



BUSINESS PROPERTY TAXATION BY CITIES

**WHAT WE KNOW, WHAT WE DON'T, AND
WHAT WE SHOULD**

A DISCUSSION PAPER

Prepared by Mike Jordan

Director of Government Relations

March 6, 2017

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Focus and Purpose of Paper	3
1.3 Scope of Paper	3
1.4 Key Findings of Paper	3
1.5 Organization of Paper	4
2. What Makes a Good Property? Criteria to Consider	
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Equity	5
2.2.1 The Benefits Principle	5
2.2.2 The Ability to Pay Principle	5
2.2.2.1 Horizontal Equity	5
2.2.2.2 Vertical Equity	6
2.3 Efficiency/Neutrality	6
2.4 Ease of Administration	6
2.5 Accountability/Transparency/Simplicity	6
2.6 Stability & Predictability	6
3. An Overview of the Property Tax	
3.1 Introduction	8
3.2 The Objectives of the Property Tax	8
3.3 The Mechanics of the Property Tax	8
3.4 Criticisms of the Property Tax	9
3.5 The Two Sides of the Property Tax Coin: Residential and Non-Residential	10
3.6 Who Pays the Property Tax?	11
4. Business Property Taxes and Competitiveness	
4.1 Introduction	12
4.2 Business Property Taxes and Benefits Equity	12
4.3 Business Property Taxes and Competitiveness	13
4.4 Business Property Taxes and Location Decisions	14
4.5 Business Property Taxes and Exporting the Burden	14
5. The Approach to Business Property Taxation in Canadian Cities	
5.1 Introduction	15
5.2 The Jurisdictional Context	15
5.2.1 Frequency of Assessments	16
5.2.2 Valuation Dates	17
5.2.3 Property Classes	17
5.2.4 Percentage of Value	17
5.3 Business Property Taxation in Selected Cities	18
5.3.1 Saskatoon	19
5.3.2 Regina	19
5.3.3 Calgary	19
5.3.4 Edmonton	19
5.3.5 Winnipeg	20
5.4 Comparative Analysis	20

6. Business Property Tax Policy Options for Consideration	
6.1 Introduction	24
6.2 Assumptions	24
6.3 Options & Approaches	25
Option 1: Tax Ratio Approach	25
Option 2: Revenue Neutral Approach	26
Option 3: Tax Shares Approach	27
6.4 Evaluation of Options/Approaches	28
6.4.1 Tax Share Approach	28
6.4.2 Tax Ratio Approach	30
6.5 Implications of Options/Approaches	32
7. Summary and Concluding Observations	35
8. References	38

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Perhaps no city in Canada has placed more focus on the relationship between residential and non-residential (i.e., business) property tax rates than Saskatoon. Almost two decades ago, in 1998, Saskatoon City Council adopted a resolution to set the non-residential property tax rate at 1.75 times higher than the residential property tax rate. At that time, the non-residential to residential property tax ratio was 2.11:1. This meant that on a property of equal value, for every one dollar paid in property taxes from residential property owners, over two dollars was paid by non-residential property owners.

The Council resolution was the result of a recommendation from Saskatoon's Tax Review Committee (1997).¹ The Committee was concerned by the tax rate differential and believed that:

- property taxes are an important variable on business location decisions;
- the existing business property tax rate could have an adverse effect on the location of businesses in the city, especially small and medium sized businesses; and
- higher property tax rates on business properties is not justified on the basis of equity.²

In fact, the equity issue, combined with the ability for non-residential property owners to deduct property taxes from their corporate income tax requirements resonated with the Committee. This formed the basis for their recommendation of a targeted (or pegged) non-residential to residential tax ratio:

The target effective tax rate we recommend...was determined taking into account the benefit that most small medium sized businesses receive from the deductibility of property taxes in the determination of income for income tax purposes...this suggests an income tax rate of greater than 40%. We believe the effective income tax rate in Saskatoon on the majority of businesses is much less than this.
(Saskatoon Tax Review Committee, 1997)

The Committee's rationale was further influenced by a paper from local public finance economists, (Gilchrist and St. Louis, 1997) commissioned and sponsored by Saskatoon business groups. They concluded that Saskatoon's business property taxes: (a) could be more transparent with explicitly stated mill rates; (b) are high relative to other prairie cities; and (c) violate standards of fairness in taxation policy.

¹ The Tax Review Committee was appointed by the City in 1996 and was required to submit recommendations to City Council by December 1997. It reported to City Council in December 1997, making 19 recommendations on property assessment and tax policy. The 1.75 ratio was a result of the calculations on property tax deductions that business are entitled to under the *Income Tax Act*, for Corporate Income Tax purposes, which at that time was roughly 43 percent.

² More precisely, it relates to the concept of horizontal equity, which means treating equal taxpayers equally. This concept is addressed in more detail in Section 2 of this paper.

Thus, in 2001, the City of Saskatoon took steps to reduce the non-residential property tax rate differential until it reached 1.75:1 in 2010, resulting in one of the lowest tax ratios among major Canadian cities. However, the issue did not end there.

About two years after the property tax ratio reached the 1.75 target, local business groups began advocating to Saskatoon City Council for a further reduction in the property tax ratio, this time arguing for a ratio of 1.43:1 by 2020 (Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce 2012).³ This new position was based on the principle advanced by the Tax Review Committee of equity and income tax deductibility, and spurred by various federal and provincial corporate income tax changes and rate reductions. In 2013, the City Council of the day, however, deferred the matter until after the 2017 property reassessment.

This issue sat dormant until it was revived three years later during Saskatoon's 2016 civic election campaign. Again, local business groups were advocating for the ratio between the non-residential property tax rate and the residential tax rate be reduced to 1.43 from 1.75. (MacPherson-a, September 29, 2016). They argue that a lower tax ratio will create more employment opportunities, attract new businesses, allow firms to reinvest in existing properties, and ultimately, make local business more competitive (MacPherson-b, October 31, 2016).

By contrast, opponents to a lower tax ratio argue that the City already has one of the most competitiveness business property tax regimes in Canada and that a further reduction in the ratio would increase the tax burden on residential property owners (CBC News, Saskatoon October 22, 2013). Part of their argument was strongly supported by a December 2016 report by the C.D. Howe Institute, concluding that Saskatoon had the most competitive business tax environment when comparing the largest city in each province (Found and Tomlinson, 2016).⁴

Given this outcome, a fundamental question becomes: if Saskatoon already has the most competitive business tax regime for capital investment, then should the City's non-residential to residential tax ratio be lowered further?

- If the answer is yes, then: (a) What is the appropriate ratio? and (b) Is there evidence to suggest that a lower tax ratio is a catalyst to additional business investment?
- If the answer is no, then (a) Is there a "better" alternative? and (b) Will maintaining or even increasing the tax ratio result in reduced commercial and industrial investment?

Moreover, does the original principle of (horizontal) equity and tax deductibility still resonate?

³ It is the author's understanding that the 1.43 ratio came from a report by the Canada West Foundation, called "A Tax Framework for Saskatchewan's Continuing Prosperity." The authors state: The reform is also complimentary to other recent tax changes, particularly the cuts in the corporate income tax rate from 17% to 12%, and the earlier elimination of the general corporate capital tax.

⁴ The analysis was based on a measure called the Marginal Effective Tax Rate (METR). In this particular analysis, the METR was limited to capital investment and is defined as "the effective tax rate on the revenue generated by the last unit of capital invested." Stated another way, it measures the percentage increase in the rate of return an investor needs to cover the cost of taxes.

1.2 Focus and Purpose of Paper

This paper attempts to address the questions posed at the end of subsection 1.1 and other fundamental issues relating to business property taxation by City governments. It does so by integrating theoretical frameworks in the economic literature with practical analysis of how selected cities approach the issue of business property taxation. The motivation for this paper is to advance various property tax policy issues (and options) so that the reader has a more complete understanding of how property taxes—especially business property taxes—work and why high taxation of business properties can be harmful to capital investment.

1.3 Scope of Paper

While the primary focus of this paper is on municipal business property taxation, the analysis also integrates the impact on municipal residential property taxes where necessary. The inclusion is needed because the two are very closely linked when it comes to local tax policy.

Although the research and topics addressed in this paper attempt to be as comprehensive as possible, there are several tax policy issues that go beyond the scope of this analysis. For example, this paper does not address in any detail:

- Property tax exemptions, rebates, and abatements;
- Education property taxes;
- Evaluation of other types of taxes, such as income, consumption or excise taxes;
- Evaluation of alternative financing mechanisms, such as user fees, tolls, and tax increment financing; and
- Local expenditures or service levels.

1.4 Key Findings of the Paper

Based on the principles of tax theory, the economic literature, and the practical applications of local tax policy, the research reveals that:

- Property taxes on business align with the “capital tax view,” meaning that the tax is borne by the owners of capital;
- High business property taxes can have an impact on capital investment and location decisions, but there is no definition of what “high” is;
- Saskatoon is the only City of those included in the research with a targeted tax ratio between residential and non-residential properties. Others use a “tax share” approach.
- The literature does not reach a consensus or advance an optimum tax ratio;
- Saskatoon’s existing tax ratio is among the lowest in Canada, however, there is no concrete proof to suggest that this is the cause of increased investment;
- Business property owners in Saskatoon face the second lowest municipal property tax burden among all cities;
- Saskatoon (and Winnipeg) rely more heavily on residential property taxes to pay for services than all other cities;

- The share of taxable assessment between residential and non-residential properties is roughly equivalent in most (Winnipeg being the exception) cities at 75 percent residential and 25 percent non-residential; and
- However, the tax mix differs with Calgary and Edmonton collecting about 50 percent of taxes from each the residential and non-residential sectors; Saskatoon collects 71 percent from residential properties and 29 percent from non-residential properties.

1.5 Organization of Paper

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows:

- Section 2 presents generally accepted public finance criteria to help provide an evaluation framework to apply to the various options for the subsequent analysis.
- Section 3 provides an overview of the property tax, and briefly addresses its key features, good and bad. It also distinguishes between residential and business property taxes and investigates the economic incidence of the tax (meaning who pays it).
- Section 4 addresses whether business property taxes have an impact on business competitiveness, location decisions, and investment.
- Section 5 compares the approaches to business property taxation in five selected cities. The section also provides an overview of the various assessment and property tax policies that are prescribed by the provinces. It also provides a time-series data analysis of the approaches used in the various cities to determine whether there is a relationship between lower tax ratios and higher business investment.
- Section 6 offers three policy options or approaches for consideration. These options, or variants of them, are used by the cities covered by this paper. This section also evaluates the options by using the criteria set out in Section 3.
- Section 7 summarizes the findings of this work and offers some concluding observations and issues that should be explored further as they concern business property taxation in Saskatoon.

2. What Makes a Good Property Tax? Criteria to Consider

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of key criteria or principles for evaluating taxes. The central objective is to identify and explain generally accepted criteria that are fundamental to the implementation and operation of a good tax system. While it may be impossible for any tax system to meet all of the criteria in establishing a good tax system, it is important to have some standard of measure so that a determination can be made on the efficacy of various property tax options that are advanced later in this paper.

2.2 Equity

The concept of “equity” is a fundamental principle of taxation. For taxation purposes, it implies that the burden of a tax should be shared fairly among individuals so that there is an equitable distribution of the cost of government to society. Since taxes are essentially the cost of government, “any measure of the equity or fairness of the tax system obviously involves weighing the burden borne by one taxpayer against the burden borne by another” (Boadway and Kitchen, 1999). There are two fundamental principles of equity: (1) the benefits principle, and (2) the ability to pay principle. The paper addresses each concept below.

2.2.1 The Benefits Principle

The benefits principle holds that the tax burden should be distributed in accordance with the benefits that taxpayers receive from a particular service. In other words, proponents of this principle argue that the financing of government goods or services should be linked to the benefits that individual or business taxpayers receive from the service. However, the benefits principle is not applicable to situations where government provides a public good, such as parks and sidewalks, or where the distribution of income or wealth is desired (Rosen et.al, 2003).

2.2.2 The Ability to Pay Principle

In contrast to the benefits principle, the ability to pay principle maintains that taxes should be distributed according to some measure of a taxpayer’s ability to pay. Ability to pay can be measured by income, consumption and wealth to determine a taxpayer’s well-being. Taxes based on an ability to pay are appropriate in circumstances where collective benefits are provided to taxpayers. That is, they are appropriate where no clear link exists between the benefit received and the taxes paid. The ability to pay principle has two important dimensions: horizontal equity and vertical equity.

2.2.2.1 Horizontal Equity

Horizontal equity is simply the equal treatment of equals. In other words, a tax is said to be horizontally equitable if taxpayers who have the same level of well-being before the tax is imposed have the same level of well-being after it is imposed (Rosen et.al, 2003). With respect to property taxes, horizontal equity can be achieved when taxpayers with similar types of properties are treated equally; that is, the same tax rates are applied to all properties in the residential and non-residential property classes.

2.2.2.2 Vertical Equity⁵

Vertical equity, on the other hand, refers to the unequal treatment of unequal taxpayers. In other words, it determines the treatment of individuals with different levels of well-being. Vertical equity is thus achieved when taxpayers who have unequal economic abilities pay annual taxes that differ so as to achieve some collective notion of fairness (Hyman & Strick, 2001). Simply, a tax that achieves vertical equity is generally a progressive tax (e.g., federal personal income tax).

2.3 Efficiency/Neutrality

Taxes are said to be efficient or neutral when they do not require firms or individuals to alter their production, consumption, work, or savings patterns in order to comply with the tax. In other words, an efficient tax does not distort the economic decisions of firms or individuals (Boadway and Kitchen, 1999). Thus, it is desirable to impose high taxes on markets that do not respond significantly to price changes, since the imposition of the tax will be reflected in market prices. Taxes also play an important role on the level of economic growth in an economy, by either impeding investment or enhancing investment.

2.4 Ease of Administration

Compliance costs are imposed on firms and individuals in order to ensure that they comply with the tax system. Similarly, administrative costs are imposed on the public sector in administering the tax system. Obviously, the more complicated the tax or tax system, the more costly to administer. A major objective of any tax or tax system, therefore, is to ensure that compliance and administration costs are kept to a minimum.

2.5 Accountability/ Transparency/ Simplicity

A transparent and simple tax system provides taxpayers with the ability to determine if they are receiving appropriate levels of public services for the amount of taxes they pay, which will improve accountability. In addition, a transparent tax system is more difficult to evade than a more convoluted one. Transparent and visible taxes offer fewer incentives for taxpayers to avoid paying taxes, thereby reducing the administrative and compliance costs associated with the tax system (Boadway and Kitchen, 1999).

Accountability is also affected by how much of tax is exported to other jurisdictions. In other words, the greater ability to export taxes to other jurisdictions, the local tax becomes less accountable (Kitchen and Slack, 2014).⁶

2.6 Stability & Predictability

A good tax, or tax system, should provide stable and predictable revenues to help governments pay for the demand of public services and meet the ongoing costs of delivering those services. For taxpayers, it means that the tax should not result in unanticipated changes over time. Thus, stable and predictable taxes are important for ratepayers in planning their finances, and for cities in planning their budgets.

⁵ Vertical equity also classifies taxes as regressive, proportional and regressive. This paper addresses these issues briefly in Section 2.

⁶ This paper address tax exporting in the context of business property taxation in Section 4.

So how do the above criteria apply to the property tax? According to the economic literature, (Kitchen and Slack 2012; Bird and Slack, 2004; and Bird and Bahl, 2008) the best local taxes are those that have the following characteristics:

- They are based on an immobile tax base, and therefore, borne primarily by local residents (not exported);
- They do not create problems with harmonization or harmful competition between local governments or local governments and other orders of government;
- They generate sufficient, stable and predictable revenues;
- They are visible to ensure accountability and transparency; and
- They are perceived to be fair and they are easy to administer at the local level.

The residential property tax meets the above criteria better than any other tax. The non-residential property tax, conversely, does not (Kitchen and Tassonyi, 2012). The next section of this paper will address the reasons why.

3. AN OVERVIEW OF PROPERTY TAXATION

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the property tax. In particular, it addresses the objective of the property tax, how it works, what types exist, and the incidence, or who bears the burden of the property tax. This section concludes by addressing some criticisms of the property tax and attempts to determine if they can be justified.

3.2 The Objectives of the Property Tax

Local governments use property taxation as a primary source of funding for services that have been requested by their taxpayers. For example, in the City of Saskatoon's 2017 Operating Budget, the property tax accounts for 46 percent of total revenues.⁷

Thus, the major objective of the property tax is to raise revenues to help finance services provided by local governments. While the property tax is used to fund local services, public perception is that there is a direct linkage between the amount of property taxes paid and services received. Although this is true, it is important to distinguish between what types of services are funded by the property tax.

If structured correctly, the property tax should pay for those services that provide collective benefits for the residents and businesses of the community; meaning, police and fire protection, maintenance and repair of roadways and public parks, and social services. It also should help to subsidize those services that provide benefits to the individual user and collective benefits to the community, such as public transit and recreation. However, it should not fund those services that provide direct benefits to a consumer of a service (Kitchen, 2015).

3.3 The Mechanics of the Property Tax

The property tax is an ad valorem ("according to value") tax that is levied on the value of real property (including both land and structures). Because the property tax is essentially a local tax in Canada, and since local governments are under the control of the provinces, the definition of real property, the valuation process, and taxing ability varies from province to province.⁸

The value of real property is determined by the property assessment process. While property assessment and taxation are two distinct processes they have an important relationship. Assessment is the process of estimating a dollar value on a property for taxation purposes so that the property tax burden can be distributed equitably. Taxation is the process of applying a tax rate to a property's assessed value to determine the taxes payable by the owner of that property.

⁷ In Canada, property taxes were about 3.8 percent of GDP in 2015 (OECD, 2016).

⁸ In Canada, a property tax is also levied at the provincial level in order to fund education. See Section 5 of this paper for an overview of the differences among provinces and cities.

In Canada, the property tax is levied on properties that are subject to taxation.⁹ Although it is different in various provinces, properties not subject to taxation are typically federal, provincial and municipal government owned properties (buildings), places of worship, and education and higher education institutes. In lieu of paying property taxes, federal and provincial governments will provide a municipality with a “payment in lieu of taxes,” which is considered to be tax revenue, just not “property tax revenue.” Almost all properties that are exempt from taxation are non-residential properties, which, in turn, reduces the non-residential tax base.

3.4 Criticisms of the Property Tax

Despite its usefulness as a primary funding source for local governments, it is likely that no tax receives as much criticism as the property tax (especially the residential property tax).¹⁰ The criticisms are largely levelled in the following ways (Slack 2001):

- The property tax is regressive because it is perceived as affecting lower income property owners more adversely than higher income property owners (this point is addressed in more detail in subsection 3.7).
- The property tax is unfair because it is levied against capital (stock) as opposed to income or consumption (flows).
- The property tax is inadequate because it does not provide enough revenues to finance local government activities.
- The property tax doesn't grow with the economy, like income or sales taxes.
- The property tax is considered to be too high because it is billed in one single instalment, instead of being deducted at the source, like income tax. Its highly salient (or visible) nature has made the property tax an unpopular revenue source for financing local government activities.
- The way properties are valued, or assessed, for tax purposes has led to the criticism that market value assessment discourages property improvements and leads to unpredictable tax burdens in volatile property markets. The perception is, therefore, that an increase in the assessed value of the property leads to an automatic increase in the property tax burden for the property owner.¹¹

Nonetheless, the obvious question becomes: are the criticisms of the property tax justified and factual? The general consensus is no, but it depends on the type of the property tax.

With respect to the residential property tax, economists and policy analysts generally agree that it is a good revenue source to fund local government services. As one economist puts it, “the property tax is...a good local tax. It is far from perfect, but perfection in taxation is not of this

⁹ Provincial legislation will allow certain types of properties to be exempt from taxation. Typically, these are provincially and federally owned properties, churches, and universities.

¹⁰ Perhaps the Canadian Goods and Services Tax (GST) is more hated, but it is interesting to note that the most salient (visible) taxes are also the most hated. For more see Cabral & Hoxby, 2012.

¹¹ An increase in property taxes does not automatically stem from the assessment process, but the budgetary and service delivery decisions of a City (or municipal) Council. The assessment process is used to simply distribute, or redistribute in the case of reassessment, the local tax burden among property owners.

world...relative to other tax bases available to local government...the property tax gets high marks” (Oates, 2001). However, a distinction needs to be made between residential and non-residential property taxes.

3.5 The Two Sides of the Property Tax Coin: Residential and Non-Residential

In the study of local public finance, much attention is paid to how the property tax affects households or people. Moreover, local governments generally communicate property tax increases in terms of their impact on a household with an average or median assessed value, and the amount more per month that such households may pay.¹²

This is to be expected, given that the residential properties (single family homes and condominiums) comprise over 70 percent of the assessment base and 90 percent of the total amount of properties in most Canadian cities.¹³ The consensus in the economic literature is that the residential property tax is a good local tax (OECD, 2010; Slack, 2011; Dahlby, 2012; and Norregaard, 2013).

Among the reasons for this conclusion are: (a) the connection between the types of services funded at the local level and the benefit to property values¹⁴; and (b) residential property cannot be moved or hidden to avoid paying the tax. However, property taxes on residential properties only tell part of the local property tax story.

The other part of the property tax story concerns the treatment of non-residential properties (e.g., commercial and industrial) or more succinctly, “business” properties. In Canada, the United States and in most of the world, business properties face higher property tax rates than residential properties (Bird and Slack, 2004) although they receive less benefits from services.¹⁵ There are several reasons for this, but one of the most commonly cited is that residential property owners vote (Bird, Slack, and Tassonyi, 2012).

Non-residential property taxes are levied on commercial (a retail store or office building) and industrial (manufacturing plant) properties. Unlike the Corporate Income Tax (CIT), business property taxes are paid regardless if the business turned a profit or not. However, non-residential property owners businesses can deduct property taxes from their CIT filings, something that residential property owners cannot do. This sometimes justifies higher non-residential property tax rates.

¹² See, for example, the City of Saskatoon’s 2017 Preliminary Business Plan and Budget, “Shaping Our Financial Future” and supporting communications material found at <https://www.saskatoon.ca/city-hall/budget-finances/financial-reporting>

¹³ In Saskatoon, residential properties make up about 80 percent of the total taxable property assessment base, while non-residential properties account for 20 percent in 2016. This share has been relatively consistent over the last 20 years. Based on the 2017 preliminary assessment data, residential properties in Saskatoon represent slightly above 96 percent of total taxable properties.

¹⁴ For example, residential property owners benefit from the access to roads and transit, parks or green spaces, etc; thus, it can be argued that the benefits of local programs are reflected in local property values.

¹⁵ See Section 4 for more on this topic.

Nonetheless, the prevailing view in the literature is that that business property taxes are not good local taxes because (a) there is a poor link to benefits received; (b) business properties are more mobile; and thus, business investment is more responsive to tax increases; and (c) the tax can be exported to owners of capital and consumers who live in other jurisdictions (Slack, 2011; Kitchen and Slack, 2012).

As several recent studies have concluded, property taxes on commercial and industrial property increase the marginal effective tax rate on capital, discouraging investment in structures, and reducing the competitiveness of the business sector (Dahlby, 2012; Found, 2014; Found and Tomlinson 2016).

3.6 Who Pays the Property Tax?

There is a widely held perception that the property tax is a regressive tax (Calgary Sun, December 4, 2013). The allegation is that the property tax takes a greater percentage of income from low-income earners than high-income earners. However, as one study has noted, “despite a series of books and papers stretching over a period of nearly 50 years, there is nothing approaching a consensus on this issue” (Fischel, Oates, and Youngman, 2011).

This lack of consensus stems from the fact that there are three different views or theories about how the property tax interacts in the economy, or what the economic incidence of the property tax is. In other words, who bears the burden of the property tax is fundamental to its understanding. There are two prevailing theories about the incidence of the property tax.¹⁶

One view, or theory, the so called “benefit view” surmises that the property tax is simply “the payment that households make for the bundle of local public services that they have chosen to consume (Fischel, 2001; Zodrow, 2007). In this case, the incidence of the property tax is irrelevant, because the tax is equivalent to a user fee for public services. This view may be applicable to residential properties, but not for business properties (Found 2014).

Another theory, the so called “capital tax view” (or new view) argues that the property tax is predominantly shifted to the owners of capital in the economy, In other words, it is a distortionary tax that has an impact on capital investment (Gilchrist and St. Louis 1997; Dahlby, 2012; Found 2014). As such, this view holds that the property tax is a progressive tax because the economic incidence falls on consumers of capital. This helps to support claims that business property owners are sensitive to higher property taxes. The next section of this paper will explore this issue in more detail.

¹⁶ A third theory, called the “traditional view,” which no longer holds much merit, claims that the property tax is an excise tax that falls on both land and structures (Fischel, Oates, and Youngman, 2011). The tax burden is borne by local housing consumers in the form of higher housing prices. According to this view then, the property tax is considered to be regressive because housing constitutes a relatively larger share of consumption for poorer individuals. This view relies on partial equilibrium model whereby capital is assumed to be immobile (meaning non-responsive to tax changes) and it assumes that the property tax has no connection to benefits local taxpayers receive.

4. BUSINESS PROPERTY TAXES and COMPETITIVENESS

4.1 Introduction

The objective of this section is to address the issues pertaining to business property taxes and their impact on competitiveness.¹⁷ More specifically this section will address the following question: do business property taxes impact the ability of a city to attract or retain investment, improve economic activity (including employment opportunities) and ultimately, influence business location decisions? But before it does, it reviews whether or not business properties are overtaxed relative to the benefits they receive from municipal services.

4.2 Business Property Taxes and Benefits Equity

As described in Section 3, one way to measure equity is through the benefits principle, meaning that the cost burden should be linked to the benefits that taxpayers receive from the delivery of local services. Benefits equity is generally covered by charging user fees for the service, but there is a residual cost for the remaining bundle of city services that is financed by property taxes (residential and non-residential).

Over the years, studies have attempted to quantify the amount of services that businesses receive from the municipality relative to residential property owners. Their intent is to determine if businesses are overtaxed relative to the benefits they receive.

The bulk of the studies have been conducted in the United States, but a few have been done in the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario. They generally conclude that the residential sector receives proportionately more benefits from local government services than the non-residential sector. For example, and as summarized in (Kitchen and Slack, 2012):

- A review of property taxes and municipal expenditures in eight municipalities in Ontario in 1990 concluded that non-residential property taxes ranged from 28 to 51 percent of total local property taxes but accounted for only 31 to 40 percent of municipal expenditures (Kitchen & Slack, 1993).
- A study in the City of Vancouver (MMK Consulting, 2007) compared the consumption of services to taxes paid by the different property classes and concluded that the non-residential sector paid \$2.42 in taxes for each \$1 of benefit received, while the residential sector paid \$0.56 for each \$1 of benefit. The study also concluded that the non-residential share of services consumed was 24 percent of the total; the residential share was 76 percent.
- In C.D. Howe Institute Commentary (Mintz and Roberts, 2006), the authors concluded that the non-residential sector is over taxed relative to the residential sector when compared with the benefits that each of these sectors receives.

¹⁷ For the purpose of this section, “competitiveness” refers to the ability to make a jurisdiction more attractive to create wealth and enhance economic prosperity.

In addition to these studies, analysis conducted by Gilchrist and St. Louis (1997) in the Saskatoon context concluded that non-residential property taxes exceed the benefits that non-residential properties receive.

Looking at the statutory tax rates in Canada and elsewhere, there is no denying that business properties are taxed at higher rates than residential properties. Higher property taxation of commercial and industrial properties is generally done in one of three ways: (1) through assessing business properties at higher values than residential properties with the same tax rate applied to both property types (see Winnipeg); (2) through the application of higher tax rates on business properties (see Calgary and Edmonton); and (3) or both (see Saskatoon and Regina). So, is this justified?

In theory, higher taxation of business properties creates efficiency and equity concerns. Efficiency in municipal service levels will not be achieved if revenues collected from property taxes on business properties are used to subsidize services consumed by the residential sector. Equity is violated because those benefiting from the services are not paying their full costs (Kitchen & Slack, 2012).

4.3 Business Property Taxes and Competitiveness

Over the last two decades, the issues of competitiveness and business property taxes have generated a significant amount of interest from business group advocates and economists through the literature. Business group advocates have placed their focus squarely on the difference in tax rates—or the tax ratio—that cities levy on residential and non-residential properties. Their aim, naturally, focuses on reducing the tax rate differential between the two property classes, and thus, the overall tax burden for business properties.

The focus of the economic literature is broader and has generally tried to investigate whether or not local business property taxes affect competitiveness, investment and location decisions and whether or not higher business property rates are equitable (Smart, 2012; Kitchen & Slack, 2012; Found 2014). The general consensus is that high business property taxes can affect competitiveness, but the literature does not define what “high” is.

For example, the tax ratio between commercial properties and residential properties in Vancouver is 4.23 to 1 and for industrial properties it is 21.7 to 1 (based on 2016 general levy rates).¹⁸ A November 2016 report by B.C.’s Commission on Tax Competitiveness found that, “the overall level of business property taxation in B.C...does not represent a competitiveness issue or a significant impediment to economic performance.”¹⁹ They do caution however, that high property tax rates on industrial properties can have “devastating effects on unprofitable plants.”

¹⁸ Rates obtained from <http://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/tax-rates.aspx> and compares the “general purpose tax levy only.

¹⁹ See Commission on Tax Competitiveness, “Improving British Columbia’s Business Tax Competitiveness,” November 15, 2016, pg 5. Obtained from https://engage.gov.bc.ca/app/uploads/sites/76/2016/11/4637_CommissionOnTaxCompetitiveness_Final_Report_Nov-2016.pdf

That said, there have been very few studies on the relationship (or influence) of non-residential property taxes on competitiveness. The general conclusion is that the impact of non-residential property taxes depends on several factors: (1) the business cycle (e.g., economic expansion vs recession); (2) the business decision (e.g., investment vs operations); (3) the nature of the business (small vs. large multi-national); (4) access to skilled labour; and (5) access to infrastructure (Kitchen and Slack, 2012).

4.4 Business Property Taxes and Location Decisions

Businesses generally locate where they can maximize profits, so in theory, property taxes can influence a firm's location decision in the same way as any other cost of production. As noted elsewhere in this paper, property taxes on business properties increase the marginal effective tax rate on capital, thereby discouraging investment on structures and reducing the competitiveness of the business sector (Dahlby 2012; Found 2014). However, according to Slack and Kitchen (2014) there is no general agreement about the importance of property taxes in location decisions.

The available evidence—largely drawn from the United States—suggests that property tax differentials are relatively unimportant in inter-municipal or inter-regional location decisions but do play a role in intra-municipal or intra-regional location decisions (Kitchen and Slack, 2012). In other words, differences in property taxes are unlikely to play a significant role in a firm's decision whether to locate in the metropolitan areas of Vancouver, Calgary, or Toronto. They are likely to play a role, however, once a firm or business decides to locate in a certain region such as the Greater Toronto Area, Metro Vancouver or the Region around Montreal.

More recently, a very technical and comprehensive study by Found (2014), in the context of Ontario, reveals that capital investment in commercial structures and commercial property values are highly sensitive to the property tax and builds on the growing consensus that property taxes on business impose a substantial economic cost. This cost then can influence a firm's decision to locate in a particular jurisdiction. However, as Kitchen and Slack (2014) report, "stakeholders in Halifax told us that there is no concrete evidence that the tax differential between commercial and residential properties is having much impact on business location...." In other words, economic models do indicate that business property taxes can influence location decisions, however, practical or empirical analysis may suggest otherwise.

4.5 Business Property Taxes and Exporting the Burden

As this paper notes in Section 2, the ability to export a tax that is levied in one jurisdiction and paid for by taxpayers in another jurisdiction weaken accountability of the tax and may reduce equity. A good explanation of tax exporting is provided in (Kitchen and Slack, 2012): "Tax exporting refers to situations in which some portion of the local tax burden is borne by people who live elsewhere either through a change in relative commodity prices or a change in the net return to non-locally owned factors of production." The ability of businesses to export the property tax depends on what the price elasticity (meaning sensitivity to price) of the demand for the product(s) is. However, according to (Kitchen and Slack, 2012) there is very little evidence of tax exporting in Canada.

5. THE APPROACH TO BUSINESS PROPERTY TAXATION IN CANADIAN CITIES

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to compare the approaches to business property taxation in selected Canadian cities: Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina, and Winnipeg.²⁰ Before the paper addresses these approaches in more detail, it first addresses some key differences about property assessment and taxation in the various jurisdictions. This will provide necessary context that will better explain the approaches that the selected cities use for business property taxation and help to determine some policy options that will be evaluated in Section 7.

5.2 The Jurisdictional Context

In Canada, the approach to both valuing and taxing properties—both residential and business—is governed by provincial legislation. In Saskatchewan, for example, *The Cities Act* (and its attendant regulations) provides the legislative framework for valuing properties, meaning the assessment process, and sets specific minimum requirements for the taxation of property.²¹ Similar legislation frameworks exist in Alberta and Manitoba, although prescriptiveness of the legislation and flexibility that local governments have varies among the provinces.

The legislative frameworks pertaining to property assessments is very prescriptive. In other words, local governments have no autonomy with respect to how properties are valued for tax purposes. The reason for this is simply to ensure that similar properties in a province are valued in equitably, regardless of where they may be located.

However, the legislative frameworks for property taxation provides local governments with limited autonomy in that they have the ability to set their own property tax rates. Simply put, cities have very little autonomy in the property assessment process, but have more autonomy with respect to tax policy. The result is a property assessment system and property tax regime that is very difficult to compare across jurisdictions. These differences are summarized in table 1 and explained in more detail below.

²⁰ The analysis includes Regina simply because they offer a different approach than the other cities, but I agree with Gilchrist and St. Louis (1997) in that both Saskatoon and Regina “face similar commercial and industrial taxation issues and their resolution will not be found in mutual comparisons.”

²¹ For more on *The Cities Act* see, <http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/english/Statutes/Statutes/c11-1.pdf>. The Assessment Process is addressed in Part X, while the property tax requirements are addressed in Part XI.

**Table 1:
Comparing Property Assessment and Tax Requirements by Province, 2016**

Function	Saskatchewan	Alberta	Manitoba
Frequency of Assessment	4 years	Annual	2 Years
Valuation Date	January 1, two years prior to reassessment year	July 1 in the year prior to the reassessment	April 1, two years prior to reassessment year
Property Classes	*residential *multi-unit residential *seasonal residential *commercial & industrial *non-arable land and improvements *other agricultural land and improvements *railways & pipelines *grain elevators	*residential *non-residential *farm land *machinery & equipment	*residential 1 *residential 2 *residential 3 *other (refers to commercial & industrial) *farm land *designated higher education *designated recreation facilities *institutional *railways *pipelines
Percentage of Value**	*Residential 70% *Non-Residential 100%	*Residential 100% *Non-Residential 100%	*Residential 45% *Non-Residential 65%

*** Note: The residential property class for residential properties in Saskatchewan changed to 80 percent for 2017.*

5.2.1 Frequency of Assessments

In terms of property assessments, each province sets its own valuation standards. Although the general approach to property valuations across all jurisdictions is “market value” (or fair market value), the frequency of assessments, the dates at which properties are to be valued, and the property classes that are to be valued and then ultimately taxed are much different.

For example, in Alberta and British Columbia, property assessments are conducted annually. In Saskatchewan and Ontario, by contrast, they are conducted every four years. In Manitoba, they are conducted every two years.²² Provinces that have more frequent assessment cycles will have smaller assessment value variances than those with longer cycles.

²² The literature and professional assessment organizations support more frequent property assessments to ensure the fair distribution of the tax burden and to reduce significant value shifts that occur between longer assessment cycles. See, for example, the International Association of Assessing Officers and Kitchen, 2004.

5.2.2 Valuation Dates

The property valuation dates, or reference dates, are also different across provinces. In Alberta, assessment values are reflective of the value of the property on July 1 of the year prior to the assessment year, resulting in a six month lag.

In Manitoba, the valuation date is April 1, two years prior to the reassessment year. So, Manitoba's 2016 reassessment used market values of April 1, 2014.

In Saskatchewan, the valuation date is January 1, two years prior to the reassessment year. For Saskatchewan, this means for the 2017 reassessment, the valuation date is January 1, 2015.

5.2.3 Property Classes

Provinces also prescribe the property classes (and subclasses) that are to be assessed and taxed. More property classes add more complexity to the tax system. Alberta has the least complex system, with only four property classes: residential, non-residential (i.e., commercial and industrial) farm land, and machinery and equipment.

Saskatchewan has a more complicated system with eight different property classes, including: residential, multi-residential, seasonal residential, commercial and industrial, non-arable land and improvements, other agricultural land and improvements, grain elevators, and pipelines and railway right of way. To simplify for taxation purposes, Saskatoon combines all residential assessment classes into one tax class and all non-residential assessment classes into a separate tax class.

Manitoba has ten property classes making it the most complex system of the three. It lists three types of residential properties (residential 1, residential 2, and residential 3), other (which refers to commercial and industrial properties) farm land, pipelines, railways, institutional, designated higher education, designated recreational facilities, and the legislative building. It is unique that Manitoba includes its legislative building as property class.

5.2.4 Percentage of Value

The final area of divergence among the provinces pertains to a term called "percentage of value." The percentage of value simply assigns the amount of value at which a property class can be taxed. In Alberta, this is very simple and transparent: all properties (with the exception of machinery and equipment) are taxed at 100 percent of their assessed value.

In Saskatchewan, the system is less transparent. Prior to 2017, residential properties were taxed at 70 percent of their assessed value. In 2017, residential properties will be taxed at 80 percent of their assessed value. However, non-residential properties are (and have been) taxed at 100 percent of their assessed value.

In Manitoba, no property class is taxed at 100 percent of its value. Residential properties are taxed at 45 percent, while commercial properties are taxed at 65 percent of their assessed value. Other classes have varying percentages of value. The percentage of value is illustrated in Table 2:

**Table 2:
Percentages of Value for Taxation Purposes (2016)**

Jurisdiction	Residential (Percentage of Value)	Non- Residential Percentage of Value
Alberta	100	100
Saskatchewan	70	100
Manitoba	45	65

The tax policy literature supports the notion that all properties should be taxed at 100 percent of their value. This will increase tax fairness as higher valued properties will pay a greater share of taxes (Slack, 2011; Bird and Slack, 2012; Ihlanfeldt, 2013).

Given this brief contextual overview of the provincial property assessment and taxation framework, this document now turns to address the practices in selected cities.

5.3 Business Property Taxation in Selected Cities

Taking the jurisdictional differences into account on how provincial property valuation and taxation rules work, this section of the document attempts to explain: how do the selected cities tax business properties? What are the similarities and differences? Do any consensus best practices emerge?

Before this paper addresses those questions, it first provides some assumptions for the analysis, so that the comparisons between the selected cities can be as close as possible. These assumptions are as follows:

- Residential properties includes single family homes, condominiums and multi-family residential (apartments).
- Non-residential properties include all commercial and industrial properties, and any other property that is not used for the purposes of individual or household accommodations.
- Excludes Business Occupancy Taxes, such as those used in Winnipeg and Calgary to assess business property tax burdens. These function differently from the property tax.
- Excludes Provincial education property taxes and tax rates.
- Property tax rates reflect the effective tax rate. This means that the property tax rate is adjusted to account for assessment and tax policy differences. For example, in those jurisdictions that have a percentage of value less than 100 percent for a property class, the tax rate is adjusted to reflect this.
- Comparisons use 2016 tax rates and 2016 assessed values to levy the taxes.

5.3.1 Saskatoon

Saskatoon currently taxes business properties 1.75:1 times higher than residential properties. In 1998, Saskatoon City Council passed a resolution to have a targeted non-residential to residential property tax ratio. The 1.75:1 tax ratio was achieved in 2010 and has remained in place since that time (see Section 6 for more on Saskatoon's approach).

As such, based on 2016 effective tax rates non-residential properties paid \$924 per \$100,000 of assessed value, while residential properties paid \$524 per \$100,000 of assessed value in municipal property taxes.

5.3.2 Regina

The City of Regina has no targeted tax rate policy. In other words, Regina does not have a residential to non-residential property tax ratio. The City of Regina uses a revenue neutral approach which means that taxes are not shifted from one property class to another due to variable valuation changes. This means that in a reassessment year Regina maintains its tax mix of about 67 percent for residential and 33 percent for non-residential.

Based on 2016 effective tax rates, non-residential properties in Regina paid \$1,275 per \$100,000 of assessed value, while residential properties paid \$590 per \$100,000 of assessed value in municipal property taxes. As a result, Regina's 2016 non-residential to residential tax ratio was 2.16:1 in 2016.

5.3.3 Calgary

Like Regina, the City of Calgary does not have a targeted tax rate policy. In fact, Calgary's approach is essentially a budget based, or tax shares approach in that it ensures that roughly 50 percent of the property taxes collected come from residential properties and 50 percent come from residential properties. Because Calgary conducts annual property assessments, real inventory growth and market value changes can be addressed in the budget year.

Based on 2016 effective tax rates, non-residential properties paid \$1,215 per \$100,000 of assessed value, while residential properties paid \$371 per \$100,000 of assessed value in municipal property taxes. Calgary's non-residential to residential tax ratio was 3.28 in 2016.

5.3.4 Edmonton

Edmonton's approach is very similar to Calgary's in that it considers real growth, market value changes, and the budget or tax policy of the City²³. It is the combination of these factors that will ultimately determine the tax ratio. Like Calgary, Edmonton allocates any budget supported property tax increases on a 50/50 basis, meaning the total tax increase is applied equally to non-residential and residential properties.

²³ To understand how these factors work together, see The City of Edmonton, "The Way We Finance: Property Assessment and Taxation White Paper," Appendix C. Obtained from https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/TWWF_Assessment_and_Taxation_White_Paper.pdf

Based on 2016 effective tax rates, non-residential properties paid \$1,554 per \$100,000 of assessed value, while residential properties paid \$562 per \$100,000 of assessed value in municipal property taxes. Edmonton’s non-residential to residential tax ratio was 2.76 in 2016.

5.3.5 Winnipeg

Winnipeg also does not have a targeted tax rate policy. In fact, the residential and non-residential tax rates in Winnipeg are exactly the same, as required by provincial legislation, in this case the Winnipeg Charter. However, the difference lies in the fact that non-residential properties are assessed higher than residential properties, resulting in a higher effective tax rate for non-residential properties.

Based on 2016 effective tax rates, non-residential properties paid \$830 per \$100,000 of assessed value, while residential properties paid \$574 per \$100,000 of assessed value in municipal property taxes. Winnipeg’s non-residential to residential tax ratio was 1.44 in 2016.

5.4 Comparative Analysis

Table 3 summarizes the effective property tax burden for residential and non-residential properties per \$100,000 of assessment in the selected cities. As the table notes, residents and businesses in Saskatoon each face the second lowest municipal property tax burden when compared among the jurisdictions. Calgary has the lowest residential property taxes, while Winnipeg has the lowest non-residential burden.²⁴

**Table 3:
Effective Property Tax Burdens and Tax Ratio**

City	Effective Property Tax Burdens per \$100,000 of Assessed Value (2016)		
	Residential	Non-Residential	Ratio
Saskatoon	\$523.54	\$923.59	1.75
Regina	\$590.06	\$1,274.79	2.16
Calgary	\$370.99	\$1,215.45	3.28
Edmonton	\$562.47	\$1,554.35	2.76
Winnipeg	\$574.47	\$829.79	1.44

The effective tax rates adjust for the differences in percentage of value as shown in Table 2. As the table also illustrates, Winnipeg has the lowest non-residential to residential tax ratio, while Saskatoon is second.

²⁴ Winnipeg also has a Business Occupancy Tax, which the C.D. Howe study includes in their analysis to demonstrate a higher Marginal Effective Tax Rate (METR). Manitoba’s Education Property Taxes also contribute to a higher METR for Winnipeg.

Table 4 offers a comparison of the property taxes collected and the share of taxable assessment for the residential and non-residential property tax classes in each city. Winnipeg and Saskatoon rely the most on residential property taxes to fund their budgets. Edmonton and Calgary each split the budgetary property tax requirements evenly across the residential and non-residential property classes.

However, when it comes to the share of taxable assessment, all cities, with the exception of Winnipeg, show a 75/25 residential to non-residential split. In other words, in all cities except Winnipeg, non-residential properties make up about a quarter of the total taxable assessment.

**Table 4:
Share of Taxes vs Share of Taxable Assessment**

City	Share (%) of Total Property Taxes Collected for Budget (2016)		Share (%) of Taxable Assessment 2016	
	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential
Saskatoon	71	29	75	25
Regina	65	35	75	25
Calgary	48	52	75	25
Edmonton	51	49	75	25
Winnipeg	73	27	80	20

A few observations emerge from the preceding analysis. The first and obvious point to note is that cities utilize different approaches when it comes to levying business property taxes. For example, Saskatoon is the only City that has a targeted non-residential to residential tax ratio. The local property tax policies are thus, generally reflective of the community values and the mix of tax supported services that such cities deliver.

Second, the cities of Calgary and Edmonton generally follow a similar approach, but have no set tax ratio. In Winnipeg, the tax rates are uniform across all types of property classes, but the taxable amount changes. It is rather ironic that Winnipeg has the lowest non-residential to residential property tax ratio and yet it does not have an explicit targeted tax ratio policy and applies a uniform tax rate to all properties. Only the effective tax rate changes because of the percentage of value.

Third, the relationship between taxable assessment and property taxes paid by property class is the strongest in Saskatoon and the weakest in Calgary. In other words, the total property tax burden for non-residential properties in Saskatoon is closely related to its total taxable assessed value.

Finally, differences in approaches to assessment and property taxation result because provinces set different standards with respect to property valuations and provide cities with a certain degree of autonomy to implement their own tax policies, provided they meet the minimum standards as set out in legislation (or regulations). As a result, it is very difficult to perform standard comparisons to determine whether one approach or system is better than any other. That said, this paper now turns to address assessment value changes over time.

As the preceding analysis has highlighted and noted, there are several differences between provincial legislative and regulatory frameworks for valuing properties for taxation purposes. Similarly, these frameworks also differ significantly from one jurisdiction to the next with respect to local tax policy. While some such as Alberta provide greater autonomy to their municipalities with respect to local tax policy, others such as Manitoba, are more restrictive. This makes property assessment and tax comparisons between jurisdictions extremely difficult, unless of course, one employs sophisticated econometric models (Found 2014).

While it goes beyond the scope of this paper to undertake such a modelling exercise, there is a way to generally compare property assessment data by looking at per capita property value changes over time. In other words, how has the tax base of the city changed over time relative to population changes?

Tables 5 - 7 show the per capita taxable assessment value for the five cities in 2006 and 2016, and the change in value over the ten year period.²⁵ As Table 7 shows, Saskatoon's residential property values grew by over \$48,000 per person, while the value of non-residential properties grew by over \$16,000 per person.

**Table 5:
Taxable Assessment Per-Capita Value (2006)**

City	Residential	Non-Residential	Total
Calgary	\$82,227	\$22,793	\$105,032
Edmonton	\$67,873	\$21,107	\$88,980
Saskatoon	\$29,656	\$9,908	\$39,563
Regina	\$25,486	\$8,431	\$33,916
Winnipeg	\$35,509	\$11,209	\$46,718

**Table 6:
Taxable Assessment Per-Capita Value (2016)**

City	Residential	Non-Residential	Total
Calgary	\$170,176	\$57,004	\$227,182
Edmonton	\$136,581	\$46,493	\$183,074
Saskatoon	\$78,151	\$26,240	\$104,391
Regina	\$71,136	\$23,114	\$94,250
Winnipeg	\$92,469	\$22,672	\$115,141

**Table 7:
Taxable Assessment Per-Capita Value Change (2016)**

City	Residential	Non-Residential	Total
Calgary	\$87,950	\$34,211	\$122,150
Edmonton	\$68,709	\$25,385	\$94,094
Saskatoon	\$48,495	\$16,332	\$64,827
Regina	\$45,650	\$14,683	\$60,333
Winnipeg	\$56,960	\$11,463	\$68,423

²⁵ The analysis uses taxable assessment data only from each of the five cities, meaning that it excludes properties that are exempt from taxation. Values are nominal. Population is based on the Census of Canada for each Census subdivision. Values do not include 2017 assessment data.

Table 8 illustrates these value changes in percentage terms. As the table shows, Regina and Saskatoon saw the largest per capita growth in assessed values for residential and non-residential properties. In percentage terms, non-residential assessment values grew the slowest in Winnipeg.

**Table 8:
Taxable Assessment Per-Capita Percentage Change (2016 - 2006)**

City	Residential	Non-Residential	Total
Calgary	76.4	93.4	79.9
Edmonton	89.0	89.8	88.0
Saskatoon	125.1	129.4	126.2
Regina	135.2	132.3	134.2
Winnipeg	118.4	80.7	109.6

Based on the data in Tables 6 and 7, a lower non-residential to residential tax ratio may have some role to play in the per capita growth in non-residential assessment values. However, given that Winnipeg has the lowest municipal effective tax rate ratio at 1.44:1, and Regina’s is higher than Saskatoon’s at 2.16:1, the correlation between municipal tax policy and non-residential property investment does not appear strong.

This suggests that business investment is combination of other factors as noted in Section 4, such as: (a) the business cycle; and (b) the total tax and fiscal environment. Again, however, it does not mean that the tax ratio is not a factor, as this paper has made the case that high business property taxes do have an impact on capital investment, it just means the analysis cannot prove causation.

Given this analysis, what are some possible policy options (or approaches) that cities use for local tax policy? The next section explores those options and reviews their relative merits.

6. BUSINESS PROPERTY TAX POLICY OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of three general policy approaches (or options) that may be considered for implementation in Saskatoon. These three approaches are as follows:

- (1) targeted tax ratio approach;
- (2) revenue neutral approach; and
- (3) tax share or (budget based) approach.

To some degree, each of these options exist in the five cities that are included in this analysis and are generally used by most cities in Canada.

Thus in order to provide an appropriate analysis of each option, this section will:

- (a) describe the purpose and intent of each option;
- (b) illustrate the property tax implications each option may have on both residential and non-residential property owners; and
- (c) evaluate each option according to the criteria laid out in Section 2. This evaluation provides the advantages and disadvantages of each option as it relates to that criteria and other noteworthy metrics.

6.2 Assumptions

In terms of the subsequent analysis on property tax options and their implications, two assumptions are worth noting:

- (1) the tax implications of each option do include the approved 2017 property tax increase that supports the City of Saskatoon's 2017 Business Plan and Budget; and
- (2) the options utilize the term revenue neutral tax burden, meaning that the tax burden does not change relative to the market value assessments of 2017.

6.3 Options & Approaches

Option 1: The Targeted Tax Ratio Approach

This option proposes to maintain the City of Saskatoon's approach of having a targeted (or pegged) non-residential to residential property tax ratio. The City's existing ratio, as described earlier in the report, is set at 1.75 to 1, meaning the non-residential property tax rate is 1.75 times higher than the residential property tax rate. As Section 5 of this paper notes, no other City included in the analysis uses this approach. Their property tax ratios are the result of other factors, which this paper addresses in Option 3.

However, this option does not mean that the City must maintain the existing ratio, even though research by the C.D. Howe Institute (2016) reveals that Saskatoon has the most competitive tax regime for capital investment. City Council can choose any ratio it desires. The ratio options and their potential impacts are included in Table 5 in Section 6.5.

Once the 2017 reassessment revenue neutral tax rate is applied, maintaining the existing 1.75 ratio would result in a tax reduction for residential properties of 5.2 percent and a tax increase of 12.6 percent for non-residential properties.

If the status quo ratio of 1.75 is maintained, then the total property taxes collected from the non-residential sector will increase to 33 percent of all property taxes collected from the current 29 percent. The share of property taxes collected from residential sector would fall to 67 percent from the current 71 percent. Again, Table 5 shows the implications for various ratio scenarios (see Section 6.5).

Advantages:

- Maintains a long established existing policy that is easy to administer.
- Sends clear signal and certainty to investors about the tax rate.
- Tax rate is simple and transparent.
- Depending on the ratio, may not distort market decisions.
- Depending on the ratio, could achieve horizontal equity.

Disadvantages:

- Depending on the ratio could increase tax burden on non-residential properties, relative to 2016.
- Depending on the size of the ratio, may result in lower investment/profitability for some business properties.
- Holding a tax ratio consistent reduces ability to distribute tax revenue equally from all classes of property.

Option 2: Revenue Neutral Approach

This option proposes to let market forces dictate the tax ratio. More precisely, this option would allow the assessment valuation changes determine the tax ratio, so that the tax change is revenue neutral. This is the approach Regina uses.

Under this option, the only tax increase to either property class would result from the budget process. A primary challenge with this option is to maintain the revenue neutral ratio in non-reassessment years, as property values do not change in non-assessment years, other than with the growth in inventory.

According to the 2017 reassessment, the revenue neutral option would see a reduction in the non-residential to residential property tax ratio from the existing 1.75:1 to 1.47:1. The reason for the fall in the ratio is because the values of non-residential properties grew at a higher rate than residential properties since the last reassessment in 2013.

Although the tax ratio would fall, the total property taxes collected from each sector would remain at 71 percent for residential properties and 29 percent for non-residential properties. In other words, the property tax burden would remain the same.

Advantages:

- Maintains the property tax burden for both property classes.
- Achieves reasonable sense of equity, in that no additional burden is placed on either property class through the assessment process.
- Market forces determine the tax ratio, so tax policy limits distortions.
- May result in additional investment.

Disadvantages:

- Results in change to existing policy (assuming the existing policy is the appropriate one).
- Does not provide certainty to investors about the potential tax rate as revenue neutrality is a function of inventory growth and market value changes.
- Does not reduce residential tax burden.

Option 3: The Tax Shares (or Budget) Approach

This option proposes no targeted tax ratio, but allows the budget process to determine the tax implications for non-residential and residential properties. This option follows the approaches used in Edmonton and Calgary and works optimally under a system that has more frequent property assessments.

In this case, the tax ratio would be the result of three factors: market values, inventory growth, and budgetary requirements. For this option to work, the City of Saskatoon would need to establish how much of the property tax is allocated to residential properties and non-residential properties for budgetary purposes.

To illustrate, let's assume that the City needs to collect an additional \$10 million in property taxes to balance its operating budget. Let's also assume that the City wants to fill that gap by requiring the residential sector to pay \$5 million and the non-residential sector to pay \$5 million. In other words, the annual property tax budget requirement is split equally between the residential and non-residential property classes.

The tax ratio is then the outcome of this process. Over a period of time, the tax mix differential between the residential and non-residential properties would become more evenly split, instead of the 70/30 split that currently exists in Saskatoon. If this approach is implemented in 2017, then Saskatoon's tax mix would see a gradual shift to a 50/50 split.

Under this option, the 4.2 percent tax increase for 2017 (includes City & Library taxes) would be split equally between the residential and non-residential properties classes. However, the increase to each class would be different due to the percentage of taxable assessment in each class. For example, the residential tax class would see a 2.9 percent tax increase, while the non-residential would increase by 7.1 percent.

Advantages:

- Reduces the property tax burden for residential properties.
- Distributes tax burden equally among all property classes.
- Easy to administer.
- Provides stable and predictable revenues.

Disadvantages:

- Results in change to existing policy (assuming the existing policy is the appropriate one).
- Violates equity as it increases the non-residential tax burden over time and has no relationship to its share of taxable assessment.
- May reduce accountability and transparency of tax policy, especially with respect to business properties.

6.4 Evaluation of Options/Approaches

The previous subsection offered three general tax policy approaches that are used by various cities in Western Canada. At one end of the spectrum is a targeted tax ratio approach and at the other end is targeted tax share approach. In the middle is the revenue neutral approach. The revenue neutral approach, as used by Regina, is essentially a hybrid of revenue neutral tax policy and a targeted tax share approach. Despite its use in Regina, the revenue neutral approach is not covered in the literature, but the tax ratio approach and the tax share approach are. As such, this section dismisses the revenue neutral approach and reviews some conclusions in the literature on the other two approaches.

6.4.1 Tax Share Approach

In 2014, the City of Vancouver's Property Tax Policy Review Commission (City of Vancouver, 2014) released a report that, among things, addressed the debate over the tax ratio approach and the tax share approach. At the time, the City of Vancouver used—and still uses—the tax share approach to allocate its municipal tax burden among property classes.²⁶ This is the same approach used in Calgary and Edmonton.

In distributing the City's local tax burden, Vancouver implements equal tax increases to residential and business tax classes. Moreover, Vancouver's business to residential tax ratio at that time was 4.32:1. However, the Commission had no major concerns over this approach and stated that, "the Commission does not believe that there is a compelling case for a further shift in the municipal tax burden from Class 6 (business) to Class 1 (residential) at this point in time." (City of Vancouver, 2014). At the time, the total tax share from business properties was 43 percent and residential properties was 57 percent.²⁷

Nonetheless, on the tax ratio approach, the Commission states that it is: "one of the legitimate ways to view equity and to allocate the tax burden across types of property...the share of taxes collected from each class of property will change in response to market changes in property assessments." The tax ratio approach is often cited as a key factor in influencing business location decisions and capital investment (Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce, 2012).

However, despite Vancouver's high business to residential tax rate ratio—at least relative to Saskatoon's—the Commission concluded that it, "finds no evidence of an increasing business tax differential, or of business investment leaving to other municipalities in Metro. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that the City leave the tax shares unchanged at this time" (City of Vancouver, 2014).

However, an earlier report seems to contradict the conclusion reached by the Vancouver Commission. In a 1997 report for Saskatoon business groups, Gilchrist and St. Louis

²⁶ This approach is actually used by most BC municipalities.

²⁷ The Commission also did not recommend an appropriate share of taxes from each sector. But if the goal is an equal allocation of the tax burden, over time, the total tax share would equal 50/50.

conclude the tax share approach violates equity and is contrary to competitiveness and efficiency goals. As they state: “to predetermine a business share, or to insist on the continuation of an historical share, is indefensible on equity grounds. It insists on a levy that is insensitive to the relative size of the business sector.” (Gilchrist and St. Louis, 1997 page 26).

It might be useful to illustrate how a tax share approach affects the property tax ratio. Under a tax share approach, the tax ratio is the outcome and will fluctuate from year to year. Charts 1 and 2 illustrate the effects of this approach as it pertains to the City of Calgary. As Chart 1 shows, historically, Calgary’s total property taxes are split almost equally among the residential and non-residential property classes.²⁸





Chart 2 illustrates how this approach affects the non-residential to residential tax ratio in Calgary. As the chart shows, the ratio fluctuates from year to year.



²⁸ The deviation from 50 percent is because of real inventory and market value growth in those years. In years of higher non-residential growth, the tax share of non-residential properties would increase.

6.4.2 Tax Ratio Approach

As noted in Section 5, the tax ratio approach is used in Saskatoon, but in no other cities in Western Canada. However, looking beyond western Canada, there is evidence of provincial jurisdictions mandating a tax ratio approach:

- In Ontario, all municipalities must adopt a bylaw that sets the tax ratios for each class of property. All property tax rates are compared to the residential tax rate. The Province has set “allowable ranges of fairness” for tax ratios.
- The City of Toronto has committed to lower its non-residential to residential tax ratio to 2.5:1.
- In New Brunswick, municipalities set a rate on residential property and the rate on non-residential property must be 1.5 times the rate on residential property.
- In Alberta, proposed changes to the province’s *Municipal Government Act* would set the non-residential to residential tax ratio to 5:1.

As the above points illustrate, the tax ratio approaches used, or proposed, in various jurisdictions have large variations. In fact, other than the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce (2012) and the Canada West Foundation (2010), the literature does not recommend a specific tax ratio between non-residential and residential properties.

For example, in a 2014 report on Nova Scotia’s property tax and assessment system, Kitchen and Slack (page 69) state: “Unfortunately, there is no single means of determining the appropriate tax rate ratio for business relative to residential properties.” They make two additional points worth mentioning: (1) they were not able to obtain empirical evidence of businesses leaving the province because of property taxes; and (2) they are unable to make a recommendation on the appropriate ratio because the setting of tax rates and ratios requires judgement by decision makers.


Kitchen and Slack’s arguments were bolstered recently by a report from the B.C. Commission on Tax Competitiveness (November 2016). Despite the fact that tax ratios for some property classes (e.g., industrial) are 20 times higher than residential properties, the Commission could not recommend a specific tax ratio. They concluded that a specific tax ratio substantially reduces the fiscal flexibility of local governments.²⁹

It appears that the tax share approach is used in those jurisdictions that have more frequent—meaning annual—property assessments (e.g., Edmonton, Calgary, and Vancouver). The tax ratio approach appears to be used in jurisdictions that have less frequent assessment cycles (e.g., Saskatoon and Toronto) although New Brunswick is in violation of this.


²⁹ They did caution, however, that excessive property taxes on major industrial and/or utilities properties creates investment uncertainty and competitiveness concerns about what the future level of property tax will be.

Nonetheless, the major benefit to the tax ratio approach is that it does provide certainty to investors about what the potential tax implications will be for new investments. However, there is no optimal tax ratio. On the other hand, the tax ratio approach can reduce a city's fiscal flexibility.

It might be useful to illustrate how a tax ratio approach affects the property tax share. Under a tax ratio approach, the tax share is the outcome and does not change from year to year. Charts 3 and 4 illustrate the effects of this approach as it pertains to the City of Saskatoon. As Chart 3 shows, since 2010, Saskatoon's non-residential to residential property tax ratio has been 1.75:1.



As Chart 4, shows, the fixed tax ratio has resulted in a fixed tax share for non-residential and residential property classes at 29 percent and 71 percent of total property classes respectively.



6.5 Implications of Options/ Approaches

The options and approaches described in subsection 6.3 can have various tax policy implications for residential and non-residential properties. Table 9 shows the implications that four different tax ratio options would produce both in terms of their impacts on residential and non-residential properties and the City of Saskatoon's non-residential and residential property tax mix. It also shows what the implications would be for revenue neutral approach and the tax share approach.

**Table 9:
Implications of Options/Approaches**

Options 1, 2 & 3	% Impact Residential			% Impact Non-Residential			%Tax Mix Result	
	Shift	Tax*	Total	Shift	Tax*	Total	Res	Non-Res
(1) Targeted Tax Ratio								
a) Maintain Ratio @ 1.75	-5.2	4.2	-1.0	12.6	4.2	16.8	67.2	32.8
b) Reduce Ratio to 1.43	0.9	4.2	5.1	-2.0	4.2	2.2	71.5	28.5
c) Reduce Ratio to 1.37	2.1	4.2	6.4	-5.0	4.2	-0.8	72.3	27.7
d) Increase Ratio to 2.0	-9.5	4.2	-5.3	23.0	4.2	27.2	64.2	35.8
(2) Revenue Neutral								
Ratio is 1.47	0.0	4.2	4.2	0.0	4.2	4.2	70.8	29.2
(3) Tax Share (budget)								
a) 50/50 Tax Share	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0	7.1	7.1	70.2	29.8
b) 60/40 Tax Share	0.0	3.5	3.5	0.0	5.7	5.7	70.6	29.4
c) 65/35 Tax Share	0.0	3.8	3.8	0.0	5.0	5.0	70.8	29.2

*Includes City and Library tax increases for 2017.

Under Option 1, there are various tax ratio scenarios that range from reducing the tax ratio to 1.37:1 and raising it to 2:1. The 1.37 tax ratio scenario follows the principle of horizontal equity and income tax deductibility that was used to originally set the City of Saskatoon's tax ratio policy back in 1998. On the other end, increasing the ratio to 2:1 follows recommended approaches in other jurisdictions.³⁰

At this point, it may be useful to explore Saskatoon's approach in more detail. The original intent of the City of Saskatoon's property tax ratio policy was to achieve (horizontal) equity among residential and non-residential properties of similar assessed values (Saskatoon Tax Policy Review Committee, 1997). This was achieved by estimating the amount of property taxes that a business could deduct for income tax purposes. Canada's *Income Tax Act* allows businesses to deduct property taxes as an expense for the purposes of filing their corporate income tax (CIT) returns in a given year.

In Canada, CITs are levied by both federal and provincial governments on the net profits (before taxes) of a business. The federal and provincial governments each establish their own CIT rates and different rates are applied to different types of business. In Saskatchewan, for

³⁰ Business stakeholders in BC have recommended a 2:1 non-residential to residential tax ratio (City of Vancouver Property Tax Commission, 2014).

example, a small business (meaning income up to \$500,000 per year) would face a combined federal and provincial tax rate of 12.5 percent (10 percent federal rate and 2.5 percent provincial rate) in 2017. However, larger corporations (income thresholds above \$500,000 per year) in Saskatchewan face a higher combined income tax rate of 27 percent in 2017 (15 percent federal rate and 12 percent provincial rate).³¹

Since 1997, federal and provincial governments have taken steps to reduce CITs.³² For example the combined general corporate income tax rate in Saskatchewan was approximately 43 percent in 1997. In 2010, it was 30 percent and, as noted, in 2017 it is 27 percent. Lower CIT rates also reduce the amount of property tax expenses that businesses are able to deduct for income tax purposes.

Table 10 illustrates how the CIT rate changes affect the business property tax liability and thus, can influence property tax equity. It suggests that business property taxes should be levied at a higher rate than residential properties.

**Table 10:
Property Tax Equity and Corporate Income Tax Deduction**

	2017		2010		1997	
	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential	Residential	Non-Residential
Taxable Property Value	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Property Tax Liability	\$1,500	\$2,055	\$1,500	\$2,143	\$1,500	\$2,632
CIT Deduction Allowance (%)	0	27%	0	30%	0	43%
CIT Deduction Amount (\$)	0	\$554.85	0	\$643	0	\$1,132
Net Tax Liability	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
Property Tax Ratio	1	1.37	1	1.43	1	1.75

Returning to the options in Table 9, the least harmful option in terms of the tax shift and budgetary tax implications for both non-residential and residential properties is Option 2, the revenue neutral approach. However, the shortcoming of the revenue neutral approach is that it is not very useful in non-assessment years in maintaining a consistent tax ratio or tax share.

Under Option 3, there are three possible tax share scenarios. These scenarios allocate the budgetary property tax increase by: (a) 50 percent share from each property class; (b) a 60 percent share from the residential property tax class and a 40 percent share from the non-

³¹ This is known as the “General Corporation” Income Tax rate applied to active business income. It is the rate that has been used by Saskatoon’s Tax Policy Review Committee in recommending the 1.75 property tax ratio and further advance by the Canada West Foundation and Saskatoon Business Groups to arrive at the 1.43 property tax ratio. (Canada West Foundation, 2010).

³² Economic research concludes that higher CIT’s (and raising CIT rates) are harmful to the economy because capital investment is highly mobile. See, (BC Tax Competitiveness Commission, 2016).

residential property tax class; and (c) a 65 percent share from the residential property class and a 35 percent share from the non-residential property class. If any of these scenarios are implemented, it would likely take over 50 years before the City's total tax mix would equal any of these shares.³³

That said and given the City of Saskatoon's original tax ratio approach, one equitable possibility might be to implement the revenue neutral approach in 2017 and then phase-in a targeted tax ratio, such as the 1.37 scenario, over time—say to the next reassessment cycle in 2020. This would mean that over four years it would add 0.5 percent per year to the residential tax class per year. On the other hand, the non-residential class would see a reduction of 1.2 percent per year for each of the four years.

³³ The timeframes are based on the assumptions of a four percent annual property tax budget increase and 2 percent growth in property inventory.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The primary focus of this paper is to provide a comprehensive overview of business property taxation issues in selected Canadian cities. Given that context, a secondary objective is to help educate and inform decision makers about the complex issues on business property taxation. It does so by integrating theoretical frameworks in the economic literature with practical analysis of how selected cities approach the issue of business property taxation.

As section one of this paper details, Saskatoon has a storied history with respect to business property taxation. It is one of the only cities in Canada with a targeted non-residential to residential tax ratio. Section 1 also revealed that the tax ratio of 1.75:1 was the result of integrating income tax deductibility and (horizontal) equity. The low ratio was credited as helping to reduce Saskatoon's marginal effective tax rate on commercial and industrial investment. Despite having one of the lowest tax ratios in Canada for a city of Saskatoon's size, there have been calls to reduce this ratio to even lower levels.

Hence, a fundamental question that emerges is: if Saskatoon already has the most competitive business tax regime for capital investment, then should the City's non-residential to residential tax ratio be lowered further?

- If the answer is yes, then: (a) What is the appropriate ratio? (b) Is there evidence to suggest that a lower tax ratio is a catalyst to additional business investment?
- If the answer is no, then (a) Is there a "better" alternative? and (b) Will maintaining or even increasing the tax ratio result in reduced commercial and industrial investment?

Moreover, does the original principle of (horizontal) equity and tax deductibility still resonate? Should Saskatoon City Council continue to uphold this principle?

In attempting to answer these questions, this paper had to first set the stage by reviewing some fundamental criteria with respect to evaluating tax policies. As Section 2 reveals, while it may be impossible for any tax system to meet all of the criteria in establishing a good tax system, it is important to have some standard of measure so that a determination can be made on the efficacy of various property tax policy options that can be implemented.

In Section 3, the paper provides a review of the property taxation, including how it works, what types exist, the criticism (and adulation) of it, and the incidence, or who pays the burden of the property tax. On the last point, we fundamentally agree that the residential property tax is generally consistent with the "benefit view" and the non-residential property tax is consistent with the "capital view", indicating that the tax burden is generally borne by owners of capital.

In Section 4, the paper turns to focus more exclusively on business property taxation. In this section the objective is to determine the nature and extent to which the business property taxes help or hinder competitiveness. The section reveals:

- On the basis of benefits received, the empirical evidence in Canada suggests that the non-residential sector is over taxed relative to the residential sector. This over-taxation is potentially harmful if it reduces the level of economic activity.

- Studies suggest that the impact of property taxes on business competitiveness depends on a number of factors – the nature of the business decision (investment in new facilities, on-going operations, etc.), the business in question, plus other factors. More specifically, property taxes on business properties are not a concern unless the firm is in financial distress and the tax is a large component of its fixed cost.
- The literature, almost all of it based on U.S. studies, suggests that property tax differentials are relatively unimportant in inter-municipal or inter-regional location decisions but do play a role in intra-municipal or intra-regional location decisions. Two Canadian studies on tax competition find no evidence of harmful competition for capital and that neighboring jurisdictions show more similarity in their tax policies than non-neighboring jurisdictions.

Section 5 provides a comprehensive overview of the approaches to business property taxation in selected Canadian cities. It reveals that given the differences in provincial property assessment and taxation legislation, it is very difficult to measure outcomes across jurisdictions without making several adjustments. Nevertheless, the section reveals that Saskatoon is the only City that uses a targeted tax ratio approach. Most other cities utilize a tax share approach.

Over the last two assessment cycles, there is no denying that Saskatoon's non-residential property assessment base has grown considerably. But so too have they in Calgary, Edmonton, and Regina, where they have higher tax ratios as a result of utilizing different approaches to business taxation.

Although there may be a correlation between a lower tax ratio and increased business assessment, there is no way to prove causation. In other words, correlation should not imply causation. On the other hand, there is no denying that the tax ratio approach has been helpful in reducing the marginal effective tax rate for business investment.

Section 6 utilizes the information in Section 5 to generate policy options for consideration. This section provides three policy options or approaches for deliberation: (1) targeted tax ratio approach; (2) revenue neutral approach; and (3) tax share (or budget) approach. This section also uses the information in sections one through four to evaluate the policy approaches. As a result, two possible approaches emerge: the tax ratio approach and the tax share approach.

In some ways, the two approaches are inversely related. Under the tax ratio approach, the tax share is the outcome. Under the tax share approach the tax ratio is the outcome. So the question is what is more important?

Well, the evidence suggests that equity can be achieved under both approaches. It can be argued that the tax ratio approach provides transparency, accountability to business investors as the tax rate is essentially fixed, while the tax share approach provides more fiscal flexibility and generally limits the tax impact to residential property owners.

However, as Kitchen and Slack (2014) argue:

Ultimately, the task of setting tax rates and ratios requires judgement on the part of decision-makers. Local governments should monitor tax changes in their municipality and neighbouring municipalities as well as the attractiveness of their municipality for business investment. This information should help to determine whether tax ratios need to be changed, keeping in mind that a lower commercial tax rate will be borne by higher residential tax rates”

In order to determine the efficacy of whatever tax policy approach the City of Saskatoon chooses, consideration should be given to providing a more quantitative analysis to measure whether the policy is actually producing the intended outcome. One way this could occur is through the development of key metrics.

In its 2014 report, the Vancouver Tax Policy Commission revealed eight metrics to help Council monitor the property tax situation for the commercial sector, and the attractiveness of Vancouver for business investment, relative to other parts of the region. These metrics are grouped as follows:

- Five metrics compare the commercial property tax situation in Vancouver to that of neighbouring municipalities – tax share, tax rates, tax per square foot, taxes per capita, and the tax rate ratio.
- The final three metrics gauge the ability of the city to retain and attract business investment relative to its neighbours (change in building permits, change in assessment, and change in vacancy rates).

The metrics need not be prescriptive, but could allow for more objectivity in determining whether or not Saskatoon’s tax policy approach is appropriate under various economic conditions (e.g., downturn vs. expansion).

Although this paper does not address the issue of property tax business incentives—meaning tax abatements—it does so here briefly. If a low tax ratio is the key driver, as some suggest, for business investment and attraction, and perhaps business location decisions, then there is little need for a general business incentive, or tax abatement policy. Tax abatements can be useful to further some social policy goals or address market failures (e.g., incentivizing a downtown grocery store) but the general consensus in the literature is that property tax incentives are not an effective strategy to encourage economic growth (Kitchen & Slack, 2014).

Thus, if City Council decides to opt for a lower tax ratio, then the tax ratio in and of itself should send a strong enough policy signal to business investors that the City would no longer need any general business incentive policies (i.e., tax abatements) that are given to specific firms rather than to all firms. As such, consideration should be given to reviewing the suite of tax incentives the City offers, as this would allow policy makers to “concentrate more on the issues of general tax policy for all firms (such as equity and efficiency) than on tax incentives for specific firms” (Kitchen and Slack, 2012).

REFERENCES

- Bartik, Timothy (1991), *Who Benefits from State and Local Economic Development Policies?* Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute.
- Bartik, Timothy (1992), The Effects of State and Local Taxes on Economic Development: A Review of Recent Research. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 6(1), pp. 102-110.
- Bird, Richard M. (2012) "A Better Local Business Tax: The BVT," *IMFG Papers of Municipal Finance*, No. 18 (Toronto: Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto).
- Bird, Richard M. and Roy Bahl (2008), "Subnational Taxes in developing Countries: the Way Forward", *Institute for International Business Paper No. 16* (Toronto: Joseph L. Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto).
- Bird, Richard M., Enid Slack, and Almos Tassonyi (2012), *A Tale of Two Property Taxes: Property Tax Reform in Ontario*, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Mass,US.
- Boadway, Robin W. and Harry Kitchen (1999) *Canadian Tax Policy*, third edition (Toronto: Canadian Tax Foundation).
- British Columbia, Commission on Tax Competitiveness, "Improving British Columbia's Business Tax Competitiveness," November 15, 2016.
- Cabral, Marika and Caroline Hoxby, "The Hated Property Tax: Salience, Tax Rates, and Tax Revolts *35–37" (National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No 18514, November 2012).
- CBC News Saskatoon "City council moves tax ratio decision to 2017," October 22, 2013, obtained from, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/city-council-moves-tax-ratio-decision-to-2017-1.2134779>
- CFIB (Canadian Federation of Independent Business) (2011) *The Municipal Property Tax Gap: Small Business Still Feeling the Squeeze in BC*.
- City of Edmonton, "The Way We Finance, Property Assessment and Taxation White Paper," March, 2016. Obtained from: https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/TWWF_Assessment_and_Taxation_White_Paper.pdf
- City of Saskatoon, "Tax Review Committee Report," December 1997.
- City of Vancouver (2014) *Report of the Property Tax Policy Review Commission*.
- Dahlby, Bev (2012) "Reforming the Tax Mix in Canada." SPP Research Papers, The School of Public Policy, University of Calgary, Vol. 5, Issue 14.

- Dahlby, Bev. & Egrete Ferede, (2011). *What Does it Cost Society to Raise a Dollar of Tax Revenue*, (Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute).
- Dave Dormer, "Calgary Mayor Naheed Nenshi Pitches Shift on Business Tax Collection", *Calgary Sun*, December 4, 2013.
- Fischel, William, (2001) "Municipal Corporations, Homeowners, and the Benefit View of the Property Tax," *National Tax Journal* 54(1): 157–173.
- Fischel, William, Wallace Oates, and Joan Youngman, "Are Local Property Taxes Regressive, Progressive or What? July, 2011.
- Found, Adam (2014). *Essays in Municipal Finance*, Toronto: Ph.D Thesis. University of Toronto.
- Found Adam and Peter Tomlinson, "Business Tax Burdens in Canada's Major Cities: The 2016 Report Card," *E-Brief*, C.D. Howe Institute, December 13, 2016.
- Found Adam and Peter Tomlinson, "Hiding in Plain Sight: the Harmful Impact of Provincial Business Property Taxes," *Commentary No*, 368, December 2012.
- Gilchrist, Donald A., and Larry V. St. Louis, "The Business and Property Tax in Saskatoon," June 25, 1997. Obtained from:
<https://www.saskatoonchamber.com/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Research%20Papers/2002%20and%20Earlier/Business%20and%20Property%20Tax%20in%20Saskatoon%201998.pdf>.
- Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce, "City of Saskatoon Property Tax Policy Submission," December 2012.
- Hyman, D. and J. Strick (2001), *Public Finance in Canada*, Harcourt, (2nd Cdn edition)
- Ihlanfeldt, Keith R. (2013), "The Property Tax is a Bad Tax, but It Need Not Be," in *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, Volume 15, Number 1.
- Kitchen, Harry (2003), CEPRA II Project, AUCC "Property Taxation: Issues in Implementation".
- Kitchen, Harry and Enid Slack (2014) "Municipal Property Taxation in Nova Scotia."
- Kitchen, Harry and Enid Slack (2012) "Property Taxes and Competitiveness in British Columbia", a report prepared for the BC Expert Panel on Business Tax Competitiveness, available at
www.fin.gov.bc.ca/docs/expert_panel_submissions/Business%20Property%20TaxCompetitiveness%20Report.pdf.
- Kitchen, Harry M. and Enid Slack (1993) *Business Property Taxation, Government and Competitiveness Project Discussion Paper no. 93-24* (Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University, School of Policy).
- Kitchen, Harry and Almos Tassonyi (2012) "Municipal taxes and user fees", in Heather Kerr, Ken McKenzie and Jack Mintz (eds.), *Tax Policy in Canada*, Canadian Tax Foundation, Toronto, Ch. 9.

- MacPherson, Alex (a), "Business advocates renew pledge for lower commercial property taxes" in Saskatoon StarPhoenix, September 29, 2016. Obtained from <http://thestarphoenix.com/business/local-business/north-saskatoon-business-association-blasts-clark-on-business-tax-ratio>
- MacPherson, Alex (b), "North Saskatoon Business Association blasts Clark on business tax ratio" in Saskatoon StarPhoenix, October 7, 2016. Obtained from <http://thestarphoenix.com/business/local-business/north-saskatoon-business-association-blasts-clark-on-business-tax-ratio>
- McMillan, Melville and Bev Dahlby (2014) "Do Local Governments Need Alternative Sources of Tax Revenue? An Assessment of the Options for Alberta Cities." SPP Research Papers, The School of Public Policy, University of Calgary, Vol. 7, Issue 26.
- Mintz, Jack M. and Tom Roberts (2006) "Running on Empty: A Proposal to Improve City Finances" *Commentary No. 226*. (Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute).
- Norregaard, John (2013) "Taxing Immovable Property: Revenue Potential and Implementation Challenges, IMF Working Paper 13/129 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Rosen, Harry S. et. al. (2003), *Public Finance in Canada* (2nd Cdn ed.) McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Slack, Enid and, Richard M. Bird (2014), "The Political Economy of Property Tax Reform" (Paris: OECD).
- Slack, Enid., (2011). "The Property Tax – in Theory and Practice," *IMFG Papers of Municipal Finance, No. 18* (Toronto: Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto).
- Smart, Michael, (2012). *The Reform of Business Property Tax in Ontario: An Evaluation, IMFG Papers of Municipal Finance, No. 10* (Toronto: Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto).
- Vander Ploeg, Casey and Jack Vicq, (2010) "A Tax Framework for Saskatchewan's Continuing Prosperity," (Calgary: Canada West Foundation).
- Zodrow, George, (2007). "The Property Tax as a Capital Tax: A Room with Three Views," (Houston: The James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy).