

Georgia State University

## ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

---

CSLF Presentations

Center for State and Local Finance

---

8-9-2013

### State Individual Income Taxes

Sally Wallace

*Georgia State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ays\\_cslf\\_presentations](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ays_cslf_presentations)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Wallace, Sally, "State Individual Income Taxes" (2013). *CSLF Presentations*. 30.  
[https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ays\\_cslf\\_presentations/30](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/ays_cslf_presentations/30)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for State and Local Finance at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in CSLF Presentations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

---

# State Individual Income Taxes

Sally Wallace

Georgia State University

Dept of Economics and Fiscal Research Center



---


# Overview

- Why have an income tax?
- Nebraska's income tax in brief
- Challenges and trends in income taxation

# Focus on Income Tax

- 41 states plus DC levy a broad-based income tax
- Most couple closely to the Feds
  - 29 use Federal AGI as base
  - 8 use Federal Taxable Income as base
- Wages = 72.5% of FAGI (2010)
- Taxable SS = 2.3% of FAGI
- Taxable pensions/annuities = 6.7% of FAGI
- Other income = 18.5 % of FAGI
- 32.1 percent of federal filers itemize

# Importance of IIT



Source: U.S. Census Government Finance Statistics

---

# Why have an income tax?

- It is income elastic, i.e., its revenues grow in proportion to income.
- It can be progressive in its distribution of tax burdens.
- It can be relatively neutral in its effects on economic decisions, thus reducing distortions in the economy.
- Raise “enough” revenue to meet expenditure needs
- It is deductible at the federal level, thus reducing the overall burden on residents by state.

- Quick example:
- AGI = \$80,000
  - Deduct state income tax = \$6,000
  - So—taxable income = \$74,000
- If federal tax rate = 30%
  - Federal tax after deduction = \$22,200
  - Without deduction = \$24,000
  - “Save” \$1,800 or 30% of your state income tax


---

# On the other hand...

- Because it is income elastic, revenues may decline during economic downturns.
- The tax may be progressive which may discourage higher-income individuals and businesses from locating in a given state.
- “Bracket creep” due to inflation results in potentially increased tax burdens with no change in real income; a progressive rate schedule may guarantee that taxes will grow faster than real income.



- The tax may be used to give special preferences to certain groups or certain income types, thus potentially disrupting the equity and efficiency advantages of the tax.
- Taxpayers may feel that compliance with the tax is cumbersome and expensive.



Income tax/Personal income

Source: Brookings-Urban Tax Policy Center data query system: <http://slfdqs.taxpolicycenter.org/pages.cfm>

---

# Options in a typical system

- Defining the base: largely wages in current systems, FAGI, other?
- Exemptions/deduction: how many, how large, what purpose
- Brackets and rates
- Credits

---

# Nebraska's Income Tax

- Coupling to Federal AGI
- Four brackets with rates from 2.46 to 6.84 percent
- Deductions and credits: standard/itemized, some capital gains, child/dependent care, EITC, elderly/disabled, angel investment, others

---

# Nebraska relative to other states

- Average number of brackets (4.8 mean, 1 minimum, 12 max – Hawaii)
- Implicit personal exemptions – similar to the average state
- Rates – not much different than U.S. average (2.63 first rate and 6.57 top rate average)

Clawback provision—a bit more unique

---

- Exemptions and credits tend to be more specific by states
- Nebraska's not out of the norm
- Overall comparisons difficult to make
- NBER Taxsim model results (2011):
  - Marginal tax rate: NE 6.49\* US 4.64
  - Average tax rate (tax/income): NE 3.84 US 3.32

---

# Issues and Trends

- Rate differentials and economic development
- Demographics
- Changing economic base
- Diversified public finances
  - Flat rates
  - Reduced profile for income tax?

---

# Rate differentials

- Effective rates important! Considers effect of credits, exemptions, etc.
- Is economic activity affected by differences in effective tax rates?
  - Certainly—but how much difference in rate is needed and how large are the impacts?



---

- Economic effects:





- If labor and capital can move, they may seek lower tax states if benefit is greater than the cost
- “All else constant”
- Evidence?

---

# Individual behavior and tax rates

- Young and Varner (2005) no impact
- Davies and Pulito (2011) find an impact
- Bluestone (2007) zero income tax states, no benefit
- Very difficult to find consensus, and more issues:
  - Relatively few individuals move out of state over a lifetime
  - Mix of taxes and expenditures are important
  - Cost of living, family lifestyles, housing all important as well

- 
- Demographics:
    - Elderly population growth
    - Affect income, sales and property tax bases
    - Less wage income, more retirement income (capital, social security, pensions)
    - States have felt pressure to reduce taxation of these forms of income



# State Treatment

- 33 states (out of 42) have state tax exclusions for some combination of private, state-local or federal civilian retirement/pension income
- 21 states allow an additional senior-related tax exemption
- Other credits and allowances in a hand full of states



- Georgia's recent change (2012):
  - Capped exemption at \$65,000 (versus unlimited exemption phase in)
  - Arguments – equity, cost
- Kentucky Reform Commission recommendation: reduce pension income exemptions (\$485 million per year with means testing)
  - *Retiree testimony “...We make over \$100,000 and don't pay a nickel in state income taxes. That's representation without taxation. That's wrong.”* (Goodman, p. 2)

---

- Michigan

- 2011 Law retained exemptions for those born before 1946
- Reduced exemptions for others, with target at those born after 1952
- Notion of hold harmless of more vulnerable resonates (?)

---

# Changing economics

- Can income tax capture where economy is headed?
  - Labor somewhat less mobile, but technology having an impact on all industry
  - Increased use of capital relative to labor
  - Health and other services
  - Where are the tax handles?



---

# Future Role of Income Tax

- Discussion of flatter rates/broader base
  - Reduce administrative costs
  - Reduce incentives to arbitrage
  - How much is possible?
  - Lots of discussion, little action
- Large reduction/elimination of income tax
  - Consumption swap: services, rate differentials
  - Enough evidence of impact?

# Resources

- “Individual Income Tax Provisions in the States,” Rick Olin, Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau, July 2012:  
[http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb/publications/Miscellaneous/Documents/2012\\_07\\_25Individual%20Income%20Tax%20Provisions%20in%20the%20States.pdf](http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb/publications/Miscellaneous/Documents/2012_07_25Individual%20Income%20Tax%20Provisions%20in%20the%20States.pdf)
- “State Tax Comparisons,” Federation of Tax Administrators:  
[http://www.taxadmin.org/fta/rate/tax\\_stru.html](http://www.taxadmin.org/fta/rate/tax_stru.html)
- “State Personal Income Taxes on Pensions and Retirement Income: Tax Year 2010,” Ronald Snell, National Conference of State Legislators, February 2011:  
<http://www.ncsl.org/documents/fiscal/taxonpensions2011.pdf>
- “Seniors are New Target for Tax Increases,” Josh Goodman, Pew Charitable Trusts, January 15, 2013: <http://www.pewstates.org/projects/stateline/headlines/seniors-are-new-target-for-tax-increases-85899442704>
- C. Young and C. Varner, “Millionaire Migration and State Taxation of Top Incomes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” *National Tax Journal* 64, no. 2 (2011): 255–284.
- A. Davies and J. Pulito (2011), “Tax Rates and Migration,” Mercatus Center Working Paper 11-31, George Mason University.

- P. Bluestone (2007), “A Historical Comparison of Neighboring States with Different Income Tax Regimes,” Fiscal Research Center Report No. 172, Andrew Young School, Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- S. Wallace (2012), “The Evolving Financial Architecture of State and Local Governments,” in Ebel and Petersen, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of State and Local Government Finance* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- R. Buschman and D. Sjoquist (
- S. Wallace and A. Stephenson (2010), “Georgia’s Individual Income Tax: Options for Reform,” Fiscal Research Center Report No. 218, Andrew Young School, Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- C. Bourdeaux (2010), “A Review of State Tax Reform Efforts,” Fiscal Research Center Report No. 216, Andrew Young School, Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- D. Sjoquist, L. Wheeler, and L. Almada (2012), “Georgia’s Corporate Income Tax: A Description and Reform Options,” Fiscal Research Center Report No. 172, Andrew Young School, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

