

SUMMER 2018

STUDENT UPDATE MEMORANDUM

to

FUNDAMENTALS OF CORPORATE TAXATION

Cases and Materials

Ninth Edition

By

STEPHEN SCHWARZ

Professor Emeritus of Law

University of California, Hastings College of the Law

DANIEL J. LATHROPE

Distinguished E.L. Wiegand Professor of Law

University of San Francisco School of Law

FOUNDATION PRESS

2018

PREFACE

This Summer 2018 Student Update Memorandum brings *Fundamentals of Corporate Taxation* up to date by summarizing major developments since publication of the Ninth Edition in June of 2016. It is organized to parallel the text, with cross references to chapter and topic headings and page numbers. The Memorandum covers developments through July 15, 2018, including all relevant provisions of the tax legislation popularly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and enacted into law on December 22, 2017 under the title, “An Act to provide for the reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution of the budget for fiscal year 2018,” Pub. L. No. 115-97 (hereinafter “the 2017 Act”). The discussion in this Update Memorandum is intended as a general summary of the provisions of the 2017 Act affecting corporations and their shareholders, and includes a preview of the planning implications.

Instructors who have adopted the text for classroom use may provide electronic or paper copies of all or part of the Update Memorandum to their students.

The Update Memorandum is organized to parallel the text, with cross references to chapter headings and page numbers.

STEPHEN SCHWARZ
DANIEL J. LATHROPE

July 2018

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1. AN OVERVIEW OF THE TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS AND SHAREHOLDERS

A. INTRODUCTION

1. TAXATION OF BUSINESS ENTITIES

Page 4, footnote 5:

The Act reduces the 70 percent dividends received deduction to 50 percent and the 80 percent dividends received deduction to 65 percent. The 100 percent deduction, when applicable, is unchanged.

2. INFLUENTIAL POLICIES

Page 6:

Impact of the 2017 Act on Influential Policies and Choice of Entity. The core infrastructure of Subchapter C (Sections 301-385) of the Internal Revenue Code – the provisions governing the tax consequences of transactions between C corporations and their shareholders – was left relatively untouched by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. But many of the influential policies previewed at pages 6 to 12 of the text, and how they relate to one another, have changed dramatically, with profound implications on the choice of entity for a business, capital structure, compensation policy, and much more. This update provides an overview of the highlights and some initial observations on how they may influence taxpayer behavior.

Congress rejected the radical step of eliminating the double tax regime of Subchapter C and instead moderated its bite by lowering the corporate income tax rate to 21 percent – a 40 percent decrease from the 35 percent top rate that had been in place for many years. As enacted, this rate cut is permanent, but of course nothing is ever “permanent” in the Code especially with the shifting of political winds. The top individual rate fell only slightly, from 39.6 to 37 percent, and the individual tax cuts are “temporary” (they are scheduled to expire in 2026 unless they are extended or made permanent). The 20 percent maximum rate on long-term capital gains and qualified dividends also was left unchanged and the 3.8 percent tax on net investment income for taxpayers above certain thresholds was retained. The end result of all this is that for the first time in over thirty years, the corporate rate is significantly lower than the highest individual marginal rates. Business taxpayers also will be allowed to deduct 100 percent of the cost of both new and used equipment (this temporary change phases out gradually beginning in 2023). But in a rough justice trade-off, all taxpayers are now subject to a limit on the deduction of net

business interest expense. Finally, to level the playing field between C corporations and pass-through business entities that are not taxed at the entity level (partnerships, limited liability companies, S corporations and sole proprietorships), Section 199A of the Code allows individual taxpayers, trusts and estates to deduct 20 percent of their allocable share of “qualified business income,” which generally is net income from an actively conducted trade or business. Those who qualify for the full deduction are effectively taxed on their business income at a top rate of 29.6 percent instead of 37 percent (29.6 percent is 37 percent multiplied by the 80 percent of taxable qualified business income after the deduction). This represents a 25 percent reduction from the pre-2018 top rate of 39.6 percent – much less than the corporate rate reduction but considerably more than the small rate cut for wage earners. The bad news is the Section 199A deduction is subject to a nasty web of special rules and limitations most of which are aimed at high-income taxpayers. These rules and limitations are previewed later in this chapter in connection with S corporations and in more depth in the update to Chapter 15.

At page 11 of the text, we summarized the influential policies relating to corporate and individual rates following passage of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 as follows:

For now, the conventional wisdom is that, in most cases, the modest increase in tax rates for high income individuals [i.e., raising the top marginal rate back up to 39.6 percent in 2013] is not sufficient to tip the scales toward conducting business as a C corporation for the majority of closely held businesses that are not planning to “go public” at a later time. But a reduction in the statutory corporate tax rates could alter the analysis and revive the use of C corporations as an attractive refuge from the more onerous individual tax rates unless that reduction is coupled with tax relief for pass-through entities, as some have proposed under the banner of protecting small businesses.

As predicted, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has once again tinkered with tax rates and, in so doing, altered these influential policies. One major takeaway is that closely held businesses previously operating as sole proprietorships or pass-through entities to avoid the double tax may want to reconsider using C corporations because of the dramatically lower corporate tax rate – provided one has confidence that the reduced corporate rate does not prove to be a fleeting fixture of the business taxation landscape. As in the good old days, corporations may be “an attractive refuge” as long as strategies can be employed to minimize, defer or, where possible, completely avoid a second layer of tax at the shareholder level. The ideal tax plan would be to leave the earnings in the corporation to compound at the lower corporate rate until the business is sold or liquidated. Better still, shareholders should wait until they die, when their stock basis is stepped up to fair market value, completely eliminating any shareholder-level tax on the unrealized appreciation up to the date of death.

The choice of entity decision is far more nuanced, however, involving many other variables such as the type of business, whether a shareholder also works for the company and is (or should be) paid reasonable compensation, employment tax issues, the shareholder's need to withdraw earnings to pay for personal consumption, the availability of business deductions and credits that may reduce a C corporation's tax liability, other opportunities for tax savings through tax-preferred fringe benefits and deferred compensation planning, the impact of state and local taxes, and myriad of other considerations unique to special situations. The new 20 percent deduction on qualified business income also must be evaluated for those who qualify for it, and it may tip the scales back toward use of a pass-through entity for all or part of the business.

Page 12:

The International Dimension. The text summarized possible approaches to U.S. international tax reform, including reducing the corporate income tax rate to make U.S. companies more competitive in the global economy, moving to a territorial system, ending the incentives to defer U.S. tax on foreign profits by keeping them offshore, and a repatriation tax holiday. The 2017 Act did not disappoint. Major changes were made to the taxation of foreign income earned by U.S. corporations by the adoption of a modified territorial system of taxation and imposing a mandatory repatriation tax on previously untaxed foreign earnings. These and numerous other changes are beyond the scope of coverage of this text.

B. THE CORPORATION AS A SEPARATE TAXABLE ENTITY

1. THE CORPORATE INCOME TAX

Pages 18-24:

Rates. Section 13001 of the 2017 Act replaced the graduated corporate income tax rate structure with a flat 21 percent rate for all C corporations, including personal service corporations. I.R.C. § 11(b). The lower rate, which is permanent (until Congress changes it again), is effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2017.

Determination of Taxable Income. The 2017 Act made numerous changes to the determination of taxable income. Highlights include: (1) the maximum corporate tax rate on net capital gain in Section 1201 of the Code is repealed as obsolete, with the result that all corporate capital gains (short or long-term) will be taxed at 21 percent (Act § 13001; I.R.C. § 11(b)); (2) the generally applicable 70 percent dividends received deduction is reduced to 50 percent and the 80 percent dividends received deduction is reduced to 65 percent (Act § 13002; I.R.C. § 243); (3) business taxpayers may expense 100 percent of the costs of acquiring both new and used equipment placed in service after September 17, 2017 and before January 1, 2023 (this benefit will be gradually phased down after 2022) (Act § 13201; I.R.C. § 168(k)); (4) new limits are imposed on the deduction of business interest expense (Act § 13301; I.R.C. § 163(j) (see the update to Chapter 3); (5) deductions for most forms of

business entertainment and certain employee fringe benefits, such as qualified parking, are eliminated (Act § 13304; I.R.C. § 274); (6) the \$1 million limitation on the deductibility of compensation paid by public companies to their top executives is broadened to encompass performance-based pay, such as stock options, and private companies with publicly traded debt are now subject to the compensation deduction cap (Act § 13601; I.R.C. § 162(m); and (7) the business deduction for local lobbying expenses is eliminated (Act § 13308; I.R.C. § 162(e)), as are deductions for certain fines, penalties, and settlement payments for sexual harassments or abuse that are subject to nondisclosure agreements (Act §§ 13306; 13307; I.R.C. §§ 162(f), (g)).

Deduction for Domestic Production Activities. Section 13305 of the 2017 Act repealed the deduction provided by Section 199 of the Code for income attributable to domestic production activities, effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2017.

Taxable Year and Accounting Period. Section 13102 of the 2017 Act reformed and simplified accounting methods for small businesses by expanding the availability of the cash method to C corporations (other than certain “tax shelters,” as defined) with average annual gross receipts for the three-year period preceding the taxable year that do not exceed \$25 million (up from \$5 million). I.R.C. § 448(c). Other more specialized amendments exempt certain small businesses from the inventory accounting requirements and broaden the exception from the uniform capitalization rules in Section 263A of the Code.

Credits. The 2017 Act generally preserved most business tax credits except in a few specialized situations where credits are subject to new limitations and the Act adds a new employer credit for paid family and medical leave (Act § 13403; I.R.C. § 45S).

2. THE CORPORATE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX

Page 24:

Section 12001 of the 2017 Act repealed the corporate alternative minimum tax, effective for tax years beginning after December 31, 2017. Transitional rules are provided for corporations with AMT credits (Act § 12202; I.R.C. § 53(e)).

4. THE S CORPORATION ALTERNATIVE

Page 28:

Deduction for Qualified Business Income of Pass-Through Entities: An Overview of New Section 199A. As previewed in the Introduction, Section 199A confers a new deduction from taxable income (through 2025) to individuals, trusts and estates in an amount equal to 20 percent of their allocable share of domestic-sourced “qualified business income” (“QBI”) from pass-through entities (including S corporations and even sole proprietorships). The

effect of this deduction is to reduce the tax rate on QBI for the highest income taxpayers from 37 to 29.6 percent.

Very generally, QBI is the net income passing through to the taxpayer from an active trade or business conducted by a pass-through entity, whether or not the taxpayer “materially participates” in the qualified trade or business (“QTB”). Amounts paid by an S corporation to an owner-employee as compensation or by a partnership or LLC as a “guaranteed payment” and traditional forms of investment income, such as interest, dividends and capital gains, do not qualify for the deduction.

The QBI deduction is subject to several different limitations which vary depending on whether the taxpayer’s taxable income exceeds certain threshold amounts and, if so, by how much. First, the deduction generally is not available for income derived from certain specified service businesses. This disfavored category adversely affects doctors, lawyers, accountants, entertainers, consultants, investment advisors, and athletes (among others) but not engineers and architects. The service business limitation does not apply, however, to married couples filing jointly with taxable income of \$315,000 or less (\$157,000 for single taxpayers), and the limitation is phased in for taxpayers with income above those thresholds (for joint filers, it is fully phased in when their taxable income exceeds \$415,000 and for other taxpayers when taxable income exceeds \$207,500).

A second more general limitation, which also does not apply to taxpayers below the taxable income thresholds described above and is phased in as a taxpayer’s income exceeds those thresholds, caps the 20 percent deduction at the greater of: (1) 50 percent of the taxpayer’s pro rata share of the “W-2 wages” paid by the QTB or (2) 25 percent of those W-2 wages, plus 2.5 percent of the taxpayer’s share of the unadjusted basis immediately after acquisition of all tangible depreciable property (including real estate) used in the QTB that has not reached the end of its recovery period prior to the close of the taxable year. In all events, the deduction may not exceed 20 percent of the taxpayer’s total taxable income reduced by net capital gain.

For now (it’s still early), all these details and others not included in this preview are less important than simply being aware that the new Section 199A deduction is important enough to be added to the list of policies influencing taxpayer behavior and, in time, identifying those taxpayers who will benefit from the deduction.

Page 30:

Employment Tax Considerations. The wage basis for Social Security and self-employment tax was raised to \$128,400 for 2018.

Page 31:

PROBLEM

Consider how the answers to this problem have changed as a result of the 2017 Act. For this purposes, take into account the new 21% corporate income tax rate under § 11 and continue to assume the individual rates are 40% on ordinary income and 20% on qualified dividends and long-term capital gains. Assume further that the depreciation was in connection with the purchase of equipment that Boots, Inc. acquired during the taxable year and fully expensed under § 168(k).

For part (b), assume Boots distributes \$395,000 each to Emil and Betty as qualified dividends. Has the effectiveness of this strategy changed as a result of the 2017 Act?

For part (c), in evaluating other strategies to mitigate the impact of the “double tax,” consider very generally the advantage, if any, of operating as a pass-through entity, such as an S corporation, partnership or limited liability company and the impact of new § 199A.

E. TAX POLICY ISSUES

2. OTHER CORPORATE TAX REFORM OPTIONS

Page 52:

Tax Reform Update. As discussed in the text, the meandering tax reform discussion continued for many years prior to and during the 2016 election campaign. The prospects for tax legislation were raised after the Republican party assumed control of the White House and both houses of Congress, but little progress had been made at the time the 2017 Update Memorandum was published in mid-summer. So we concluded then, as many times before, with the familiar refrain “stay tuned.” Now, at last, with the enactment of a major tax bill, we can say something else, such as “elections have consequences” and “be careful what you ask for.”

The 2017 Act did not adopt any of the corporate integration approaches discussed at pages 43 to 50 of the text. Instead, Congress took a more conventional route by permanently reducing the corporate income tax rate (although not as low as the 15 percent promised by President Trump in his campaign platform) but it did so without the base broadening necessary to make the legislation revenue neutral. Instead, many business tax expenditures were left in place (individual taxpayers were not as fortunate), and significant “incentives” were added, such as 100 percent expensing of most capital expenditures for equipment and tax relief for owners of pass-through entities. Some revenue will be raised by a new limit on deductibility of net business interest expense, and desirable simplification was achieved by the repeal of the corporate alternative minimum tax and the deduction for income from domestic production activities. Overall, however, the 2017 Act adds more complexity than it removes, and many of its provisions are temporary and will sunset

within eight years. As for the deficit, it is projected to grow considerably unless, as proponents of the Act have promised, the stimulus provided by the lower rates and other incentives lead to a sustained period of economic growth, more jobs, and enough future revenue to balance the budget

PART 2: TAXATION OF C CORPORATIONS

CHAPTER 2. FORMATION OF A CORPORATION

F. COLLATERAL ISSUES

1. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAPITAL

Page 110:

Effective for contributions made after December 22, 2017 (the date of enactment), Section 13312 of the 2017 Act provides that for purposes of Section 118 of the Code the term “contribution to capital” does not include: (1) any contribution in aid of construction or any other contribution from a customer or potential customer, and (2) any contribution by any governmental entity or civic group (other than a contribution made by a shareholder as such). As a result, these types of contributions will be included in a corporation’s gross income. This change was made to eliminate what Congress believed to be a federal tax subsidy for financial incentives that some corporations were receiving from public entities and customers to locate operations within a particular municipality or general location. The Conference report makes it clear that Section 118, as so modified, applies only to corporations, a position long held by the I.R.S.

CHAPTER 3. CAPITAL STRUCTURE

A. INTRODUCTION

Page 115:

The tax bias in favor of debt has been further eroded by the new limitation on deductibility of business interest discussed below. The 1989 excerpt from the Joint Committee on Taxation report at page 117 of the text continues to raise policy issues that have not been fully addressed, but its assumptions regarding rates and the full deductibility of interest expense are out of date.

Page 122:

Limitation on Deduction of Business Interest. Section 13301 of the 2017 Act amended Section 163(j) of the Code to limit the deduction for “business interest” for any taxable year. The deduction cap is the sum of: (1) business interest income for the taxable year; (2) 30 percent of the taxpayer’s “adjusted taxable income;” and (3) the taxpayer’s “floor financing interest” (a specialized category for retail car dealers). I.R.C. § 163(j)(1). Business interest

disallowed under this provision may be carried forward indefinitely. I.R.C. § 163(j)(2). The new limitation applies to all business taxpayers, not just corporations, and it is applied after any other limitations, such as those requiring deferral or capitalization of interest expense in certain situations. Special rules, not directly relevant to C corporations, apply to pass-through entities. I.R.C. § 163(j)(4).

“Business interest” is any interest paid or accrued on indebtedness properly allocable to a trade or business. It does not include “investment interest,” which continues to be subject to its own set of limitations under Section 163(d). Business interest income is interest income allocable to a trade or business. I.R.C. § 163(j)(5), (6). In the case of a C corporation, virtually all interest income and expense will be allocable to its trade or business activities.

The key measure for the deduction cap is “adjusted taxable income” (“ATI”), which is defined as the taxpayer’s taxable income computed without regard to: (1) tax items not properly allocable to a trade or business; (2) any business interest expense or business interest income; (3) the amount of any net operating loss deduction; (4) the 20 percent deduction provided by Section 199A for certain “qualified business income” from pass-through entities; and (5) for tax years beginning before January 1, 2022, deductions for depreciation, amortization or depletion (this category would include any costs expensed under Sections 168(k) or 179). I.R.C. § 163(j)(8). ATI is thus conceptually similar to what is known in accounting jargon as EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization), a metric used by financial analysts to measure a company’s operating performance without regard to its capital structure, taxes, or cost recovery deductions. Beginning in 2022, ATI is determined without adding back depreciation and amortization so that it resembles EBIT (earnings before interest and taxes) and, in most cases, the impact of this change is to lower the ceiling (because the cap will be 30 percent of a lower number), further limiting the deduction for business interest. The combination of immediate expensing for equipment and the harsher post-2021 cap has the odd effect of punishing companies that increase their capital investment. This future change in the formula presumably was made to increase the revenue estimates for the “out years” of the relevant budget window rather than for any discernable policy reasons. Thus, there is at least some possibility that the post-2021 change in the ATI formula may be repealed.

Relief from the limitation is provided for “small businesses,” which generally are taxpayers with average annual gross receipts not exceeding \$25 million for the three-year period ending with the prior taxable year. I.R.C. § 163(j)(3). An exception also is available, at the taxpayer’s election, to a real property trade or business, as broadly defined in Section 469(c)(7)(C) to encompass real estate development, redevelopment, construction, reconstruction, acquisition, conversion, rental, operation, management, leasing, brokerage trade or business, and (according to the legislative history) operation or management of a lodging facility. I.R.C. § 163(j)(7)(A)(ii), (B). The trade-off for taxpayers who make this election is that they must use the slightly slower alternative depreciation system under Section 168(g), which requires straight line cost recovery over 30 years for residential rental property (instead of 27.5 years) and 40 year for commercial property (instead of 39 years). Real estate businesses will need to do a cost/benefit analysis in deciding whether or

not to make this election. Similarly, at the taxpayer's election, any farming business and certain agricultural or horticultural cooperatives, will not be subject to the interest deduction limitation. I.R.C. § 163(j)(7)(A)(iii), (C). Regulated public utilities also are exempted. I.R.C. § 163(j)(7)(A)(iv).

The implications of the new interest deduction limitation will vary depending on a corporation's capital structure. Industries that typically rely more on debt, or particular companies that are highly leveraged, will take a bigger hit. For those C corporations that historically have enjoyed the tax benefits from debt-financing for operations, dividend payments, and stock buybacks, the stakes will change. At this point, it seems fairly certain that the interest limitation, coupled with the reduced corporate income tax rate, will increase the cost of issuing debt, causing a ripple effect on the corporate bond market.

B. DEBT VS. EQUITY

3. SECTION 385

Page 141:

Proposed Regulations. In April 2016, the Service issued proposed regulations under Section 385 that primarily affect the treatment of indebtedness between related parties for tax purposes. REG-108060-15, 2016-17 I.R.B. 636. The proposed regulations are intended to curb what the Service believed to be certain abusive transactions used by multinational corporations to shift income outside the United States but they potentially had a broader reach. Highlights included: (1) strict documentation and other procedural requirements that must be met as a prerequisite for treating certain related-party transactions as debt; (2) a new per se rule that automatically reclassifies certain related-party transactions as equity without regard to the multi-factor tests under current law; and (3) authorization for the Service to treat certain related-party interests as part debt and part equity based on the "substance" of the instrument.

After receiving a barrage of critical comments, the Service issued much narrower final and temporary regulations in October 2016. T.D. 9790, 2016-45 I.R.B. 540. One notable change that is easily understood was the removal of IRS authorization to bifurcate instruments into part debt and part equity.

In early 2017, a resolution ([H.J. Res. 54](#)) was introduced in the House expressing disapproval of these regulations and providing that they would have no force and effect. In Notice 2017-36, 2017-33 I.R.B. 208, the IRS delayed application of the strict documentation regulations highlighted above for at least twelve months so that they would apply only to certain interests issued or deemed issued after January 1, 2019. Later in the year, the Treasury Department, as part of its effort to identify and reduce tax regulatory burdens, included the documentation regulations as a candidate for revocation and replacement by a substantially streamlined and simplified version with a delayed effective date to allow time

for comments and compliance. Other aspects of the Section 385 proposed regulations are being reevaluated in light of changes made by the 2017 Act to the U.S. international tax regime. See The Treasury's Second Report to the President on Identifying and Reducing Tax Regulatory Burdens 82 Fed. Reg. 48,013, 48,016-17 (Oct. 16, 2017).

Including the Preamble, the final and temporary regulations are over 500 pages and relevant primarily if not exclusively to international transactions well beyond the scope of the basic domestic coverage in this text.

CHAPTER 4. NONLIQUIDATING DISTRIBUTIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

2. QUALIFIED DIVIDENDS

Page 154:

The 2017 Act does not change either the 20 percent top rate for qualified dividends or the 3.8 percent tax on net investment income imposed on high-income taxpayers.

Page 155:

In the second line of the carryover paragraph, "18.3 percent" should be "18.8 percent."

B. EARNINGS AND PROFITS

Page 161:

Problems. The facts should be changed to assume that the cost of the equipment is \$7,000 and it was fully expensed under Section 168(k) in the year it was acquired.

E. CONSTRUCTIVE DISTRIBUTIONS

Page 176:

Some of the assumptions and calculations in the Note are now out of date as a result of the reduction of the corporate income tax rate to 21 percent and several other changes made by the 2017 Act.

F. ANTI-AVOIDANCE LIMITATIONS ON THE DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTION

1. IN GENERAL

Page 177:

Section 13302 of the 2017 Act lowered the generally applicable 70 percent dividends received deduction to 50 percent and the 80 percent dividends received deduction (for dividends from 20 percent or more owned corporations) to 65 percent, effective for tax years beginning after 2017. The effect of these changes is that eligible dividends will be taxed at a maximum rate of 10.5 percent or 7.35 percent, respectively. The Act did not change the 100 percent deduction for dividends received from 80 percent or more owned corporations.

In the parenthetical beginning in the fourth line from the bottom of the page, “by vote or value” should be “by vote and value.”

2. SPECIAL HOLDING PERIOD REQUIREMENTS

Page 178:

The illustrations in the text should be changed to reflect the 21 percent corporate income tax rate and the reduction of the 70 percent dividends received deduction to 50 percent.

3. EXTRAORDINARY DIVIDENDS: BASIS REDUCTION

Page 179:

The illustration from the Committee report in the text does not reflect the 21 percent corporate income tax rate and the 50 percent dividends received deduction.

In the third full paragraph, the beginning of the third sentence should be: “A dividend is extraordinary if it equals or exceeds certain threshold percentages” (not just “exceeds”).

4. DEBT-FINANCED PORTFOLIO STOCK

Page 181:

Although the 2017 Act left Section 264A unchanged, the illustrations in the text do not reflect: (1) the lower corporate income tax rate; (2) the now 50 percent dividends received deduction; and (3) the impact of the limitation on deduction of business interest expense.

CHAPTER 5. REDEMPTIONS AND PARTIAL LIQUIDATIONS

H. REDEMPTIONS TO PAY DEATH TAXES

Page 292:

Section 303 was not changed by the 2017 Act but its importance is somewhat reduced by the doubling of the gift, estate and generation-skipping tax exemptions, which increase to \$11.2 million per person in 2018 and will continue to be indexed annually. In 2026, the exemption is scheduled to revert back to \$5 million per person.

Page 294:

Problems. To make this problem relevant in light of the increased wealth transfer tax exemption amounts, all the numbers should be doubled.

CHAPTER 8. TAXABLE CORPORATE ACQUISITIONS

C. ASSET ACQUISITIONS

1. TAX CONSEQUENCES TO THE PARTIES

Page 357:

The illustrations of basic asset acquisition transactions in the text are affected by the reduction of the corporate income tax rate to 21 percent and, to a lesser extent, by the reduction of the top marginal individual rate to 37 percent. For illustrative purposes and computational convenience, it now should be assumed that C corporations are taxed at a flat 20 percent rate, with individuals still taxed at 40 percent on ordinary income and 20 percent on long-term capital gains. Using these revised assumptions, the 20 percent corporate tax on a liquidating distribution or sale of Gainacre is reduced from \$140,000 to \$80,000. A recognizes \$220,000 long-term capital gain on the distribution (\$400,000 distribution less \$80,000 corporate tax less A's \$100,000 basis in the T stock), and A incurs a shareholder-level tax at capital gains rates of \$44,000 (20% x \$220,000). The combined corporate and shareholder tax on the liquidation and sale is \$124,000 (down from \$172,000), leaving a happier and wealthier A with \$276,000.

2. ALLOCATION OF PURCHASE PRICE

Page 358:

The pricing of taxable acquisitions and allocation of the purchase price may be affected by the 2017 Act's temporary extension of 100 percent expensing for purchases of "used" property. See I.R.C. §§ 168(k)(2)(A)(ii); 168(k)(2)(E)(ii). Buyers will be able to immediately deduct the portion of the purchase price allocated to qualified property. It remains to be seen whether lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 to 21 percent, coupled with 100 percent expensing, will lead to a greater use of actual or deemed asset acquisitions.

C. STOCK ACQUISITIONS

2. OPERATION OF SECTION 338

Page 373:

In footnote 71, the citation to Reg. § 1.338-2(c)(3)(i) should be changed to Reg. § 1.338-3(d).

D. COMPARISON OF ACQUISITION METHODS

Page 380:

Problems. To bring the assumptions closer to the current rate structure, assume (if your instructor requests specific computations) that C corporations are taxed at a flat rate of 20 percent and individuals are taxed at a flat 40 percent on ordinary income and a 20 percent rate on long-term capital gains.

F. POLICY ISSUES: CORPORATE ACQUISITIONS AND THE PROBLEM OF EXCESSIVE DEBT

Page 386:

The lower corporate income tax rate and the new limitation on deduction of business interest alter the stakes and policy issues discussed in the text and render much of the discussion in the text largely obsolete, albeit not totally irrelevant. For example, future investment returns from leveraged buyouts fueled with excessive debt would appear to be negatively affected by these changes, but the resourceful private equity business is likely to adapt and continue to prosper by adjusting their deal structure.

CHAPTER 9. ACQUISITIVE REORGANIZATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

2. OVERVIEW OF REORGANIZATIONS

Page 396, footnote 14:

Exchange of Net Value Requirement. The proposed regulations on “exchange of net value” have been withdrawn. REG-139633-08 (July 13, 2017).

B. TYPES OF ACQUISITIVE REORGANIZATIONS

1. TYPE A: STATUTORY MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATIONS

B. CONTINUITY OF PROPRIETARY INTEREST: QUANTITY AND QUALITY

Page 405:

When to Measure Continuity of Interest. As discussed in the text, the regulations provide certain conventions to determine how and on what date to value the acquiring corporation’s stock for purposes of the continuity of proprietary interest test. If an agreement provides for “fixed consideration,” the stock is valued as of the close of the last business day before the parties enter into a binding commitment to consummate the transaction (this is known as the “signing-date” rule). Reg. § 1.368-1(e)(2)(i). Prior to these regulations, IRS policy was to require valuation as of the “effective date” of the transaction. This “closing-date” rule still applies if the potential reorganization does not provide for fixed consideration. Under both rules, the valuation was to be made on a specific date, but in most real-world transactions the parties typically prefer to use an average price over a period of days as a hedge against market volatility.

In Rev. Proc. 2018-12, 2018-6 I.R.B. 349, the IRS acknowledged that the use of average trading prices is a more reliable method of valuation than relying on the stock price on a single date. To provide this type of flexibility, Rev. Proc. 2018-12 permits taxpayers to select from among three safe harbor valuation methods if the following requirements are met: (1) shares of one or more classes of issuing corporation stock are traded on a national securities exchange; (2) all parties to the potential reorganization treat the acquisition in a consistent matter (as either qualifying or not qualifying as a reorganization); and (3) the transaction is pursuant to a binding agreement specifying the safe harbor method, the measuring period (generally it must include at least five but not more than 35 consecutive trading days), and the national securities exchange and reporting source to determine trading prices. Rev. Proc. 2018-12, § 3. The safe harbor methods endorsed in the revenue

procedure are: (1) the average of the daily volume weighted average prices; (2) the average of the average high-low daily prices; and (3) the average of the daily closing prices. Id., § 4.

CHAPTER 10. CORPORATE DIVISIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

4. OVERVIEW OF SECTION 355

C. ADVANCE RULINGS

Page 468:

In Rev. Proc. 2016-45, 2016-37 I.R.B. 344, the Service announced that it would resume issuance of letter rulings pertaining to the corporate business purpose requirement and the device limitation provided the issue is not inherently factual in nature.

In Rev. Proc. 2017-52, 2017-41 I.R.B. 283, the Service introduced a pilot program expanding the scope of letter rulings to include, until March 21, 2019, rulings on the tax consequences of a distribution of stock, or stock or securities, of a controlled corporation under Section 355. This new pilot program is an expansion of the more limited ruling position announced in Rev. Proc. 2013-32.

B. THE ACTIVE TRADE OR BUSINESS REQUIREMENT

Page 481:

Relative Size of Active Trade or Business. As part of a new “minimum size” requirement for purposes of the active trade or business test, the Service issued proposed regulations formalizing the five percent test first announced in Notice 2015-59. REG 134016-15 (July 15, 2016), 2016-31 I.R.B. 205. These proposed regulations also provide guidance on the types of property that may be counted as assets used in an active trade or business. For example, reasonable amounts of cash and cash equivalents held for working capital and liquid assets held for business exigencies or to comply with regulatory requirements may be treated as active business assets. Prop. Reg. § 1.355-9(a)(3).

C. JUDICIAL AND STATUTORY LIMITATIONS

4. DISTRIBUTIONS INVOLVING SIGNIFICANT CASH AND INVESTMENT ASSETS

B. SPIN-OFFS OF SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT ASSETS

Page 501:

The Service followed up on the announcement of its no ruling policy discussed in the text by issuing proposed regulations clarifying the application of the active trade or business requirement and the device limitation to corporate divisions involving corporations owning a high percentage of nonbusiness assets. These regulations are a major barrier to the “hot dog stand” transactions discussed in the text.

As discussed earlier in this Update Memorandum, the proposed regulations impose a new five percent minimum value requirement for purposes of the active trade or business test. They also provide clearer standards for determining when the ownership of substantial nonbusiness assets is evidence of a prohibited device for distributing earnings and profits. The strength of the evidence will be based on all the facts and circumstances, including the percentage of nonbusiness assets owned by each corporation and the difference between the “nonbusiness asset percentage” of those corporations. Prop. Reg. § 1.355-2(d)(2)(iv)(C). Under a new “per se” test, a distribution is deemed to be a device if: (1) nonbusiness assets are more than two-thirds of the total assets of either the distributing or controlled corporations; and (2) there is a significant difference between the percentage of nonbusiness assets held by the two corporations, with the gap determined by a set of sliding scale numerical formulas. Prop. Reg. § 1.355-2(d)(5)(iii). For example, if the nonbusiness asset percentage of one corporation is between 66-2/3 and 80 percent, and is less than 30 percent in the other corporation, the transaction will fail the per se test. *Id.* But under the general tests in the regulations, if the nonbusiness asset percentage of both corporations is less than 20 percent, the presence of those assets ordinarily would not be evidence of a device. Prop. Reg. § 1.355-2(d)(2)(iv)(C)(1). The policy underlying this approach is that if either the distributing or controlled corporations holds a significant percentage of nonbusiness assets as compared to a much lower proportion of such assets held by the other corporation, the evidence of a device is so strong that it outweighs the presence of any non-device factors.

Finally, recall that under the current regulations the presence of a corporate business purpose for a distribution is viewed as a nondevice factor that can be used to outweigh evidence of a device based on either corporation holding significant nonbusiness assets. Reg. § 1.355-2(d)(3)(ii). The proposed regulations modify this rule by stating that a corporate business purpose relating to a separation of nonbusiness assets from one or more businesses or business assets is not evidence of a nondevice unless the business purpose involves an exigency requiring an investment or other use of nonbusiness assets in a business. Prop. Reg. § 1.355-2(d)(3)(ii).

The proposed regulations also include definitions, operating rules (e.g., for asset valuations) and other details to cover specialized situations.

As of mid-2018, these regulations were not yet final but their very presence likely has chilled the incentive for transactions that fail the bright line numerical tests under the active trade or business requirement and device limitation.

CHAPTER 12. CARRYOVERS OF CORPORATE TAX ATTRIBUTES

B. SECTION 381 CARRYOVER RULES

Page 564:

General Carryover Rules. Section 13301(b) of the 2017 Act added “carryforward of disallowed business interest” to the list of carryover tax items in Section 381. I.R.C. § 381(c)(20).

C. LIMITATIONS ON NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYFORWARDS: SECTION 382

1. INTRODUCTION

Page 568:

Modified Net Operating Loss Deduction. Section 13302 of the 2017 Act modified the net operating loss deduction by limiting it to 80 percent of the taxable income for the taxable year, effective for losses arising in tax years beginning after December 31, 2017. The NOL two-year carryback rules are repealed for tax years ending after 2017 (except for certain farming losses and in other specialized situations), and carryforwards will be indefinite, rather than expiring after 20 years, for NOLs arising in tax years after 2017. I.R.C. § 172(a), (b). Corporate capital loss carrybacks and carryovers are not affected. This change means that financially distressed companies will not be able to carry back NOLs to receive refunds for taxes paid in the two previous years.

CHAPTER 13. AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS

A. RESTRICTIONS ON AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS

2. LIMITATIONS ON MULTIPLE TAX BENEFITS

Page 599:

Section 1561. Section 13001(b)(6)(A) of the 2017 Act modified Section 1561 by limiting its reach to the limitation of the accumulated earnings credit and removing as obsolete the limitations related to the repealed lower corporate income rates in Section

11(b) and the corporate alternative minimum tax exemption. The illustrations at pages 600-601 of the text also have been rendered obsolete for tax years beginning after December 31, 2017.

CHAPTER 14. ANTI-AVOIDANCE RULES

A. INTRODUCTION

Page 623:

The reduction of the corporate income tax rate to 21 percent, when compared with the top individual rate of 37 percent on ordinary income, may breathe new life into the accumulated earnings and personal holding company taxes. It remains to be seen whether these venerable anti-avoidance rules will rise again to prevent the gaming of the system that many have already predicted will become rampant as a result of the new business tax rate regime.

B. THE ECONOMIC SUBSTANCE DOCTRINE

2. COMMON LAW ROOTS

Page 631:

In *Summa Holdings, Inc. v. Commissioner*, 848 F.3d 779 (6th Cir. 2017), the Sixth Circuit, reversing the Tax Court, declined to apply the substance over form doctrine to recast a complex tax avoidance transaction in which domestic international sales corporations were used to transfer profits from a family owned company to Roth IRAs with the goal of lowering the family's taxes (this superficial description does not do justice to the facts, but that may be a good thing for our purposes.)

Despite the absence of a non-tax business purpose, the court respected the form chosen by the taxpayers and, in so doing, limited the application of the venerable common law judicial doctrine to situations in which “the taxpayer’s financial characterization of a transaction fails to capture economic reality and would distort the meaning of the Code in the process.” 848 F.3d at 787. The court followed the plain text of the Code provisions and applauded the planning skills of the taxpayers who “to [their] good fortune, had the time and patience (and money) to understand how a complex set of tax provisions could lower [their] taxes” and who “complied in full with the printed and accessible words of the tax law.” 848 F.3d at 781. The opinion reasoned that it was the responsibility of Congress, not the courts, to address any abuses from tax-motivated transactions that comply with the literal language of the Code, observing that “[t]he last thing the federal courts should be

doing is rewarding Congress's creation of an intricate and complicated Internal Revenue Code by closing gaps in taxation wherever that complexity creates them." 848 F.3d at 790.

The year in controversy in *Summa Holdings* preceded the enactment of the codified economic substance doctrine, which may limit the significance of this sweeping taxpayer-friendly opinion.

In *Wells Fargo & Co. v. United States*, 260 F.Supp.3d 1140 (D. Minn. 2017), the legal issue was whether a loan transaction should be disregarded as a sham even if it had "objective economic substance" because the taxpayer lacked a subjective non-tax business purpose. Applying its favored conjunctive test, the government's answer to this question was "yes," but the court disagreed. The court applied a more flexible approach and permitted Wells Fargo Bank to deduct interest paid on a loan that was found by a jury to have a reasonable possibility of pre-tax profit but lacked any business purpose apart from tax savings. (The jury also found that another part of the transaction designed to generate foreign tax credits was a sham because it had neither a possibility of pre-tax profit nor a nontax business purpose, and the court upheld the IRS's imposition of negligence penalties.)

The court reasoned that the objective (possibility of pre-tax profit) and subjective (non-tax business purpose) prongs of the sham transaction doctrine should be viewed as factors in a single flexible analysis rather than as two separate rigid tests, as the government has long argued with some success. This approach, in the court's view, "makes particular sense in light of the Supreme Court's frequent admonition that taxpayers are allowed to engage in tax planning."

Under the economic substance doctrine as codified in Section 7701(o)(1), a transaction passes muster only if it has both objective economic substance and the taxpayer has a substantial non-tax business purpose for entering into the transaction. The tax year involved in *Wells Fargo* preceded the effective date of Section 7701(o), but that did not stop the court from observing that the codified economic substance doctrine only applies to transactions in which that doctrine is "relevant." That determination is to be made "in the same manner as if [Section 7701(o)] had never been enacted." I.R.C. § 7701(o)(1), (o)(5)(C). The court interpreted this cryptic language as supporting a measure of flexibility in determining if the threshold requirement of relevance has been met.

C. THE ACCUMULATED EARNINGS TAX

Page 639:

As previewed above, beginning in 2018 the differential between the top corporate and individual rates described in the text has widened considerably (21 percent corporate vs. 37 percent individual), although it is not as wide as in the good old days when the accumulated earnings tax was first added to the Code. As noted in the update to Chapter 1, it is likely that in some situations C corporations will be more widely used to take advantage of the lower rates on business income while avoiding distributions that will

result in another level of tax. The accumulated earnings tax was designed to patrol against this type of strategy, but its many available defenses (e.g., accumulation for the reasonable needs of the business) reduce its effectiveness.

D. THE PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY TAX

1. INTRODUCTION

Page 656:

The reduction of the corporate income tax rate to 21 percent also may breathe new life into the mostly dormant personal holding company rules, which were designed to prevent taxpayers from using C corporations to circumvent the steeper individual marginal rates (when they were much higher). Under the current rate structure, with most dividends and long-term capital gains taxed at 20 percent (23.8 percent for taxpayers subject to the 3.8 percent tax on net investment income), there is nothing to be gained by incorporating a stock portfolio. Interest income, however, is still taxed at the highest individual marginal rates, as are most forms of compensation. This raises the possibility that corporations will re-emerge as tax shelters for those forms of more highly taxed income.

PART 3: TAXATION OF S CORPORATIONS

CHAPTER 15. S CORPORATIONS

B. ELIGIBILITY FOR S CORPORATION STATUS

Page 676:

Electing Small Business Trusts. Section 13541 of the 2017 Act amended the Code to permit electing small business trusts to have nonresident alien beneficiaries, expanding the ESBT's role in international estate planning. I.R.C. § 1361(c)(2)(B)(v). Section 13542 of the 2017 Act provides that the charitable contributions deduction for the portion of an ESBT holding S corporation stock is determined under the rules in Section 170 (e.g., percentage limitations and carryovers) applicable to individuals rather than the rules in Section 642(c) applicable to trusts. I.R.C. § 641(c)(2)(E). This amendment addresses an arcane technical issue beyond the coverage in the text but, for those who are interested, its effect is generally favorable to ESBTs that make distributions to charitable beneficiaries.

D. TREATMENT OF THE SHAREHOLDERS

2. LOSS LIMITATIONS

A. IN GENERAL

Page 689:

Limitation on Excess Business Losses. S corporation shareholders who materially participate in a business activity that operates at a loss will now be impacted by new Section 461(l) (added by Section 11012 of the 2017 Act), which disallows a current deduction for any "excess business loss" of a noncorporate taxpayer. I.R.C. § 461(l)(1). An "excess business loss" is defined as the aggregate deductions of the taxpayer attributable to all of the taxpayer's trades or businesses (determined without regard to this limitation), reduced by the sum of: (1) the aggregate gross income or gain of the taxpayer for the taxable year which is attributable to such trades or businesses, and (2) a threshold amount that in 2018 is \$500,000 for married filing jointly taxpayers and \$250,000 for all others (the threshold amounts are indexed for inflation beginning in 2019). I.R.C. § 461(l)(3). For S corporations, the loss limitation applies at the shareholder level to the shareholder's pro rata share of all tax items from trades or businesses attributable to the corporation. I.R.C. § 461(l)(4). Any disallowed excess business loss is carried forward and treated as part of the taxpayer's net operating loss carryforward in subsequent taxable years, subject to the new rule allowing NOLs only up to 80 percent of taxable income. I.R.C. § 461(l)(2).

Section 461(l) applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017 and before January 1, 2026. I.R.C. § 461(l)(1).

Page 699:

After the carryover paragraph, insert the following new section and redesignate the topic heading that follows it as “4. SALE OF S CORPORATION STOCK”:

3. DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED BUSINESS INCOME

Code: § 199A (selectively)

Introduction. While the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 was headlined by the reduction of the top corporate income tax rate from 35 to 21 percent, lawmakers who favored significant tax reductions for business taxpayers were concerned about providing relief for public companies and other businesses organized as C corporations to the exclusion of “small businesses,” which often are conducted by sole proprietorships, partnerships, LLCs, or S corporations. To level the playing field, Section 11011(a) of the 2017 Act introduced Section 199A, which generally provides a temporary (through taxable years beginning before 2026) income tax deduction to individuals, trusts and estates equal to 20 percent of the taxpayer’s allocable share of “qualified business income” from these pass-through vehicles. In all cases, the deduction may not exceed 20 percent of the taxpayer’s taxable income (determined without the Section 199A deduction) reduced by net capital gain. I.R.C. § 199A(a)(2), (e)(1). When fully available, the deduction effectively lowers the tax rate applicable to this income from 37 to 29.6 percent for the highest income taxpayers. This deduction is not allowed in computing adjusted gross income and thus does not affect limitations based on AGI, but it is available to taxpayers who do not otherwise itemize deductions. I.R.C. §§ 62(a); 63(b)(3).

Qualified Business Income Defined. As a starting point, “qualified business income” (“QBI”) is the net amount of qualified items of income, gain, deduction and loss that are effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States and are included or allowed in determining taxable income for the relevant year. I.R.C. § 199A(c)(3)(A). Consistent with the intention to limit the deduction to operating income, the definition excludes a broad range of items that generally are derived from investment activities, such as: capital gains or losses, dividends (or payments in lieu of dividends), interest income, net gains from commodities transactions, net foreign currency gains, net income from notional principal contracts, and annuities. I.R.C. § 199A(c)(3)(B). The statute’s treatment of Section 1231 gain, however, is not entirely clear. Presumably, that gain will be excluded from QBI to the extent the gain is ultimately treated as long-term capital gain at the owner level through the operation of Section 1231(a)(1), but the issue would benefit from regulatory guidance.

Significantly, the definition of QBI excludes reasonable compensation or similar payments an individual receives from a business for services rendered, enhancing the tax preference for generating service income as an independent contractor or business owner rather than as an employee. In the context of an S corporation that is owned by shareholders who also provide services to or on behalf of the entity, QBI does not include compensation paid to the shareholder-employee or amounts the Service recharacterizes as such. I.R.C. § 199A(c)(4).

Qualified Trade or Business. For taxpayers who fall below critical taxable income thresholds established under Section 199A (discussed below), the scope of a qualified trade or business is remarkably broad. It includes any trade or business other than providing services as an employee. I.R.C. § 199A(d)(1)(B). Accordingly, an employee in her capacity as such cannot benefit from the Section 199A deduction. Rather, the deduction is limited to independent contractors, sole proprietors, and owners of S corporations, partnerships, and LLCs who are actively involved in the company's business. But as also discussed below, this otherwise broad reach is restricted considerably for high-income taxpayers who are engaged in trades or businesses involving the performance of services in certain specified fields.

Taxable Income Limitation. In all cases, the Section 199A deduction may not exceed 20 percent of the taxpayer's total taxable income (determined without reference to the Section 199A deduction) reduced by net capital gain. I.R.C. § 199A(a)(2), (e)(1). This limitation typically will arise only when the bulk of an individual's taxable income consists of QBI.

Basic Example. To illustrate a straightforward application of Section 199A, assume A, a single taxpayer who does not itemize deductions, practices law as a solo practitioner. Over the course of the year, her practice generates \$140,000 of legal fees and \$2,000 of interest income from her business deposits. A incurs \$40,000 of deductible expenses attributable to her practice and she has no other sources of income. In this case, A is engaged in a qualified trade or business under Section 199A, as she is not providing services in an employee capacity. While her net income from the practice totals \$102,000, only \$100,000 constitutes QBI because the \$2,000 of interest income is excluded from the definition. A's taxable income (computed without the Section 199A deduction) would be \$90,000 (\$102,000 less a \$12,000 standard deduction). Accordingly, A may deduct 20 percent of the lesser of: (1) her \$100,000 of QBI from the law practice, or (2) the \$90,000 taxable income amount. Thus, A's Section 199A deduction is \$18,000, reducing her final taxable income to \$72,000. The \$18,000 deduction has the effect of reducing A's average tax rate on the income from her law practice. Note that if A were an associate in a law firm and her wages as an employee were \$100,000, she would not be entitled to any deduction under Section 199A.

Income-Based Thresholds: In General. The basic application of Section 199A becomes considerably more complex once a taxpayer reaches certain taxable income thresholds. Those thresholds – determined without reference to the deduction otherwise provided by Section 199A – are \$157,500 for a single taxpayer and \$315,000 for married taxpayers filing jointly, with each figure being indexed for inflation after 2018. Once these thresholds are

reached, Section 199A imposes two independent limitations: (1) it excludes certain specified service-predominant activities from the definition of a qualified trade or business, and (2) it imposes a cap on the amount otherwise deductible under Section 199A, determined by reference to a percentage of the W-2 wages paid by the business (i.e., wages paid to its employees) or by references to a lesser percentage of W-2 wages paid and the cost of its depreciable property used in the production of QBI. These limitations, addressed in more detail below, are fully phased in when taxable income reaches \$50,000 above the threshold amount for single taxpayers (\$207,500 in 2018) and \$100,000 above the threshold amount for married taxpayers filing jointly (\$415,000 in 2018). Within the phase-in range, the limitations are each applied based on the ratio by which the taxable income of the taxpayer over the threshold amount bears to \$50,000 for single taxpayers, or \$100,000 for married taxpayers filing jointly. I.R.C. § 199A(b)(3)(B). For purposes of simplicity, the discussion below will refer to the limitations as applied in their fully phased-in form to “high-income taxpayers.”

Limitation for Specified Service Businesses. For high-income taxpayers, Section 199A excludes any “specified service trade or business” from the definition of a qualified trade or business. I.R.C. § 199A(d)(1)(A), (3). A specified service trade or business for this purpose includes any trade or business involving the performance of services in the fields of health, law, accounting, actuarial science, performing arts, consulting, athletics, financial services, brokerage services, and any trade or business the principal asset of which is the reputation or skill of one or more of its employees or owners. I.R.C. § 199A(d)(2) (incorporating, with modifications, the definition under I.R.C. § 1202(e)(3)(A)). Notably, engineers and architects are excluded from the list of affected trades or businesses, but investment managers and traders in securities are included in the “specified service trade or business” category. I.R.C. § 199A(d)(2). The exclusion of income generated by high-income taxpayers engaged in specified service trades or businesses from the Section 199A deduction creates a powerful incentive for businesses to segregate labor-generated income from income representing a return on capital. This type of segregation likely will occur through the formation of separate business entities that contract with one another.

As explained in the legislative history of the 2017 Act, the taxable income thresholds at which the exclusion for a specified service trade or business applies was intended by Congress “to deter high-income taxpayers from attempting to convert wages or other compensation for personal services to income eligible for the 20 percent deduction under the provision.” The exclusion, however, applies without regard to the taxpayer’s subjective motivation. For instance, returning to the basic example above, if A were married and filed a joint return with her husband B who earned \$350,000 in salary as an employee, A’s law practice would no longer constitute a qualified trade or business for purposes of Section 199A.

W-2 and Qualified Property Limitations. In addition to limitations on the type of activities that will constitute a qualified trade or business, high-income taxpayers are subject to a cap on the amount that can be deducted under Section 199A. Although the deduction is generally equal to 20 percent of QBI, for high-income taxpayers that amount is limited to the greater of: (1) 50 percent of the “W-2 wages” with respect to the qualified

trade or business, or (2) the sum of 25 percent of the “W-2 wages” with respect to the trade or business plus 2.5 percent of the unadjusted basis immediately after acquisition of all “qualified property” used in the trade or business. I.R.C. § 199A(b)(2)(B).

The scope of “W-2 wages” for purposes of this limitation includes the total amount of wages subject to income tax withholding, amounts paid into qualified retirement accounts, (such as Section 401(k) plans) and certain other forms of deferred compensation paid to the employees of the business. I.R.C. § 199A(b)(4). For labor-intensive businesses, the figure determined by 50% of W-2 wages paid by the business likely will serve as the relevant cap on the amount deductible from that trade or business for purposes of Section 199A.

For capital-intensive businesses (e.g., real estate), however, an alternate cap exists. It starts with 25 percent of W-2 wages paid by the trade or business and adds to this amount 2.5 percent of the unadjusted basis (immediately after acquisition) of “qualified property.” Qualified property for this purpose encompasses tangible property—real or personal—of a character subject to depreciation (hence, not land) that is held by and available for use in a qualified trade or business at the close of the taxable year, which is used in the production of qualified business income, and for which the depreciable period of the property has not ended before the close of the taxable year. I.R.C. § 199A(b)(6)(A). The “depreciable period” of property for purposes of Section 199A ends upon the later of (a) 10 years after the date the property is placed in service, or (b) the last day of the last full year in the applicable recovery period that would apply to the property under Section 168. I.R.C. § 199A(b)(6)(B).

Special Apportionment Rules. The application of the Section 199A to sole proprietors is fairly straightforward, as there can exist only one owner of such business. Accordingly, references to the qualified income, W-2 wages, and qualified property of the trade or business include all such amounts generated by the trade or business. However, for pass-through entities, such as S corporations that have more than one owner, these amounts must be apportioned among the respective owners. Section 199A provides special rules for this purpose. See I.R.C. § 199A(f). Each partner or shareholder takes into account only her “allocable share” of each item of income, gain, deduction and loss from the qualified trade or business. I.R.C. § 199A(f)(1)(A)(ii). The allocable share of a shareholder in an S corporation will be based on pro-rata stock ownership (different rules apply to partners). With respect to determining the cap applicable to taxpayer’s deduction under 199A, those amounts too will be determined by reference to the shareholder’s allocable share of the W-2 wages and unadjusted basis of qualified property in the trade or business. Again, the allocable shares of S corporation shareholders will be based on pro-rata stock ownership.

Examples. The examples below illustrate the operation of Section 199A in situations implicating the limitations on high-income taxpayers.

Example 1. C, a single taxpayer, holds a 25 percent ownership interest in an S corporation that operates a restaurant. C’s allocable share of net operating income from the corporation totals \$100,000 for the year. C also has \$200,000 of taxable income from sources unrelated to the business, subjecting him to the high-income limitations imposed by Section

199A. The corporation pays its employees \$120,000 in wages over the course of the year. The corporation leases the building in which the restaurant is located, but it owns equipment and furnishings having an unadjusted basis of \$400,000 and a recovery period of ten years under Section 168. The corporation expensed the cost of the equipment and furnishings under Section 168(k) when it placed them into service two years ago.

C's deduction under Section 199A is equal to the lesser of: (1) 20 percent of C's allocable share of qualified income from the trade or business (note that it is not a specified service trade or business), or (2) the greater of: (a) 50 percent of the C's allocable share of the W-2 wages paid by the corporation or (b) 25 percent of C's allocable share of the W-2 wages paid by the corporation plus 2.5 percent of the unadjusted basis of qualified property used in the corporation's trade or business. Keeping in mind that C's pro rata share of all tax items from the business is based on his 25 percent ownership, the starting point for calculating C's deduction under Section 199A is 20 percent of \$100,000, or \$20,000. However, this amount is capped by the greater of: (1) 50 percent of C's \$30,000 share of W-2 wages paid by the corporation (\$15,000), or (2) 25 percent of C's \$30,000 share of W-2 wages paid by the corporation (\$7,500) plus 2.5 percent of C's \$100,000 share of the unadjusted basis of qualified property held by the corporation (\$2,500). Accordingly, C's deduction under Section 199A is capped at the higher of these two amounts, which is \$15,000.

Example 2. D owns a 10 percent interest in an S corporation that owns and operates a commercial office building purchased five years ago for \$550 million, \$50 million of which was allocated to the underlying land. The corporation generates \$50 million of net rental income for the year, and it pays its employees W-2 wages of \$500,000. In the absence of any cap, D's deduction under Section 199A would equal 20 percent of his \$5 million allocable share of net rental income, or \$1 million. If this amount were capped at 50 percent of D's \$50,000 allocable share of W-2 wages paid by the corporation, the deduction would be reduced significantly to \$25,000. However, the alternate cap of 25 percent of D's 50,000 allocable share of W-2 wages (\$12,500) when added to 2.5 percent of D's \$50 million allocable share of the unadjusted basis of the commercial office building (\$1.25 million) produces a cap on D's Section 199A deduction of \$1,262,500. Accordingly, D's \$1 million deduction under Section 199A based on 20 percent of his qualified income from the corporation and is not subject to the limitation.

E. DISTRIBUTIONS TO SHAREHOLDERS

Page 704:

Distributions after Conversion from S to C Corporation Status. As described in the text, distributions from S corporations generally are treated as coming first from the corporation's accumulated adjustments account ("AAA") and, when relevant, any excess is treated as coming from earnings and profits generated by the corporation when it was a C corporation or carried over under Section 381 as a result of a tax-free transaction such as a merger. I.R.C. § 1368. If an S corporation's S election terminates, causing it to become a C corporation, the Code provides special rules for cash distributions made during a post-

termination transition period (“PTTP”), which generally is one year. I.R.C. § 1377(b). A cash distribution during the PTTP is treated as a reduction of basis to the extent it does not exceed the S corporation’s AAA, but after the PTTP expires, distributions are treated as coming first from earnings and profits and taxed as a dividend to that extent. I.R.C. § 1371(e)(2).

Section 13543(b) of the 2017 Act provides additional relief in the S to C corporation conversion scenario by providing that, for cash distributions made after the expiration of the PTTP, the AAA shall be allocated to the distribution, and the distribution shall be chargeable to accumulated earnings and profits, in the same ratio as the amount of the AAA bears to the amount of the accumulated E & P. To qualify for this relief provision, the corporation must: (1) have been an S corporation on December 31, 2017 (the day before the date of enactment of the Act); (2) revoke its S election within the two-year period beginning on the date of enactment; and (3) have the same owners on the date its S election is revoked and in the same proportions as on the date of enactment. I.R.C. §§ 1371(f); 481(d)(2).

F. TAXATION OF THE S CORPORATION

Page 705:

Tax on Certain Built-in Gains. Effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017, the reduction to the highest corporate income tax rate results in a corresponding reduction of the Section 1374 tax rate from 35 to 21 percent.

Page 707:

In the ninth line of the first full paragraph, “ten years” should be “five years.”

Page 708:

Tax on Passive Investment Income. Effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017, the reduction of the highest corporate income tax rate results in a corresponding reduction of the Section 1375 tax rate from 35 to 21 percent. In the illustration at pages 709-710 of the text, X’s liability will be reduced from \$1,750 to \$1,050 (\$5,000 x 21%).

G. COORDINATION WITH OTHER INCOME TAX PROVISIONS

1. SUBCHAPTER C

Page 718:

Change of Accounting Method on Conversion of S Corporation to C Corporation.

With the corporate income tax rate reduced to 21 percent, some S corporations may choose to revoke their S elections and become C corporations. Since C corporations generally are required to use the accrual method of accounting, the conversion may require the corporation to change from the cash to the accrual method, triggering certain adjustments under Section 481 in computing taxable income. To provide relief in this situation, Section 13543 of the 2017 Act permits any such Section 481 adjustments arising from a change in accounting method caused by an S to C conversion to be taken into account ratably over six tax years. I.R.C. § 481(d).