



**House  
Legislative  
Analysis  
Section**

Washington Square Building, Suite 1025  
Lansing, Michigan 48909  
Phone: 517/373-6466

**SALES TAX: EXEMPT GRAIN BINS**

**Senate Bill 222 (Substitute H-2)**  
**First Analysis (12-1-88)**

**Sponsor: Sen. Nick Smith**  
**Senate Committee: Finance**  
**House Committee: Taxation**

**RECEIVED**  
**JAN 18 1989**  
*Mich. State Law Library*

**THE APPARENT PROBLEM:**

Under the General Sales Tax Act, certain tangible personal property sold to farmers for agricultural purposes is exempt from taxation. Specifically, the exemption from sales tax applies to property "sold to a person engaged in a business enterprise" who uses or consumes the property in the "tilling, planting, caring for, or harvesting of the things of the soil or in the breeding, raising, or caring for livestock, poultry, or horticultural property." The exemption does not apply to property "permanently affixed and becoming a structural part of real estate."

Over the last several years, there has been substantial disagreement as to whether bins purchased by farmers for storing and aerating grain are subject to sales taxes. The disagreement stems largely from the fact that these bins can be regarded as either "permanent" or "movable" structures. Typically, these bins, consisting mainly of metal sheets bolted together to make a container structure, are erected on and bolted to a poured concrete foundation. Bins vary in size and capacity: one business, reportedly, markets bins ranging from 15 to 100 feet in diameter and 15 to 75 feet in height. Other apparatus, such as grain drying equipment, is generally sold and installed along with the bins as part of a grain drying system.

It has been the Department of Treasury's contention that the bins are permanent structures that as such fall outside the agricultural property sales tax exemption. Farmers and those who market and install the bins, on the other hand, have insisted that the bins are portable, and that though they may be sold along with "permanent" farm property, such as barns or land, they do not have to be, since they can be disassembled, unbolted from their foundation, and moved. They believe that the agricultural property sales tax exemption should be amended to clarify that the exemptions include portable grain bins.

**THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:**

The bill would exempt from the sales tax portable grain bins, which would be defined in the bill as structures used or to be used to shelter grain and designed to be disassembled without significant damage to component parts.

MCL 205.54a

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION:**

The Senate version of the bill would also have exempted "agricultural land tile," which is used in drainage systems. The House substitute does not contain this exemption.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The following information was taken from a Senate Fiscal Agency analysis of Senate Bill 222 dated 5-19-87:

In a 1981 hearing before the Michigan State Board of Tax Appeals, Max Wayland Fricke v Department of Treasury,

Revenue Division, the appellant, Fricke, claimed the agricultural exemption from sales and use taxes for sales of grain bins and drying systems. Though the treasury department had allowed exemptions for certain components of the system — the dryer, elevator, auger, screen and duct work components — it had denied exemptions for the corrugated bins or tanks in which the grain was placed. The board stated that the "process of aerating and drying grain, beans and corn is within the purview of the exemption," and that bins were an "integral part of the process." The board argued that it was difficult to distinguish the components of the drying system that had been exempted from assessment from those that had not. The board added that "although the larger bins are clearly sizable enough to rank as structures on land, the fact remains that not only can they be easily disassembled and moved upon sale[,] they usually are." The board concluded that the appellant was entitled to the exemption.

In a similar case decided by the Michigan Court of Appeals in 1983, Miedema Metal Building Systems, Inc. v Michigan Department of Treasury, a different conclusion was reached. Miedema, a corporation engaged in selling and installing grain storage bins with drying systems, had appealed an assessment for use tax on the bins. (Other components of the drying systems had not been assessed for taxation.) The department had successfully argued before the Tax Tribunal that the use tax could be assessed since the appellant was considered a "contractor that affixed items to realty."

The court ruled that the fact that the "grain bins may be part of a system used in agricultural production does not exempt it [sic] from use tax. . . because the plain language of the statute states that the exemption does not apply to tangible personal property 'permanently affixed and becoming a structural part of real estate'", and affirmed the tribunal's finding that Miedema was a contractor for purposes of the use tax.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The Senate Finance Committee has estimated that the bill will cost the state between \$250,000 and \$2 million. (11-30-88)

**ARGUMENTS:**

**For:**

The bill would make it clear once and for all that portable grain storage bins, essential components of many farmers' businesses, are exempt from sales taxes. To fabricate a distinction for taxation purposes between the bins themselves and the other parts of the grain drying systems attached to them, as has been done in the past, is highly questionable, since all the components of the grain drying systems are detachable and portable. The process of

OVER

S.B. 222 (12-1-88)

storing and drying grain in the bins is part and parcel of the whole agricultural process, just as feeding livestock, plowing, or harvesting crops are, and the equipment required for this process should be exempt as that for other agricultural processes already is.

***Against:***

Farmers and grain bin marketers have testified that bins are portable and that they can be sold and moved. That may be true, but while the bins are in place on a farm they are as close to "permanent" as they conceivably can be. Reportedly, their erection requires pouring of a concrete foundation and bolting the bins to anchor brackets imbedded about ten inches into the concrete, and the size of some of the larger bins would certainly discourage moving them: they may be as large as small barns or houses. Indeed, bins reportedly often are sold as part of a farm. To that extent, at least, they should be treated like other personal agricultural property that becomes a structural part of real estate, and not exempted from sales taxes. Further, this bill will lead to the argument by agriculturalists that the grain bins should be exempt from the tax on real property as well, since the bill treats the bins as tangible personal property.

***POSITIONS:***

The Department of Treasury testified in opposition to the bill before the House Taxation Committee. (11-30-88)