REPORT #799

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

Letter on New York Nonresident

Table of Contents

Cover	Letter:	i	_

TAX SECTION 1994-1995 Executive Committee MICHAEL L. SCHLER

Chair 825 Eighth Avenue New York City 10019 212/474-1588

CAROLYN JOY LEE First Vice-Chair

First Vice-Chair 212/903-8761 RICHARD L. REINHOLD

Second Vice-Chair 212/701-3672

RICHARD O. LOENGARD, JF Secretary 212/820-8260

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Bankruptcy Elliot Pisem Joel Scharfstein

Basis, Gains & Losses
David H. Brockway
Edward D. Kleinbard

CLE and Pro Bono

Damian M. Hovancik

Prof. Deborah H. Schenk

Compliance, Practice & Procedure Robert S. Fink

Consolidated Returns
Dennis E. Ross
Dana Trier

Corporations Yaron Z. Reich

Steven C. Todrys

Cost Recovery

Katherine M. Bristor

Katherine M. Bristor Stephen B. Land Estate and Trusts

Kim E. Baptiste Steven M. Loeb Financial Instruments

Financial Instruments
David P. Hariton
Bruce Kayle
Financial Intermediaries

Richard C. Blake Stephen L. Millman Foreign Activities of U.S. Taxpayers

Diana M. Lopo
Philip R. West
Individuals

Victor F. Keen Sherry S. Kraus Multistate Tax Issues

Arthur R. Rosen Sterling L. Weaver Net Operating Losses

Stuart J. Goldring Robert A. Jacobs New York City Taxes Robert J. Levinsohn

Robert Plautz

New York State Income Taxes
Paul R. Comeau

New York State Sales and Misc. E. Parker Brown, II

Maria T. Jones Nonqualified Employee Benefits Stephen T. Lindo

Loran T. Thompson Partnership Andrew N. Berg William B. Brannan

Pass-Through Entities Roger J. Baneman Thomas A. Humphreys

Qualified Plans Stuart N. Alperin Kenneth C. Edgar, Jr.

Real Property
Linda Z. Swartz
Lary S. Wolf

Reorganizations Patrick C. Gallagher Mary Kate Wold

Tax Accounting
Jodi J. Schwartz
Esta E. Stecher

Linda D'Onofrio Patti T. Wu Tax Exempt Entities

Tax Exempt Entities Franklin L. Green Michelle P. Scott

Tax Policy
Reuven S. Avi-Yonah
Robert H. Scarborough
U.S. Activities of Foreign Tax

U.S. Activities of Foreign Taxpayers Michael Hirschfeld Charles M. Morgan, III

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

M. Bernard Aidinoff Geoffrey R.S. Brown Robert E. Brown Harvey P. Dale Harry L. Gutman Harold R. Handler Charles I. Kingson Richard M. Leder Erika W. Nijenhuis Ann-Elizabeth Purintun Mikel M. Rollyson Stanley I. Rubenfeld Eugene L. Vogel David E. Watts Joanne M. Wilson

August 18, 1994

Honorable James W. Wetzler Commissioner of Taxation and Finance Building 9, W. A. Harriman Campus Albany, New York 12227-1215

Re: New York Nonresident Audit Guidelines

Dear Commissioner Wetzler:

As you know, the Department of Taxation and Finance recently promulgated revised audit guidelines relating to "residency audits," <u>i.e.</u>, personal income tax audits that involve questions of an individual's domicile or statutory residence in New York, or of the allocation of income to New York. The residency audit program has been a source of considerable concern and discussion, and last year the Tax Section commented on an earlier version of these guidelines.¹

We strongly commend you and your staff for these greatly improved guidelines. We are very pleased by the many changes in substance and tone reflected in the revised guidelines, including many changes reflecting our prior comments. We are particularly pleased to see the emphasis that an auditor should compare New York contacts with out-of-state contacts, instead of merely relying on the extent of retained New York contacts.

The Tax Section's comments on the first set of guidelines, issued in February 1993, were provided to you under cover letter dated December 23, 1993.

FORMER CHAIRMEN OF SECTION:
John W. Fager Hon. Renato

Howard O. Colgan Charles L. Kades Carter T. Louthan Samuel Brodsky Thomas C. Plowden-Wardlaw Edwin M. Jones Hon. Hugh R. Jones Peter Miller

John E. Morrissey Jr. Charles E. Heming Richard H. Appert Ralph O. Winger Hewitt A. Conway Martin D. Ginsburg Peter L. Faber Hon. Renato Beghe Alfred D. Youngwood Gordon D. Henderson David Sachs J. Roger Mentz Willard B. Taylor Richard J. Hiegel Dale S. Collinson Richard G. Cohen Donald Schapiro Herbert L. Camp William L. Burke Arthur A. Feder James M. Peaslee John A. Corry Peter C. Canellos Moreover, the new guidelines properly reinforce the message that the purpose of an audit is to "verify the correctness of the return filed," and that the auditor's "mission" is not to find residence but to establish the facts through a fair and balanced inquiry. The guidelines also properly remind auditors of the burdensome and intrusive nature of residency audits, and properly encourage the use of short-form questionnaires and "triage" to require a detailed analysis only where it is warranted.

We do not necessarily agree with all of the conclusions expressed in the guidelines concerning current law, 2 nor do we believe that every suggested audit question in the guidelines will necessarily be relevant to the ultimate resolution of a particular case. We recognize, however, that the revised guidelines are designed simply as guidelines for the conduct of audits, and are not official pronouncements of existing law. Accordingly, we believe the Department has a legitimate interest in suggesting to its auditors the lines of inquiry discussed in the guidelines. Furthermore, while we believe that there continue to be aspects of the law and regulations that could benefit from substantive reexamination, we recognize that these issues are beyond the scope of the guidelines.

The true test of the revised audit guidelines will come in the field. It is imperative that every auditor engaging in residency audits embrace these guidelines, especially the balanced spirit of the guidelines, as a mission statement. While it will be helpful for taxpayers to be able to refer to the guidelines, the guidelines will achieve their intended effects only if they become reflected in the day-to-day handling of residency audits.

For example, the guidelines state that membership in and regular attendance at a house of worship are not to be considered at all in evaluating an individual's domicile. We believe, however, that an individual can rightly point to his or her patterns of religious behavior as relevant to domicile.

The promulgation of the revised guidelines also serves to raise another question, which is the degree to which these and other audit guidelines are to be followed by Conciliation conferees and Law Bureau attorneys. Audit quidelines reflect the Commissioner's policy. Where the application of audit guidelines to a particular case leads to the conclusion that a deficiency should not have been asserted, conferees and attorneys should be directed to follow the policies reflected in the guidelines and dispose of the case accordingly. Formalizing a direction to conferees and attorneys to cancel asserted deficiencies where the taxpayer establishes that the case would not have been pursued under the guidelines would be particularly helpful in the residency audit area, given the transition in audit experience as a result of the promulgation of these new guidelines.

We understand you may be planning training programs to acquaint the auditors with the new guidelines. We would be pleased to assist you in this effort in any way. Again, we thank you for your responsiveness to our comments, and for the thoughtful and comprehensive revisions to the nonresident audit guidelines.

Very truly yours,

Michael Schler Chair, Tax Section

cc: William F. Collins, Esq.