HOUSE REVENUE COMMITTEE JANUARY 30, 2003 8:30 AM STATE CAPITOL BUILDING

| Members | Present: | Represe Represe Represe Represe Represe Represe Repre | resentative Lane Shetterly, Chair sentative Wayne Scott, Vice Chair entative Joanne Verger, Vice Chair entative Phil Barnhart entative Vicki Berger entative Vicki Berger entative Pat Farr sentative Mark Hass sentative Elaine Hopson sentative Max Williams |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| Witness P | resent: | | Potiowsky, State Economist, Office of Economic Analysis Kennedy, Revenue Economist, Office of Economic Analysis |
| Staff Pres | ent: | | Varner, Legislative Revenue Office ooley, Committee Assistant |
| <u>TAPE 23,</u> 004 | SIDE A Chair Shetterly | | Calls meeting to order at 8:33 a.m. |
| 023 | Tom Potiowsky | | Presented "Overview of Revenue Forecast Process", (Exhibit 1), referring to the publication "Oregon Economic And Revenue Forecast", (Exhibit 2). |
| 032 | Potiowsky | | Continued presentation, beginning "Oregon's Revenue Forecast Process", (Page 1, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 046 | Potiowsky | | Continued presentation, beginning "Revenue Forecast Methodology", (Page 2, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 048 | Rep. Barnhart | | Question and discussion interspersed. |
| 069 | Potiowsky | | Continued presentation, beginning "General Fund Forecast Components", (Page 2, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 074 | Potiowsky | | Continued presentation, beginning "Economic and Revenue Models", (Page 3, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| | | | Questions and discussion interspersed. |
| 101 | Potiowsky | | Continued presentation, beginning "Personal Income Tax Models, (Page 3, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 128 | Michael Kenned | y | Presented overview of models behind the corporate and personal income tax forecast, beginning "System being modeled", (Page 4, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 143 | Kennedy | | Continued presentation, beginning "Personal Income Tax Model", (Page 4, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 149 | Kennedy | | Continued presentation, beginning "Developing Total Liabilities: Tax Calculator", (Page 5, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 152 | Chair Shetterly | | Asks Kennedy to inform the Committee about national consultant firm, |

| 154 | Potiowsky | "Global Insights". Global Insights is a firm that provides extensive information on variables that affect the Oregon Economic Model. It provides a sense of what is happening in the national economy; and other factors such as the Iraq War and possible impacts on the national economy and on Oregon. Global Insights was originally made up of two forecasting groups, DRI (Data Resources), and WEFA (Wharton Economic Financial Group). Global Insights also consults with PGE and Pacific Power. |
|-----|---------------|---|
| 175 | Rep. Williams | How accurate are they? |
| 177 | Potiowsky | In some areas okay. Corporate profits are hard to predict and the company does as well as others. |
| 214 | Kennedy | Continues presentation, beginning "Personal Income Tax: Quarterly Collections Models", (Page 5, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 238 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Personal Income Tax: Quarterly Collections Models, (Page 6, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). (Slides switched order). |
| 242 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Timing of Collections related to the 2001 tax year (Millions), (Page 6, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 258 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Personal Income Tax Collections Forecast", (Page 7, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 267 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Corporate Income Tax Models", (Page 7, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 269 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Corporate Income Tax Model", (Page 8, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 272 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Corporate Income Tax Quarterly Collections Models", (Page 8, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| | | Questions and discussion interspersed. |
| 377 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Corporate Income Tax – Relationship Between Collections and Liability", (Page 9, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 382 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Corporate Income Tax Quarterly Collections Models", (Page 9, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 385 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Corporate Income Tax Collections Forecast", (Page 10, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 405 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Close of Session Forecast", (Page 10, Slide Bottom", Exhibit 1). |
| 410 | Rep. Verger | Are there any industries that you particularly, local or national, that closely measure what is happening in the economy? |
| 416 | Potiowsky | The high tech industry, especially semi-conductors and the influence they have on corporate profits income. Also, lumber and wood industry, national and international factors affect that, for example Canadian soft lumber. Transportation equipment is another area trucking industry affects Freightliner. Interest rates, gasoline prices affect RV makers. |
| 451 | Rep. Verger | Is there an industry that allows prediction of an economic decrease? |

| 457 | Potiowsky | There are few indicators: The Institute of Supply Management can indicate when manufacturing might have problems. In high tech, the Semi-Conductor Book to Bill Ratio, looks at orders in and shipments out, which indicates strength. Turning points are extremely difficult to predict. Office of Economic Analysis is in the process of building a leading economic indicator model for Oregon which may become a quicker barometer. |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| 494 | Chair Shetterly | Has the model changed over the past 5 to 10 years in measuring performance, or has it been consistent. |

TAPE 24, SIDE A

| 035 | Kennedy | The structure of the model has been the same since it was developed. The liability model has changed in terms of what is driving income. |
|-----|-----------|--|
| 045 | Warner | The structure is pretty much the same as it has been since 1981. The key difference is in the components of adjusted gross income and the components of the tax base. Another change is the emergence of high tech and the semi-conductor industry over the past 10 years, which the model has been able to capture. The key is getting the upper income group which is paying a large part of the tax burden. |
| 066 | Rep. Hass | Have stock options and bonuses and capital gains from the high tech sector been factored into new models? |
| 072 | Potiowsky | Have incorporated into model, but collection of data provide delays. |
| 089 | Kennedy | Continues presentation, "Revenues Exhibit Considerable Volatility", (Page 11, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 092 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, "Actual revenues compared to COS Forecast and naïve trend (13.5%). (Page 12, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 113 | Kennedy | Continued presentation "Data available for December forecast", (Page 12, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 122 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Quarterly PIT Collections Volatile – Product of Numerous Factors", (Page 13, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 190 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Data available for December forecast", (Page 13, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| | | Questions and discussion interspersed. |
| 260 | Potiowsky | Continued presentation, beginning "Unusual Times for the Economy", (Page 14, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 287 | Potiowsky | Continued presentation, beginning "Estimated Data Available for the May 2001 Forecast Compared to Revised Data to Date", (Page 14, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 303 | Potiowsky | Continued presentation, beginning "Latest Revenue Forecast", (Page 15, Side Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 315 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "General Fund Revenue Forecast", (Page 15, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |

| 322 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Historical and Forecast General Fund growth, not including Kicker refunds", (Page 16, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 347 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Factors Influencing Projected Growth in General Fund Revenues", (Page 16, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 352 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Factors Influencing Projected Growth in General Fund Revenues", (Page 17, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 366 | Rep. Williams | Commented that a 13.6% growth rate, even a 7% growth rate seems aggressive. |
| 384 | Chair Shetterly | Should see how this fares in March forecast. |
| 391 | Kennedy | Will answer in next few graphs. Continued presentation, beginning "Personal Income Growth", (Page 17, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 390 | Chair | Does the coming boom forecast assume the same manufacturers in high tech in Washington County that we had in the 90's, or production overseas. |
| 438 | Kennedy | The economic model forecast is less optimistic because Oregon may not be the recipient of the increase in high tech to '90s levels. |
| 451 | Potiowsky | For December, the economic forecast indicates that Oregon is coming out of recession, but not to 90's levels. High tech projections do not get back to pre recession rates until late 2004. |

TAPE 23, SIDE B

| 030 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Factors Influencing Projected Growth in General Fund Revenues", (Page 18, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| 037 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Capital Gains, Retirement Income Outpace Gross Income Growth", (Page 18, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 039 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Factors Influencing Projected Growth in General Fund Revenues", (Page 19, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| 041 | Kennedy | Continued presentation, beginning "Effective Tax Rates Climbs in 1990s", (Page 19, Slide Bottom, Exhibit 1). |
| 065 | Kennedy | (Continued presentation, beginning "PIT Forecast slightly below long term trend", (Page 20, Slide Top, Exhibit 1). |
| | | Questions and discussion interspersed. |
| 185 | | End of Revenue Forecast Overview. |
| 188 | Chair Shetterly | Informed new members of the Committee of Paul Warner's background as the former State Economist 1989-1999. |
| 215 | Warner | At the Chair's direction, provided the Committee with a review of revenue forecasting methodology, "Revenue Forecast Review", Exhibit 3, and a memo to the House Revenue Committee, entitled "Review of Revenue Forecasting Process", Exhibit 4. The scope of the review included: |

• An explanation of the large forecast error for 2001-2003 fiscal year.

| | | Recommendations for methodological improvements for the forecast process. Recommendations for improvements in the forecast process. Recommendations for any statutory changes that could potentially improve forecast results and/or process |
|---------------|-----------|--|
| | | Told the Committee that he has worked with Legislative Council to begin drafting some of these recommendations. |
| 250 | Warner | Explained economic forecasters are generally conservative, and that this was the first forecast below the close of session estimates since 1981-83. Looked at December vs. May forecasts for 2001, 2002 calendar years. Shortfall fell primarily between following four areas. |
| | | Wage and salary income is \$10.6 billion less for 2001-2002. with a revenue reduction of 37% or \$742 million Corporate income accounts for 23% of error, \$464 million, attributable to the change in the national profit forecast, \$272 million; bonus depreciation enacted by Congress, \$100 million; and the remaining \$75 million due to the apportionment factor. Capital gains, 17%, \$340 million Business income and investment income, 10%, \$203 million. |
| | | Questions and discussion interspersed. |
| <u>TAPE 2</u> | 4, SIDE B | |
| 064 | Warner | Gave history of Forecast Process starting in 1980. Its first task was to develop the Oregon Econometric Model the structure of which is basically the same today, (Page 3, Exhibit 4). |
| 103 | Warner | Discussed strengths of the current system, (Exhibit 3). Four strengths stand out: |
| | | Formal links to National Forecast Model. Governor's Council of Economic Advisors Maintain a Single Forecast Point Regular Formal Quarterly Updates. |
| 155 | Warner | Recommended technical changes (Exhibit 3): |
| | | Updating taxpayer sample to 2000 tax year, will be adjusted because 2000 tax year was not a normal year Industry specific data, withholding by sector Leading Index can help with citing turning points with monthly read Personal income and adjusted gross income Wage rates/bonus projections Produce Methodology review on a regular annual schedule. |
| 210 | Warner | Recommended structural and reporting changes (Exhibit 2) |
| | | Establish a Revenue Forecast Board, requires statutory action. Create a Legislative/Executive Board that would have appointing authority for state economist position, may require statutory action. A function of the board would be the release of forecasts simultaneously to appointing authorities. |

| 251 | Chair Shetterly | A 4 member board has its problems, asked Warner to look into drafting legislation to go to a 5 person board, to avoid a deadlock. |
|---------------|-----------------|---|
| | | Questions and discussion interspersed. |
| 312 | Chair Shetterly | For the record, "There has never been as far as I know, and I will say this on the record, any issue as to the independence of the actual numbers in the forecast or the information going into it or the credibility of (the State Economist)." |
| 280 | Warner | Continued with a third structural/reporting recommendation, |
| | | • Create a Revenue Forecast Advisory Committee that would review preliminary revenue numbers and make recommendations or reactions to the forecast. The ultimate decision maker in the forecast process to rest with the State Economist. |
| 359 | Chair Shetterly | Asked if the committee would be a corollary to the Governor's Council on Economic Advisors; on the revenue side of the forecast process? |
| 350 | Warner | Answered yes. Warner recommended that the committee be exempt from open meetings law given the sensitivity of the revenue numbers and the need for candid advice. |
| 392 | Warner | Continued with a fourth structural/reporting recommendation: |
| | | Recommended a monthly revenue tracking report. This would be a procedural change and would not require a statutory change. |
| 417 | Warner | Historically, the Office of Economic Analysis, had one duty and that was to forecast General Fund Revenue. Additional duties consistent with their mission such as lottery forecast, and prison inmate forecast; have been added. Recommended through the Legislative Fiscal Office Budgetary Review process that other ancillary functions be given to other agencies. |
| 442 | Chair Shetterly | Asked the Committee if anyone felt uncomfortable with possible legislative changes as a result of the revenue forecasting recommendations. |
| <u>TAPE 2</u> | 5, SIDE A | |
| 033 | Rep. Berger | Told the Committee she was concerned that forecasting took a lot of hits, and that the recommendations were an overreaction to forecast errors resulting from rapid changes in numbers and "folks taking heat for it". |
| 038 | Chair Shetterly | Felt it would be an overreaction if the committee suggested creation of an economic forecaster within the legislative branch, but felt recommendations were a fine tuning of the process. |
| 060 | Potiowsky | Advised the Committee that a lot of the items in "C and D" (Exhibit 3) were thought about before 2001 such as formation of a Revenue Forecast Advisory Committee. |
| 082 | Warner | Advised the Committee that he does not see a fiscal impact. The Advisory Committee would be people within government appointed on a voluntary basis. There may be a fiscal impact with the Forecast Board. |

099 Rep. Hopson Felt moving some of the functions to other agencies needs investigation so

| | | that the core mission of the State Economist is not weakened. |
|-----|-----------------|---|
| 105 | Chair Shetterly | Ask Warner to continue to work with Potiowsky and Legislative Counsel to draft legislation for Committee review |
| 115 | Chair Shetterly | Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. |

Tape Log Submitted by,

Kathy Tooley, Committee Assistant Reviewed by Kim Taylor James

Exhibit Summary:

- Potiowsky, Kennedy, "Oregon's Revenue Forecast process", 21 pages.
 Potiowsky, "Oregon Economic and Revenue Forecast", 103 pages
 Warner, "Revenue Forecast Review", 1 page
 Warner, Memo "Review of Revenue Forecasting Process", 7 pages