# SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE TAX EXPENDITURE WORKING GROUP

| # | Source | Area | Ideas for change or improvement; suggestions for consideration | Notes |
|---|--------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1 | PEW | Data | Can evaluators securely access relevant data? | |
| 2 | TERWG | Data | Should there be a standard administrative process/format for administering agency collection and reporting of data necessary for evaluation?  How to handle confidential information. | |
| 3 | MRS | Expedited Review | Remove expedited review process | |
| 4 | OPEGA | Expedited Review | Consider how to continue with expedited reviews now that 6-year cycle is complete. (Is continuing review helpful; balance resources needed compared to usefulness.) | |
| 5 | DECD | Full Evaluations | Shift focus on economic development tax expenditures to DECD 3d-party evaluation required by 5 MRSA §13070-O (Related challenge: Reviewing TE programs in isolation overlooks inter-relationships and does not permit broad policy considerations) | |
| 6 | MRS | Full Evaluations | Identify (prioritize) type of tax expenditures that should be subject to full review. | |
| 7 | MRS | Full Evaluations | Focus full reviews on tax policy of expenditure using empirical and survey findings and other methods to analyze effectiveness (Related challenge: Should so much attention be placed on administrative audit functions or should tax policy analysis be focus?) | |
| 8 | MRS | Full Evaluations | Limit full reviews to one per year.  Focus on TAX committee priorities (Related challenge: Amount of time required is burdensome) | |
| 9 | OPEGA | Full Evaluations | Consider options for remaining full evaluations: Assess what remains as a group; consider targeted background research to compile basic information and/or assess Initial review whether statutory provision is ready for review or whether needs legislative clarification. | |

| # | Source | Area | Ideas for change or improvement; suggestions for consideration | Notes |
|---|--------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 10 | OPEGA | Future Evaluation | Consider whether statutes and/or legislative process should be amended to ensure tax expenditure legislation is set up to facilitate future evaluation. (Related challenge: Many older TEs do not have statutory structure to facilitate evaluation (purposes and goals; measurable outcomes; data reporting requirements); data may be difficult to obtain and/or confidential). | |
| 11 | TERWG | OPEGA Resources | Should staff numbers be increased to permit more rapid review? Should OPEGA have TER dedicated staff rather than staff who do both TER and program review? | |
| 12 | OPEGA | Overall process | Working Group should consider Legislature's general purpose, intent and priorities for TER process. What are the priorities in the balancing act between output, resources and scope of work, while ensuring quality is maintained? | |
| 13 | OPEGA | Overall process | Review the statutory language set up to guide the process before we had experience with the reviews; Should statutory language that frames the review be revised to clarify needs and expectations? Consider degree of specificity and evaluation process requirements (compare to other OPEGA reviews) | |
| 14 | PEW | Overall process | Does the scope of the evaluation process reflect legislative priorities and evaluator capacity? | |
| 15 | PEW | Overall process | Is the process suitably linked with policymaking? | |
| 16 | PEW | Overall Process | Does the review schedule yield maximum benefit? | |
| 17 | TERWG | Overall process | Should roles of GOC and TAX be considered in review of OPEGA final reports? | |
| 18 | TERWG | Overall process | Should WG review neglected statute requiring DECD to review certain economic development legislation prior to enactment to assist legislature in meeting evaluation process objectives? See 5 MRSA §13070-O. | |
| 19 | TERWG | Overall process | Difficulty of verifying "but for" requirement. (Isolating impact; attribution) | |

| # | Source | Area | Ideas for change or improvement; suggestions for consideration | Notes |
|---|--------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 20 | TERWG | Overall process | Is there a way to address overlap of OPEGA, DECD, MRS/other agencies review? | |
| 21 | FAME | Policy Committees | Consider increasing input by policy committee when suggesting program design or reporting requirement changes. | |
| 22 | OPEGA | Policy Committees | Consider options for addressing policy committees' needs during session consideration of legislation.<br>(Related challenge: Timing.  Policy committee may want evaluation to support work on legislation currently before it.   Reports may become available when policy committee is fully scheduled with session responsibilities or during interims when meetings are difficult to schedule.) | |
| 23 | TERWG | Policy Committees | What is best timing for transmission of report to facilitate timely policy committee consideration? | |
| 24 | TERWG | Policy Committees | Should evaluation parameters be provided to policy committee prior to decisions on bills being considered? | |
| 25 | FAME | State Agencies | Agency could use additional funding resources to assist with functions required by review process<br>(Related challenge: Review process requires significant commitment of FAME resources with limited available resources.) | |
| 26 | MRS | State Agencies | Allow agency review communications during review process<br>(Related challenge: Inability to communicate with other agencies ) | |