

Statewide Policy Analysis Tools
Meetings with Consensus Estimating Conference Principals
August 17 and 18, 2010

Attendees

EDR	Amy Baker Sayed Miah Carolyn Dubard	Frank Williams Kathy McCharen Beth Lines	David Dobbs Pam Schenker	Tim Campbell Jim LaCrosse
House	Don Langston Stephanie Massengale	Greg Davis	Allyce Heflin	Gail Lollie
Senate	Tim Sadberry Paul Bryant	Mike Hanson Mark Armstrong	Marta Hardy	Kurt Hamon
EOG	Christian Weiss Holger Ciupalo	Randy Ball Glenda Newman	Thomas Zuehlke Scott Kittle	Carolyn Hardy

Discussion

A series of four meetings was held the week of August 16, 2010, with each of the consensus estimating conferences (Criminal Justice, Social Services, Education, and Revenue and Demographics) most likely to be impacted by the Statewide Policy Analysis Tools legislation (SB 1178) passed during the 2010 legislative session. A handout providing an overview of the legislation was provided to each of the participants.

The meetings included:

- Overview of the legislation
- Overview of the tools mentioned in the legislation – protocols and procedures, policy analysis techniques, and the model
- Description of the policy analysis techniques mentioned in the legislation – cost-benefit (C/B), return-on-investment (ROI), dynamic scoring and other techniques
- Summary of the project timeline
 - Year 1 – Protocols and procedures
 - Year 2 – Standardization and implementation of the policy analysis techniques
 - Year 3 – Completion of the Florida specific model to provide input to the policy analysis techniques
- Discussion of cost-benefit and return-on-investment analyses that have been provided by outside entities in the past
- Discussion of the timeframe for the policy analyses – number of years to be included
- Discussion of whether the special policy analyses should be addressed in the existing consensus estimating conferences or by a new consensus estimating conference structure
- Discussion of whether the special policy analyses should be statewide or regional

Statewide Policy Analysis Tools
Meetings with Consensus Estimating Conference Principals
August 17 and 18, 2010

- Discussion of whether the results of the special policy analyses should be supplemental information or fully integrated into the planning and budgeting process
- Discussion of who will be able to request special policy analyses

C/B and ROI provided by outside entities – most of the participants stated that they have received some analyses from outside entities in the past, and some participants stated that they have requested C/B analysis from outside entities on proposed legislation. A benefit of developing and adopting the protocols and procedures for the statewide policy analysis techniques is that they will provide the standard for judging analyses from outside entities.

Timeframe for policy analyses – the number of years discussed were 5, 7, 10 and 20. 10 years was the general consensus because it is the minimum amount of time most policy changes will need to affect the economy; the annual Long-Term Revenue Analysis is 10 years; and, statute requires the consensus estimating conferences to produce forecasts of at least 10 years (s. 216.134, F.S.).

Consensus estimating conferences to address special requests – all of the participants expressed the opinion that, regardless of the structure, they would be involved in analyses related to their areas. Considerations were that performing the special analyses may change the purview of the existing conferences. Also, some special policy analyses may involve staff from more than one of the existing conferences. However, if new conferences were established, then statute may need to be changed.

Statewide or regional analyses – some participants expressed an interest in producing regional impact analyses; however, the consensus was that the ability to produce statewide analyses is the priority and the ability to produce regional analyses could be explored later.

Supplemental information or integral part of analysis – the general consensus was that, at least to begin with, the results of the special analyses should be supplemental information for policy makers. As the process matures, the goal is to make the results an integral part of policy analyses.

Ability to request special policy analyses – current statute specifies that the President and Speaker may request a special policy analysis. In essence, anyone has the ability to suggest topics for special analyses to the President and Speaker.