

**Prepared Statement of
American Trucking Associations**

**Before the
Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law
Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives**

February 4, 2010

Hearing on H.R. 1083

**The Business Activity
Tax Simplification Act of 2010**

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Franks, and members of the Committee:

Interstate commerce depends very heavily on efficient freight transportation. Most of that freight is carried by truck – some 69% by tonnage and some 83% as measured by transportation receipts. The interstate motor carrier industry is correspondingly large, comprising several hundred thousand companies. Although some carriers are large, the overwhelming majority of trucking companies are small businesses. The average trucking company operates a fleet of only six trucks, and there are many thousands of operations with only a single vehicle.¹ In many respects, these small businesses resemble their counterparts in other industries, except that even the smallest motor carriers may operate in dozens of states in the regular course of their business.

Our industry faces a serious threat of disproportionate state business taxation, along with the administrative costs and burdens that come with it, from states in which trucking companies do little or no business and with which they have few if any of the connections that are commonly considered to establish tax nexus. The American Trucking Associations appreciates this opportunity to join with other industries to support the call for federal relief from overreaching and inequitable state taxation of interstate commerce.² H.R. 1083, the Business Activities Tax Simplification Act of 2010, represents the kind of effort that is necessary. We urge Congress to enact such business tax relief promptly.

Background

Until 1980, interstate motor carriers were subject to strict federal regulation in an economic sense. Prior to deregulation, individual trucking companies did not typically travel in more than a few states and therefore were not exposed to taxation in many states. The great expansion in the number of trucking companies and in the scope of their operations in a largely deregulated economy has changed that. And with deregulation, states began to tap what they saw as a new source of revenue. The fact that trucking companies might be involved in critical areas of interstate commerce seems to have made them more rather than less attractive objects for taxation for states and localities, since, in any given place, most of the trucks passing through do not represent local residents but businesses from outside the state.

¹ Some 88% of motor carriers operate fewer than seven trucks; less than 4% operate more than twenty. American Trucking Assns., *2009-2010 American Trucking Trends*, ATA: Arlington, VA, 2010, pp. v-vi.

² ATA is the national trade association of the American trucking industry. It is a united federation of motor carriers, state trucking associations, and national trucking conferences created to promote and protect the interests of the motor carrier industry. ATA's membership includes more than 2,000 trucking companies and suppliers of motor carrier equipment and services. Directly and indirectly through our affiliated organizations, ATA encompasses over 37,000 companies and every type and class of motor carrier operation.

Prior Congressional Action

Time and again since 1980, Congress has had to step in to protect the motor carrier industry from the effects of state and local taxation, to restrict the taxing authority of these jurisdictions and the manner in which they may administer valid taxes. Some years ago, for example, a number of states began to assess personal income taxes against interstate truck drivers who merely drove through in the course of their employment. Congress responded to this intolerable situation by prohibiting any state but the state of residence from taxing an interstate transportation worker, and from requiring transportation company employers from withholding wages except for the state of residence.³ Again, following a U.S. Supreme Court decision on a state tax issue that could drastically have affected interstate bus operators, Congress stepped in to give this segment of motor carriers the relief they needed.⁴ And in the Motor Carrier Act of 1980 itself, Congress provided the industry protection against discriminatory state and local property taxes and access to federal district courts to invoke that protection.⁵

Because of deregulation and the competition it has so successfully fostered, trucking is today a low-margin industry. Deregulation of our industry has saved the overall American economy billions in reduced transportation costs, but truck rates remain much lower in real terms than they were before 1980.⁶ In a typical year, the average for-hire trucking operation may clear a 2% to 3% profit - very roughly, 3 to 6 cents per mile traveled by a truck. In a bad year, the average industry profit may sink close to zero.⁷ Compared to many other industries, motor carriers commonly have little in the way of net income for states to subject to tax.

The years 2008 and 2009 have been extraordinarily bad years for trucking. The deregulated industry has never faced times like these. Truck tonnage is down very substantially at the current time, the number of loads hauled is likewise down, and carriers' revenue per load is down most of all. The current year is not expected to see a return to business as usual for motor carriers.

Under economic regulation, except for the largest operations, motor carriers fulfilled their state business tax obligations at home. To a great extent, this has remained the case: small trucking companies, like small businesses in other industries, file corporate tax reports in their state of domicile and in perhaps one or two others where a significant proportion of their business may occur.⁸ Indeed, the typical smaller trucking operation

³ See, 49 U.S.C. 14503.

⁴ See, 49 U.S.C. 14505.

⁵ Congress has granted the railroad industry much more comprehensive protection in this respect, however; compare 49 U.S. 14502(b) with 49 U.S.C. 11501(b).

⁶ American Trucking Assns., *2009-2010 American Trucking Trends*, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁷ Statistics from 1993 through 2002. American Trucking Assns., *2004 American Trucking Trends*, ATA: Alexandria, VA, p. 15. The U.S. DOT has yet to release data for more recent years.

⁸ All interstate trucking operations, large and small, pay vehicle registration fees and motor fuel taxes for the use of the roads to each state in which they travel. Carriers fulfill these obligations to pay taxes through two organizations - the International Registration Plan and the International Fuel Tax Agreement - that, under Congressional mandate (*see*, 49 U.S.C. 31701, *ff.*), ensure that all states administer these tax

has but one place of business – in its home state – and has no property or payroll in any other jurisdiction.⁹

Held for Ransom

Imagine now if you will the situation of a small trucking company, one that might be based in any state and operates only a few trucks. In the course of its business, it gets a call to pick up or to deliver a load in New Jersey, a state it may enter only occasionally. In New Jersey, perhaps at a rest stop or a shipper or consignee's loading dock, an agent of the New Jersey Division of Taxation approaches the truck, identifies himself to the driver, states that the company hasn't registered for the state's corporate tax, and asks the driver how long the company has been picking up or delivering loads in New Jersey. The driver is unlikely to know, of course, but will probably venture some number of years. The state multiplies the number given by \$1,100, and the resulting sum serves as a "jeopardy assessment" of corporate tax – in practical effect the ransom for the truck, the driver, and its cargo. The truck and cargo is impounded, the driver is told to contact the company and that the truck will be released only when the money is wired to the state. If the driver protests at the outrage, he may be taken to jail. *There is evidence that New Jersey has held up some 40,000 interstate motor carriers in this fashion over the last five to ten years, extracting many millions of dollars, whether owed or not, from interstate commerce, primarily from small businesses.*¹⁰

Other State Campaigns

New Jersey is – so far – the only state that has attacked interstate commerce by truck so aggressively. Periodically, however, and typically in bad economic times like the present, one or more states mount a general campaign to force smaller trucking companies located outside their borders but traveling on their roads to pay their business taxes. Such a campaign typically starts with a widespread mailing of a "nexus questionnaire" to hundreds or thousands of motor carriers that have paid operating taxes to the state.¹¹ Companies that answer the questionnaire and return it – and those that do not return it receive increasingly threatening communications from the state until they do – typically then receive a further letter from the state, advising them that the state has

programs by means of a uniform structure that all states the revenues due them and minimizes administrative costs for state and motor carrier alike. These operating taxes are not at issue here.

⁹ Larger companies, of course, with facilities in multiple states, are obligated to file returns in those states as well as where their home offices are located.

¹⁰ New Jersey does accord a carrier the option of appealing the assessment – once it has been paid – but the process is long, laborious, expensive, and uncertain. Note too that owner-operators that have incorporated, and many have, are also subject to the New Jersey tax, even though they may never operate in the state under their own interstate authority, but always while leased to another carrier. Sometimes, therefore, the presence of a single truck, making a single delivery of freight, is nexus – as far as New Jersey is concerned, that is – for two entities. In times like these, a jeopardy tax assessment such as those New Jersey has been in the habit of levying on the industry could easily be the last straw for a company attempting to stave off bankruptcy.

¹¹ When the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue began its "nexus campaign" against the industry about 1993, it mailed out threatening notices and assessments to some 30,000 interstate trucking companies.

determined that they have nexus there and enclosing a bill, typically for several years (occasionally even decades) of back taxes, plus penalty and interest.

Particularly for smaller motor carriers, this is a cruel absurdity. Typically, the state that seeks to force interstate motor carriers to pay its business taxes not only assesses for years of back taxes, but also either imposes a minimum corporate tax or taxes gross rather than net receipts.¹² Through the use of these gimmicks, a state will have magnified the claimed liability out of all proportion either to the carrier's travel in the state or to its net income.

A large, unanticipated assessment for back taxes frequently represents a disaster for a small (or even a larger) motor carrier. For the more distant back years, the carrier will also be precluded by the statute of limitations from amending the returns it filed with its home state and claiming a credit. Last – and definitely not least – are the accountant's fees the carrier must pay to have the newly required return prepared. These can run upwards of \$1,500 for even a relatively simple corporate tax report. And this is an expense the carrier can look forward to bearing in each year into the future, for once it starts filing an annual tax return with a state it cannot easily stop doing so.

State Nexus Standards

What do states commonly assert as tax nexus for an interstate motor carrier? This is often unclear; state tax statutes and regulations often have nothing specific to motor carrier nexus, and provisions adequate for less mobile industries can be perplexing for administrator and carrier alike when applied to trucking. Moreover, while it is undoubtedly the case that a state may under the U.S. Constitution levy a tax on an interstate motor carrier,¹³ the U.S. Supreme Court has left this area of the law in obscurity. A state may make a mere assertion of nexus rather than define it exactly. Until recently, no state has sought to collect tax from a motor carrier that merely travels on its roads and has no business at all in the state, but now at least a couple of states seem prepared to try to collect money on even that slim basis.¹⁴

This uncertainty in the law leaves motor carriers in a quandary, not knowing whether to file in a given state or not. Some carriers file in many more states than is warranted, and spend thousands of dollars annually in accountants' fees to pay perhaps hundreds of dollars in state taxes.¹⁵ Others, in the absence of any indication from a state that out-of-

¹² California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania have all aggressively sought to tax interstate motor carriers while they imposed minimum taxes of several hundred to well over \$1,000 per year. Michigan and Pennsylvania have sought to impose taxes based at least in part on gross receipts on the industry. Other states that regularly seek to impose their business taxes on interstate motor carriers with only slight contacts with the state include Illinois, Nebraska, Ohio, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

¹³ In fact, the leading case in this area, *Complete Auto Transit v. Brady*, 430 U.S. 274 (1977), involved state taxation of a motor carrier.

¹⁴ Nebraska and New Mexico have recently asserted nexus for motor carriers on the basis solely of such "pass-through" miles, no other contact with the state being, in their view, legally necessary.

¹⁵ Filing in many states has another danger for interstate motor carriers: overlapping state apportionment formulas can capture more than all of a carrier's net income for state taxation. *See*, for example,

state carriers need to file there, forego filing until suddenly the state changes its position and sends out bills for three, five, seven, or more years of back taxes to thousands of interstate carriers. All of these costs of uncertainty, both administrative costs and the tax liabilities themselves, are passed on, sooner or later, to motor carriers' customers, and are borne by interstate commerce and the Nation's economy in general.

State Retaliation

The year 2009 saw something new in this difficult area – an instance of one state threatening to retaliate against another because of the latter's aggressive pursuit of business taxes motor carriers based in the former. Colorado Joint Resolution HJR09-1024, adopted May 6, 2009, and attached to this testimony, first recites the elements of the problem we are addressing here, and then encourages the Colorado Department of Revenue to increase its enforcement of Colorado business taxes against carriers based in states that have “unreasonably” burdened Colorado's. In somewhat similar fashion, South Dakota Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, adopted March 9, 2009, and also attached to this testimony, calls on the state of Nebraska to “provide tax relief and amnesty” to trucking companies based in South Dakota. The situations these resolutions seek to address are serious, but it may be evident that state efforts of this sort could easily make things worse rather than better for interstate motor carriers. A federal solution is needed. The current economic times only make this more urgent.

Conclusion

For the reasons we have outlined, interstate motor carriers are joining with the other industries and approaching Congress for relief from the efforts of states to impose their taxes on interstate businesses that have very tenuous contacts with those states. Public Law 86-272 is of very limited -- if indeed any -- assistance to our industry, and the provisions of that law, which was both necessary and appropriate for its time, urgently need updating to reflect the Nation's deregulated, more mobile, more service-oriented economy. Trucking companies – indeed interstate commerce, to which trucking is so critical – need protection from taxation by a state when they do not have a significant physical establishment within its borders.

Once again, we appreciate this opportunity to testify before this committee.

Robert C. Pitcher
Vice President, State Laws
American Trucking Associations

Consolidated Freightways Corp. of Delaware v. Wisconsin Dept. of Revenue, 477 N.W.2d 44 (Wisc., 1991).