

Reproduced with permission from Tax Management Weekly State Tax Report, 2015 WSTR 11/20, 11/20/2015. Copyright © 2015 by The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (800-372-1033) <http://www.bna.com>

### Constitutional Limitations

Federal remote seller legislation has historically been both popular and troubled in Congress. In this article, Sylvia Dion of PrietoDion Consulting discusses the Marketplace Fairness Act (MFA), the Remote Transactions Parity Act (RTPA) and the potential for remote seller legislation to finally become law.

## The MFA v. the RTPA: Will Changes in the House and an Expiring ITFA Help Advance or Further Stall Federal Remote Seller Bills?



By SYLVIA DION

### Introduction

**A**s the U.S. Congress moves into the final quarter of the first year of its two-year term, it is again time to ponder whether federal remote seller legislation will finally become law. With two proposals currently

*Sylvia F. Dion, CPA, is the Founder and Managing Partner of PrietoDion Consulting Partners LLC, a State and Local and Employment Tax consulting firm. Sylvia can be reached via e-mail at [sylviadion@verizon.net](mailto:sylviadion@verizon.net) or by phone at (978) 846-1461.*

under consideration and the possibility that more may be introduced, along with upheaval in the House leadership ranks and the expiration of a 17-year moratorium on Internet access taxation, there are many factors that could impact whether a federal remote seller law will be enacted—and no shortage of drama. This article begins with a brief historical recap of Congress' prior efforts to enact federal remote seller legislation and follows with an in-depth comparison of the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2015 and the Remote Transactions Parity Act of 2015. The article also discusses how current developments, such as the looming December 11<sup>th</sup> expiration of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA), could lead to the introduction of a proposal combining federal remote seller provisions with the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act of 2015. Finally, the article explores how recent upheaval in the House leadership ranks, specifically the surprise resignation of House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and assumption of the House Speaker role by Paul Ryan (R-Wisc.), could impact the future of the federal remote seller proposals.

### Historical Recap Of Congress' Prior Attempts to Enact Federal Remote Seller Legislation

Prior to delving into the current federal remote seller proposals, it's important to realize that efforts to enact federal remote seller legislation began years ago. In fact, Congress first introduced federal legislation which would have overturned the U.S. Supreme Court *Quill*

decision<sup>1</sup> almost as soon as the case was decided. However, while many of the earliest proposals<sup>2</sup> received minimal support, the possibility that federal legislation granting states collection authority over out-of-state remote sellers that failed to meet *Quill's* physical presence standard could become law became more likely in 2011 when three competing proposals were introduced by the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress: the Main Street Fairness Act of 2011,<sup>3</sup> the Marketplace Equity Act of 2011<sup>4</sup> and the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2011.<sup>5</sup> With three distinct proposals to consider, each with provisions that were applauded by some but criticized by others,<sup>6</sup> and despite some significant momentum of the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2011 as 2012 came to a close, by the time the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress adjourned, none of the proposals had been enacted.<sup>7</sup>

It came as no surprise, therefore, that marketplace fairness legislation was quickly re-introduced soon after the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress convened.<sup>8</sup> What began with the introduction on Feb. 14, 2013, of bicameral Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013 proposals<sup>9</sup> moved quickly, by legislative standards, to the passage of marketplace fair-

ness legislation by an overwhelming majority of the full U.S. Senate on May 6, 2013.<sup>10</sup>

An interesting side note is that the marketplace fairness legislation passed by the Senate in May of 2013 wasn't one of the two original bills introduced on Feb. 14, 2013, but a *third* Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013<sup>11</sup> bill introduced on April 16, 2013. One might wonder why the Senate would introduce yet one more marketplace fairness proposal with almost identical language to the two previously introduced bills. As the earlier proposals were stalled in committee, this action allowed the Senate to circumvent the usual committee and debate process by invoking a cloture motion, a Senate procedure that serves to prevent the Senate from filibustering a bill.<sup>12</sup> Eliminating the potential of a filibuster allowed the bill to move quickly to a full Senate vote. Heralded at the time as a historic event—as this was the first time federal remote seller legislation had been passed by at least one chamber—this was no guarantee the legislation would become final law. Despite this initial momentum, and a subsequent effort in the summer of 2013 to roll the marketplace fairness provisions into a combined piece of legislation that would extend the expiration date of the Internet Tax Freedom Act, when the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress adjourned, neither the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013 nor the combined proposal had survived.

## The 114th Congress Introduces Two Federal Remote Seller Proposals

Enter the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, and it was once again time to reintroduce federal remote seller legislation. The first proposal, S. 698, the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2015 (MFA)<sup>13</sup> was introduced on March 10, 2015, by U.S. Sen. Mike Enzi (R-Wyo.) and eight co-sponsors. As the newly introduced MFA of 2015 was essentially identical—except for one provision—to the MFA of 2013<sup>14</sup> proposal discussed above, S. 698 was, in effect, a re-introduction of the former marketplace fairness legislation which failed to become final law by the time the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress adjourned.

On June 15, 2015, a second federal remote seller proposal was introduced by Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) and 16 additional co-sponsors. H.R. 2775, the Remote Transactions Parity Act of 2015 (RTPA),<sup>15</sup> is similar to the MFA of 2015 in that it also expands a qualifying

<sup>1</sup> *Quill Corp. v. North Dakota*, 504 U.S. 298 (1992).

<sup>2</sup> A few of the earlier federal remote seller proposals introduced in prior Congressional sessions include the Main Street Fairness Act, H.R. 5660, 111th Cong. (2009-2010); the Sales Tax Fairness and Simplification Act, H.R. 3396, 110th Cong. (2007-2008); the Streamlined Sales Tax Simplification Act, H.R. 2153, 109th Cong. (2005-2006), the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Act, H.R. 3184/S. 1736, 108th Cong. (2003-2004).

<sup>3</sup> The first proposals introduced by the 112th Congress were two companion bills: The Main Street Fairness Act, S. 1452, 112th Cong., 1st Sess. (2011) and the Main Street Fairness Act, H.R. 2701, 112th Cong., 1st Sess. (2011). These bicameral bills were introduced on July 29, 2011.

<sup>4</sup> The Marketplace Equity Act of 2011, H.R. 3179, 112th Cong., 1st Sess. (2011). October 12, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> The Marketplace Fairness Act of 2011, S. 1832, 112th Cong., 1st Sess. (2011). November 9, 2011.

<sup>6</sup> The Main Street Fairness Act of 2011 would have limited its collection authority to states that were full members of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement (SSUTA) and offered no alternative for non-SSUTA states. The second remote seller proposal, the Marketplace Equity Act, took a divergent approach, making no mention of the SSUTA, and instead included its own set of simplification and other requirements that states would need to implement to obtain collection authority. For this reason, critics felt it would have diminished years of progress towards simplification that had been made by the Streamlined Sales Tax Project (SSTP) as well as the Streamlined Sales Tax Governing Board's (SSTGB) role. The third proposal, the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2011, was a hybrid bill that would grant collection authority to both full member Streamlined Sales Tax (SST) and non-SST states and was substantially similar to the subsequent Marketplace Fairness proposals discussed in this article.

<sup>7</sup> For more about the federal remote seller proposals introduced by the 112th Congress, see "Internet Sales Tax Legislation: 2012 Review—and 3 Predictions for 2013," by Sylvia Dion, SalesTaxSupport.com.

<sup>8</sup> The 113th U.S. Congress convened on Jan. 3, 2015, the same date on which the 112th Congress adjourned.

<sup>9</sup> The Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013, S. 336, 113th Cong., 1st Sess. (2013). Feb. 14, 2013. The Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013, H.R. 684, 113th Cong., 1st Sess. (2013). Feb. 14, 2013.

<sup>10</sup> On May 6, 2013, the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly approved the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013 (S. 743, 113th Cong.) in a 69-27 vote.

<sup>11</sup> The Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013, S. 743, 113th Cong., 1st Sess. (2013). April 16, 2013.

<sup>12</sup> A cloture motion on S. 743 (113th Cong.) was invoked on April 25, 2013. A cloture motion is the only procedure by which the Senate can vote to place a time limit on consideration of a bill or other matter and thereby overcome a filibuster. (Standing Rule XXII of the U.S. Senate, i.e., the "cloture rule," the Senate may limit consideration of a pending matter to 30 additional hours by a vote of three-fifths of the full Senate).

<sup>13</sup> The Marketplace Fairness Act of 2015, S. 698, 114th Cong., 1st Sess. (2015). March 10, 2015.

<sup>14</sup> The only provision in S. 698 that differs from the predecessor proposal is found at §3(h)(1),(2) which deals with the initial exercise of a state's collection authority.

<sup>15</sup> The Remote Transactions Parity Act of 2015, H.R. 2775, 114th Cong., 1st Sess. (2015). July 15, 2015.

state's authority to impose its tax collection duties on remote out-of-state businesses.

## How the RTPA and the MFA Are Similar

The two proposals are also similar in that each is a compromise or hybrid bill which will grant collection authority to states that are full members of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement (SST states) and to non-SST states<sup>16</sup> which enact state legislation to adopt the simplification provisions and implement all of the requisites detailed in each proposal.<sup>17</sup> The similarities between the two proposals are detailed below.

**The RTPA and MFA's Similar Simplification Requirements.** In many ways, the foundation of the RTPA is the MFA. As a result, many of the provisions and simplification requisites in the two proposals are identical. For instance, both the MFA and RTPA require states to enact legislation that specifies the taxes to which the simplification requirements and authority apply<sup>18</sup> and the products and services to which the new law does not apply,<sup>19</sup> and both impose the following requirements on states:

- A single state-level entity to administer all sales and use tax laws, including the administration, processing and audits of all state and applicable local sales and use taxes for all remote seller sales sourced to the state;<sup>20</sup>

- A single audit for all state and local taxing jurisdictions within the state;<sup>21</sup>

- A single sales and use tax return to be used by remote sellers for filing with the state-level entity and a requirement that remote sellers not be mandated to file sales and use tax returns more frequently than non-remote sellers;<sup>22</sup>

- A uniform sales and use tax base among the state and its local taxing jurisdictions;<sup>23</sup>

- Information regarding the taxability of products and services, along with any product and service exemptions.<sup>24</sup> The RTPA elaborates on the requirement by noting that the taxability and exemption table be updated quarterly, easily accessible and capable of being downloaded into an easy-to-use format;

- A rates and boundary database.<sup>25</sup> The RTPA elaborates on this requirement by adding that the rate and boundary database be updated quarterly and ca-

pable of being downloaded into an easy-to-use format;<sup>26</sup> and

- A 90-day notice of rate changes, along with liability relief to both remote sellers and Certified Service Providers (CSPs).<sup>27</sup>

**Similar Sales Sourcing Rules Apply Under MFA and RTPA.** Both proposals provide sourcing rules that non-SST states can apply when determining to which state a sale is sourced.<sup>28</sup> Essentially identical, the sourcing provisions under the RTPA and MFA instruct that a sale is first sourced based on the location where the purchaser instructs the seller to deliver the purchase. However, if a delivery location is not specified, then the sale is sourced to the customer's address that is already on record with the seller or which is obtained during the transaction, which could be based on the address of the customer's credit card or other payment instrument. Finally, if an address is not known, the sale is sourced to the address from which the remote sale was made. Additionally, both proposals instruct that SST member states apply the sourcing rules in the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement (SSUTA). One additional clarifying concept found in the RTPA, but absent from the MFA, is a sentence which states that the term "received" means taking possession of a product or making first use of services.<sup>29</sup>

**Liability Relief Provisions.** Under both the RTPA and the MFA, implementing states are also required to provide the following liability relief provisions to remote sellers and CSPs:

- Remote sellers are relieved from liability for incorrectly collecting or remitting or for failing to collect sales and use tax if the liability is the result of: (1) an error or omission made by the CSP, or (2) incorrect information or software provided by the state;<sup>30</sup>

- CSPs are similarly relieved from liability for incorrectly collecting or remitting or for failing to collect sales and use tax if the liability is the result of: (1) misleading or inaccurate information provided by a remote seller, or (2) incorrect information or software provided by the state;<sup>31</sup> and

- Both remote sellers and CSPs are relieved from liability for collecting sales and use taxes at the immediately preceding effective rate during the 90-day notice period if a state does not provide the required rate change notice.<sup>32</sup>

**Effective Dates.** The effective dates under the MFA and RTPA are essentially the same. SST states that meet all of the MFA's or RTPA's requirements are entitled to exercise their collection authority 180 days after the state publishes a notice of the SST state's intent to exercise its authority, but no sooner than the first day of the calendar quarter that is at least 180 days after the act is enacted.<sup>33</sup> Also, under both proposals, SST states are defined as those that are full members, not associ-

<sup>16</sup> S. 698 § (4)(8).

<sup>17</sup> Both S. 698 and S. 2275 provide that SST full-member states qualify for collection authority "but only if changes to the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement made after the date of enactment of this Act are not in conflict with the minimum simplification requirements" detailed in the proposal. S. 698, §2(a); H.R. 2775, §2(a).

<sup>18</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(1)(A); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(1)(A).

<sup>19</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(1)(B); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(1)(B).

<sup>20</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(A)(i); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(A)(i).

<sup>21</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(A)(ii); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(A)(ii).

<sup>22</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(A)(iii); S. HR 2775, §2(b)(2)(A)(iv). Under both proposals, local jurisdictions are not permitted to require a remote seller to submit a local jurisdiction return.

<sup>23</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(B); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(B).

<sup>24</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(D)(i); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(i).

<sup>25</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(D)(i); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(ii).

<sup>26</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(D)(ii); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(ii).

<sup>27</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(H); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(H).

<sup>28</sup> S. 698, §4(7); H.R. 2775, §4(10).

<sup>29</sup> H.R. 2775, §4(10).

<sup>30</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(E) & (G); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(E) & (G).

<sup>31</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(F) & (G); H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(F) & (G).

<sup>32</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(H); HR 2775 §2(b)(2)(H).

<sup>33</sup> S. 698, §2(a); H.R. 2775 §2(a).

ate members, of the SSUTA.<sup>34</sup> Non-SST states which meet all of the MFA's or RTPA's requirements are entitled to exercise their collection authority no earlier than the first day of the calendar quarter that is at least six months after the state enacts legislation to implement the law's requirements.<sup>35</sup> A further limitation applies to the initial collection of taxes on remote sales. Under both proposals, a state cannot exercise its initial collection authority prior to one full year after the date of enactment or during the final quarter of the calendar year.<sup>36</sup>

## How the RTPA Differs From The MFA: New and Expanded Provisions

As discussed above, the MFA and the RTPA contain many of the same core simplification provisions. However, other key provisions differ significantly, in particular the RTPA's small-seller exception provision, the role of and requirements imposed on CSPs and the limitation of a state's authority to subject certain smaller remote sellers to audits.

### Small-Seller Exception: Distinction In Receipts Base, RTPA Phase-Out

Both the RTPA and MFA exempt remote sellers that meet each proposal's small-seller definition; however, the small-seller exemptions in the two proposals operate quite differently.

Under the MFA, remote sellers with total U.S. annual *remote* gross receipts of \$1,000,000 or less in the preceding calendar year would be exempt from collecting sales tax in qualifying states.<sup>37</sup> It's important to note that the MFA's threshold is based on *remote* gross receipts, which under the MFA means receipts sourced to states in which the seller wouldn't be legally required to pay, collect or remit tax if it weren't for the collection authority granted under the MFA.<sup>38</sup>

The RTPA introduces several significant changes to defining an exempt small seller. The first is that the RTPA's small-seller threshold is based on annual gross receipts. Thus, a remote seller would need to consider its annual remote and *non*-remote sales in determining whether its receipts exceed the small-seller threshold. A second significant difference is the RTPA's complete phase-out of the small-seller exception over a four year period. In the first calendar year in which a state's collection authority is in effect, the RTPA would exempt sellers with annual gross receipts of \$10 million or less in the immediately preceding calendar year. In the second year, the annual gross-receipts threshold would be reduced to \$5 million; in the third year, it would be reduced to \$1 million; and in the fourth year, it would be

reduced to zero, thereby completely eliminating the small-seller exception.

Although the MFA considers annual U.S. *remote* gross receipts and the RTPA considers annual gross receipts when determining whether the small-seller exception applies, under both proposals, sales made by related businesses, such as corporate members of the same controlled group, are included in determining if the respective small-seller threshold is exceeded.<sup>39</sup>

**Excluded From Small-Seller Definition: Marketplace Sellers.** However, regardless of the level of annual gross receipts, under the RTPA, a seller that utilizes an electronic marketplace for the purpose of making products or services available to the public is not eligible for exempt-small-seller status and would be mandated to comply with a state's collection authority.<sup>40</sup> The RTPA defines an "electronic marketplace" as a digital marketing platform utilized by more than one remote seller for the purpose of offering products and services for sale and where consumers can make their purchases through a common system of financial transaction processing.<sup>41</sup>

**Remote Seller Access to National CSP Software.** Although both the MFA and the RTPA mandate the provision of free software for remote sellers, the RTPA's provisions are more extensive.

Under the MFA, states seeking collection authority are required to provide free software to remote sellers that will calculate the sales tax due on each transaction at the time the transaction is complete, file sales and use tax returns and reflect tax rate changes.<sup>42</sup> The MFA also prohibits a state from denying a remote seller the ability to deploy and use a CSP of the seller's choice.<sup>43</sup>

Like the MFA, states seeking collection authority under the RTPA must also provide remote sellers free<sup>44</sup> software capable of calculating the proper sales and use tax due at the time of sale<sup>45</sup> and determining proper sales and use tax in every qualified state.<sup>46</sup> Other conditions imposed by the RTPA, but absent in the MFA, include a requirement that the CSP-provided software generate and electronically file returns<sup>47</sup> and electronically remit sales and use taxes due to the state.<sup>48</sup> The free CSP software must also report all processed trans-

<sup>39</sup> S. 698, §2(c)(1). Whether another business is considered related is based on the attribution rules under IRC §267 or 707(b)(1).

<sup>40</sup> H.R. 2775, §2(c)(1)(A)(ii). Also see "From Click-Through to Marketplace to Economic Nexus: How Far Will States Push the Nexus Envelope on Remote Sellers," by Sylvia Dion, (2015 Weekly State Tax Report 3, 5/15/15) for a discussion on how states such as New York and Washington have recently attempted to enact legislation which would have expanded the definition of a retailer with substantial nexus to include remote sellers who utilize a marketplace for facilitating sales to in-state consumers.

<sup>41</sup> H.R. 2775, §4(3)(A),(B).

<sup>42</sup> S. 698, §2(b)(2)(D)(ii).

<sup>43</sup> S. 698, §3(c).

<sup>44</sup> H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(iii) adds that free access to software includes the installation, setup and maintenance of the CSP's automated system into the remote seller's system.

<sup>45</sup> H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(iii).

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

<sup>47</sup> H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(iii)(II).

<sup>48</sup> H.R. 2775, §2(b)(2)(D)(iii)(III).

<sup>34</sup> As of the date of publication, the 23 full SST states include: Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

<sup>35</sup> S. 698, §2(b); H.R. 2775 §2(b).

<sup>36</sup> S. 698, §3(h)(1) and (2); H.R. 2775 §3(h)(1) and (2).

<sup>37</sup> S. 698, §2(c).

<sup>38</sup> S. 698, §4(5).

actions to the remote seller<sup>49</sup> as well as provide safeguards and protect the privacy of consumers whose data is stored by the CSP.<sup>50</sup>

**Limitation on Remote Seller Audits and the Expanded Role of the CSP.** One of the main concerns voiced about the MFA of 2015 and predecessor marketplace fairness proposals was that MFA legislation would expose smaller remote sellers to an influx of state audits. The RTPA introduced numerous provisions that seek to mitigate the disruption of an audit by transferring a larger role in the audit proceedings to CSPs.

With regard to the CSPs' expanded role, the RTPA provides that in situations where a remote seller utilizes a CSP, the state, upon receiving a remote seller's approval,<sup>51</sup> is directed to first contact the CSP, and the CSP is required to respond.<sup>52</sup> The CSP is also responsible for providing the state with a complete record of the remote seller's processed transactions, representing the remote seller in the audit and for the audit findings.<sup>53</sup> Although the CSP will represent the remote seller in the audit proceedings and provide the required records, a remote seller retains the right to contest the audit findings.<sup>54</sup>

Furthermore, unless there is reasonable suspicion of intentional misrepresentation or fraud, the RTPA limits a state's authority to audit a remote seller that has registered through the central registration system<sup>55</sup> and has gross receipts of less than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year.<sup>56</sup> It should be noted that, although the gross receipts amount is determined in the same manner as gross receipts for the small-seller exception, the RTPA doesn't include a phase-out of the audit limitation threshold.

Additionally, although the RTPA will permit states to delegate the audit function to compensated third parties, contingent fee audits where the third-party audit firm is compensated based on a percentage of findings are prohibited.<sup>57</sup> Other limitations imposed on third-party auditors include prohibiting a third party auditor from pursuing a cause of action against a remote seller unless the auditor has provided written notice to the seller.<sup>58</sup>

**Preemption, or Lack Thereof.** One additional, yet highly significant, difference between the RTPA and the MFA is the absence of a preemption clause in the RTPA.<sup>59</sup> While the MFA's preemption clause would hold in check a state's ability to enact legislation in conflict with the MFA,<sup>60</sup> the absence of a preemption

clause in the RTPA means that states could adopt laws that impose collection requirements on remote sellers lacking the requisite physical presence, and such state laws wouldn't be preempted by the RTPA. Thus, the RTPA grants collection authority to states that comply with its requisites, but will continue to allow states to enact their own laws imposing collection duties on remote sellers not meeting the physical presence standard, even if such law is in conflict with the RTPA.

## Will Congress Once Again Attempt To Combine a Remote Seller Bill With a "Must Pass" Federal Proposal?

With several federal proposals with state tax implications under consideration by the current Congress, it would come as no surprise to see proponents of the MFA or RTPA attempt to combine a federal remote seller proposal with another "must pass" piece of legislation. Like the federal remote seller proposals, other federal legislation which would limit or expand states' authority, such as the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2015,<sup>61</sup> have been introduced in consecutive sessions by congressional sponsors that are equally anxious to see their proposals finally become law.

However, the most likely scenario would be legislation that combines a federal remote seller proposal with the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act of 2015 (PITFA).<sup>62</sup> Introduced by Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) Jan. 9, 2015, and passed by the full House on June 9, 2015, PITFA would make permanent a 17 year moratorium on imposing taxes on Internet access, discriminatory 'Internet only' taxes and multiple taxes on electronic commerce.<sup>63</sup> Originally intended to be temporary, the Internet Tax Freedom Act of 1997 (ITFA)<sup>64</sup> has been extended four times previously, including in 2001, 2004, 2007 and 2014.<sup>65</sup> Most recently, the ITFA, which

---

State or local jurisdiction under the law of such State or local jurisdiction or under any other Federal law," except as otherwise provided in the MFA.

<sup>61</sup> The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act, H.R. 2315, 114th Cong., 1st Sess. (2015). May 14, 2015.

<sup>62</sup> The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, H.R. 235, 114th Cong., 1st Sess. (2015). Jan. 9, 2015.

<sup>63</sup> A moratorium on the "taxation of the Internet" was first established with the Internet Tax Freedom Act of 1997, which was signed into law by former President Bill Clinton on Oct. 21, 1998.

<sup>64</sup> 47 U.S.C. 151, § 1105.

<sup>65</sup> In addition to prohibiting state taxation of Internet access, PITFA would also lift a grandfather clause which has permitted states that enacted legislation imposing some form of taxation on Internet access prior to Oct. 21, 1998, to continue to impose Internet access taxes. Lifting this grandfather clause would mean that states such as Hawaii, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas and Wisconsin would no longer be allowed to tax Internet access and would translate to a significant loss of tax revenue. See "Congress Should End—Not Extend—the Ban on State and Local Taxation of Internet Access Subscriptions," by Michael Mazerov, Center on Budget Policy and Priorities (CPP), July 10, 2014, in which the CPP reports on its study supporting that lifting the grandfather clause would translate to a loss of approximately \$500 million in annual sales tax revenue for those states which currently impose some level of taxation on Internet access.

<sup>49</sup> H.R. 2775, § 2(b)(2)(D)(iii)(IV).

<sup>50</sup> H.R. 2775, § 2(b)(2)(D)(iii)(VI).

<sup>51</sup> H.R. 2775, § 2(b)(2)(A)(iii).

<sup>52</sup> H.R. 2775, § 2(b)(2)(D)(iii)(V).

<sup>53</sup> H.R. 2775, § 2(b)(2)(A)(iii).

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*

<sup>55</sup> H.R. 2775, § 3(i)(1)(A).

<sup>56</sup> H.R. 2775, § 3(i)(1)(B).

<sup>57</sup> H.R. 2775, § 3(i)(2).

<sup>58</sup> H.R. 2775, § 2(b)(2)(I)(i). Additionally, the written notice must contain sufficient information to determine the validity of the asserted under collection or refund claim.

<sup>59</sup> In accordance with the supremacy clause of the Constitution, U.S. Const. art. VI., § 2, when federal and state law conflict, federal law displaces, or preempts, state law.

<sup>60</sup> S. 698, § 6 states that the MFA "shall not be construed to preempt or limit any power exercised or to be exercised by a

was scheduled to expire on Sept. 30, 2015, was extended until Dec. 11, 2015, as part of a continuing appropriations bill<sup>66</sup> enacted in order to divert a government shutdown.

The introduction of a combined remote seller/PITFA would be yet another example of history repeating—as this is exactly what occurred in the summer of 2014 when sponsors of the 2013 version of the MFA introduced the Marketplace and Internet Tax Freedom Act of 2013<sup>67</sup> in an attempt to see remote seller collection provisions enacted by linking the MFA of 2013 to the ITFA in light of the ITFA's anticipated Nov. 1, 2014, expiration date.<sup>68</sup> Although last year's attempt to enact a combined MFA/ITFA proposal failed, the current Dec. 11 expiration of the ITFA, coupled with the frustration felt by sponsors of the remote seller proposals, would indicate that a congressional showdown is almost inevitable.<sup>69</sup>

## Conclusion

The quest to once again see federal remote seller legislation enacted is in full force. Two proposals with similar provisions have been introduced thus far this year: S. 698, the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2015, and H.R. 2775, the Remote Transactions Parity Act of 2015. While both proposals offer a hybrid solution for SST and non-SST states, the marketplace fairness proposal is essentially a reintroduction of the same marketplace fairness legislation that has been introduced in the two prior congressional sessions. The RTPA, while based on the fundamentals of the MFA, introduces new and expanded provisions. While certain RTPA provisions appear to address concerns from earlier proposals, such as by limiting smaller sellers' exposure to audits from jurisdictions across the country, certain other RTPA provisions are cause for concern. In particular, the eventual phase-out of a small-seller exception and especially the exclusion from the small-seller definition of any seller that utilizes an electronic marketplace. Given that hundreds of thousands of smaller online retailers that might otherwise meet the small-seller definition if it weren't for the electronic marketplace exclusion will be subject to qualifying states' remote seller collection authority, this provision renders the small-seller exclusion worthless.

But recent upheaval in the political front, in particular House Speaker John Boehner's (R-Ohio) surprise announcement that he would step down as speaker at the end of October, has suddenly thrust attention on what impact the change in leadership could have on the current proposals and tax legislation in general. The possibility that a change in the House leadership ranks would help advance federal remote seller legislation

seemed most likely when Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah), chief author and key sponsor of the RTPA, announced his bid for House Speaker Oct. 4.<sup>70</sup> However, Chaffetz withdrew his name when Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) Oct. 22 officially announced that he would run.<sup>71</sup>

Although seen by many in Congress as the best choice for this role,<sup>72</sup> it was only after careful contemplation and garnering of crucial support from conservative and moderate House factions that Ryan decided to move forward and run.<sup>73</sup> He was elected Oct. 9. But whether Speaker Ryan will help or hurt the possibility that remote seller legislation will become final law is uncertain. As former Chairman of the tax-writing House Ways & Means Committee, Ryan understands tax policy—and the complexity of drafting tax legislation.

In 2013, Ryan was quoted, in response to the 2013 Marketplace Fairness bill, as saying that he thought the "concept" of the 2013 remote seller bill was "right" and that it is unfair for a local brick-and-mortar retailer to have to collect sales taxes when online competitors are exempt.<sup>74</sup> However, Ryan later clarified that he did not support the Senate's 2013 Marketplace Fairness proposal, adding that the bill wasn't written in a tight enough manner to avoid doing other forms of taxation or retroactive taxation. He also added that there should be a way to address the inequity without giving government power to expand taxing authority beyond that intent. Indeed, this is perhaps one reason Ryan is not a co-sponsor of the current remote transactions parity proposal and did not co-sponsor the 113th House version of the marketplace fairness legislation.<sup>75</sup>

Thus, as speaker, Ryan, like his predecessor, has the authority to impact a federal remote seller bill.<sup>76</sup> Still, as the events leading up to Ryan's accession to speaker demonstrate, there is much dysfunction in the House. Even Rep. Chaffetz, through his legislative director, has expressed skepticism that there is a path forward for online sales tax legislation in the current Congress.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>70</sup> See "Chaffetz as Speaker Could Revive Internet Tax," by Rudy Takala, *Washington Examiner*, Oct. 6, 2015.

<sup>71</sup> On Oct. 20th, Rep. Ryan delivered statement that he would tentatively agree to run. See "Paul Ryan Will Run for House Speaker, Under Certain Conditions," by Robert Costa and Mike DeBonis, *The Washington Post*, Oct. 20, 2015.

<sup>72</sup> Once House Majority Leader, Rep. Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.), assumed to be next in line, abruptly withdrew his name from consideration Oct. 8, attention turned to Paul Ryan as the best choice. Ryan initially voiced that he would not run for House Speaker.

<sup>73</sup> See "Paul Ryan Announces Candidacy for House Speaker," by Susan Corwell, *Reuters*, Oct. 22, 2015.

<sup>74</sup> See "Ryan Backs 'Concept' of Online Sales Tax," by Brendan Sasso, *The Hill*, May 1, 2013.

<sup>75</sup> Speaker Ryan is not currently listed as a co-sponsor of H.R. 2775, the Remote Transactions Parity Act. He was also not a co-sponsor of the House version of the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013, H.R. 684, introduced by the 113th Congress on Feb. 14, 2013.

<sup>76</sup> As 2014 neared its conclusion, former Speaker Boehner voiced that he would not entertain the 2013 marketplace fairness proposal, leading many to say the speaker all but killed the proposal's chance of becoming law. See "Boehner Kills Internet Sales Tax Bill," by Steven Dennis, *Roll Call*, November 2014.

<sup>77</sup> See "Online Sales Tax Bills Face Hurdles in House: Chaffetz Staffer," by Jessica Watkins and Genie Nguyen, *2015 Weekly State Tax Report* 21, 11/6/15.

<sup>66</sup> H.R. 719, §127, TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2015, 114th Cong., 1st Sess. (2015).

<sup>67</sup> The Marketplace and Internet Tax Freedom Act, S. 2609, 113th Cong., 2nd Session (2014).

<sup>68</sup> Although the MITFA of 2013 was a combined proposal, it didn't call for a permanent ban of Internet access taxation. Instead, it would have extended the ITFA moratorium, including the grandfather clause, for 10 additional years or until Nov. 1, 2024.

<sup>69</sup> See "Internet Tax Ban Extension Sets Up December Sales-Tax Fight," by Marc Heller, *2015 Weekly State Tax Report* 16, 9/25/15.

As discussed above, the looming extension of the ITFA's expiration date has once again aligned with the timing on seeing a federal remote seller proposal enacted, thus making a combined proposal almost inevitable.<sup>78</sup> Add to all of this the possibility that another remote seller proposal is expected to be introduced by Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), House Judiciary Chairman. A discussion draft of Rep. Goodlatte's Online Sales Simplification Act of 2015 was released on Jan. 13, 2015, but has yet to be formally introduced. This proposal, which is dramatically different from current proposals, would likely further polarize an already dysfunctional Congress.

Given the history of failed attempts, the potential for a congressional showdown and dysfunction on the political front, will Congress really be able to enact federal remote seller legislation this session? Or is it time for

---

<sup>78</sup> See "Sales Tax Slice: Rep. Chaffetz' Surprise Bid for Speaker Complicates Future of ITFA and Remote-Seller Tax Legislation," by Ryan Voorhees, Bloomberg BNA SALT Tax Blog, Oct. 6, 2015.

the U.S. Supreme Court to step in and render a decision that would finally overturn *Quill*? At least one state tax agency official believes so. In a recent Bloomberg BNA interview with Michael Fatale, Deputy General Counsel with the Massachusetts Department of Revenue, he was asked whether the U.S. Supreme Court might once again be asked to address *Quill*. Mr. Fatale said, "I think there is a better chance that the Court will address the remote vendor issue than Congress will—although I think that if the Court rules in favor of the states, you would likely see Congress then move forward with a stripped down version of the Marketplace Fairness Act."<sup>79</sup>

As the oft quoted saying goes, "those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it." Will we once again witness a repeat of prior years' events, or will Congress or the U.S. Supreme Court change history?

---

<sup>79</sup> See "Bloomberg BNA Q&A With Michael Fatale of the Massachusetts Department of Revenue" by Ryan Tuck, 2015 Weekly State Tax Report 7, 10/9/15.