***Trentadue v. Commissioner*, T.C. Memo. 2004-209**

Vineyard trellises are considered agricultural equipment eligible for a shorter depreciation period, while irrigation systems and wells are land improvements with a longer depreciation period, based on permanence and affixation to land.

Summary

In this Tax Court case, the petitioners, vineyard owners, depreciated trellises, irrigation systems, and a well as agricultural equipment (10-year class life). The IRS reclassified these as land improvements (20-year class life), leading to tax deficiencies. The Tax Court, applying the six *Whiteco* factors to assess permanence, held that vineyard trellises are properly classified as agricultural equipment due to their movability and function directly related to grape production. However, the court determined that drip irrigation systems and the well, being substantially affixed to the land and intended to be permanent, are land improvements. This decision clarified the distinction between farm equipment and land improvements for depreciation purposes in vineyard operations.

Facts

Petitioners operated Trentadue Winery and Vineyards, growing grapes for wine production. They used trellises for most grape varietals and drip irrigation systems. Trellises consisted of posts, stakes, and wires, designed to train vines and improve grape quality. Irrigation systems involved buried PVC pipes and surface tubing delivering water to each vine. A newly constructed well supplied water for the entire farm property. Petitioners depreciated trellises, irrigation, and the well as agricultural equipment with a 10-year class life. The IRS determined these were land improvements with a 20-year class life.

Procedural History

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) issued a notice of deficiency, adjusting petitioners' depreciation deductions by classifying trellises, irrigation systems, and the well as land improvements instead of agricultural equipment. Petitioners contested this determination in the U.S. Tax Court.

Issue(s)

1. Whether vineyard trellises should be classified as land improvements (20-year class life) or agricultural equipment (10-year class life) for depreciation purposes.
2. Whether vineyard drip irrigation systems should be classified as land improvements (20-year class life) or agricultural equipment (10-year class life) for depreciation purposes.
3. Whether the farm well should be classified as a land improvement (20-year class life) or agricultural equipment (10-year class life) for depreciation

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

purposes.

Holding

1. No, vineyard trellises are classified as agricultural equipment because they are not considered permanent improvements to land due to their movability and direct relation to grape production.
2. Yes, vineyard drip irrigation systems are classified as land improvements because a substantial portion is buried underground and intended to be a permanent part of the vineyard infrastructure.
3. Yes, the farm well is classified as a land improvement because it is permanently affixed to the realty and intended to be a long-term water source for the property.

Court's Reasoning

The court applied the six factors from *Whiteco Industries, Inc. v. Commissioner* to determine if the assets were permanent land improvements. These factors considered movability, design permanence, intended affixation length, removal difficulty, damage upon removal, and affixation method.

For **trellises**, the court found:

- Movability: Trellis components are movable and reusable.
- Design: Not designed to be permanently in place.
- Intended Length: Intended to last the life of the vines, but vines are replaced.
- Removal: Labor intensive but components can be salvaged.
- Damage: Minimal damage if carefully removed.
- Affixation: Posts are rammed into the ground, not set in concrete, easily removable.

Based on these factors, a majority favored petitioners, leading the court to conclude trellises are not permanent land improvements but are akin to "fences" which are classified as agricultural equipment. The court stated, "*The posts and stakes used by petitioners, in combination with the wires, constitute a machine that is adjusted, modified, and changed in order to train grapevines to produce high-quality grapes for the production of wine.*"

For **irrigation systems**, the court found:

- Movability: Difficult to remove and largely unusable after removal.
- Design: Intended to remain permanently, mostly buried underground.
- Intended Length: Intended to last the life of the vines.
- Removal: Time-consuming and destructive to the system.
- Damage: Significant damage upon removal.
- Affixation: Buried underground.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

A majority of factors favored the IRS. The court analogized irrigation systems to underground sprinkler systems, deemed permanent improvements. The court noted, *"The placement of a substantial portion of the pipe or tubing in the ground and the difficulty of removing the system are the primary factors that render the irrigation systems we consider here to be permanent land improvements."*

For the **well**, all factors indicated permanence, as it is drilled deep into the ground, encased in concrete, and intended as a permanent water source.

Practical Implications

Trentadue provides guidance on classifying farm assets for depreciation, especially in vineyards. It emphasizes the *Whiteco* factors to distinguish between land improvements and equipment. Assets easily moved, not permanently affixed, and directly related to crop production (like trellises) are more likely equipment with shorter depreciation. Assets deeply affixed, intended to be permanent infrastructure (like wells and buried irrigation), are land improvements with longer depreciation. This case highlights that even if an asset is essential to farming, its degree of permanence and affixation to land are key in determining its depreciation class life. Legal professionals should analyze similar cases using the *Whiteco* factors to determine proper asset classification for depreciation in agricultural settings.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.