the combinations of state and city taxes, we certainly take that into allowance and do some adjustments, that these taxpayers have shown us that they were making an effort and just slipped up. There has been some adjustments to equalize that, certainly not waiving all of it, but at least adjusting it. This will basically, bring it into line with what we are doing anyway. I don't see a major change here.

With no further testimony, the hearing was closed.

COMMITTEE ACTION 3-7-01, TAPE 1, SIDE B, METER #3628

REP. CLARK Made a motion for a DO PASS.

REP. SCHMIDT Second the motion. **MOTION CARRIED.**

11 YES 0 NO 4 ABSENT

REP. CLARK Was given the floor assignment.

Date: 3-7-6/ Roll Call Vote #: /

2001 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 58 2060

House FINANCE & TAXAT	ION			_ Comi	mittee
Subcommittee on		aryuwanya ayan da kanada gamada		Persiana dissinguistica di conse	
or					
Conference Committee					
Legislative Council Amendment Nu	mber _				
Action Taken	D _o	4	Pass		
Motion Made By Rep. Cla	AK_	Se	conded By Rep. Sc	hmic	it
Representatives	Yes	No	Representativ es	Yes	No
CARLSON, AL, CHAIRMAN	1		NICHOLAS, EUGENE	1	
DROVDAL, DAVID, V-CHAIR	V		RENNER, DENNIS	1	
BRANDENBURG, MICHAEL	1		RENNERFELDT, EARL	1	
CLARK, BYRON			SCHMIDT, ARLO		<u> </u>
GROSZ, MICHAEL	1		WIKENHEISER, RAY	1	
HERBEL, GIL	1/1		WINRICH, LONNY		
KELSH, SCOT	1			-	
KROEBER, JOE	1			-)
LLOYD, EDWARD					
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	 			 	
	 		Parada Pa	-	
Total (Yes)		No			
Total (Tes)		140	\wedge		
					
Absent	4				
	<u> </u>				
Floor Assignment Ken. C	MK				
f the vote is on an amendment, briefly	y indicate	e intent	•		

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410) March 7, 2001 1:22 p.m.

Module No: HR-39-5016 Carrier: Clark Insert LC: Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMINITEE

SB 2060, as engrossed: Finance and Taxation Committee (Rep. Carlson, Chairman) recommends DO PASS (11 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 4 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). Engrossed SB 2060 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

2001 TESTIMONY

SB 2060

SENATE BILL NO. 2060

Testimony prepared by
Gary L. Anderson
North Dakota Office of State Tax Commission
January 15, 2001

Chairman Urlacher and members of the Schate Finance and Taxation Committee, my name is Gary L. Anderson, Director of Sales & Special Taxes. Senate Bill No. 2060 represents a request by the Office of State Tax Commissioner for a change in the manner in which penalty is applied when a sales and use tax or income tax withholding return is not timely filed or paid.

Most states apply an automatic penalty system for failure to file timely tax returns. These penalty systems generally involve a flat penalty rate but with a dollar minimum. The dollar minimum will most often apply to those filers owing little or no tax but yet create a substantial administrative expense by not filing timely tax returns.

Current North Dakota law provides for the application of penalty based upon the delinquency history of the filer. The more delinquent returns or payments a filer has will result in a larger penalty rate. The current penalty application follows:

	Delinquent returns/payments	Penalty (first month late)
Monthly Filer:	1 to 6	5% or \$5, whichever is greater
-	7 to 14	10% or \$25, whichever is greater
	15 or more	25% or \$100, whichever is greater
Quarterly filer:	1 to 3	5% or \$5, whichever is greater
	4 to 8	10% or \$25, whichever is greater
	9 or more	25% or \$100, whichever is greater

Although the intent of the current penalty application is to apply a higher penalty rate to those filers having continual delinquencies, the penalty application can often result in an assessment of the higher penalty rate to a filer having a good filing history. For example, a filer may experience a large number of delinquencies during the first few years of business, then file timely returns for several years. Because the filer's delinquency history reflects a number of previous delinquent returns, the filing of one

delinquent return several years later can result in the application of the higher penalty rates.

With the increase in the number of local sales and use taxes, which currently totals 84 cities and one county, the filer can also find themselves subject to the same penalty rates for each individual city and county.

North Dakota is the only state currently applying a penalty rate based on a Taxpayer's delinquency history.

North Dakota, like most states, wants to encourage the timely filing of returns and payment of taxes. It is for this reason that most states provide for the application of penalty when a filer is delinquent in its responsibilities.

Section 1 of SB 2060 repeals the current penalty provision as it applies to the income tax withholding. By repealing this provision, the penalty that applies to corporate income tax returns, as provided in subsection 2(b) of section 57-38-45, will also be applicable to income tax withholding returns that are not filed timely. This subsection provides for an application of a 5% penalty or \$5.00 per month; whichever is greater, up to a maximum of 25 percent if the filer fails to file a tax return.

Section 2 and 3 of SB 2060 repeals the current penalty provisions in the sales and use tax laws. The additional language in each section also provides for an application of a 5% penalty or \$5.00 per month, whichever is greater, up to a maximum of 25 percent if the filer fails to file a tax return.

SB 2060 provides for the application of an increased penalty rate based on the filer's failure to file a timely return, instead of basing the penalty rate on a filer's filing history. SB 2060 proposes a penalty application for delinquent sales and income tax withholding returns that is administratively workable and fair.

Although the fiscal effect cannot be determined, SB 2060 will generally reflect a reduced penalty if the delinquent returns are filed the first month or two of being delinquent. SB 2060 will generally provide for progressive penalties for successive delinquencies and for added months of delinquency, which places an increased pressure on the more hard-core delinquents. The Office of State Tax Commissioner would ask for a Do Pass on Senate Bill No. 2060.

Senate Bill No. 2060 Addendum to January 15, 2061 Testimony Presented by Gary L. Anderson North Dakota Office of State Tax Commissioner

Application of penalty as provided by SB2060:

Third MonthFourth MonthDelinquentDelinquent	5% or \$5.00 5% or \$5.00 whichever is greater
Second Month Third Delinquent Delin	5% or \$5.00 5% or \$5.0 whichever greater
First Month Seco	5% or \$5.00 5% whichever is whi greater greater
	Penalty

ABC Company has a requirement to file a tax return (could be a sales & use tax return or an income tax withholding tax return) no later than December 31. The tax liability for ABC Company is \$1,000.

If delinquent:	January	February	March	April	May	Total Penalty
Penalty to appily.	\$50 (5%)	\$50 (5%)	\$50 (5%)	\$50 (5%)	\$50 (5%)	\$250 (25%)
If ABC Company fil	les the return in Jan	If ABC Company files the return in January, the total penalty will be \$50.	y will be \$50.			

If Return is filed after May, no additional penalty will apply but the filer will be subject to an interest rate of 1% per month until filed and paid.

.....in May, the total penalty will be \$250 (January plus February plus March plus April plus May)

......in April, the total penalty will be \$200 (January plus February plus March plus April)

.....in March, the total penalty will be \$150 (January plus February plus March)

in February, the total penalty will be \$100 (January plus February)