Renew Political Tax Credit?

Presentation re HB 2407

Steve Robinson, Decision Metrics May 9, 2013





The data

- About **98,000** individual political contributors in 2010, half in the top 20% of earners
- **58%** of benefit to top tier
- Average credit: **\$78** for top tier, **\$27** for lowest
- Taxpayers claiming credit: **5.1%** since 1990
- Only **2%** participation in bottom 60%
- Total revenue impact:
 - 2011-13: **\$14.9 M** (\$17.1 M in 2014 \$)
 - Renewal, 3 biennia: **\$48.5 M** (in 2014 \$)





Contributions in 2012

Total transactions	Over 100,000
Total "new money" contributions	\$56.1 million
Individual contributions	\$15 million
Exceeding \$50-100 tax credit	~60%

Distribution of Credit, 2011



Total cost of program to date:

Originated in 1969 **21** biennia

Revenue impact in 2011-13: \$14.9 million

21 x \$14.9 million = **\$313 million**

(assuming 2011-13 was average)

HSCO Evaluation Criteria: Program Design

• Clear goal statement?

Typical:

"The statute that allows this expenditure does not explicitly state a purpose. Presumably, ..."

HSCO Evaluation Criteria: Program Design

- Clear goal statement?
- Desired, measurable objectives?

If missing or unclear:

- Try to amend statutes to correct problem
- Evaluate tax break against clear goals and objectives

If performance doesn't measure up

Options:

- 1. Terminate tax break program
- 2. Make immediate changes
- 3. Ask proponents to return in 2014 or 2015 with new, improved product

HSCO Evaluation Criteria: Program Design

- Clear goal statement?
- Desired, measurable objectives?
- Most efficient approach to goals?
- Properly targeted, avoids redundancy?
- Benefits exceed costs?
- Sufficient in size to achieve goals?
- Avoid negative results (e.g. windfall)?

HSCO Evaluation Criteria: Distribution and Administration

- Analysis of who benefits and how?
 - By type of beneficiary
 - By industries and/or geography
 - By income group
- Workable, efficient administration?
 - Clear qualification standards
 - Efficient enforcement, adequate safeguards
 - Sunset date no more than 3 biennia
 - Transparency, annual outcome reporting

Comparing Political Contribution Credit with HSCO Criteria

HSCO Criterion

Clear goal statement? Desired, measurable objectives?

Purpose statement in TER

"The statute that allows this expenditure does not explicitly state a purpose. Presumably, ... the purpose is to increase participation in the political process."

No

HSCO Criterion	?
Clear goal statement? Desired, measurable objectives?	No
Most efficient approach to goals? Benefits exceed costs? Sufficient in size to achieve goals?	N/A

Secretary of State:

"We are unable to determine if a tax expenditure is the most fiscally effective means of increasing public participation in the political process."



Statewide candidates include governor, legislators, judges, etc.

HSCO Criterion	?
Clear goal statement? Desired, measurable objectives?	Νο
Most efficient approach to goals? Benefits exceed costs? Sufficient in size to achieve goals?	N/A
Targeted, avoids redundancy?	Yes

HSCO Criterion	?
Clear goal statement? Desired, measurable objectives?	Νο
Most efficient approach to goals? Benefits exceed costs? Sufficient in size to achieve goals?	N/A
Targeted, avoids redundancy?	Yes
Avoids negative results, windfalls	Νο

HSCO Criterion	?
Analysis of who benefits?	Yes
Workable, efficient administration?	Yes
Clear standards?	Yes
Efficient enforcement?	Yes
Sunset date	Yes
Annual outcome reporting?	Νο

Public Disclosure Commission								
Home 👻	PUBLIC RESOURCES	✓ FILER RESOUR	CES – SEARC	CH THE DATABASE	- VIEW A	CTUAL REPORTS 👻	ONLINE FILING 🔻	
LECTION	TOTALS CANDIDATE	S COMMITTEES	INDEPENDENT	EXPENDITURES	LOBBYING	ADVANCED SEARCH		
							•	
ELECTIC	ON TOTALS CANDIDA	TE TOTALS COMM	ITTEE TOTALS	PARTY PREF: CO	NTRIBUTIONS	PARTY PREF: EXPE	NDITURES IE TOTALS	
			S EOD 2040. ¢	404 005 907 20				
ONTR	IBUTION TOTALS F	OR COMMITTEE	S FOR 2012: \$	104,005,827.30				
lection \								
2012 🔻	Switch to	o Expenditure Totals			෧ 😒 🍾	1	📑 💟 🖂 🖶 < 🛛	
Details	Contributor Types	Amount						
Details	Anonymous	:	\$80,257.31	Cont	Contributions to Committees for 2012 by			
Details	Business	\$28,	317,874.29		Contributor Type			
Details	PAC	\$6,	948,057.82					
Details	Individual	\$37,	324,267.87					
Details	Caucus	\$1,	273,145.00					
Details	Other	\$25,	197,436.16					
Details	Party	S	239,873.08				Other	
Details	Self	S	105,220.00	Busine	ss			
Details	Minor Party		\$7,040.00	PAC				
Details	Union	\$4,	512,655.77	Individ	ual		onion	
2				Other Union				
							Business	
						PAC	Duomeso	

THE GRID ABOVE SHOWS CONTRIBUTION TOTALS FROM ALL CONTRIBUTOR TYPES.

THE CHART ABOVE SHOWS CONTRIBUTOR TYPES WITH 4% OR MORE OF TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

Overall evaluation

Secretary of State:

"It is difficult to determine whether this expenditure has been effective in achieving its purpose."

My Evaluation: Needs Improvement Recommendations:

- 1. Clarify goals and objectives (top priority)
- 2. Means test (high priority): Eliminate* for incomes over threshold
 - Could save half the cost (\$25 million / 3 biennia)
- 3. Make Refundable (low priority)
 - Provides access to low income earners at low cost

Steve Robinson

<u>steve@decisionmetrics.org</u> 541-554-2335