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Subject: Oppose Excluding Swipe Fees on Sales Tax
Proposals to exclude swipe fees on the sales tax portion of transactions have been consistently rejected in state legislatures nationwide due to the significant threats they pose to the electronic payment system.

Swipe fees, also known as interchange fees, amount to mere pennies on the dollar and cover essential cardservicing expenses like statements, card issuance, customer service, fraud prevention and protection, and credit monitoring. Additionally, these fees contribute to credit card rewards for consumers.

Despite the considerable benefits currently enjoyed by retailers, including boosted sales, decreased fraud, and quicker payments, these misguided proposals represent an attempt by retailers to transfer their operational expense onto financial institutions and consumers, even though electronic payments are more cost-effective than cash transactions. Furthermore, retailers can avail themselves of federal tax deductions for swipe fees in their entirety, not solely the sales tax portion.

The current card payment system is known for its efficiency and interoperability, and it is designed to transmit the least amount of information necessary to complete a transaction safely and accurately. When a retailer makes a sale, the system recognizes only the final purchase amount on which the swipe fee is based and does not transmit information regarding the product sold nor the amount of sales tax collected.

This legislation necessitates the creation of new, as-yet-undeveloped, specialized payment terminals and software. These tools must be designed to detail and transmit segmented data during a transaction, introducing enhanced risks to consumer data privacy. The legislation otherwise may lead to a system where two transactions are necessary - one for the item sold and another for the remitted sales tax. While big box stores might reap large windfalls, the burden of these system redesign costs would fall on consumers and small businesses while diminishing swipe fee revenues crucial for the maintenance and development of innovative payment technology.

Retailers often wrongly attribute elevated swipe fee costs to alleged price gouging by card networks, banks and credit unions. The increase in swipe fees is a direct outcome of the widespread adoption of electronic payments by consumers and merchants for daily transactions, driven by their speed, convenience, and safety. Government intervention in swipe fees undermines how electronic payments serve and protect consumers while also disrupting a complex ecosystem crucial for the economy to operate and thrive.

We strongly oppose price controls on swipe fees and welcome the opportunity to discuss the ramifications of these proposals and answer any questions.

## Retailers are conflating fixed vs. variable costs and percentages vs. dollars

Retailer Claim: "My credit card fees are higher
than my rent/mortgage"

Rent/Mortgage:
Fixed Cost
Same monthly amount, regardless of sales

## Example:

\$15,000 / month, regardless of sales

## Credit Card Fees:

Variable Cost

Different monthly amount, based on sales

## Example:

~ 25 month = $\sim \$ 1,000$ in credit card sales
~ $\$ 15,000$ month $=$
$\sim \$ 600 \mathrm{~K}$ in credit card sales
~\$75,000 month =
~ $\$ 3 \mathrm{MM}$ in credit card sales

> Would you rather have \$1,000 in monthly credit card sales (card fees much lower than rent) or $\$ 3,000,000$ in monthly credit card sales (card fees much higher than rent)?

Retailer Claim: "My credit card processing fees have increased from $\$ \mathbf{5 0 , 0 0 0}$ to $\$ 100,000$ in the last 2 years"

- When retailers make this claim they will most likely quote a dollar figure, not a percent
- Credit card processing fees as a dollar figure have increased because sales have increased
- Credit card processing fees as a percent of sale are flat, negotiable, and competitive
- State and local sales tax revenue has increased, especially during and after the pandemic
- This is due to increased customer spending, not an increase in the sales tax rate

When a retailer complains about increased credit card processing fees, they are complaining about an expense directly attributable to increased sales. Why would increased sales require government intervention?

# PAYMENT FORMS: CONSUMER \& MERCHANT BENEFITS 

For merchants and consumers, when it comes to the costs and benefits of choosing a form of payment, credit and debit cards are the clear-cut winner.

Consumer Benefits Merchant Benefits

| Digital Access | Security \& Fraud Protection | Access to Liquidity | Rewards/ Benefits | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E-Commerce } \\ & \text { Digital } \\ & \text { Channels } \end{aligned}$ | Guaranteed payment | Higher Sales \& Faster Checkout | Average Merchant Cost of a \$100 Transaction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  |  |  | VISA | \$1.43-\$2.40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2.50-\$3.50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $P$ PayPal | \$3.20-\$4.40 |
| $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | amazon pay | \$3.20-\$3.90 |
| $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  | $\sqrt{2}$ |  |  |  | a Pay | \$1.43-\$3.50 |
| $v$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | afterpay $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ | \$4.21-\$6.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Klarna. | \$3.59-\$5.99 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CASH: FOOD/ GROCERY | \$4.70 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CASH: } \\ \text { CONVENIENCE/ } \\ \text { GAS } \end{gathered}$ | \$8.30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CASH: AVERAGE ACROSS ALL SEGMENTS ${ }^{1}$ | \$9.10 |

Note: Apple pay merchant costs are calculated assuming users access the service with either a Visa, Mastercard or Amex branded card. Assuming this, merchants are liable to a cost range between the lowest and highest estimated charge of the three networks
${ }^{1}$ IHL Group: Cash Multipliers - How reducing the costs of cash handling can enable retail sales and profit growth (January 8, 2018) https://www.ihlservices.com/product/costofcash/

## This bill shifts an expense from big box retailers who already have ways to recoup the cost of remitting

 sales tax. The expense is shifted to financial institutions and customers| Small Business Example |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Annual Revenue <br> Sales Tax Collected: <br> (weighted average reflecting local tax added <br> in Philadelphia \& Alleghany) | 0.0621 | $\$ 62,100$ |
| Sales via Credit Card or Debit Card |  |  |
| - Credit Card* | Debit Card* | $32 \%$ |
| Sales Tax from Credit Card sales | $\$ 4 \%$ | $\$ 420,000$ |
| Sales Tax from Debit Card sales |  | $\$ 19,000$ |
| Average Credit Interchange: | $2.50 \%$ | $\$ 27,324$ |
| Average Debit Interchange: | $\$ 496.80$ |  |
| Interchange on Sales Tax from credit \& debit <br> sales per year <br> Monthly Savings from Exemption Legislation |  |  |


| Home Depot Example |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Stores in Pennsylvania** |  | 70 |
| Annual Revenue Per Store (pre-sales tax)** |  | \$62,265,000 |
| Gross Revenue (Sales + Sales Tax) |  | \$4,629,402,750 |
| Sales Tax Collected: 6.21\% (weighted average reflecting local tax added in Philadelphia \& Alleghany) | 0.0621 | \$287,485,911 |
| Sales via Credit or Debit Card |  |  |
| - Credit Card* | 32\% | \$1,481,408,880 |
| - Debit Card* | 44\% | \$2,036,937,210 |
| Sales Tax from Credit Card sales |  | \$91,995,491 |
| Sales Tax from Debit Card sales |  | \$126,493,801 |
| Average Credit Interchange: | 2.50\% | \$2,299,888 |
| Average Debit Interchange: | 0.30\% | \$379,481 |
| Interchange on Sales Tax from credit and debit sales per year |  | \$2,679,369 |
| Monthly Savings from Exemption Legislation |  | \$223,280 |

- A PA small business with $\$ 1 \mathrm{MM}$ in annual sales will reduce its interchange expense by $\sim \$ 579 / \mathrm{yr}$. Home Depot will reduce its interchange expense in PA by $\sim \$ 2.68$ million $/ \mathrm{yr}$.
- PA retailers can already hold back $1 \%$ of sales tax collected, capped at $\$ 300$ per year. Raising the cap to a higher number is a more appropriate policy change. 10 states have no cap. Interchange expense is already tax deductible and retailers can also add a surcharge for credit card transactions.
- Card issuers assume $100 \%$ of default risk. If the customer defaults, card issuers absorb the loss; we don't ask the retailer for the money back. Interchange supports the operation of the global payments network, funds rewards, and is one piece of the transfer of risk from the retailer to the financial institution.
- The costs will be borne by PA consumers and small businesses in the form of higher fees, higher interest, or fewer rewards. A large portion of interchange fees are returned to customers as rewards. The legislation creates no discernable "savings" other than to big box retailers. This bill has been tried and defeated $\sim 60$ times in $\sim$ two dozen states since 2006 .


## Retailers already pay no interchange on sales tax in the 5 states that have no sales tax. Yet merchandise is the same price. No savings are passed along to the customer

State with Sales Tax


Merchandise Price = \$102.90


State without Sales Tax


No interchange on sales tax because there is no sales tax

- New Hampshire, Oregon, Montana, Alaska, and Delaware (NOMAD states) have no sales tax. Retailers pay no interchange on sales tax because there is no sales tax.
- If exempting sales tax from interchange results in savings to customers as bill proponents claim, then merchandise should already be cheaper in the NOMAD states. It is not.
- In the example above from a major retailer website, the merchandise price is exactly the same, regardless of whether it is shipping to a state with sales tax or without sales tax.
- This bill is simply a giveaway to big box retailers who can already hold back a portion of sales tax. They can also surcharge for using credit cards. Additionally, interchange on the total transaction amount, not only the sales tax, is already tax deductible to them


## A Long Line of Rejected Legislation

Expected legislation announced in a Pennsylvania State House co-sponsorship memorandum unwisely proposes to prohibit the levying of interchange fees on any portion of a credit card or debit card sale representing any state or local taxes.

Following is a list of similar proposals that have been carefully considered in previous years in other states. Each proposal was uniformly rejected due to harm to consumers, loss of sales tax revenue, legal deficiencies, and operational hurdles.

2006
Kentucky HB 592
New York AB 11193

2007
Florida SB 1724
Kansas SB 348
New York AB 1020
Washington SB 5884
Washington SB 5885

2008
Kansas HB 2862
Louisiana HB 673
Louisiana SB 516
New Jersey SB 1138
New Jersey AB 2261
Rhode Island HB 7509

2009
Connecticut HB 6311
Massachusetts HB 1025
Nebraska LB 186
New Jersey SB 1138
New Jersey AB 2261
North Carolina HB 1576

2010
New Jersey SB 1631

2011
New Jersey SB 1631
2012
Iowa HSB 666
New Jersey SB 944
2013
Arkansas SB 607
New Jersey B 944
2014
Nebraska LB 991

2015
Arkansas HB 1775
Colorado HB15-1154

2016
Minnesota HF 302

2017
Nebraska LB 559

2018
New Jersey SB 2577
2019
New Jersey SB 2577

2020
Tennessee HB 2500

## 2021

Alabama SB 316
Illinois SB 2083
Indiana HB 1493
lowa HF 627
Maine LD 1544
Mississippi HB 1076
Mississippi SB 2856
Oklahoma HB 2181
Oklahoma SB 798
Tennessee HB 375
Tennessee SB 880
Wisconsin SB 572

2022
Idaho SB 1293
Mississippi HB 1428
Mississippi SB 2742
Virginia HB 152
2023
Alabama SB 125
Florida SB 564
Florida HB677
Georgia SB 126
Idaho SB 1066
North Dakota SB 2217
Tennessee SB 132
Tennessee HB 615
Texas SB 1541
Texas HB 3395

