



OFFICE OF
CHIEF COUNSEL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20224

February 2, 1999

CC:EBEO:Br.2:
FREV-120283-98

Number: **199921003**

Release Date: 5/28/1999

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRICT COUNSEL

FROM: CHIEF, BRANCH 2
(EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND EXEMPT
ORGANIZATIONS)

SUBJECT: Position Paper "Rig Rentals"
UILC # 62.02.00

This is in response to your memorandum of _____ requesting our
review of a position paper prepared by the _____

. The position paper, which is not case specific,
considers the treatment of amounts an employer pays to employees for use of the
employees' rig welding equipment. These payments are commonly called "rig
rentals". Specifically, you asked us to review the position paper and advise if there
are any additional legal or policy issues related to the rig rentals.

Conclusion

The position paper suggests an analysis and conclusion that would apply in
every case. We agree that the primary issue is whether the rig rentals are wages
for Federal employment tax purposes, and the position paper sets forth an
appropriate analysis. However, we cannot agree that the same conclusion will
apply in every case. Whether the rig rentals are wages depends upon whether the
rentals are paid pursuant to an accountable plan. If so paid, the payments are not
wages for employment tax purposes. Thus, the issue that must be resolved based
upon the facts and circumstances of each case is whether the rig rentals are paid
pursuant to an accountable plan. We recommend that the Examination Division
develop an appropriate case for litigation.

Facts

The position paper sets forth typical facts of a rig rental arrangement. In general, an employer engaged in the business of specialized industrial construction will hire employee rig welders. Welders are highly skilled workers and when hired to perform welding services that is the only function they perform at the job site. They provide all of their own equipment, which generally includes a truck, welder, welding tanks and related items. On a non-union job, welders are required to provide all their own welding supplies. On a union job supplies are generally provided by the employer.

Employers compensate the welders by paying them a small hourly wage such as \$10.00 per hour and treat that amount as wages subject to employment taxes. In addition, the employer will pay the welder an additional amount per hour, such as \$20.00 to rent the employee's welding equipment. The position paper specifies that the welder is paid at the end of each week when he turns in his "rig ticket" which reports the hours worked each day, but does not indicate the expenses the welder incurred associated with his equipment. Thus, the amount of rig rentals is based solely on hours worked. The employer issues the employee two checks, one for wages and one for rig rentals. The amount treated as wages will be reported to the employee on Form W-2, and the rig rental if reported, will be reported on Form 1099.

Law & Analysis

The position paper accurately discusses the applicable Federal employment tax law. However, for completeness in responding to your inquiry we include a discussion of the applicable law.

I.R.C. § 62

As stated, the issue is whether the rig rentals are wages for employment tax purposes. The three Federal employment taxes are the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) taxes, Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA) tax, and income tax withholding. In general, wages are defined for FICA, FUTA and income tax withholding purposes as all remuneration for employment unless otherwise excluded. I.R.C. §§ 3121(a), 3306(b) and 3401(a). There is no statutory exception from wages for amounts paid by employers to employees for employee business expenses. However, Treas. reg. § 1.62-2(c)(4) provides that amounts an employer pays to an employee for employee business expenses under an "accountable plan" are excluded from the employee's gross income, are not required to be reported on the employee's Form W-2, and are exempt from the withholding and payment of

employment taxes. Treas. reg. §§ 31.3121(a)-3, 31.3306(b)-2, and 31.3401(a)-4 of the Employment Tax Regulations, and Treas. reg. § 1.6041-3(h)(1) of the Income Tax Regulations.

Whether amounts are paid under an accountable plan is governed by I.R.C. § 62 which includes the provisions on employee reimbursement or other expense allowance arrangements. Section 62 generally defines "adjusted gross income" as gross income minus certain ("above-the-line") deductions. Section 62(a)(2)(A) allows an employee an above-the-line deduction for expenses paid by the employee, in connection with his or her performance of services as an employee, under a reimbursement or other expenses allowance arrangement with the employer. Section 62(c) provides that an arrangement will not be treated as a reimbursement or other expense allowance arrangement for purposes of I.R.C. § 62(a)(2)(A) if the arrangement does not require the employee to substantiate the expenses covered by the arrangement to the person providing the reimbursement or gives the employee with the right to retain any amount in excess of the substantiated expenses covered under the arrangement.

Under section 1.62-2(c)(1) of the regulations, a reimbursement or other expense allowance arrangement satisfies the requirements of I.R.C. § 62(c), if it meets the three requirements of business connection, substantiation, and returning amounts in excess of expenses, set forth in paragraphs (d), (e), and (f), respectively, of Treas. reg. § 1.62-2 ("the three requirements").

If an arrangement meets the three requirements, all amounts paid under the arrangement are treated as paid under an "accountable plan." Treas. reg. § 1.62-2(c)(2)(i). The regulations further provide that if an arrangement does not satisfy one or more of the three requirements, all amounts paid under the arrangement are paid under a "nonaccountable plan." Amounts paid under a nonaccountable plan are included in the employee's gross income for the taxable year, must be reported to the employee on Form W-2, and are subject to withholding and payment of employment taxes. Treas. Reg. §§ 1.62-2(c)(5), 31.3121(a)-3(b)(2), 31.3306(b)-2(b)(2) and 31.3401(a)-4(b)(2).¹

¹Section 62(c) of the Code was enacted by the Family Support Act of 1988, Pub. L. 100-485. Through enactment of section 67 of the Code by section 132 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, (1986 Act), Pub. L. 99-514, 1986-3 C.B. (vol 1) 30, the Congress sharpened the distinction between the tax treatment of unreimbursed and reimbursed employee business expenses. Among other changes, unreimbursed employee business expenses plus other miscellaneous itemized deductions generally were made subject to a two-percent floor. At the same time, the Congress decided to retain the above-the-line deduction treatment for reimbursements received by an employee

An arrangement meets the business connection requirement of Treas. Reg. § 1.62-2(d) if it provides advances, allowances (including per diem allowances, allowances for meals and incidental expense, and mileage allowances), or reimbursements for business expenses that are allowable as deductions by Part VI (section 161 through section 196), subchapter B, Chapter 1 of the Code, and that are paid or incurred by the employee in connection with the performance of services as an employee. Section 1.62-2(d)(3)(i) provides that the business connection requirement will not be satisfied if the payor arranges to pay an amount to an employee regardless of whether the employee incurs or is reasonably expected to incur business expenses described in paragraphs (d)(1) or (d)(2).

Section 1.62-2(e) of the regulations provides that the substantiation requirement is met if the arrangement requires each business expense to be substantiated to the payor (the employer, its agent or a third party) within a reasonable period of time. As for the third requirement that amounts in excess of expenses must be returned to the payor, the general rule of Treas. reg. § 1.62-2(f) provides that this requirement is met if the arrangement requires the employee to return to the payor within a reasonable period of time any amount paid under the arrangement in excess of the expenses substantiated.

Section 1.62-2(k) provides that if a payor's reimbursement or other expense allowance arrangement evidences a pattern of abuse of the rules of section 62(c) and the regulation sections, all payments made under the arrangement will be treated as made under a nonaccountable plan.

Revenue Ruling 68-624

Employers typically rely on Rev. Rul. 68-624, 1968-2 C.B. 424 as authority for designating a portion of an employee's compensation as a rental payment and excluding that amount from wages. The question raised in Rev. Rul. 68-624, is what percentage of the total amount paid by a corporation for the use of a truck and the services of a driver is allocable as wages of the driver for FICA purposes. The facts specify that the corporation hires a truck and driver to haul stone from its quarry to its river loading dock at a fixed amount per load and allocates one-third of

pursuant to a reimbursement arrangement. This rationale for allowing an above-the-line deduction to offset true reimbursement amounts does not apply in the case of nonaccountable plans. Under nonaccountable plans, the amount received by the employee from the employer is not determined by the actual amount of expenses incurred by the employee during the year.

the amount paid the employee as wages and two-thirds as payment for the use of the truck. The ruling holds that an allocation of the amount paid to an individual when the payment is for both personal services and the use of equipment must be governed by the facts in each case. If the contract of employment does not specify a reasonable division of the total amount paid between wages and equipment, a proper allocation may be arrived at by reference to the prevailing wage scale in a particular locality for similar services in operating the same class of equipment or the fair rental value of similar equipment.

Although Rev. Rul. 68-624, has not been obsoleted, we believe it should not be relied upon to exclude rental payments for equipment from wages. The analysis in Rev. Rul 68-624 is incomplete under current law because it does not consider whether the rental payments are paid under an accountable plan. Under current law, the rental payments can be excluded from wages only if they are paid under an accountable plan. An employment contract that merely allocates compensation between wages and rentals will not satisfy the requirements of I.R.C. § 62(c). To exclude employee reimbursements or other expense allowance payments from wages an employer must establish an accountable plan.

Case Law

The Service has not issued any private letter rulings or technical advice memoranda concerning whether rig rentals are wages for employment tax purposes. In addition, to our knowledge, no case has considered this specific issue.² However, two recent cases Trans-Box Systems v. United States, No. C-97-2768 THE, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3560 (N.D. Cal. August 28, 1998,) (*appeal pending* 9th Cir.), and Welch v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo 1998-310 are helpful in analyzing the rig rental issue.

Trans-Box, a courier service, paid its courier drivers, who used their own cars to make deliveries, \$8.95 per hour. Trans-Box treated 45% of the \$8.95 as wages subject to employment taxes and treated the remaining 55% as either lease payments or vehicle expense payments. The government assessed employment taxes on the entire \$8.95. In opposing the government's motion for summary judgment, Trans-Box's primary position was that the automobile lease payments or vehicle expenses were paid under an accountable plan and were exempt from

²In Baker v. Barnard Construction Co., Inc., 1994 WL 371558 (D.N.M.) rig welders prevailed on a summary judgment motion that they were employees for purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Although this decision is not relevant for tax purposes, it is interesting that the facts specify that the affected rig welders filed as independent contractors for tax purposes.

employment taxes. Trans-Box asserted that it had substantially complied with the accountable plan requirements in I.R.C. § 62 citing American Air Filter Co., Inc. v. Commissioner, 81 T.C. 709 (1983).

Trans-Box raised two alternative arguments. First, it argued the drivers were independent contractors rather than employees for purposes of the automobile lease payments and thus, not subject to I.R.C. § 62. Second, Trans-Box argued that it was entitled to relief under Section 530 of the Revenue Act of 1978. The government argued that Trans-Box had treated the drivers as employees for all purposes and the arrangement Trans-Box established was not an accountable plan because the drivers were not required to substantiate their expenses or return any amounts received that exceeded their expenses.³

The court concluded that Trans-Box failed to create a triable issue of fact regarding whether the drivers were, at least for some purposes, independent contractors. The court noted that the facts in the record point to the conclusion that Trans-Box had treated the owner-operators as employees for all purposes. It had paid the drivers hourly wages, reported those on Form W-2 and not filed any Forms 1099 for the automobile payments.

The court pointed out that Trans-Box's primary argument was that the drivers were employees for all purposes and that it substantially complied with the requirements of I.R.C. § 62(c). While acknowledging that Trans-Box was free to argue alternative or conflicting legal arguments the court stated "serious questions about the veracity of its allegations are raised because Trans-Box's alternative argument relies upon conflicting versions of the material facts at issue." Trans-Box Systems v. United States, 1998 U.S. Dist.3 Lexis *10-11. Thus, the court granted the government's motion for summary judgment on the plaintiff's claims and summary judgment on the government's counterclaim for recovery of unpaid employment taxes. The court did not address the Section 530 argument.

Although the court's decision rests on Trans-Box's failure to create a triable issue of fact on worker classification, the decision is significant because the court refused to apply a substantial compliance rule to I.R.C. § 62(c) or to allow Trans-Box to argue different versions of the facts.

³Although not asserted by the government, Trans-Box also did not satisfy the business connection requirement. Treas. reg. § 1.62-2(d)(3)(i) provides that the business connection is not satisfied if a payor arranges to pay an amount to an employee regardless of whether the employee incurs (or is reasonably expected to incur) business expenses.



In Welch v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo 1998-310 the Tax Court held that Mr. Welch's equipment leasing activities in 1993 were not passive activities. Mr. Welch, a carpenter, was hired by movie production companies as a construction coordinator. Mr. Welch and the production company would enter into a "deal memorandum" setting forth the terms of his employment including the rate that he would be paid and the rate at which he rented his equipment to the company. Typically, an inventory of his tools and equipment would be attached to the deal memo. The production company would report Mr. Welch's wages on a Form W-2 and the tool rentals on a Form 1099. As construction coordinator, he constructed movie sets, hired employees, arranged for the purchase of materials and furnished all the required tools. He was required to purchase, maintain, transport and repair the tools as needed. The facts also specify that in 1993, Mr. Welch rented tools to a third party for \$1,500.00 for a project for which he was not the construction coordinator.

The court analyzed whether Mr. Welch's rental activity was a rental activity for purposes of I.R.C. § 469 and concluded it was not because he provided equipment to production companies for an average period of 30 days or less and he performed significant personal services in connection with making the property available for use by customers. The court noted that he acquired, maintained, transported and repaired the tools and equipment. The court concluded that Mr. Welch provided extraordinary personal services and the rental of the tools and equipment by the production companies was incidental to receipt of Mr. Welch's services as a construction coordinator. The court further held that Mr. Welch materially participated in his business as a construction coordinator and therefore, was not subject to the loss limitations imposed by I.R.C. § 469.

Although the Tax Court was not required to decide whether the rental arrangement was an accountable plan within the meaning of I.R.C. § 62(c) or whether Mr. Welch was an employee or independent contractor, the facts illustrate an arrangement for the rental of equipment that was an arms length transaction memorialized in a writing. Perhaps the most significant fact is that Mr. Welch actually rented his tools to a third party that did not also employ him as the construction coordinator. Thus, at least in that instance his rental activity was separate from the services he performed as an employee.

Case Development, Hazards, and Other Considerations

It is our view that the best approach to address the rig rental issue is to develop an appropriate case for litigation. Accordingly, we make the following suggestions for case development. Analyzing whether a rig rental arrangement is an accountable plan requires factual development, including an understanding of the details of the arrangement.



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

If you have further questions, please call me at (202) 622-6040.

JERRY E. HOLMES