



128 Dorrance Street, Suite 400
Providence, RI 02903
Phone: (401) 831-7171
Fax: (401) 831-7175
www.riaclu.org
info@riaclu.org

**COMMENTS ON PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE REGULATIONS ON
“EXEMPTION OF SALES BY WRITERS, COMPOSERS AND ARTISTS”¹
[280-RICR-20-70-11]
September 2023**

The ACLU of Rhode Island appreciates the opportunity to comment on these proposed regulations, for they address a topic on which we have received many inquiries from affected artists, and particularly authors.

The statewide sales tax exemption on art has been in effect for a decade now, but its implementation has been rocky. As the Department knows, a few years ago the ACLU was forced to sue over the agency’s implementation of the statute when it decided that non-fiction books did not constitute artwork covered by the sales tax exemption law. We are pleased that these proposed regulations codify the outcome of that lawsuit and make explicit that works qualify regardless of whether they are deemed fiction or non-fiction.

However, the proposed regulation’s attempt to further clarify – and narrow – the sales tax exemption’s reach only creates other problems, which we briefly outline below. We recognize that the Department, along with the State Council on the Arts, has been placed in a difficult position. The statute itself – by failing to define what constitutes a “one-of-a-kind, limited-production” work of art – is far from a model of clarity and has helped contribute to the confusion and controversy that has accompanied the state’s implementation of the law. Nonetheless, the goal of the statute – to “strengthen Rhode Island’s identity as an arts-friendly destination” – must always be kept in

¹ These comments should be taken as also applying to the similar amendments being simultaneously proposed to DOR’s rules governing “Modification of Certain Income of Writers, Composers and Artists,” 280-RICR-20-55-13, which deals with the exemption’s reduction of federal gross adjusted income pursuant to R.I.G.L. §44-30-1.1.

mind in adopting implementing regulations. The Department's attempt to craft a narrow definition of what constitutes a qualifying work of art negates that goal.

Presently, the regulations require a "limited edition" that qualifies for an exemption to be a solitary work "intended for limited reproduction signed and numbered by the artist." The proposal would additionally require the work to be self-published; to total no more than 300 copies; and to not be "sold through an online marketplace or third-party vendor." Without conceding the validity of the current definition,² we find these additional limitations inappropriate and urge their rejection.

Whether a book is self-published is, in our view, totally unrelated to either the creative or Rhode Island-based nature of the work and, therefore, irrelevant to whether it should qualify for an exemption. An author should not be penalized merely for relying on a third party to handle the non-creative aspect of having their art presented to the public. The use of a third party to publish a book should not, and does not, turn it into a non-exempt "commercial" production, and nothing about the two specific examples cited in the regulations to explain the term suggests otherwise. *See* §11.5(K)(3)(a-b). Indeed, it would be virtually impossible to apply such a broad standard to other creative works exempt under the statute, such as films or plays.

We also cannot conceive of a compelling rationale for limiting the sale of a book to 300 copies in order to qualify for the exemption. Just as a practical matter, of course, a person will have no idea, at the time of applying for the exemption, whether a book they have written will sell more than 300 copies, and it seems absurd to require as a condition of obtaining the exemption that the author agree in advance not to sell more than 300 copies of their work.³

² For example, we strongly question DOR's basis for requiring a work to be "solitary." The statute specifically refers to creative works written "either solely or jointly." R.I.G.L. §44-18-30B(c)(2)(ii). We have related concerns about the regulation's definition of "one of a kind," but that term is not being amended in this proposal, and we have limited our comments to addressing only revisions being proposed in this rule-making proceeding.

³ If the regulation's intent is to limit the exemption to the *first* 300 copies of the work sold, it does not make that clear.

While the statute refers to “limited production” works of art, that term, whatever it means, certainly should not be interpreted as being restricted to such a relatively small number of copies of a book or other writing. In that regard, we note that there is no comparable limitation on the number of produced “painting[s], print[s], photograph[s] or other like picture[s]” to qualify for an exemption, nor should there be.

For the same reasons that we object to the proposal’s requirement that books be “self-published,” we oppose the prohibition on their being sold “through an online marketplace or third-party vendor.” As the proposal recognizes by seeking to exclude art galleries from this limitation, there are legitimate bases for relying on third parties to sell a work of art. Especially in this day and age, disqualifying a book (or other artwork) from the tax exemption merely because copies are sold through a website inappropriately and unnecessarily hampers the statute’s goal.

We therefore urge the Department to reject these provisions narrowing the exemption’s scope. Instead, we encourage the agency to make use of the Administrative Procedures Act’s advance rule-making provisions, R.I.G.L. §42-35-2.5, to bring interested stakeholders together to discuss the regulatory implementation of the artist sales tax exemption statute and to consider fairer and more suitable definitions of what qualifies for the exemption. Such a meeting could also be helpful in addressing complaints we have received that the exemption process is sometimes unduly lengthy and burdensome and has led to what some see as arbitrary decision-making.

We appreciate your attention to our views, and trust that you will give them your careful consideration. If the suggestions we have made are not adopted, we request, pursuant to R.I.G.L. §42-35-2.6(1), a statement of the reasons for not accepting the arguments we have made.

Submitted by: Steven Brown, Executive Director
American Civil Liberties Union of Rhode Island
