

# Learning from Other States' Successes and Failures in Tax Reform

This article will appear in ACRE's forthcoming publication *The Citizen's Guide to Understanding Arkansas Economic Data*, which will be released in Summer 2018. We are very excited for this data book to be released, but we are giving you a sneak preview of one chapter that is especially relevant to the ongoing tax reform debate in Arkansas.



May 2018

Jeremy Horpedahl

Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Central Arkansas  
ACRE Scholar, The Arkansas Center for Research in Economics

Nicole Kaeding

Director of Special Projects, Tax Foundation

Arkansas Center for Research in Economics  
University of Central Arkansas  
College of Business  
210 Donaghey Avenue  
Conway, Arkansas 72035

# Learning from Other States’ Successes and Failures in Tax Reform

---

## Introduction

How can Arkansas improve its tax system? In 2016, we undertook an in-depth research project to better understand Arkansas’s tax system, what the citizens and businesses of Arkansas liked and disliked about taxes, and how Arkansas compares to other states on a variety of measures. The results of that study were published in our book *Arkansas: The Road Map to Tax Reform* in November 2016.<sup>1</sup>

In this paper, we have three objectives. First, we briefly summarize the findings and suggestions from our book. Second, we discuss some recent changes to Arkansas’s tax system, following our book’s publication. Finally, we review several tax reform efforts in other states, all of which have reforms and lessons that are useful for Arkansans to understand.

In the time since our book was published, we have received a lot of feedback and many questions, and a common theme was: This all sounds great, but is this really possible? Have any other states tried similar reforms in recent years? The answer to both questions is a resounding yes. And in this paper, we will get into the details of what other states have done, focusing on areas of reform that either we suggested in our book or have been under debate in Arkansas. Right now is an especially important time to learn from other

states, as the Arkansas Tax Relief and Reform Task Force is actively working to produce its own report on taxes in Arkansas (more on this to come).

---

## Arkansas’s Current Tax Structure

Arkansas last passed comprehensive tax reform in 1971, leaving the Natural State with an almost 50-year-old tax code, a tax code unprepared for and uncompetitive in the 21st century. According to the *State Business Tax Climate Index*, Arkansas ranks in the bottom third of all states, with the 39th-best tax climate among the 50 states.<sup>2</sup>

The state’s individual and corporate income taxes are particularly uncompetitive. Arkansas has the highest individual income tax in the Southeast, with a top marginal rate of 6.9 percent. The state’s individual income tax is also quite complicated, as it uses four sets of rates and brackets, making it the only state with this structure.

The state’s corporate income tax is also high, with a top marginal rate of 6.5 percent applied to income over \$100,000. Arkansas also continues to use a problematic throwback rule, adding complexity to the system, while significantly lagging

---

1 Nicole Kaeding, Scott Drenkard, Jeremy Horpedahl, Joseph Bishop-Henchman, and Jared Walczak, “Arkansas: The Road Map to Tax Reform,” Tax Foundation, November 14, 2016, <https://taxfoundation.org/arkansas-road-map-tax-reform/>.

2 Jared Walczak, Scott Drenkard, and Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “2018 State Business Tax Climate Index,” Tax Foundation, October 17, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/state-business-tax-climate-index-2018/>.

other states on corporate income tax base provisions, such as net operating losses.

Arkansas's sales tax also needs reform. The state has the third highest combined state and local sales tax rate in the country. Because changes to the sales tax only require a majority vote in the legislature (compared to changes to the individual and corporate income tax, which need supermajorities), Arkansas frequently uses its sales tax as a way to raise revenue, leading to the high rate. While the top income tax rate has not been increased since 1971, the sales tax rate has been increased six times (three times with voter-approved constitutional amendments, three times by the legislature). Additionally, the state's sales tax base is too small. The state exempts a number of goods, such as prescription drugs, while providing a preferential rate on groceries. The state also excludes most services from its sales tax base.

Finally, Arkansas is an outlier among states. It still has a franchise tax (also known as a capital stock tax) and an inventory tax. Only 17 states have a franchise tax, with Arkansas's tax having the second highest rate nationally. Since 2010, five states — Kansas, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Missouri, and Pennsylvania — have phased out their franchise taxes, while Mississippi and New York are currently phasing theirs out. Additionally, Arkansas is one of only 12 states that fully taxes business inventory within its property taxes.

Our book, *Arkansas: The Road Map to Tax Reform*, includes three comprehensive tax reform options for improving the state's tax competitiveness.<sup>3</sup> These plans lower tax rates, broaden tax bases, and follow the examples of other states that have completed tax reform in the last several years.

---

3 Kaeding et. al., "Arkansas: The Road Map to Tax Reform."

---

## Recent Changes to Arkansas's Tax Structure

Since the release of our book in 2016, Arkansas has made several positive revisions to its tax code. In 2017, the state repealed its largest business tax credit, the InvestArk credit. The credit rebated part of a firm's sales tax liability when it expanded within Arkansas, but it served as an offset for its improperly structured sales tax on machinery repair parts. Arkansas decided to remedy both issues simultaneously: it repealed the credit, while removing the sales tax on repair parts.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, the state lowered income taxes for low-income tax filers, those with income below \$21,000, effective for the 2019 tax year, and it created the Arkansas Tax Relief and Reform Task Force.<sup>5</sup> The task force's job is to study Arkansas's tax code and provide recommendations to the legislature by September 2018 on how to improve Arkansas's tax code. The task force is supposed to use four criteria to judge its research and to make recommendations:

- "Modernize and simplify the Arkansas tax code."
- "Make the Arkansas tax laws competitive with other states in order to attract businesses to the state."
- "Create jobs for Arkansans."
- "Ensure fairness to all individuals and entities impacted by the tax laws of the State of Arkansas."<sup>6</sup>

---

4 Nicole Kaeding, "Trading Bad Policy for Good Policy in Arkansas," Tax Foundation, February 21, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/investark-sb362-trading-bad-policy-good-policy-arkansas/>.

5 Nicole Kaeding, "Tax Cuts Signed in Arkansas," Tax Foundation, February 2, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/tax-cuts-signed-arkansas/>.

6 Ibid.

---

## Lessons from Other States’ Experiences

As Arkansas undertakes the herculean task of reforming and modernizing its state tax code, it can learn from the lessons of other states. A number of states have developed and passed tax reforms in the last several years. This paper looks in depth at five recent state tax reform efforts in Utah, Indiana, North Carolina, the District of Columbia, and Kansas. The first four are generally considered to be successful examples of tax reform. While each approached the important questions differently, these four all broadened tax bases, lowered tax rates, and simplified their tax structures. North Carolina and Utah completed theirs in one large tax package, with smaller modifications later. Indiana completed a series of smaller reforms over a number of years, while the District of Columbia used a series of tax triggers to accomplish its goals.

Kansas is the unique state in this grouping, and instead, illustrates the risks to state tax reform. Base broadening is an essential part of tax reform. Kansas exempted a large part of income from its tax base, leading to tax avoidance.

---

## Utah’s Reforms before (and during) the Great Recession

In 2006 and 2007, Utah enacted a major reform of its tax code, first in a special legislative session in late 2006, and then in the 2007 general session a few months later. The major achievement of this tax reform was the creation of a flat-rate tax system for the individual income tax, which was passed in a 2006 special session. In the 2007 general session, Utah enacted several more tax

changes, including a small decrease in the overall state sales tax rate and a larger decrease in the sales tax on groceries.

Unlike North Carolina (discussed later in this paper), Utah began its tax reform efforts from a position of strength in its tax system. It already ranked well (18th) in the 2006 edition of the Tax Foundation’s *State Business Tax Climate Index*.<sup>7</sup> Today, in the 2018 edition of the *Index*, Utah has moved up even further, with the eighth best overall score and the 11th best score for the individual income tax. And that eighth best overall score is actually the highest score among states that have all three major tax types.<sup>8</sup> Utah started from a strong position, but its 2006–07 reforms moved the state up to have one of the best business tax climates in the country.

Prior to the 2006–07 reforms, Utah had a progressive income tax with six brackets. The brackets ranged from 2.3 percent up to 7 percent, and this specific set of brackets had been in place since 1997, though Utah had a multibracket income tax since its enactment in 1931.<sup>9</sup> The top rate of 7.0 percent applied to married couples with taxable income above \$8,627 per year (or \$4,314 for single filers). The standard deduction and personal exemption were both tied to the federal standard deduction and personal exemption in Utah, and reforms converted these deductions into credits.

The big change was to move Utah from a six-bracket, progressive tax system to a flat-rate income tax of 5 percent. The initial reform passed in the 2006 special session created a dual-track

---

7 Jonathan Williams, “Utah’s New Flat Tax,” Tax Foundation, September 22, 2006, <https://taxfoundation.org/utahs-new-flat-tax/>.

8 Jared Walczak, Scott Drenkard, and Joseph Bishop-Henckman, “2018 State Business Tax Climate Index,” Tax Foundation, October 17, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/state-business-tax-climate-index-2018/>.

9 Utah State Tax Commission, Economic & Statistical Unit, “History of the Utah Tax Structure,” November 2016, 160, <http://tax.utah.gov/esu/history/history.pdf>.

system, where filers could either continue filing under the old progressive system or use the new flat rate. The flat rate was initially set at 5.35 percent, though this rate and the dual-track system only existed for tax year 2007. In 2007, the legislature lowered the rate to 5 percent and eliminated the six-bracket system, leaving only the flat rate system for all taxpayers.

Prior to the reform, a married couple would not be paying a 5 percent marginal rate until they were above \$5,177 in taxable income (the rate was 5.2 percent), so some taxpayers would have seen a net tax increase under this reform. To partially offset this tax increase, Utah made two changes to the sales tax rates, as well as one change to income tax credits. The general sales tax rate was lowered slightly, from 4.75 percent to 4.65 percent, and the tax rate on food was lowered to 1.75 percent in two steps.<sup>10</sup>

Utah added new income tax credits to help make whole those taxpayers who would see their rates increase under a flat-rate income tax. Instead of taking the standard deduction and personal exemption to arrive at taxable income, the new tax system applied these as credits (equal to 6 percent of the total) after the tax is calculated.<sup>11</sup> The credits are nonrefundable, and start to phase out above \$24,000 for married-filing-joint returns (this figure is adjusted for inflation, so it is almost \$28,000 today).<sup>12</sup> Thus, high-income taxpayers pay exactly 5 percent of their income in taxes, whereas low-income taxpayers pay less than 5 percent (zero at some income levels), retaining some progressivity even within a flat-rate system.

---

10 Utah Legislature, Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, “Tax Relief & Reform: What Does It Mean for Taxpayers?” briefing paper, March 2007.

11 Taxpayers can also use federal itemized deductions as their credit (less any state income tax included in itemized deductions). The personal exemption credit is set at 75 percent of the federal level.

12 Utah Legislature, “Tax Relief & Reform: What Does It Mean for Taxpayers?”

These changes to the tax code did result in a net cut to state revenue. The individual income tax changes resulted in a roughly \$190 million revenue reduction, and the sales tax changes reduced state revenues by about \$160 million (with most of that coming from the sales tax reduction on groceries).<sup>13</sup>

Utah also had the unusual experience of its tax changes going into effect right as the Great Recession hit state budgets. But because Utah carried out its reforms in a prudent manner, the state did not suffer additional adverse effects from the recession (other than the effects all states felt). By lowering rates, broadening the base, and making sure the overall package was roughly revenue-neutral, Utah demonstrated that good tax reform can work even in a rough business cycle.

---

## Indiana’s Consistent Path to Reform

Unlike Utah and North Carolina, which tackled the majority of their reforms in one legislative session, Indiana approached reform in smaller pieces. The state passed small reforms in multiple sessions, which, in combination, represent a far-reaching reform of the Hoosier state’s tax code. By lowering individual and corporate tax rates, reforming the state’s tangible personal property tax, and repealing its inheritance tax, Indiana now ranks ninth in the *State Business Tax Climate Index*,<sup>14</sup> the second-highest rank of a state with every major tax type (following only Utah).<sup>15</sup>

---

13 Ibid.

14 Walczak, Drenkard, and Bishop-Henchman, “2018 State Business Tax Climate Index.”

15 States ranking above Indiana, except for Utah, are missing one or more of the major taxes. For instance, Wyoming, ranked first, does not have an individual or corporate income tax due to the state’s heavy reliance on severance taxes.

Indiana's first step toward tax reform began in 2011. In that year, the state launched a bold strategy, lowering the corporate income tax rate from 8.5 percent to 6.5 percent by 2015. The rate would fall by 0.5 percent each fiscal year, slowly lowering the tax burden for Indiana businesses.<sup>16</sup>

Table 1.  
**Indiana's Original Corporate Income Tax Phasedown**

Fiscal Year	Rate
2012	8.0%
2013	7.5%
2014	7.0%
2015	6.5%

*Note: Indiana's corporate income tax reductions were made on July 1 of each year.*

The corporate rate reduction was financed in part by eliminating a tax credit for municipal bonds from other states. Indiana was unique in that it allowed credits for non-Indiana bonds. The state also eliminated net operating loss carrybacks after the 2011 tax year.

In 2013, the first year of then-Governor Mike Pence's (R) term, the state continued its tax reform. This tax package made several key changes. First, it established a phasedown for the individual income tax, to match the state's corporate income tax. When fully phased in, Indiana would have the second lowest individual income tax, behind only Pennsylvania, of any state that taxes individual income in the country.<sup>17</sup> The 2013 tax package also accelerated the elimination of the state's inheritance tax. The tax, originally slated for elimination in

<sup>16</sup> Joseph Bishop-Henchman, "Indiana Approves Tax Changes, Including Corporate Tax Rate Reduction," Tax Foundation, May 2, 2011, <https://taxfoundation.org/indiana-approves-tax-changes-including-corporate-tax-rate-reduction>.

<sup>17</sup> In the interim, North Dakota cut its individual income tax rate. In 2017, Indiana had the third lowest individual income tax rate of states that tax individual income.

2022, was repealed immediately.<sup>18</sup> Finally, the plan retained the corporate income tax phasedown created in 2011.

Table 2.  
**Indiana's Individual Income Tax Phasedown**

Year	Rate
2013	3.40%
2014	3.40%
2015	3.30%
2016	3.30%
2017	3.23%

Indiana continued its trend of tax reform in 2014, with further reductions in the state's corporate income tax. By 2022, the state's corporate income tax rate will be 4.9 percent, an impressive reduction from the state's 8.5 percent rate in 2011.

Table 3.  
**Indiana's Further Corporate Income Tax Phasedown**

Fiscal Year	Rate
2012	8.50%
2013	8.00%
2014	7.50%
2015	7.00%
2016	6.50%
2017	6.25%
2018	6.00%
2019	5.75%
2020	5.50%
2021	5.25%
2022	4.90%

*Note: Indiana's corporate income tax reductions were made on July 1 of each year.*

<sup>18</sup> Joseph Bishop-Henchman, "Indiana Approves Income Tax Reductions," Tax Foundation, May 14, 2013, <https://taxfoundation.org/indiana-approves-income-tax-reduction>.

The state also made noteworthy changes to its local tangible personal property taxes in 2014.<sup>19</sup> Tangible personal property taxes are local property taxes on inventory, machinery, and other capital investments of businesses. Indiana recognized the need to reduce and eliminate these taxes, but was concerned about how to proceed given local governments' reliance on the tax revenue. The state came up with a creative solution: local governments were granted significant authority to reduce these taxes. Local governments could first decide to exempt the small amounts, less than \$20,000, in tangible personal property value. Localities were also permitted to exempt new property purchases.<sup>20</sup>

Never content on tax issues, the Hoosier state pushed forward again in 2015,<sup>21</sup> eliminating its throwback rule for corporate income taxes. Throwback rules are complicated provisions that require businesses to add untaxed income, known as "nowhere income," from other states into another state's tax base. Multiple states try to claim this untaxed income, requiring firms to engage in a tangled web of calculations to determine their taxable income. Eliminating this rule further simplified the state's corporate income tax.

The state also furthered its tangible personal property reforms from 2014. While 2014's reform allowed localities the option to exempt up to \$20,000 in tangible personal property, in 2015, the state automatically exempted the amount statewide.<sup>22</sup>

---

19 Scott Drenkard, "Indiana's 2014 Tax Package Continues State's Pattern of Year-over-Year Improvements," Tax Foundation FF no. 425, April 7, 2014, <https://taxfoundation.org/indiana-s-2014-tax-package-continues-state-s-pattern-year-over-year-improvements>.

20 Ibid.

21 Ben Bristol and Scott Drenkard, "Indiana Tackles Throwback Rule and Personal Property Tax," Tax Foundation, June 30, 2015, <https://taxfoundation.org/indiana-tackles-throwback-rule-and-personal-property-tax/>.

22 Ibid.

The state also created a taxpayer rebate program in 2011. If the state's rainy-day fund exceeded 10 percent (later revised to 12.5 percent) of the state's budget spending, the excess would be automatically refunded. Half the money would help to lower the unfunded liability within the teacher's pension program, while the other half would be refunded to Indiana residents via an income tax credit. Residents saw a \$111 tax refund in 2012, when the state had a \$2.5 billion surplus.<sup>23</sup> The state continued to run surpluses, but future legislatures dedicated more of the surplus to education.<sup>24</sup>

At the same time that all these reforms took place, the state also launched a nation-leading tax incentive review process.<sup>25</sup> All Indiana tax incentives must be reviewed on a five-year basis by the state's Legislative Services Agency (LSA). And even more important, when cost-benefit analysis of the incentives proved the provisions were ineffective, the state has seen fit to repeal them.<sup>26</sup> In 2015, LSA's research showed that a program providing a tax deduction for solar-powered roof vents was not fruitful. According to the report, "The link between the solar-powered roof vent/fan deduction and taxpayers' expenditures ... is questionable and appears to be very weak, if at all

---

23 Kevin Rader, "Indiana Announces Taxpayer Refunds," WTHR-TV, November 21, 2012, <https://www.wthr.com/article/indiana-announces-taxpayer-refunds>.

24 Tony Cook, "Automatic Tax Refund from the State? Don't Expect One," *Indianapolis Star*, July 3, 2015, <https://www.indystar.com/story/news/politics/2015/07/03/automatic-tax-refund-state-expect-one/29675755/>.

25 Pew Charitable Trusts, "Indiana: Tax Incentive Evaluation Ratings," May 3, 2017, <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/fact-sheets/2017/05/state-tax-incentive-evaluation-ratings-indiana>.

26 Indiana General Assembly, "House Enrolled Act No. 1142," 2015, <https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2015/bills/house/1142#document-2e46b813>.

present.”<sup>27</sup> Eliminating these incentives allowed the state to finance other tax reforms.

Finally, in 2017, Indiana raised its gasoline tax as part of a package to create a long-term transportation funding plan. The 10-cent-per-gallon increase is expected to generate \$1.2 billion annually and help fund a number of construction projects around the state.<sup>28</sup> Approximately \$850 million would finance state construction projects, with \$350 million going to local infrastructure projects. This plan followed a transportation study committee identifying \$1 billion a year in funding projects.<sup>29</sup> While raising a gas tax is often unpopular, aligning user fees, like gas taxes, with the associated spending projects, like road construction, is a sound financing approach for states. Recent polling further suggests that ensuring the dedication of Indiana’s gas taxes to road maintenance and construction has increased the popularity of what may appear on its face to be an unpopular tax hike.<sup>30</sup>

Indiana has launched an aggressive campaign in the last six years to overhaul and reform its state tax code. Almost every year since 2011, the state has passed tax reforms to improve its competitiveness, including lowering its individual and corporate income tax rates, reforming tangible personal property taxes, and reforming corpor-

ate tax base rules. Indiana’s actions represent a responsible step forward, particularly for states concerned about enacting too many changes at one time.

---

## North Carolina’s 2013 Tax Reforms

North Carolina’s tax code had long been uncompetitive before its recent reform. The state’s tax code was among the bottom 10 of states on the Tax Foundation’s *State Business Tax Climate Index*, ranking 46th in 2011, 45th in 2012, and 44th in 2013, the final score before the first comprehensive tax reform.<sup>31</sup>

The list of issues with the state’s tax code was long. The state had the highest individual income tax rate in the Southeast at 7.75 percent, and its progressive rate structure had low rate kick-ins. Income above \$12,750 was taxed at 7 percent.

Business taxes were also high in North Carolina. The corporate income tax in the Tar Heel State was the highest in the Southeast at 6.9 percent, and the state was plagued by a narrow corporate tax base. From 2003 to 2009, North Carolina provided more than \$6.7 billion in economic development incentives, such as tax credits, abatements, and special incentive packages, but the success of these packages was lackluster.<sup>32</sup> North Carolina was one of only 20 states with a franchise tax,<sup>33</sup> a tax on business assets, with the high rate of 0.15 percent of assets.

---

27 Indiana General Assembly, Indiana Legislative Services Agency, “Indiana Tax Incentive Review,” November 2014, 17, [https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2014/publications/tax\\_incentive\\_review/#document-0b08377d](https://iga.in.gov/legislative/2014/publications/tax_incentive_review/#document-0b08377d).

28 Kasey Chronis, “Gas Tax Hike of 10 Cents per Gallon Takes Effect in Indiana,” WNDU-TV, <http://www.wndu.com/content/news/New-laws-budget-items-take-effect-in-Indiana-and-Michigan-on-Saturday-431727563.html>.

29 Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Indiana Gas Tax Proposal: Existing User Taxes & Fees Cover Less Than Half of Road Costs,” Tax Foundation, January 11, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/indiana-gas-tax-proposal-existing-user-taxes-fees-cover-less-half-road-costs/>.

30 Brian Slodysko, “Poll: Majority Approve of Indiana’s 10-Cent Fuel Tax Increase,” Associated Press in *South Bend (Indiana) Tribune*, October 23, 2017, [https://www.southbendtribune.com/news/local/poll-majority-approve-of-indiana-s--cent-fuel-tax/article\\_1f59837f-523d-5213-8fd2-6c9079470d36.html](https://www.southbendtribune.com/news/local/poll-majority-approve-of-indiana-s--cent-fuel-tax/article_1f59837f-523d-5213-8fd2-6c9079470d36.html).

---

31 “North Carolina Illustrated: A Visual Guide to Tax Reform,” Tax Foundation, November 2015, <https://taxfoundation.org/north-carolina-illustrated/>.

32 Joseph Bishop-Henchman and Scott Drenkard, “North Carolina Tax Reform Options: A Guide to Fair, Simple, Pro-Growth Reform,” Tax Foundation, January 23, 2013, <https://taxfoundation.org/north-carolina-tax-reform-options-guide-fair-simple-pro-growth-reform>.

33 Several states have repealed their franchise tax since North Carolina began reform. Currently, 17 states have a franchise tax.



In 2013, the state undertook comprehensive tax reform, seeking to improve the state's tax climate. The North Carolina legislature passed a dramatic, comprehensive overhaul of the state's tax code. The plan broadened, flattened, and lowered the individual income tax, lowered a number of business taxes, and expanded the sales tax base, among other changes.

The first major change was a modification to the state's individual income tax. The state consolidated its three income tax brackets, with a top rate of 7.75 percent, into a flat income tax with a top rate of 5.8 percent. It also included a further phasedown of rates to reach 5.75 percent in 2015.

To mitigate concerns about regressivity in this change, the state coupled its rate changes to tax base changes. The state increased its standard deduction from \$6,000 for married filers to \$15,000, while repealing its personal exemption of \$2,000.<sup>34</sup> Combined, North Carolinians would see the first \$15,000 of their income be exempt from taxation, compared to \$8,000 prior to reform. The state also increased the amount of its child tax credit for lower-income households. The credit increased from \$100 to \$125, but the increase was limited to married filers below \$40,000 in income.<sup>35</sup>

At the same time, the state limited a number of its individual tax expenditures to finance these tax changes. The total number of individual income tax expenditures fell from 40 to 17, and even for the retained expenditures, many were limited.<sup>36</sup> The total itemized deduction for mortgage

interest and property taxes paid was capped at \$20,000.<sup>37</sup> The adoption tax credit decreased from 50 percent of the federal credit to 30 percent of the federal credit.

North Carolina also lowered its corporate income tax, as part of its tax reform package, from 6.9 percent to 6 percent in 2014 and 5 percent in 2015. Additionally, the state created a unique tax trigger to further lower the corporate rate if the state's revenue hit specific targets. If revenues exceeded \$20.2 billion in 2015, the corporate income tax rate would fall again to 4 percent in 2016, with another cut to 3 percent in 2017 if 2016 revenues exceeded \$20.975 billion. In both cases, the state achieved the revenue target, lowering corporate income tax rates.<sup>38</sup>

Similar to the individual income tax, the state eliminated several corporate tax expenditures. The state's generous film credit was allowed to expire and was subsequently replaced with a grant program. Credits for low-income housing, historic rehabilitation, and recycling oyster shells, among others, were also allowed to expire.<sup>39</sup>

Finally, the state made large changes to its sales tax structure as part of its tax reform package. North Carolina had two sales tax holidays. The first exempted clothing, school supplies, and computers, among other items, in early August each year for back-to-school purchases. The second, in November, exempted ENERGY STAR® home appliances, such as refrigerators, from the sales tax. The state eliminated both sales tax holidays as part of its tax reform package.

34 Tax Foundation, "North Carolina Illustrated: A Visual Guide to Tax Reform."

35 Ibid.

36 North Carolina Department of Revenue, "North Carolina Biennial Tax Expenditure Report – 2011," [https://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/nc\\_tax\\_expenditure\\_report\\_11.pdf](https://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/nc_tax_expenditure_report_11.pdf), and North Carolina Department of Revenue, "North Carolina Biennial Tax Expenditure Report – 2013," [https://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/nc\\_tax\\_expenditure\\_report\\_13.pdf](https://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/nc_tax_expenditure_report_13.pdf).

37 North Carolina State Law 2013-316 §1.1.(d).

38 Jared Walczak, "Designing Tax Triggers: Lessons from the States," Tax Foundation, September 7, 2016, <https://taxfoundation.org/designing-tax-triggers-lessons-states/>.

39 North Carolina Department of Revenue, "North Carolina Biennial Tax Expenditure Report – 2013," and North Carolina Department of Revenue, "North Carolina Biennial Tax Expenditure Report – 2015," [https://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/nc\\_tax\\_expenditure\\_report\\_15.pdf](https://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/nc_tax_expenditure_report_15.pdf).

The state expanded its sales tax base to include several new purchases as well, though to a lesser degree than in several of the original proposals.<sup>40</sup> For instance, bread and other bakery items sold at a bakery were no longer exempt from the sales tax. North Carolina also began charging sales tax on admission fees to entertainment experiences such as live performances, movies, festivals, and museums.<sup>41</sup> Finally, the state expanded its sales tax base to more fully tax manufactured and mobile homes.<sup>42</sup>

North Carolina's tax reform was groundbreaking, making it the first state to pass comprehensive tax reform in one legislative session since Utah in the mid-2000s. By broadening its tax bases, the state was able to dramatically lower its individual and corporate income tax rates, lowering tax burdens for individuals. Compliance costs were also lowered with the larger standard deduction. And finally, North Carolina's strategic use of a tax trigger ensured that the state had sufficient revenues to meet its spending needs. North Carolina's 2013 tax reforms are an excellent example of what is possible for a state to accomplish with tax reform.

---

## NC 2015 Tax Reforms

Following the passage of its comprehensive tax reform package in 2013, North Carolina made further modifications and reforms during its 2015 legislative session. These changes advanced upon the principles of its 2013 reform. The state made further cuts to its individual income tax, lowering the rate from 5.750 to 5.499 percent in 2017. North Carolina also slightly increased its standard

---

40 Liz Malm and Scott Drenkard, "North Carolina Considers Impressive Tax Reform Options," Tax Foundation, June 7, 2013, <https://taxfoundation.org/north-carolina-considers-impressive-tax-reform-options/>.

41 N.C.S.L. 2013-316, §5(b) and (c).

42 Tax Foundation, "North Carolina Illustrated: A Visual Guide to Tax Reform."

deduction from \$15,000 to \$15,500 for married filers. Finally, the state kept its corporate income tax rate trigger in place, which allowed rates to decrease to 4 percent in 2016 and 3 percent in 2017.

The state also expanded its sales tax base to include service contracts, such as those for "repair, maintenance, and installation" services,<sup>43</sup> and used the additional revenues to ensure equity among its local governments for their spending priorities.<sup>44</sup>

---

## NC 2017 Tax Reforms

In 2017, the state legislature continued to push forward with state tax reforms, even after the party in the governor's mansion flipped with the election of Democratic Governor Roy Cooper. The Republican-controlled legislature passed multiple tax reforms within its budget, and subsequently overrode the governor's veto of the changes.<sup>45</sup>

The state's individual income tax rate is scheduled to be reduced again in 2019, from 5.499 percent to 5.250 percent. At the same time, the state's standard deduction will increase from \$17,500 to \$20,000 for married filers.<sup>46</sup>

Businesses will also see additional tax cuts under the budget agreement. The corporate income tax will fall from 3 percent to 2.5 percent,

---

43 North Carolina State Law 2015-6§105-164.3(33d).

44 Scott Drenkard, "North Carolina Budget Compromise Delivers Further Tax Reform," Tax Foundation, September 17, 2015, <https://taxfoundation.org/north-carolina-budget-compromise-delivers-further-tax-reform/>.

45 Colin Campbell, "NC House Overrides Budget Veto, Making the Spending Plan Law," (Raleigh, NC) *News & Observer*, June 28, 2017, <http://www.newsobserver.com/news/politics-government/state-politics/article158589669.html>.

46 Nicole Kaeding, "North Carolina Continues Its Successful Tax Reforms," Tax Foundation, October 27, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/north-carolina-continues-tax-reforms/>.

also in 2019.<sup>47</sup> At the same time, the franchise tax will be lowered for S corporations. Instead of 0.15 percent on all assets, S corps will pay a flat \$200 on their first \$1 million in capital value. Assets in excess of \$1 million will be subject to the 0.15 percent rate.<sup>48</sup>

---

## District of Columbia

In 2014, the District of Columbia passed a tax reform package that lowered individual income tax rates and business tax rates, increased the standard deduction and personal exemption amounts, and expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit for childless workers. Some of the changes took place right away, while many of the changes used a tax trigger, so they were not implemented until enough new tax revenue was available.<sup>49</sup> As of January 2018, all the changes that required tax triggers have been enacted.<sup>50</sup> In addition to the tax triggers, the tax changes were partially paid for by expanding the sales tax base to several personal services.

Many of the changes DC enacted came directly from the recommendations of a Tax Revision Commission, which held a series of meetings and public hearings over a 16-month period in 2012 and 2013.<sup>51</sup> Some of the commission's recommendations addressed ways that DC could

be more competitive with neighboring Virginia and Maryland. For example, the district's business franchise tax rate (a form of a corporate income tax) was 9.975 percent prior to the reforms, while Maryland's was 8.25 percent and Virginia's was even lower at 6 percent. The commission recommended lowering the rate to match Maryland's, and the reform package put this change in place. Much of the reduction was done in steps triggered by tax revenue surpluses.

The individual income tax changed in two major ways. First the "zero bracket," the amount of income a taxpayer can earn without owing any tax, was greatly expanded by increasing both the standard deduction and personal exemptions to match the amounts in the federal tax code. For example, a married couple with two children now had \$27,800 of untaxed income, whereas before it was only \$10,800.<sup>52</sup> Second, a new 6.5 percent tax bracket was added, lowering the rate for households with incomes of \$40,000 to \$60,000 (it had been 8.5 percent, which still applied to those over \$60,000). As with the changes to the business tax, these two changes to the individual income tax were done in steps through tax triggers.

While the tax reform package as a whole reduced revenue by about \$67 million, there was one major change that increased revenue: the expansion of the sales tax base to certain personal services. The services included in the base expansion were recommended by the Tax Revision Commission as well. The list of services included construction contractors and other construction-related services, storage of household goods and mini-storage, water for consumption at home, barber and beautician services, carpet and upholstery cleaning, health clubs and tanning studios, car washes, and bowling alleys and billiards parlors. As would be expected, businesses in these

---

47 Ibid.

48 Ibid.

49 The District of Columbia used a unique tax trigger approach to manage its revenue availability during tax reform. It divided all its recommendations into 26 concrete steps. The first nine were implemented immediately, with the remaining 17 being added as revenues allowed. For a full list, see Joseph Bishop-Henchman, "DC to Enact Remaining Tax Cuts after Projection of Large Recurring Surplus," Tax Foundation, February 28, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/dc-enact-tax-cuts-large-surplus>.

50 Jared Walczak, "State Tax Changes That Took Effect on January 1, 2018," Tax Foundation, January 2, 2018, <https://taxfoundation.org/state-tax-changes-took-effect-january-1-2018/>.

51 D.C. Tax Revision Commission, "Final Report of the D.C. Tax Revision Commission," May 2014, <http://www.dctaxrevisioncommission.org/final-report>.

52 These figures will change under the revised federal tax code, as changed by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. The District of Columbia conforms to the federal standard deduction and personal exemption.

industries opposed the idea of being included in the sales tax base, and health clubs even tried to name this a “yoga tax.” But despite the orchestrated fanfare, the sales tax base expansion was included in the final tax package.

The tax reform package in DC demonstrates a number of important tax reform principles in action. First, lowering rates by broadening the tax base can be done effectively, even when narrow interests object to being included in the base. Second, when structured correctly, tax triggers are a prudent means of implementing tax cuts, as we saw in North Carolina. Finally, tax cuts don’t necessarily have to diminish the progressivity of the overall tax code, as evidenced by the expanded zero bracket and earned income tax credit.

---

## Kansas’s Missteps in Tax Reform

Unlike the states discussed in this paper, Kansas represents a case study in how not to approach state-level tax reform. Kansas passed large tax rate cuts without accompanying base broadening, creating a large hole in the state’s budget. At the same time, the state completely exempted one type of income from the income tax, leading to tax avoidance.

In 2012, Governor Sam Brownback (R) proposed an aggressive tax package. It would have lowered the state’s individual income tax, with the top rate falling from 6.45 percent to 4.9 percent, while increasing the state’s standard deduction.<sup>53</sup> A number of other deductions, such as mortgage interest, would be eliminated. At the same time, nonwage income from pass-through

businesses would be exempt. Overall, the plan would have been revenue-neutral.<sup>54</sup>

However, the package actually passed by the legislature differed significantly from the original plan proposed by Governor Brownback. After several months of debate among the governor, house, and senate, the house grew frustrated and sent the unresolved plan to the governor’s desk.<sup>55</sup> Many of the identified pay-fors in the governor’s plan were removed from the final package, representing a large net tax cut for the state. The governor decided to go ahead and sign the plan, and promised to sign a compromise bill to supplant it when the house and senate ironed out the details. But negotiators balked, and the state was left with a tax cut with estimated annual costs of \$803 million by 2014.<sup>56</sup>

The plan was also problematic for its complete exemption of nonwage income for pass-through businesses. Pass-through businesses, such as sole proprietorships and LLCs, are taxed through the individual income tax rather than the corporate tax. Owners of these businesses pay themselves a wage, but any additional income is taxed on Schedule C of their income tax return. Kansas’s tax plan dictated that all nonwage income would be exempt from taxation, creating an incentive for tax avoidance.<sup>57</sup>

Reports of abuse of this provision quickly circulated within the state. Bill Self, head coach of the Kansas University men’s basketball team, had the majority of his income paid to an LLC in the

---

54 Ibid.

55 Mark Robyn, “Not in Kansas Anymore: Income Taxes on Pass-Through Businesses Eliminated,” Tax Foundation, May 29, 2012, <https://taxfoundation.org/not-kansas-anymore-income-taxes-pass-through-businesses-eliminated/>.

56 Mark Robyn, “Legislators Maneuver in Kansas’ Income Tax Reform Debate,” Tax Foundation, May 11, 2012, <https://taxfoundation.org/legislators-maneuver-kansas-income-tax-reform-debate/>.

57 Mark Robyn, “Not in Kansas Anymore.”

---

53 Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Kansas Governor Proposes Significant Income Tax Reform, Reducing Rate from 6.45% to 4.9%,” Tax Foundation, January 19, 2012, <https://taxfoundation.org/kansas-governor-proposes-significant-income-tax-reform-reducing-rate-645-49/>.

state to help avoid Kansas income taxes.<sup>58</sup> A study by several academic economists highlighted the tax avoidance caused by the provision. First, filers with pass-through income increased the amount of their nonwage income to take advantage of the tax change. Second, the economists found “no evidence of increases in investment.” Their research found “income shifting rather than real economic activity.”<sup>59</sup> State estimates put the total loss of revenue from this provision at \$200 million to \$300 million a year.<sup>60</sup>

In 2013, Kansas considered ways to pass the base broadeners needed to finance its 2012 tax cuts. Again, “legislators stripped out the base broadening and kept the tax cuts,” arguing that “starving the beast” was the preferred approach.<sup>61</sup> Many in the legislature refused to confront the issues they had created the year before. Large tax cuts without revenue or spending offsets create large budget holes, impacting the ability of the state to provide services. The final package passed in 2013 did end up raising revenues, but it was still a large net tax cut. After all the changes, the state still passed an almost \$500 million tax cut for 2014, with the amounts increased further in later years. (By 2018, the cut was expected to be over \$900

million in annual revenue.<sup>62</sup> For comparison, Kansas’s general revenue budget was \$6 billion.)

At the same time, the state continued to miss a number of its revenue projections, partly due to weak agricultural prices and partly due to the pass-through exemption. These missed projections added to the budget crunch, as the state continued to struggle for revenue to pay for spending programs.<sup>63</sup>

As a result, the state faced a large budget crunch. Kansas had to drain its rainy-day fund and issue furloughs for state employees, among other efforts.<sup>64</sup> Finally, in 2015, the state began a series of tax increases to finance the previous cuts. The sales tax rate was increased and a number of deductions were eliminated, among other changes.<sup>65</sup> In 2017, over Governor Brownback’s veto, Kansas passed another round of tax increases, including repeal of its pass-through exemption, to help close the budget gap.<sup>66</sup>

While the state’s individual income tax in 2018 will still be lower than it was before tax reform efforts began in 2012, Kansas’s story over the last five years illustrates the risks of cutting taxes without regard to sound tax policy or a state’s spending priorities. By providing a wholesale exemption to pass-through income, the state encouraged individuals to simply reclassify their income. It was

---

58 Dan Margolies and Sam Zeff, “Thanks to Tax Cuts, Bill Self, Highest Paid State Employee, Owes Little in Kansas Income Taxes,” KCUR-FM, May 16, 2016, <http://kcur.org/post/thanks-tax-cuts-bill-self-highest-paid-state-employee-owes-little-kansas-income-taxes#stream/0>.

59 Jason DeBacker, Bradley T. Heim, Shanthi P. Ramnath, and Justin M. Ross, “The Impact of State Taxes on Pass-Through Businesses: Evidence from the 2012 Kansas Income Tax Reform,” September 1, 2017, p. 2, [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2958353](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2958353).

60 Scott Drenkard and Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Testimony: Reexamining Kansas’ Pass-Through Carve Out,” Tax Foundation, January 19, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/testimony-reexamining-kansas-pass-through-carve-out/>.

61 Liz Malm and Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Kansas May Face Budget Problems as Senate Again Strips Tax Reform Out of Tax Cut Bill,” Tax Foundation, March 15, 2013, <https://taxfoundation.org/kansas-may-face-budget-problems-senate-again-strips-tax-reform-out-tax-cut-bill/>.

---

62 Joseph Bishop-Henchman and Scott Drenkard, “Kansas 2013 Tax Reform Improves on Last Year’s Efforts,” Tax Foundation, June 18, 2013, <https://taxfoundation.org/kansas-2013-tax-reform-improves-last-years-efforts/>.

63 Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Kansas May Drop Pass-Through Exclusion after Revenue Projections Miss Mark Again,” Tax Foundation, April 30, 2015, <https://taxfoundation.org/kansas-may-drop-pass-through-exclusion-after-revenue-projections-miss-mark-again/>.

64 Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Kansas Approves Tax Increase Package, Likely Will Be Back for More,” Tax Foundation, June 12, 2015, <https://taxfoundation.org/kansas-approves-tax-increase-package-likely-will-be-back-more/>.

65 *Ibid.*

66 Joseph Bishop-Henchman, “Kansas Pass-Through Carve-out Repealed after Legislature Overrides Gov. Brownback’s Veto,” Tax Foundation, June 6, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/brownback-pledges-veto-kansas-tax-bill/>.

not an economic growth driver, as some proponents had promised. Additionally, the state's reckless slashing of revenues, without accompanying spending changes, risked the fiscal solvency of the state. By 2017, Kansas was one of only four states without budget reserves.<sup>67</sup>

Tax reform is difficult, and Kansas's experience illustrates how states should not approach these challenging questions.

---

## Concluding Insights from State Legislators Who Were There

In December 2017, the Arkansas Tax Relief and Reform Task Force invited legislators from Indiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Kansas to share their thoughts and experiences on tax reform. Throughout the conversation, five key themes emerged.<sup>68</sup>

First, tax reform is a process. Representative John Szoka (R) of North Carolina described tax reform as an "evolution, not a revolution." Second, cutting revenue cannot be the single goal. Representative Steven Johnson (R) from Kansas discussed how Kansas's 10 percent revenue cut put the state at risk. Third, spending must be considered simultaneously. North Carolina Representative Bill Brawley (R) discussed the state's new highway prioritization system, while Speaker Tim Moore (R) noted that North Carolina also reformed its education and unemployment insurance programs. Balanced budget requirements mean that states must consider spending changes as part of tax reform. Fourth, tax trigger designs are critical. As discussed previously, North Carolina's tax trigger was a critical

part of its tax reform efforts. Oklahoma Tax Commissioner Clark Jolley (R) spent a large part of his presentation discussing his state's challenging tax trigger.

But most importantly, all the presenters echoed that tax reform is worth the effort. Eliminating tax expenditures and handling trade-offs isn't politically easy, but in the end, the presenters reiterated that tax reform was worth the effort. Senator Brandt Hershman (R) of Indiana outlined the various accolades Indiana continues to receive for reforming its tax code, and how those changes are translating into greater economic opportunity for Hoosiers.

There are important lessons to learn from other state experiences with tax reform. While Kansas's troubled experience teaches us that reforms must be thoughtful and diligent, comprehensive reforms in Utah, Indiana, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia illustrate that smart, sensible tax reform is possible, and can dramatically improve a state's competitiveness.

---

## Conclusion

As Arkansas's Tax Relief and Reform Task Force meets in 2018 to develop recommendations on improving Arkansas's tax climate, there are important lessons to learn from other states' and jurisdictions' experiences with tax reform. Utah, Indiana, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia illustrate that smart, sensible tax reform is possible and can dramatically improve competitiveness. However, reforms must be thoughtful and diligent, and not haphazard, as Kansas illustrates. Slashing a state's tax revenues, without making necessary spending or tax base changes, puts the state's fiscal health in jeopardy.

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Nicole Kaeding, "Arkansas Tax Reform: Lessons from Other Legislators," Tax Foundation Blog, December 6, 2017, <https://taxfoundation.org/arkansas-tax-reform-lessons-legislators/>.

## AUTHORS

**Jeremy Horpedahl** is an assistant professor of economics at the University of Central Arkansas and a scholar with the Arkansas Center for Research in Economics, where he studies state and local tax policy. He received his Ph.D. in Economics from George Mason University in 2009. His research has been published in peer-review journals including *Public Choice*, *Econ Journal Watch*, *Constitutional Political Economy*, and the *Atlantic Economic Journal*. His popular writings have been published in the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*,

*Des Moines Register*, *Yahoo! Finance*, and *US News and World Report*, and he has been a guest expert on NPR's *Marketplace*.

**Nicole Kaeding** is Director of Special Projects at the Tax Foundation, where her research analyzes trends in state budget and tax policy. Her analysis of tax issues has been featured in the *Washington Post*, *Chicago Tribune*, National Public Radio, *Huffington Post*, *National Review Online*, and numerous other national, state, and local publications.

## DISCLAIMER

The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of Central Arkansas, nor are they endorsed by the University of Central Arkansas. ACRE does not campaign for, promote, advocate, or support specific political parties or political candidates. If you have questions or comments, or if you would like more information about ACRE and its activities, please contact us at [acre@uca.edu](mailto:acre@uca.edu).



**Arkansas Center for Research in Economics**

University of Central Arkansas

College of Business

210 Donaghey Avenue

Conway, Arkansas 72035