## The "Border Tax Problem"

$\square$ Residents of a high-tax jurisdiction may buy goods in neighboring low-tax jurisdictions in order to avoid paying the higher tax charged in their own jurisdiction
$\square$ This is illegal tax evasion not legal tax avoidance because there is a 'use tax' liability on goods brought into Washington, but is is often not collected on consumer goods.

## The Border Tax Problem for Washington

$\square$ Is likely to be serious with a state sales tax rate of $6.5 \%$ and local tax rates ranging from $0.5 \%$ to $2.3 \%$ while
$\square$ Oregon has no sales tax and
$\square$ Idaho's state sales tax rate is only $5 \%$ (with local sales taxes up to 2\%)

## Four Aspects of the Border Tax Problem

$\square$ Loss of sales tax revenue, estimated at $\$ 22$ million for the state

- ( $1 \%$ of total sales tax collections in 1989) and $\$ 4.7$ million for local governments ( $8 \%$ of local sales taxes in border counties)
$\square$ Loss of business and employment in the border counties


## Four Aspects of the Border Tax Problem

$\square$ Inequity of border area residents being able to evade their "fair share" of state taxes
$\square$ Tax evasion by Washington residents gives Oregon retailers an unfair advantage over Washington retailers.

# A Previous Attempt to Deal With Washington's Border Tax Problem 

$\square$ A February 1983 increase in the state sales tax rate from $5.4 \%$ to $6.5 \%$, left tax rate at $5.4 \%$ in four designated "border counties" in the PortlandVancouver area

- In November 1984, the Washington State Supreme Court ruled that the lower tax rate in border counties violated article 11 of the state constitution, requiring uniform state taxes


# A Previous Proposal to Deal With Washington's Border Tax Problem 

- Alleviating the border tax problem was one rationale for governor's committee (1989) proposal to reduce the state sales tax rate to $3.75 \%$ and introduce a personal income tax to replace revenues lost by the cut in the sales tax


# Is This Only a Problem in the Portland-vancouver Area? 

$\square$ An argument might be made that Portland-Vancouver is special because shopping and a neighboring low-tax county is more attractive if that county offers the diversity of retail stores found only in metropolitan areas, but this question can only be answered by empirical analysis

## Empirical Estimates

$\square$ Elasticity of taxable retail sales per capita with respect to the price (including sales tax) in the county relative to the price in the neighboring low-tax county
$\square-5.876$ in the Portland-Vancouver MSA (Clark \& Skamania counties)
$\square-3.2131$ in all other border counties (except Columbia \& Garfield)

Source: John H. Beck, "The border tax problem in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas of Washington," Western Tax Review 10 (winter 1992): 15-35, using 1984-1988 data.

# Another Estimate of the Elasticity of Retail Sales 

Allowing for long-run effects of past differences in tax rates on the pattern of retail sales
$\square-1.825$ in the short run
$\square-2.443$ in the long run

## Estimated Increase in Retail Sales

From Elimination of Tax Differential ${ }^{*}$

| County | Total taxable <br> retail sector <br> sales in 1988 | Gain estimated by <br> Beck |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Asotin | $\$ 31,422,903$ | $\$ 1,964,003$ |
| Benton | $\$ 387,726,715$ | $\$ 101,426,591$ |
| Clark | $\$ 645,477,579$ | $\$ 339,099,454$ |
| Columbia | $\$ 6,113,109$ | 0 |
| Cowlitz | $\$ 309,373,970$ | $\$ 75,127,027$ |

*i.e., if Oregon and Idaho imposed tax rates equal to Washington's

## Estimated Increase in Retail Sales

From Elimination of Tax Differential ${ }^{*}$

# County 

Total taxable retail sector
sales in 1988
\$5,084,051
Pacific
Pend Oreille
Skamania

$$
\$ 5,146,769
$$

$$
\$ 20,936,179
$$

\$44,544,559
\$11,914,508
\$7,226,902

Gain estimated by Beck
\$12,158,014
\$744,684
\$3,528,110
*i.e., if Oregon and Idaho imposed tax rates equal to Washington's

## Estimated Increase in Retail Sales

From Elimination of Tax Differential *

| County | Total taxable retail <br> sector sales in <br> 1988 | Gain estimated <br> by Beck |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Spokane | $\$ 1,526,466,432$ | $\$ 119,885,569$ |
| Wahkiakum | $\$ 3,771,810$ | $\$ 986,679$ |
| Walla Walla | $\$ 137,171,110$ | $\$ 35,452,501$ |
| Whitman | $\$ 78,801,876$ | $\$ 5,977,511$ |
| TOTAL | $\$ 3,216,094,421$ | $\$ 701,434,193$ |
| (14 counties) |  |  |

*i.e., if Oregon and Idaho imposed tax rates equal to Washington's

## The Border Tax Problem With The Cigarette Tax

$\square$ Evasion occurs through purchases of cigarettes in neighboring states with lower tax rates, on some Indian reservations, and through the Internet and mail order.

- I-773 raised the tax by 60 cents per pack. Increased evasion is likely.


## Previous Estimate Of Revenue Loss From Cigarette Tax Evasion

## WA State Untaxed Cigarettes and Losses FY 1992 through FY 2001

## Estimated Cigarette Untaxed Packs

Retail Price Tax/pack (millions) per capita

| 2001 | $\$ 3.52$ | $\$ 0.825$ | 94.8 | 20.2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2000 | 3.13 | 0.825 | 96.7 | 21.3 |
| 1999 | 2.91 | 0.825 | 107.2 | 23.2 |
| 1998 | 2.60 | 0.825 | 114.8 | 24.9 |
| 1997 | 2.40 | 0.825 | 116.8 | 25.7 |
| 1996 | 2.35 | 0.815 | 108.7 | 24.8 |
| 1995 | 2.10 | 0.565 | 78.3 | 19.7 |
| 1994 | 2.10 | 0.540 | 75.2 | 19.6 |
| 1993 | 2.00 | 0.340 | 52.8 | 15.6 |
| 1992 | 2.00 | 0.340 | 23.1 | 10.0 |

Revenue Loss*
(millions)

$\$ 107.2$
105.4
114.9
120.0
120.1
110.2
58.1
54.0
26.9
11.8
*State and Local

Source: Washington State DOR ~ Research Division. (September 2001).

## Conclusions

$\square$ Differing sales tax rates or no sales tax in border areas result in:

- Significant loss of state and local sales tax revenue in border areas.
- Loss of business and employment in the border areas
- Increased evasion


## Conclusions

$\square$ Border areas are very sensitive to any changes in tax rates.
$\square$ Constitution requires uniform state taxes. Supreme court overturned attempted solution to border problem-lower tax rates in border areas.

