

# Thinking Ahead for the Next Ten Year Cycle

Summarizing the topic, setting a goal, and suggesting a process

## **TOPIC FOR COMMISSIONERS TO CONSIDER**

As we move into the second decade of conducting reviews, how do we most efficiently utilize commissioner expertise and JLARC staff resources to provide the Legislature with the most valuable analysis of the performance of tax preferences, while recognizing that resources are limited?

## **GOAL**

Define a process that efficiently utilizes commissioner expertise and JLARC staff resources prior to establishing a new 10 year schedule.

- The new 10 year schedule covering 2017-2026 would likely be adopted by June 2016.

## **INITIAL STEP TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL**

At the May 2015 meeting:

- Identify whether there is consensus to assess the overall process and consider establishing strategic priorities for the future.
- Develop key issues for consideration.
- Charge JLARC staff with developing issue briefs.
- Establish key dates, with a likely suggestion for two extra Commission meetings.
- Determine process for public input.

## **Potential Key Issues:**

1. Are there categories of previously reviewed preferences that may merit de-emphasizing for a second review by JLARC staff? For example:
  - *Preferences previously reviewed by JLARC staff with no subsequent legislative action.*
  - *Preferences recommended to continue for administrative or structural reasons, such as avoiding double-taxation.*
  - *Preferences recommended for continuation by both JLARC staff and the Commission.*
  - *Preferences with no data to evaluate metrics, regardless of whether they are implied or stated.*
  - *Etc.*
2. Should the Commission continue to group preferences by industry sector or by preferences established for a similar purpose?
3. Are there preferences that the Commission wants to declare a “critical part of the structure of the tax system” (and not subject to review)?
4. Should preferences with new “performance statement” provisions receive greater priority in the schedule?
5. Should the Commission de-emphasize preferences that do not result in a net change in revenues (e.g., property tax preferences)?
6. Are there questions evaluated by the JLARC staff that should be de-emphasized? Are there questions that should be added? If so, do they require additional JLARC resources?
7. Does the overall review effort merit additional JLARC staff resources?

**Potential Decision Process and Dates:**

ACTIVITY	DATE	RESPONSIBILITY
Consensus to proceed; identification of key issues; notification to public that Commission seeks input at September meeting	May 2015	Commissioners
Public input/comment	September 2015	Commissioners
JLARC staff report back on issue briefs, Commissioners discuss and receive additional public comment (either written or oral)	April 2016	JLARC staff
Commissioners develop proposals for new policies/processes	pre-May 2016 meeting	Commissioners JLARC staff to distribute electronically
Commission adopts policies and issues report	May 2016	Commissioners
Commission adopts new 10-year schedule	June 2016	Commissioners