



# THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

1620 EYE STREET NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006  
TELEPHONE (202) 293-7330  
FAX (202) 293-2352  
URL: [www.usmayors.org](http://www.usmayors.org)

President:  
STEPHEN K. BENJAMIN  
Mayor of Columbia, SC

Vice President:  
BRYAN K. BARNETT  
Mayor of Rochester Hills

Second Vice President:  
GREG FISCHER  
Mayor of Louisville

Past President:  
ELIZABETH B. KAUTZ  
Mayor of Burnsville

Trustees:  
STEVE ADLER  
Mayor of Austin  
SHANE T. BEMIS  
Mayor of Gresham  
J. CHRISTIAN BOLLWAGE  
Mayor of Elizabeth  
JAMES BRAINARD  
Mayor of Carmel  
FRANK COWNE  
Mayor of Des Moines  
BILL DE BLASIO  
Mayor of New York  
JORGE O. FLORZA  
Mayor of Providence  
JOHN GILES  
Mayor of Mesa  
KIM McMILLAN  
Mayor of Clarksville  
MIKE RAWLINGS  
Mayor of Dallas  
JAMES J. SCHMITT  
Mayor of Green Bay  
MARTIN J. WALSH  
Mayor of Boston  
NAN WHALEY  
Mayor of Dayton

Advisory Board:  
JUAN CARLOS BERMUDEZ  
Mayor of Dorset  
MURIEL BOWSER  
Mayor of the District of Columbia  
ARDELL E. BREDE  
Mayor of Rochester, MN  
SHARON WESTON BROOME  
Mayor of Baton Rouge  
ROY BUCH  
Mayor of Dubuque  
PETE BUTTIGIEG  
Mayor of South Bend  
CHRISTOPHER L. CABALDON  
Mayor of West Sacramento  
PAULINE RUSSO CUTTER  
Mayor of San Leandro  
HARDIE DAVIS, JR.  
Mayor of Augusta  
BUDDY DYER  
Mayor of Orlando  
KAREN FREEMAN-WILSON  
Mayor of Gary  
JOSEPH T. GAMIM  
Mayor of Bridgeport  
OLIVER G. GILBERT, III  
Mayor of Miami Gardens  
CAROLYN G. GOODMAN  
Mayor of Las Vegas  
SYLVESTER "SLIP" JAMES, JR.  
Mayor of Kansas City, MO  
HARRY LaROUSIERE  
Mayor of Plano  
JOSEPH T. McELVEEN, JR.  
Mayor of Sumter  
LYDIA L. MIHALIK  
Mayor of Findlay  
JON MITCHELL  
Mayor of New Bedford  
MARK W. MITCHELL  
Mayor of Tempe  
KENNETH D. MIYAGISHIMA  
Mayor of Las Cruces  
FRANK C. ORTIS  
Mayor of Pensacola Pines  
MIGUEL A. PULIDO  
Mayor of Santa Ana  
MADELINE ROGERO  
Mayor of Knoxville  
HILLARY SCHIEVE  
Mayor of Reno  
PAUL SOGLIN  
Mayor of Madison, WI  
GARY SOISETH  
Mayor of Turlock  
MARK STODOLA  
Mayor of Little Rock  
FRANCIS X. SUAREZ  
Mayor of Miami  
SYLVESTER TURNER  
Mayor of Houston  
BRIAN C. WAHLER  
Mayor of Piscataway  
ACQUANETTA WARREN  
Mayor of Fontana

CEO and Executive Director  
TOM COCHRAN

The Honorable Charles P. Rettig  
Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service  
U.S. Department of Treasury  
1500 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20220

Internal Revenue Service  
PO Box 7604 CC:PA:LPD:PR, room 5203  
Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044

December 20, 2018

RE: IRS REG-115420-18, Opportunity Zone

Commissioner Rettig,

Please find below the U.S. Conference of Mayors' comments to proposed Opportunity Zone regulations and guidance under new section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code published on October 29, 2018 in the Federal Register.

In order for Opportunity Zones to meet the shared goal of attracting investment to communities that have suffered long-term disinvestment, we encourage Treasury to adopt rules that support new and growing operating businesses in such zones. We also encourage Treasury to develop regulations that address the intent of the Opportunity Zone provisions to empower and benefit residents within the zones.

Our comments are as follow:

## 1. Substantially All Threshold for Qualified Opportunity Zone Businesses

Treasury offered clarity in the proposed regulations on a number of important definitional issues, including, most importantly, the definition of "substantially all" of a Qualified Opportunity Zone (QOZ) Business's tangible assets that must be Opportunity Zone Business Property. The proposed threshold of 70 percent provides the operational flexibility needed by small and medium-sized businesses and their potential investors. We encourage Treasury to adopt this 70 percent threshold in their final regulations.

We also ask Treasury to consider responsible carve-outs for types of property that should not count against the substantially all threshold for QOZ Businesses, such as goods and services in transit, and vehicles used to transport goods and services in and out of zones.

## 2. 50 Percent Gross Income Test

We are deeply concerned with the proposed rule requiring a Qualified Opportunity Zone Business to derive 50 percent of its gross income from the active conduct of a trade or business “*in the qualified opportunity zone.*” This requirement is a departure from the plain language of the statute, and adds a level of rigidity that would dramatically curtail investments in operating businesses, given that many of these businesses will sell their products and services outside of the boundary of the zone in which they operate. Additionally, this would impose huge administrative burdens on businesses receiving Opportunity Fund investments to determine how to accurately calculate income received from activities conducted inside and outside of an Opportunity Zone. To address these concerns, we urge Treasury to adhere to the original language in the statute that requires at least 50 percent of an Opportunity Zone Business’s total gross income come from the active conduct of its trade or business.

## 3. Timing Flexibility for Qualified Opportunity Funds

We believe that Qualified Opportunity Funds (QOFs) should be given adequate start up time in order to work with cities to identify projects that have the most impact in providing economic opportunity to low income residents. This is particularly true for QOFs that are formed to invest in zones with high concentrations of poverty and historic patterns of dis-investment where even with the added incentives offered by Opportunity Zones, investors face high hurdles. Cities are currently developing investment projects and strategies to present to QOFs for potential investment into such communities. We are committed to using our resources to unlock private capital for these places as well, but such a development process requires sufficient lead time. The proposed regulations include a 31-month safe harbor at the business level for the acquisition, construction, and/or substantial improvement of tangible property, but a similar safe harbor is needed for Opportunity Funds to allow time to prudently deploy capital. In addition, flexibility should be provided for the safe harbor in the event project development is delayed due to court-imposed permitting delays.

## 4. Substantial Improvement Test for Operating Businesses

In defining Qualified Opportunity Zone Business Property, the statute requires that the property’s original use in the zone commences with the QOF, or that the QOF substantially improve the property by adding 100 percent of its basis over a 30-month period. In the context of an operating QOZ Business, it could be quite difficult and administratively burdensome to try to meet this test on an asset-by-asset basis. Treasury could provide that this test be met by a QOZ Business on an aggregate basis; if the QOZ Business doubled its basis in its aggregate business assets over the 30-month period, it would be treated as substantially improving its business assets. This would allow existing businesses to qualify as QOZ Businesses while still requiring that new investment and economic activity occur in the zone, and reducing undue administrative burden.

Treasury should consider allowing QOF investments into existing businesses that result in a substantial increase in the *intangible* property of a qualifying business to qualify under the substantial improvement test, just as investments that result in a substantial improvement of tangible property are eligible. The tangible property requirement is biased against financing the growth of QOZ businesses whose assets are primarily intangible in nature--often the very STEM businesses, such as software firms or biotech startups, that have the most transformative potential for local economies. Such businesses, however, must contribute economic activity to the zone.

**5. Reporting Requirements**

In order to properly evaluate the impact and intended effects of the Opportunity Zone program, Treasury should require QOFs to collect and submit transactional level information on the projects they invest in, including anticipated economic and job creation benefits to the zone. The collection of data should not be onerous, but sufficient to allow researchers and local government officials to reasonably measure the impact QOF investments have on low-income neighborhoods and their residents.

**6. Alignment with Complementary Programs**

It is important to recognize that some important projects, especially those in communities of historic dis-investment, will require additional incentives to come to fruition. It is likely that some projects will require incentives from the New Markets Tax Credit, the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and other development incentives. We encourage Treasury to affirm that these other tax credits can be used in the financing of projects that also have QOF investment.

We look forward to continuing to work with Treasury and the IRS to develop effective Opportunity Zone provisions that will bring much needed investment to communities in need.

If you have any questions, please contact U.S. Conference of Mayor staff Dave Gatton [dgatton@usmayors.org](mailto:dgatton@usmayors.org) 202-861-6712.

Sincerely,



Steve Benjamin  
President  
U.S. Conference of Mayors  
Mayor of Columbia, SC



Tom Cochran  
CEO and Executive Director  
U.S. Conference of Mayors