Essential tax and wealth planning guide

2027 EDITION

Multistate tax developments



Deloitte.

GET STARTED

03 Multistate tax developments





03 Multistate tax developments

There is a growing trend among the states to increase taxes on high-net-worth individuals. In this chapter, we highlight new taxes in several states and localities, including noteworthy tax measures that voters approved and rejected in the November election.

Some of these taxes, like the failed wealth tax in California, would have broken new ground by taxing the value of assets, including unrealized gains, but most are imposed on income or property:

- **Higher marginal rates for the top income tax bracket**
- **Surcharges on income above a certain threshold**
- **Taxes on capital gains**
- **Property taxes on high-value second homes**
- **Expanded sourcing rules that operate to tax capital gains in states other than one's state of residence**

03 Multistate tax developments

Expanded sourcing rules may result in individuals receiving unexpected tax bills from a state with which they have little or no direct connection.

For many affected individuals, these taxes may factor into decisions about where to live, own property, and invest. State tax burdens already vary significantly across the country, and recent developments may increase those differences. These developments, particularly proposals involving wealth taxes, also raise policy and legal questions that are beyond the scope of this publication.

The table beginning on the next page summarizes the new taxes. We also included California's Proposition 40, which voters rejected, because its proponents have indicated that they intend to pursue a similar measure in California in 2028, and similar proposals may arise in other jurisdictions.[1] We cover California, New York City, and the topics of residency and taxing gains of nonresidents in more detail below.



[1] Alicia Clanton and Felipe Marques, "California voters poised to reject first-ever billionaire tax," *Daily Tax Report State* (Bloomberg Tax), November 5, 2026.

03 Multistate tax developments

Where each measure stands

In effect now | Enacted, effective later | Passed Nov. 3 | Failed Nov. 3 | Constitutionally prohibited

Income taxes

Thresholds shown are for single filers. For Maine, Maryland, and Hawaii, the threshold amount is doubled for joint returns.
Rhode Island and Massachusetts apply one threshold regardless of filing status.

Maine*	2% surtax on taxable income over $1 million for tax years after 2025, producing a 9.15% top marginal rate.
Maryland	6.25% on taxable income over $500,000 and 6.5% on taxable income over $1 million, plus a separate 2% tax on capital gain where federal adjusted gross income exceeds $350,000, for tax years after 2025.
Massachusetts*	4% surtax on taxable income over $1,107,750 (indexed for inflation going forward) for tax years after 2023.
New York City	Unincorporated business tax credit reduced from 23% for city residents with city taxable income over $1 million, phased down to a reduction of 15% for city taxable income over $1.25 million, for tax years after 2025.
Rhode Island	3% surtax on taxable income over $1 million, phasing in at 1% in 2027 and 2% in 2028 and reaching 3% in 2029, for an 8.99% top marginal rate.
Hawaii	13% top rate on taxable income over $500,000 for tax years beginning after 2026.
Washington*	9.9% tax on income over $1 million per household, for tax years after 2027.
California	Proposition 3 made the existing 10.3%, 11.3%, and 12.3% rates permanent after tax year 2030, which is when they were scheduled to expire.
Colorado	Amendment 87 replaced the 4.4% flat rate with graduated rates reaching 8.4% on income over $1 million, after tax year 2026.

* Maine, Massachusetts, and Washington: These states have passthrough entity tax provisions. This means that for income received from a partnership or S corporation, the entity may elect to pay the state tax on behalf of the partner or shareholder. This reduces the distributive share of income to the partner or shareholder, but effectively allows the partner or shareholder to deduct their state taxes in excess of the federal limitation, which is currently $40,000.

Where each measure stands (continued)

In effect now | Enacted, effective later | Passed Nov. 3 | Failed Nov. 3 | Constitutionally prohibited

Property taxes

New York City	0.8% to 1.3% annual surcharge on non-owner-occupied residential properties with market values of $5 million or more starting July 1, 2026, as discussed in more detail in the New York City section on page 34.
Rhode Island	0.5% annual surcharge on non-owner-occupied residential properties with assessed values above $1 million, and only the portion above it, starting July 1, 2026.

Net worth taxes

California	Proposition 40 would have imposed a one-time 5% tax on the net worth of any individual who was a resident of California on January 1, 2026, and who had a net worth of over $1 billion as of December 31, 2026, as discussed in more detail in the California section below.
Texas	In 2023, voters approved a constitutional amendment that bars the state from enacting a tax measured by net worth.

Ballot-measure results described in this chapter reflect results reported by the relevant election authorities as of November 9, 2026. Reported results remain subject to each state's canvass, certification, and any applicable recount or judicial process.

California's failed wealth tax and other ballot measures

On November 3, 2026, California voters approved Propositions 3 and 42 and rejected Propositions 40 and 41. Proposition 40—the Billionaire Tax Act (or the "Act")—would have imposed a one-time 5% tax on the net worth of any individual who was a resident of California on January 1, 2026, and who has a net worth of over $1 billion as of December 31, 2026.

This highlights a unique aspect of California's political framework. In California, a ballot initiative becomes law if it receives a simple majority of votes cast in the election. By comparison, for the California Legislature to enact a tax law, two-thirds of both houses must approve. Unlike the final text of legislation, which is developed through a deliberative legislative process, a ballot initiative is drafted by its proponents; its text cannot be revised, and voters approve or reject it as written.

A health care workers' union sponsored Proposition 40 in response to reductions in federal health care funding. Its drafters (three tax law professors and an economist) designed the measure to address what they view as a limitation of tax systems that tax income and not wealth: "The taxation system is poorly adapted to the way that today's top sliver of Americans accumulate wealth, contributing to soaring inequality. While the tax system is fairly effective at collecting revenue from wage earners, it allows massive wealth to amass outside the income tax system."[2] *The Wall Street Journal* reported that "the four have advised on a host of similar measures at both the state and federal level that have stalled so far," none of which has been enacted to date.[3]

The drafters also designed the statute to be portable, meaning other states could adopt it with modifications. The table beginning on the next page summarizes the key provisions of Proposition 40.



[2] Juliet Chung, "The four academics who dreamed up California's billionaire tax," *Wall Street Journal*, October 29, 2026.

[3] Ibid.

Proposition 40 at a glance

Tax	One-time 5% excise tax on the activity of sustaining excessive accumulations of wealth. Not deductible for income tax purposes.
Tax base	The entire net worth of an individual who was a California resident on January 1, 2026 (an "Applicable Individual"), with a net worth over $1 billion measured on December 31, 2026. A married couple counts as one Applicable Individual. (For net worth between $1 billion and $1.1 billion, the 5% rate phases in linearly starting at 0% for $1 billion, increasing by 0.1% for each $2 million over $1 billion).
Property included in net worth	All assets owned by the taxpayer and their spouse worldwide are included unless expressly excluded. In addition, the following assets are treated as owned by the Applicable Individual: • Assets above $50,000 owned by anyone who can be claimed as a dependent. • Property transferred to others after October 15, 2025 (e.g., cash and the value of property given away, including to charities). • Assets held in trust, as discussed later. • The value of Roth IRAs in excess of $10 million.

Property excluded from net worth	• Directly held real property—must be held directly or by a revocable trust. • Obligations of the United States that cannot be taxed by reason of 31 U.S.C. § 3124 (e.g., U.S. Treasuries). • Tangible personal property physically outside California for at least 270 days during 2026. • Tax qualified retirement plans such as a 401(k), 403(b), and traditional IRA.
Property held in trusts	• In general, the value of a trust is attributed to an Applicable Individual if the Applicable Individual transferred property to the trust at any time in the past. • If a trust has a beneficiary that is a resident of California, and if there is no attribution to an Applicable Individual, then the beneficiary is treated as owning the trust's assets that are currently distributable to him or her, whether or not distributed.

Proposition 40 at a glance (continued)

Valuation rules	The general rule is "fair market value"—the price property would trade for in an arm's-length transaction between a willing buyer and willing seller. • Publicly traded property is valued using the market price on December 31, 2026 (e.g., publicly traded securities and other property traded on an exchange, like cryptocurrencies, etc.). • Interests in privately owned entities are valued using a prescribed formula: GAAP book value plus 7.5% times GAAP book profits (average of last three years); the resulting value is multiplied by the taxpayer's ownership percentage. • This formula value is presumed correct. A taxpayer may rebut the presumption by obtaining a "certified appraisal" establishing a lower FMV, although discounts (e.g., lack of control and lack of marketability) are expressly prohibited. • In the case of profits interests, a taxpayer's ownership percentage is presumed to equal the maximum percentage of the entity's profits that may be earned. • In the case of interests that have control rights, a taxpayer's ownership percentage is presumed to equal the control percentage. • An asset cannot be valued for less than the amount for which it is insured.

Filing and payment	The tax will be reported on forms included with the personal income tax return, and the tax will be due on the extended due date for filing the return, October 15, 2027. A taxpayer can pay in full, or may elect to pay in five annual installments with a nondeductible 7.5% annual deferral charge. Taxpayers who do not have sufficient liquid assets to pay the tax may qualify for an Optional Deferral Account, which allows for payment over time as assets become liquid, and the obligation continues until fully paid by the taxpayer or their estate.
Penalties and enforcement	If tax is understated by more than 20% of the amount shown on the return, a penalty equal to 20% of the understatement is assessed. If the understatement is more than 40% of the tax shown on the return, the penalty is 40% of the understatement. The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) is directed to audit all individuals who report and pay the tax. The Act also includes anti-avoidance provisions, that effectively direct the FTB to review whether actions taken by a taxpayer were principally for the purpose of tax avoidance. The statute of limitations for the FTB to make an assessment is 10 years, i.e., October 15, 2037.

03 Multistate tax developments

If enacted, Proposition 40 would have been the first wealth tax in the country. Although it did not pass, its proponents have indicated that they intend to continue advocating for a wealth tax in future election cycles, including in 2028.[4] Because the drafters designed the statute to be portable, conceptually similar proposals may also arise in other jurisdictions.

Several provisions of the Act would have raised legal and policy questions. For example, the Act would have included the current value of certain trust property in a settlor's or beneficiary's taxable net worth, even though settlors and beneficiaries do not own or possess the trust property. Furthermore, gifts (charitable or otherwise) an individual made at the end of 2025 and during 2026 would have been included in the donor's net worth.

During 2026, some high-net-worth individuals and family offices evaluated whether their net worth exceeded $1 billion and how the statute's provisions might apply to their circumstances.

Applying the valuation rules previously discussed to specific circumstances presented practical challenges. Contract rights, deferred compensation, S corporation stock, and interests in partnerships, including venture capital and private equity funds, may be difficult to value. An owner might look to a capital account or liquidation value as an indicator of fair market value. However, the statute would have required the business to be valued under a prescribed formula or through a certified appraisal, and investors may not have had the information needed to apply either method.

The law would have required the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) to audit each individual who reported and paid the tax, and it would have provided a 10-year statute of limitations. This would have resulted in prolonged audits and related administrative appeals and litigation, primarily contesting the value of specific assets, and the potential for additional tax liability, penalties and interest.



[4] Clanton et al., "California voters poised to reject first-ever billionaire tax."

03 Multistate tax developments

The drafters also left many interpretative questions to the FTB, which would have had only a few months to issue regulations. Even so, many questions would have likely remained unresolved well into 2027, although the tax would have remained due on October 15, 2027.

In short, this would not have been an easy tax to understand and apply, especially in such a short time frame. The drafters have published lengthy papers explaining the meaning and intent of the Act's provisions in response to questions from the professional community. Those questions and explanations reflect the Act's complexity.

Voters also decided the fates of Propositions 41, 42, 43, and 3, as shown in the table on the next page.

If enacted, Proposition 40 would have been the first wealth tax in the country.



Tax measures on the November 2026 ballot

Measure	Pass/Fail	What it does or would have done	Interaction with Proposition 40
Proposition 40	Fail	Would have imposed a one-time 5% excise tax on the net worth of individuals who were California residents on January 1, 2026, with a net worth in excess of $1 billion, as discussed above.	N/A
Proposition 41	Fail	Would have nullified state taxes enacted after January 1, 2026, that exempt their revenues from the voter-approved state spending limit. Would have required pre-election and recurring audits of programs funded by new special taxes.	N/A. Both measures failed.
Proposition 42	Pass	Amends the California Constitution to prohibit any new state tax (1) on the ownership or control of retirement holdings, individually owned assets, and other forms of personal savings, or (2) that applies retroactively based on a taxpayer's past activities. Nullifies taxes enacted after January 1, 2026, that conflict with this measure.	Because Proposition 40 failed, no conflict between the two measures arises. However, Proposition 42 may prohibit a similar net worth tax in the future.
Proposition 43	Fail	Would have raised the percentage of votes required to pass local special taxes (e.g., taxes to support a city or school district, etc.) from 50% to two-thirds.	N/A
Proposition 3	Pass	Makes permanent the high-income rates approved in 2012 and extended in 2016, which otherwise expire in 2031, as previously discussed.	N/A

03 Multistate tax developments

The passage of Proposition 42 may prove to be even more significant than the failure of Proposition 40. This is because Proposition 42 amends the California Constitution to prohibit the enactment of any "tax on the ownership or control of retirement holdings, individually owned assets, and other forms of personal savings, whether held directly or indirectly." This constitutional amendment would have to be repealed by the voters in order for California to enact a wealth tax in the future, whether as a ballot initiative or legislation. Proposition 42 also effectively limits the California Legislature to raising revenue by traditional measures (i.e., income, real property and sales taxes).



New York City pied-à-terre tax

New York City enacted an annual tax (referred to as a surcharge) on the market value of homes not used as a primary residence by the owner, an immediate family member of the owner, or a tenant with an arm's-length lease of at least one year. The tax is effective for five years beginning July 1, 2026. The rate depends on the property type and value, as shown in the table on the right. For reasons related to New York City's property assessment rules, condominiums and cooperative units are taxed at a higher rate for the first two years of the tax.

New York City surcharge rates on non-primary residences

For the fiscal years beginning July 1, 2026, and July 1, 2027.

Property type	Market value tier	Rate (applies to entire value)
One- to three-family home	$5M to $15M	0.8%
One- to three-family home	Above $15M to $25M	1.05%
One- to three-family home	Above $25M	1.3%
Condo or co-op dwelling unit	$1M to $3M	4.0%
Condo or co-op dwelling unit	Above $3M to $5M	5.25%
Condo or co-op dwelling unit	Above $5M	6.5%

For the fiscal years beginning July 1, 2028, July 1, 2029, and July 1, 2030.

Property type	Market value tier	Rate (applies to entire value)
All covered property	$5M to $15M	0.8%
All covered property	Above $15M to $25M	1.05%
All covered property	Above $25M	1.3%

03 Multistate tax developments

State tax residency and sourcing considerations

A state's tax policies may influence individuals' behavior, including whether to reside in a state, own property in a state, or invest in businesses that support the state's economy. For some, tax considerations may be a significant factor in decisions to leave high-tax states for low- or no-tax states.[5] State inheritance taxes may also factor into these decisions, as demonstrated by a few tax cases involving individuals who moved shortly before death with a stated intent not to be subject to the state's inheritance tax.

Press reports suggest that some wealthy individuals left or considered leaving California in anticipation of Proposition 40's proposed net worth tax.[6] The same is true in Washington state, which enacted an income tax on millionaires.[7]

The current trend toward higher state taxes on wealthy individuals may prompt families to evaluate the tax implications of where they live and where they own property. Those considerations may include the impacts of moving elsewhere. Another, less visible development may also affect these decisions: Some states are beginning to tax investment gains realized by nonresident individuals. The next section discusses these developments.



[5] *See* Cristobal Young and Ithai Lurie, "Taxing the rich: How incentives and embeddedness shape millionaire tax flight," *American Journal of Sociology* 131, no. 2 (2025): pp. 371–407 (finding that tax incentives affect migration at the margin, while personal and professional ties constrain mobility); *see also* Enrico Moretti and Daniel J. Wilson, "Taxing billionaires: Estate taxes and the geographical location of the ultra-wealthy," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 15, no. 2 (2023): pp. 424–66 (examining billionaires' residence responses to state estate taxes).

[6] *See* Jeanne Kuang and Kristen Hwang, "Billionaire tax explained: What you need to know about Prop. 40," *CalMatters*, updated October 20, 2026; Biz Carson and Dylan Sloan, "Billionaires ramp up California exits ahead of proposed 5% tax," *Bloomberg Law*, January 8, 2026.

[7] *See* Paul Roberts and Jim Brunner, "Are WA millionaires really leaving to avoid tax?," *Seattle Times*, republished in *The Spokesman-Review*, updated August 31, 2026.

Taxing nonresidents on investment gains

Under most state rules, when an individual sells an interest in a partnership, limited liability company, or S corporation, the gain is generally taxable only by the seller's state of residence. This has been the general rule for so long that many people take it for granted. Over the past few years, some states have changed or attempted to change this rule by treating a portion of the individual's gain as income sourced to, and therefore taxable by, the state. The "portion" the state seeks to tax generally is related to the percentage of business done by the entity in the state, based on tax rules that apportion the income of a business to the various states. The table on the right shows three examples.

How three states reach a nonresident's partnership gain

Gain on the sale of an intangible has generally been taxable only where the owner lives. Each state departs from that differently.

State	How the gain is sourced	What triggers it	Limits and exceptions
Illinois *35 ILCS 5/303(b)(4), added by P.A. 104-6, effective for tax years ending on or after June 16, 2025*	The average of the entity's Illinois apportionment factor for the year of sale and the two preceding years.	The entity is taxable in Illinois. Reaches S corporation shares as well as partnership interests.	An interest in an investment partnership. Whether a lower-tier interest qualifies is tested under Howey.
California *Cal. Code Regs. tit. 18, sections 17952 and 17951-4(d); FTB Legal Rulings 2021-01 and 2022-02*	To the seller's state of residence, unless the seller is unitary with the partnership, in which case the partnership's own factors apply.	Unity. A general partner is presumed unitary. A holding entity formed to give its owner control is unitary. An owner serving as an officer is not passive.	The Office of Tax Appeals rejected the section 751(a) sourcing position in FTB Legal Ruling 2022-02 in July 2026.
New York *N.Y. Tax Law sections 631(b)(1)(A)(1) and 632(a)(1)*	For a real-property-rich entity, in the ratio of New York real property to total assets. For a section 1060 sale, the partnership's business allocation percentage.	New York real property is at least 50% of assets, counting only assets held two years. Or the sale is subject to Internal Revenue Code section 1060.	Gain on intangibles is otherwise sourced to residence unless the property is employed in a business carried on in the state.

03 Multistate tax developments

Illinois and New York enacted statutes. By contrast, California and Massachusetts have asserted tax on this basis in audits, which means these positions are less publicly documented. These audit positions may create substantial uncertainty for years while taxpayers challenge them in tax tribunals and courts. Recent cases in California and Massachusetts highlight this point.

CALIFORNIA

A Florida resident did not pay tax to California on gains he realized in 2012 and 2013, relying on existing statutory and case law. The California FTB conducted an audit and assessed tax based on a novel legal theory, as announced publicly in Legal Ruling 2022-02. The taxpayer spent nearly 13 years challenging the assessment and ultimately prevailed in the Office of Tax Appeals, a decision the FTB cannot appeal.[8] While this particular position may be settled in favor of taxpayers, the FTB has also developed another position that results in taxing these gains in a similar manner, as noted in the table.

MASSACHUSETTS

Similar to the situation in California, the Massachusetts Department of Revenue sought to impose tax on a nonresident's gain from the 2013 sale of an interest in a partnership that did business in Massachusetts. The taxpayer challenged the assessment on constitutional grounds, and in 2022, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts ruled in favor of the taxpayer.[9] The court found that although the Constitution likely permitted Massachusetts to tax a portion of the nonresident's gain, Massachusetts had not enacted a statute to do so.

State and local tax developments may affect where high-net-worth individuals choose to live, own property, and invest, as well as the tax consequences of selling a business interest. The relevant considerations extend beyond tax rates and an individual's state of residence to include the types of taxes imposed and the rules governing residency, valuation, and sourcing. Individuals should work with their tax advisers to monitor developments in relevant jurisdictions and evaluate their potential effects before making significant personal or investment decisions.

This chapter contains general information only and is not a substitute for professional tax, legal, or financial advice. All figures and statuses reflect publicly available information as of November 16, 2026 and are subject to change as legislation, litigation, and ballot outcomes develop.

[8] *Appeal of Burch*, OTA Case Nos. 230112266 and 230112267, 2026-OTA-527P (Cal. Off. Tax App. July 24, 2026).

[9] *VAS Holdings & Invs. LLC v. Comm'r of Revenue*, 186 N.E.3d 1240 (Mass. 2022).

Deloitte.

This document contains general information only and Deloitte is not, by means of this document, rendering accounting, business, financial, investment, legal, tax, or other professional advice or services. This document is not a substitute for such professional advice or services, nor should it be used as a basis for any decision or action that may affect your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser. Deloitte shall not be responsible for any loss sustained by any person who relies on this document.

About Deloitte
Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") does not provide services to clients. In the United States, Deloitte refers to one or more of the US member firms of DTTL, their related entities that operate using the "Deloitte" name in the United States and their respective affiliates. Certain services may not be available to attest clients under the rules and regulations of public accounting. Please see deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms.

Deloitte Private is the brand under which firms in the Deloitte network provide services to privately owned entities and high-net-worth individuals.

Copyright © 2026 Deloitte Development LLC. All rights reserved.