

SB 654

TAXBILLSERVICE

126 Queen Street, Suite 304

TAX FOUNDATION OF HAWAII

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Tel. 536-4587

SUBJECT: INCOME, Residential construction and remodeling tax credit

BILL NUMBER: SB 654; HB 1307 (Identical)

INTRODUCED BY: SB by Baker; HB by Har, Aquino, Awana, Chang, Cullen, Hashem, Ichiyama, Ito, Manahan, McKelvey, Mizuno, B. Oshiro, Tokioka, Tsuji, Yamane, Yamashita & 2 Democrats

BRIEF SUMMARY: Adds a new section to HRS chapter 235 to allow taxpayers who own residential real property to claim a residential construction and remodeling tax credit of ___% for the construction or renovation costs incurred during a taxable year; provided that the costs do not exceed \$_____ in the aggregate for each residential unit and the costs are incurred before July 1, _____.

A husband and wife filing separately, or multiple owners of a property filing separately, may apportion the credit among themselves; provided the credit may be claimed only once for a single residential property. If a deduction is taken under IRC section 179 (with respect to election to expense depreciable business assets), no tax credit shall be allowed for that portion of the construction or remodeling cost for which the deduction is taken.

Credits in excess of tax liability shall be applied to tax liability in subsequent years until exhausted. Requires all claims for the credit to be filed before the end of the twelfth month following the tax year. The director of taxation shall prepare forms as may be necessary to claim the credit and may adopt rules pursuant to chapter 91.

Defines “construction or remodeling cost” and “net income tax liability” for purposes of the measure.

Require the department of taxation to submit a report to the 2012 legislature that compares the impact on jobs and on the state budget that is produced by four separate tax credits for: (1) new construction to residential apartment units and houses; (2) renovations to residential apartment units and houses; (3) new construction to hotels and resorts; and (4) renovations to hotels and resorts.

This act shall be applicable to tax years beginning after 12/31/10 and ending prior to 1/1/14.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Tax years beginning after December 31, 2010

STAFF COMMENTS: The legislature by Act 10, Third Special Session of 2001, established a nonrefundable tax credit equal to 4% of residential construction and remodeling costs up to \$250,000 to spur private sector construction activity. Since the credit was scheduled to expire on July 1, 2002, the legislature by Act 174, SLH 2002, extended the credit to July 1, 2003. This measure proposes a similar credit with unspecified amounts.

Although some may claim that the previous tax credit incentive “jump started” construction activity

especially in the wake of 9/11, looking back there is general agreement that the tax credit created artificial dislocations in the economy, creating demand that exceeded the industry's ability to respond, sending labor and material costs beyond reasonable limits. The result is that in the years following the termination of the credit, the cost of construction exceeded reason. As a result, when the credit crisis occurred, the cost of construction was so high that there was insufficient latitude in the availability of credit to meet the demand. Thus, construction activity came to a screeching halt that is now being experienced. Instead of the spike that the tax credit created, recovery in the construction industry should have been stimulated with public works projects that allowed government to take advantage of a skilled workforce available at reasonable rates. It would have allowed recovery with moderation. As many homeowners rushed to take advantage of the last tax credit boom, they found that workers became scarce and the added cost was only mitigated by the tax credit. Thus, care should be exercised in jumping on this bandwagon again.

It should be remembered that the tax system is an inefficient means to accomplish this goal as the proposed measure would grant a credit regardless of a taxpayer's need for tax relief. This would merely result in a subsidy by government and plunge the state further into the red financially. While the adoption of this measure may alleviate some of the costs to entice homeowners to renovate their homes, it comes at a price to the state who is asked to provide public services with what little resources are available. The state cannot afford the enactment of this measure which will put it further in debt.

In addition, it is doubtful that a tax credit of this magnitude will spur the construction of new housing as long as the credit markets remain frozen. Home buyers are reporting the slow pace of financing as financial institutions exercise increased caution in making home loans in the wake of the subprime debacle which brought the financial industry to its knees along with the national economy. While there is indeed demand for more housing, getting the financing to secure that home is proving to be a challenge. Until the credit markets thaw, financing a home purchase, let alone a new home purchase, will be challenging.

Finally, it should be noted that while the SB is numbered as 654, pages 3-5 are numbered 655.

Digested 2/8/11