AGENDA

Friday, September 20, 2013
1:00 p.m.
John A. Cherberg Building
Senate Hearing Room 3
Olympia, WA

Revised

1. Action Item: Approval of August 16, 2013, Meeting Minutes

2. Action Item: 10-Year Review Schedule
   A. Technical Changes After 2013 Session
   B. Determination of 2014 Review Schedule
   C. Approval of 10-Year Schedule

   Possible Recess

3. Public Comment on 2013 Tax Preference Performance Reviews


To better inform their deliberations, Commissioners ask that stakeholders include responses to a set of questions when presenting testimony either in support or in opposition to a tax preference. The questions are found on the back of this agenda or at the link below.

Link to Committee Questions for Public Testimony

Please Note: The Commission reserves the right to move agenda items as needed.

* Added agenda item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Commissioners’ Questions for Individuals Providing Public Testimony Regarding a Specific Tax Preference</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To better inform their deliberations, Commissioners ask that stakeholders include responses to a set of questions when presenting testimony either in support or in opposition to a tax preference. Commissioners are seeking stakeholder input on all tax preferences currently under review, including both those for which JLARC audit staff has prepared analyses and recommendations (Full Report) and those for which staff has not prepared analyses or recommendations (Expedited Report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners request stakeholders supplement their testimony by directly answering the following questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there evidence that the tax preference is achieving its intended purpose, as noted in the 2013 tax preferences reports? If so, please explain and provide documented evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the tax preference provide other benefits which are not stated in its purpose? If so, please explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the tax preference stimulate economic activity that either results in additional tax revenues or reduces state budget expenditures by an amount that exceeds the direct loss of revenue from the preference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the tax preference have any negative consequences? For example, were other industries, workers, or the environment harmed by the economic activities stimulated by this tax preference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>