



New York State Bar Association

One Elk Street, Albany, New York 12207 • 518/463-3200 • <http://www.nysba.org>

TAX SECTION

2006-2007 Executive Committee

KIMBERLY S. BLANCHARD
Chair
Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
22nd Floor
New York, NY 10153
212/310-8799

PATRICK C. GALLAGHER
First Vice-Chair
212/446-4998

DAVID S. MILLER
Second Vice-Chair
212/504-6318

CHARLES MORGAN
Secretary
212/735-2470

COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

Bankruptcy and Operating Losses

Stuart J. Goldring
Deborah L. Paul

Compliance, Practice & Procedure

Robert Cassanos
Bryan C. Skarlatos

Consolidated Returns

Lawrence M. Garrett
Jonathan Kushner

Corporations

Kathleen L. Ferrell
Gordon Warnke

Employee Benefits

Andrew L. Oringer
Max J. Schwartz

Estates and Trusts

Carlyn S. McCaffrey
Jeffrey N. Schwartz

Financial Instruments

Michael S. Farber
Erika W. Nijenhuis

Financial Intermediaries

Dickson G. Brown
Yaron Z. Reich

"Inbound" U.S. Activities of Foreign

Taxpayers

David R. Hardy
David R. Sicular

Individuals

Janet B. Korins
Sherry S. Kraus

Multistate Tax Issues

Robert E. Brown
Paul R. Comeau

New York City Taxes

Robert J. Levinsohn
Irwin M. Slomka

New York State Franchise and

Income Taxes

Maria T. Jones
Arthur R. Rosen

"Outbound" Foreign Activities of

U.S. Taxpayers

Peter H. Blessing
Jodi J. Schwartz

Partnerships

Joel Scharstein
David H. Schnabel

Pass-Through Entities

Andrew W. Needham
Marc L. Silberberg

Real Property

William B. Brannan
Elliot Pisem

Reorganizations

Karen Gilbreath Sowell
Linda Z. Swartz

Securizations and Structured

Finance

Jiyeon Lee-Lim
W. Kirk Wallace

Tax Accounting

Jeffrey Hochberg
Stephen B. Land

Tax Exempt Bonds

Bruce M. Serchuk
Patti T. Wu

Tax Exempt Entities

Stuart L. Rosow
Michelle P. Scott

Tax Policy

David W. Mayo
Diana L. Wollman

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Andrew W. Braitterman
Peter J. Connors
Edward E. Gonzalez
Alyse Grossman

Mary L. Harmon
Sherwin Kamin
Elizabeth T. Kessenides
Charles I. Kingson

Gary B. Mandel
Douglas R. McFadyen
William L. McRae
David M. Schizer

Andrew P. Solomon
Richard R. Upton
Andrew Walker

March 2, 2006

Hon. Andrew Eristoff
Commissioner
NYS Department of Taxation and Finance
State Campus, Building 9
Albany, NY 12227

Hon. Martha Stark
Commissioner
NYC Department of Finance
One Centre Street, Room 500
New York, NY 10007

Re: Proposed Amendments to Article 9-A Regulations
Relating to the Taxation of Corporate Partners

Dear Commissioners Eristoff and Stark:

I am pleased to submit the New York State Bar Association Tax Section's Report No. 1105 (the "Report") on the proposed amendments to the Article 9-A regulations relating to the taxation of corporate partners.

The Tax Section commends the Department for undertaking this important project, and for doing so in a collaborative effort with others outside the Department. As you know, several members of the Tax Section participated in the working group that the Department assembled to consult about these proposed amendments.

FORMER CHAIRS OF SECTION:

Samuel Brodsky
Edwin M. Jones
Peter Miller
John E. Morrissey, Jr.
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
Michael L. Schler
Carolyn Joy Lee
Richard L. Reinhold
Richard O. Loengard
Steven C. Todrys
Harold R. Handler

Robert H. Scarborough
Robert A. Jacobs
Samuel J. Dimon
Andrew N. Berg
Lewis R. Steinberg
David P. Hariton

We generally support the proposed amendments, in particular the preference they accord to the use of the aggregate approach in taxing corporate partners. Under the amendments, the aggregate method would be required unless the partner is unable to gain access to the partnership information necessary to report under that method. We understand that, although not reflected in the current draft amendments, the Department proposes to require partnerships that file New York partnership returns to furnish the necessary information to their partners using a prescribed form. Because we believe that the aggregate method is the best method and will generally produce results that are fair to taxpayers and fair to the State, we endorse this plan.

We also understand that one other aspect of the draft proposals will be changed. The draft amendments contain six presumptions of access to information, e.g., a general partner is presumed to have access to the requisite information. As currently drafted, the amendments would require a partner to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that it is unable to obtain the required information from the partnership, even if none of those six presumptions was met. Moreover, exactly the same rebuttal standard is applied where one or more of the presumptions is met, effectively rendering the presumptions a nullity. We understand that this aspect of the draft amendments will be changed so that if none of the presumptions is met, a partner need not establish that it lacks access to the requisite information.

The Report contains several recommendations for further revisions of the regulations. In particular, we believe that the presumption of access to information that applies to any one percent or greater partner is too low especially as applied to a limited partner. We recommend that a 10 percent threshold be adopted instead.

We also believe that the Department should consider establishing higher levels of proof for demonstrating lack of access to information in some cases and lower levels in others. For example, we believe that the burden of proof should be higher on a general partner, a partner with a very significant stake in a partnership or a partner engaged in a unitary business with the partnership, than the burden would be on a limited partner with a less significant interest in the partnership.

Another issue addressed by the Report is the rule in the draft amendments that imposes a blanket prohibition on a corporate partner treating its proportionate share of a partnership's stock investments as an item of subsidiary capital. We believe that the failure to look through a partnership in order to determine whether a corporate partner owns, beneficially, at least 50% of the voting stock of a partnership's corporate subsidiary is inconsistent with the aggregate method and leads to results unsupported by any policy rationale. We also believe that there is nothing in the Tax Law that requires such a result. Thus, for example, if a corporation owns more than 50% of a partnership and that partnership holds 100% of the voting stock of a lower-tier corporation, we see no reason in law or policy to prevent the corporate partner from treating that underlying investment as an investment in subsidiary capital.

We have several other recommendations, all of which, as well as the recommendations above, are described more fully in the Report. We appreciate your consideration of our comments and would be pleased to discuss them with you further. We would be happy to provide any other assistance that you would find helpful.

Respectfully submitted,



Kimberly S. Blanchard
Chair

Cc: Marilyn Kaltenborn,
Technical Services Division,
NYS Department of Taxation and Finance

John Bartlett,
Office of Counsel,
NYS Department of Taxation and Finance