

SB1178 Open Meeting Minutes  
Relating to Cost Benefit, Return on Investment and Dynamic Scoring Techniques  
November 4, 2010

**Attendees**

<b>EDR</b>	Amy Baker Melissa Hallaian	Frank Williams	David Dobbs	Sayed Miah
<b>House</b>	Don Langston	Sarah Voyles	Adam Tecler	
<b>Senate</b>	Jose Diez-Arguelles	Ellen Fournier		
<b>OPPAGA</b>	Mark West			
<b>EOG</b>	Christian Weiss	Clyde Diao		
<b>Agencies</b>	Rick Creamer (HSMV) Keith Veitinger (HSMV)	Jim Lewandowski (HSMV)		
<b>Others</b>	Stefan Norrbin (FSU) Charles Milsted (AARP) Jose Gonzalez (AIF)	Don Schlagenhauf (FSU) Kurt Wenner (Tax Watch) Stephen Shiver (AIF Consultant)		

**Discussion**

Amy Baker began the meeting by discussing the outline of the report required by SB 1178 on the protocols and procedures developed to govern the use of the statewide policy analysis tools. A brief description was then given of each section of the report which included the Discussion Items, Protocols, and Procedures (see attached handout).

The meeting was then opened for questions.

A question was asked about whether the results of the analysis techniques would be incorporated into the budgeting process and estimating conference products. The response was that the formal use of the analysis techniques is new to the state. Therefore, initially the results will be provided as supplemental information for policy makers. After gaining experience with the process and calibrating the tools to actual results, the state will evaluate whether the analysis techniques have evolved to the point that the results are precise enough to be incorporated into the budgeting process and the estimating conference reports. The key criterion is that the constitutional requirement to have sufficient revenues to meet the expenditures of the state is met. In addition, for the first few years, the statewide model will only be used to analyze tax proposals. The ability to analyze budget proposals will be added gradually.

A question was asked as to whether staff were talking to others outside of state government and whether the process was going to be open and transparent. The response was that staff began the process by reviewing all of the available literature on the analysis techniques. In addition, staff has contacted university personnel and other states with experience in the techniques. The conduct of a peer review of the statewide model once it has been developed is also under discussion. The intention is for the process of employing the analysis techniques to be completely transparent. To that end, documentation on assumptions, protocols, procedures, the statewide model, and completed analyses will all be made available through the internet.

# MEETING HANDOUT