

## Why Prepaid Rent (Unfortunately) Isn't Nonqualified Financial Property Part Two

By Douglas Banghart, Holland & Knight

**O**ccasionally new markets tax credit (NMTC) transactions are structured such that the qualified active low-income community business (QALICB) makes a one-time, up-front, rent payment to its lessor. A frequently raised issue is whether this prepayment could be reclassified by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) or a court as a loan, which presumably would make it a prohibited non-qualified financial property (NQFP). This article argues that in the non-NMTC world, and even though many taxpayers would prefer otherwise, prepaid rent is almost never classified as a loan. Given this, this article maintains that it is extremely unlikely that the IRS could take the position that prepaid rent is NQFP because it is simply contrary to the law and would create enormous income tax deferral opportunities. Last month, part one of this two-part series on prepaid rent explained the rules that existed before Congress and the IRS got smart and started making our tax system take into account the time value of money concepts. This month, part two will deal with what happens under Section 467 of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC).

Under Section 45D of the IRC, community development entities (CDEs) are authorized to designate investors' equity contributions into those CDEs as qualified equity investments (QEIs), entitling the investors to NMTCs. The CDEs are then required to use such QEIs to make qualified low-income community investments (QLICIs) in QALICBs during a seven-year compliance period. Section 45D(d)(2) of the IRC sets forth the various tests that must be satisfied in order for the borrower to be a QALICB, one of which is that the adjusted basis of any NQFP held by the QALICB cannot exceed 5 percent of the adjusted basis of all of the QALICB's

assets. Loans are NQFP, as are stock, partnership interests, options, futures contracts, forward contracts, warrants, notional principal contracts and annuities. The legislative history of the NMTC is sparse, but presumably the policy rationale of the NQFP prohibition is that Congress wants to subsidize active business activity, not passive investing.

Last month's article argued that the IRS would be unlikely to argue under pre-IRC Section 467 law that prepaid rent paid by a QALICB to its lessor would be a loan because of the enormous deferral opportunities that position would create in non-NMTC transactions. Under pre-IRC Section 467, those payments are income to the lessor, so they cannot also be loans. If they are not loans, then they should not constitute NQFP. This month, part two of this two-part series on prepaid rent, explains the rules that exist under IRC Section 467.

### Section 467 Rental Agreements

IRC Section 467 applies to rental agreements. A "467 rental agreement" includes rental agreements that contain "increasing or decreasing rents;" "deferred rents;" or "prepaid rents." Each of these terms has a peculiar definition. The peculiarity stems from the fact that the 467 regulations assume that the rent schedules in most leases have three columns rather than the two columns with which we are typically familiar: the year and the amount to be paid in that year. The strange new third column is labeled "rent allocation." In other words, the regulations assume (and permit, within certain limitations) that the parties might decide to book the tax consequences of the rent payments other than as they are paid. For example, in a three-year lease, the parties might pay even amounts of rent in each year, but book all

*continued from page 1*

the income and deductions in the last year.

For purposes of analyzing prepaid rent, let's say we have a 10-year lease for \$1 million, all of which is paid in the first year. Since no rent is paid in the second year, it certainly sounds like we have either decreasing rents or prepaid rent, either of which would mean we have a 467 rental agreement that would be subject to the complicated IRC Section 467 rules.

Increasing or decreasing rents exist if the "annualized fixed rent" allocated to any "rental period" exceeds the annualized fixed rent allocated to any other rental period in the lease term. Annualized fixed rent is determined by multiplying the "fixed rent" "allocated to the rental period" by the number of periods of the rental period's length in a calendar year. Fixed rent is any rent to the extent its amount and the time at which it is required to be paid are fixed and determinable. Importantly, the taxpayer in determining what constitutes fixed rent is specifically required to ignore the possibility of default under the rental agreement, as well as the possibility that one of the parties may be insolvent. See Treas. Reg. § 1.467-1(h)(1) & (2).

How is this fixed rent allocated to the rental period? If the rental agreement specifically allocates (a) for periods no longer than a year, an amount of rent for which the lessee becomes liable on account of the lease during that period, and (b) the total amount (for all periods), so specified totals the total amount due under the lease, then the amount "allocated to each rental period" will be whatever is specified on the rent schedule.

So do we have increasing or decreasing rents and therefore a 467 rental agreement? That depends on how we allocate the rent for tax purposes on the rent schedule in the third column discussed above. Let's take two scenarios based on our \$1 million prepayment example above: in the first, assume we spread the \$1 million rent allocation over the 10-year term, such that \$100,000 is allocated to each year; in the second, assume that we simply allocate the \$1 million just as we paid it: i.e. the full \$1 million in the first year. Note in both instances the total rent allocated equals the total amount paid.

In the first scenario, because the rental amount allocated to each year is the same, the annualized fixed rent allocated to any rental period obviously can't exceed the annualized fixed rent allocated to any other period, so we have don't have increasing or decreasing rents. In the second scenario, because the annualized fixed rent allocated to the first year exceeds the annualized fixed rent allocated to the second year (and every year thereafter), we have increasing or decreasing rents and therefore have a 467 rental agreement.

Because, under the second scenario, we have a 467 rental agree-

*continued on page 3*

## Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits Editorial Board

### PUBLISHER

Michael J. Novogradac, CPA

### MANAGING EDITOR

Alex Ruiz

### EDITOR

Jane Bowar Zastrow

### TECHNICAL EDITORS

Robert S. Thesman, CPA

James R. Kroger, CPA

Owen P. Gray, CPA

Thomas Boccia, CPA

Daniel J. Smith, CPA

### STAFF WRITERS

Jennifer Dockery

Jennifer Hill

### CONTRIBUTING WRITERS

Douglas Banghart

Kelly Beigle

Tom Boccia, CPA

Jerome Breed

Brandi Day

Brad Elphick, CPA

Jenny Ho, CPA

Jim Kroger, CPA

John Leith-Tetraut

Forrest David Milder

Donna Rodney

Buzz Roberts

Daniel J. Smith, CPA

Annette Stevenson, CPA

### PRODUCTION

Jesse Barredo

James Matuszak

## Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits Information

Address all correspondence and  
editorial submissions to:  
Alex Ruiz / 415.356.8088

Address inquiries regarding  
advertising opportunities to:  
Emil Bagalso / 415.356.8037

Editorial material in this publication is for informational purposes only and should not be construed otherwise. Advice and interpretation regarding the low-income housing tax credit or any other material covered in this publication can only be obtained from your tax advisor.



**NOVOGRADAC  
& COMPANY** LLP®

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

© Novogradac & Company LLP  
2010 All rights reserved.  
ISSN 2152-646X

Reproduction of this publication in whole or in part in any form without written permission from the publisher is prohibited by law.

## Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits Advisory Board

### LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS

Bud Clarke	BOSTON FINANCIAL INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT
Jana Cohen Barbe	SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
Tom Dixon	BOSTON CAPITAL
Valerie White	STANDARD & POOR'S CORPORATION
Rick Edson	HOUSING CAPITAL ADVISORS INC.
Richard Gerwitz	CITI COMMUNITY CAPITAL
Rochelle Lento	DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
John Lisella	U.S. BANCORP COMMUNITY DEV. CORP.
Phillip Melton	GRANDBRIDGE REAL ESTATE CAPITAL
Thomas Morton	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
Stephen Ryan	COX, CASTLE & NICHOLSON LLP
Arnold Schuster	SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
Rob Wasserman	U.S. BANCORP COMMUNITY DEV. CORP.

### PROPERTY COMPLIANCE

Rose Guerrero	CALIFORNIA TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE
Sharon Jackman	SIG SERVICES LLC
Michael Kotin	KAY KAY REALTY
Patricia Murphy	TEXAS DEPT. OF HOUSING & COMM. AFFAIRS
Mardi Roberts	WASHINGTON STATE HOUSING FINANCE COMMISSION
Michael Snowdon	MCA HOUSING PARTNERS
Gianna Solari	SOLARI ENTERPRISES
Ruth Theobald Probst	THEOPRO COMPLIANCE & CONSULT. INC.
Kimberly Taylor	HOMESTEAD CAPITAL

### HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Sheldon Schreiber	PEPPER HAMILTON LLP
Monica Sussman	NIXON PEABODY LLP

### NEW MARKETS TAX CREDITS

Frank Altman	COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT FUND
Bruce Bonjour	PERKINS COIE LLC
Neil Kimmelfield	LANE POWELL
Scott Lindquist	SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
Ruth Sparrow	FUTURES UNLIMITED LAW PC
Herb Stevens	NIXON PEABODY LLP
Mary Tingerthal	HOUSING PARTNERSHIP NETWORK
Tom Tracy	HUNTER CHASE & COMPANY
Joseph Wesolowski	ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT INC.

### HISTORIC TAX CREDITS

Don Holm	FARRIS BOBANGO BRANAN PLC
John Leith-Tetrault	NATIONAL TRUST COMM. INVESTMENT CORP.
Bill MacRostie	MACROSTIE HISTORIC ADVISORS LLC
Donna Rodney	BRYAN CAVE LLP
John Tess	HERITAGE CONSULTING GROUP

### RENEWABLE ENERGY TAX CREDITS

Ed Feo	MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP
Michael Hall	BORREGO SOLAR SYSTEMS
Jim Howard	DUDLEY VENTURES

continued from page 2

If the rental agreement specifically allocates (a) for periods no longer than a year, an amount of rent for which the lessee becomes liable on account of the lease during that period, and (b) the total amount (for all periods), so specified totals the total amount due under the lease, then the amount "allocated to each rental period" will be whatever is specified on the rent schedule.

ment, we have to determine how to allocate the rent. There are three methods of doing this, which are mandated to be applied and are not optional. The first, "constant rental accrual," requires that the Commissioner affirmatively determine that because of a tax avoidance purpose, the agreement should be treated as a "long term lease" or a "disqualified leaseback." If the lessor and the lessee's marginal tax rates do not differ by more than 10 percent, there is what amounts to a "no tax avoidance purpose" safe harbor and constant rental accrual should not apply. See Treas. Reg. § 1.467-3(c)(2)(ii). For our purposes, we will assume the lessor and lessee have the same tax rates.

The second method, called "proportional rental accrual," applies if the constant rental accrual method above does not apply (and we concluded above it doesn't) and the 467 rental agreement does not provide "adequate stated interest on fixed rent." When proportional rental accrual applies, then the fixed rent for a rental period is the "proportional rent amount."

The third method, called "Section 467 rental accrual," applies if the 467 rental agreement does provide adequate stated interest on fixed rent. If this method applies, then the fixed rent for the rental period is whatever is written on the rent schedule.

Given this, whether we apply the second or the third method turns on whether we have adequate stated interest with respect to the 467 rental agreement. A 467 rental agreement provides adequate stated interest if, among other things, it does not contain prepaid rent.

One could reasonably conclude we have prepaid rent given we are paying all the rent in the first year. However, for these purposes prepaid rent exists only if the cumulative amount of rent payable at the end of a year exceeds the cumulative amount of rent allocated as of the close of the succeeding calendar year. The rent payable under our lease is all paid in the first year and, under our second example, the allocated rents and payable rents are identical since the allocated rent is also being booked in year one. Given this, the cumulative amount of rent payable as of the close of the first year cannot exceed the cumulative amount allocated as of the close of the succeeding year, because there is no rent paid or

continued on page 3

*continued from page 3*

allocated in the second year. The same rationale applies for all the remaining years. Given this, we do not have prepaid rent, so we have adequate stated interest, and we are therefore required to use the Section 467 rental accrual method.

Note however, that in the first example in which we prepaid all the rent but spread the allocation out over the entire lease, then we would have prepaid rent because the million dollars paid in the first year would exceed the \$200,000 allocated by the end of the second year. If we had prepaid rent, we would have a 467 rental agreement but would not have adequate stated interest, so the proportional rental accrual method would apply. But making proportional rental not apply is generally as simple as booking the rent payments as they are actually paid.

### **Conclusion**

The bottom line is that so long as you book the tax consequences of rent payments in the years in which they are paid, and as long as the lessor and the lessee's marginal rates are not expected to differ by more than 10 percent during the term of the lease, you will never have prepaid rent or deferred rent for purposes of Section

467, even if the rent is prepaid or deferred in common parlance. If you don't have prepaid rent or deferred rent for purposes of Section 467, then the rent allocations are simply those stated on the rent schedule: no complicated interest calculations are required. Complicated calculations which could raise NQFP issues will generally only arise if the parties are trying to book the rent allocations other than as they are being paid. Given this, under both Section 467 and the authority that existed before Section 467, none of the rent is required (or, indeed, permitted) to be recharacterized as a loan. If none of it is a loan, none of it should be NQFP. ❖

*Douglas R. Banghart is a partner in the Boston office of Holland & Knight. He practices in the area of state and federal tax credit syndication, partnership taxation and not-for-profit organizations. He represents major institutional investors, developers, local governments, CDEs and not-for-profit organizations, primarily in real estate redevelopment projects. He has extensive experience in closing new markets tax credit leverage fund transactions, including acting as lead attorney on the largest new markets transaction ever closed, and twinned historic and new markets tax credit transactions.*

---

*This article first appeared in the July 2010 issue of the Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits.*

© Novogradac & Company LLP 2010 - All Rights Reserved

*Notice pursuant to IRS regulations: Any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this article is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code; nor is any such advice intended to be used to support the promotion or marketing of a transaction. Any advice expressed in this article is limited to the federal tax issues addressed in it. Additional issues may exist outside the limited scope of any advice provided – any such advice does not consider or provide a conclusion with respect to any additional issues. Taxpayers contemplating undertaking a transaction should seek advice based on their particular circumstances.*

*This editorial material is for informational purposes only and should not be construed otherwise. Advice and interpretation regarding property compliance or any other material covered in this article can only be obtained from your tax advisor. For further information visit [www.novoco.com](http://www.novoco.com).*