

## **SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE IGA FOR TRANSACTION PRIVILEGE TAX COLLECTION BY THE ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE**

The attached “Modification to Intergovernmental Agreement Between the State of Arizona And City/Town” incorporates five agreed upon changes into the existing intergovernmental agreement between the city/town and the Department related to the collection of the city/town transaction privilege tax. Below is a summary of the intent and impact of each change by section.

### **1) 9.6 Adjustments to Reported Taxes**

The addition of this new section addresses an issue that came up during the past year. In some cases, the Department knew there was an error by the taxpayer in identifying which city or town was supposed to receive the tax, but there was no mechanism allowing them to hold the distribution while the error was being corrected. As a result there were instances when the DOR had to send funds to a city or town knowing it was incorrect, only to pull those funds back in a subsequent distribution after the error had been resolved. This change allows the Department to avoid these incorrect distributions and recoveries when they are aware of a problem from the outset.

### **2) 9.7 Taxpayer Rulings and Uniformity**

The addition of this new section provides for municipal input in the drafting of rulings and interpretations that impact the Model City Tax Code, including interpretations of State statute that flow through to the MCTC because the Model language matches the State language. Under current statute, the DOR is responsible for addressing all taxpayer written requests for rulings, even when the question is based on the Model City Tax Code. This section allows the cities to have some influence over issues raised by taxpayers that have a direct impact on local tax imposition and interpretation, without disrupting the normal course of business within the Department on routine matters.

### **3) 10. Financing Collection of Taxes**

This section is being amended by adding the second sentence. This addition recognizes that the cities and towns have agreed to a statutory financial obligation to contribute to the State for the operation of the DOR, and this obligation is not in conflict with the Department’s TPT collection and administration efforts being financed through the State general fund appropriation.

### **4) 28.1 (relating to automatic annual renewal of the agreement)**

This section has been changed to remove the specific years in the original document, so this section will not need to be changed annually. Also, this section added a provision stating any agreed upon changes that arise from the annual review in Section 28.5 are retroactive to July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. The agreement automatically renews without any action unless there are modifications agreed upon in any given year, and if so, you only need to adopt the modifications.

### **5) 28.5 (relating to annual review of the IGA)**

This section has been changed to state the review period begins on June 1<sup>st</sup>, rather than requiring the review being completed by March 1<sup>st</sup>. The March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline was simply unrealistic given the legislative session responsibilities of many of the typical reviewers.