REPORT #860

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

Letter on 1996 Business Plan

Table of Contents

Cover Letter	:	.i
--------------	---	----

TAX SECTION 1995-1996 Executive Committee CAROLYN JOY LEE

Chair Worldwide Plaza 825 Eighth Ave New York, NY 10019 212/903-8761 RICHARD L. REINHOLD

First Vice-Chair 212/701-3672

RICHARD O. LOENGARD, JR. Second Vice-Chair 212/859-8260

STEVEN C. TODRYS Secretary 212/715-9331

COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

Bankruptcy

Joel Scharfstein Linda Z. Swartz

Basis, Gains & Losses

Stephen B. Land Robert H. Scarborough

CLE and Pro Bono

Damian M. Hovancik Deborah H. Schenk

Compliance, Practice & Procedure

Arnold Y. Kapiloff Consolidated Returns Ann-Elizabeth Purintun

Dennis E. Ross Corporations

Katherine M. Bristor Deborah L. Paul Cost Recovery Geoffrev R.S. Brown

Elliot Pisem **Estate and Trusts** Carlyn S. McCaffrey

Georgiana J. Slade Financial Instruments David P. Hariton Bruce Kayle

Financial Intermediaries Richard C. Blake Thomas A. Humphreys

Foreign Activities of U.S. Taxpayers Reuven S. Avi-Yonah

Philip R. West Victor F. Keen

Sherry S. Kraus Multistate Tax Issues Robert F. Brown

Net Operating Losses Stuart J. Goldring

Robert A. Jacobs **New York City Taxes** Robert J. Levinsohn Robert Plautz

New York State Franchise and Income Taxes

James A. Locke Arthur R. Rosen New York State Sales and Misc.

Maria T. Jones Joanne M. Wilson Nonqualified Employee Benefits

Stuart N. Alperin Kenneth C. Edgar, Jr

Andrew N. Berg William B. Brannan **Pass-Through Entities**

Partnerships

Roger J. Baneman Stephen L. Millman

Qualified Plans Stephen T. Lindo Loran T. Thompson Real Property

Alan J. Tarr Lary S. Wolf Reorganizations Patrick C. Gallagher

Mary Kate Wold Tax Accounting

Erika W. Nijenhuis Tax Exempt Bonds Linda L. D'Onofrio

Tax Exempt Entities Michelle P. Scott

Jonathan A. Small Tax Policy

Peter v. Z. Cobb

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 Dickson G. Brown E. Parker Brown, II

Scott F. Cristman Harold R. Handler Walter Hellerstein Sherwin Kamin Charles I. Kingson Richard M. Leder

Yaron Z. Reich Stanley I. Rubenfeld David R. Sicular

Esta E. Stecher Eugene L. Vogel David E. Watts

January 4, 1996

FEDERAL EXPRESS

Glen A. Kohl, Esq. Tax Legislative Counsel Department of the Treasury 1500 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20220

> Re: 1996 Business Plan

Dear Glen:

In considering topics for the 1996 Business Plan our members have identified a few projects that we believe should be include:

- Finalizing Proposed Regulation section 1.1502-15;
- Finalizing the proposed securities lending regulations;
- Providing guidance on PFIC definitional issues (beyond that already provided for banks and securities dealers); and
- Providing guidance on issues presented by the extension of the straddle rules to equity swaps,

FORMER CHAIRS OF SECTION: Alfred D. Youngwood

Howard O. Colgan, Jr. Charles L. Kades Samuel Brodsky Thomas C. Plowden-Wardlaw Edwin M. Jones Hon. Hugh R. Jones Peter Miller John W. Fager

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

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 Michael L. Schler

You also asked that we consider your suggestion to reverse the election currently prescribed under Code section 83(b), so that the general rule would be that persons receiving restricted property would be taxed in the year of the transfer, unless an election was made to postpone the income inclusion until the restriction lapsed.

I reviewed that proposal with the Chairs of our Committees on Qualified Plans and Nonqualified Employee Benefits. Their clear consensus was that reversing the section 83(b) election was not a good idea.

First, as a theoretical matter, the current structure of section 83 is more consistent with general income tax principles, in that persons are not presumed to have income unless and until they have an unrestricted right to property. Reversing section 83 would mean people are presumed to have income even though their rights to property are circumscribed, and would require an affirmative election to conform the tax treatment of such persons to their economic position. This seems an unnecessary complication.

Furthermore, while it does seem that many people make section 83(b) elections it also seems these elections tend to be made in cases where something unusual is occurring, such as where stock is received in connection with an acquisition. There are, by contrast, large numbers of employees who receive stock periodically under longstanding "plain vanilla" corporate compensation plans, and who do not, in our experience, routinely elect to treat restricted stock as current income. For these individuals, a reversal of the election requirements of section 83 would mean that they would now have to file elections, perhaps annually, in order to continue the tax treatment they currently receive.

One group or the other is burdened by an affirmative election requirement under section 83(b). On balance, however, it is our view that the current structure of the election is preferable, for it better conforms to general tax principles, and it focuses the need to elect more on the out-of-the-ordinary situations, which are more likely to be the subject of planning and analysis at the individual level. Please call if you would like to discuss any of this in greater detail.

Very truly yours,

Carolyn Joy Lee Chair