

From: Veldran, Katherine
To: John Hazzard <johnhazzard@scsenate.gov>
Date: 9/10/2015 1:39:04 PM
Subject: FW: Session Shortener - H 3340
Attachments: (2013-02-20) H 3340 - Session Shortener w amend (v01).docx
Release - House Passes Session Shortening Bill...for the 10th Time.eml

John,
Below was our proposal in 2013.
Let's discuss H.3014 when you're available.
Thank you,
Katherine

H.3340 effectively shortens the session by dropping a month at both ends...starting a month later (2nd Tuesday in February) and adjourning sine die a month earlier (1st Thursday in May).
What we would propose would be to leave the end date where it is in early June, and instead, to start two months later than today (2nd Tuesday in March). There are two reasons to make this change. The primary reason is because the most important thing the legislature does each year is pass a budget. The current version of H.3340 effectively makes the budget due a month earlier than it is now (early May instead of early June). This is problematic because it means the final data we have when we pass the budget will be a month further away from the start of the relevant fiscal year. So it means we'd have significantly less certainty as to what current year collections have looked like, and also revenue forecasts for the plan year that are one month "hazier," if that makes any sense. The earlier the budget is due, the larger the margin of error in our revenue projections for the plan year. Making the budget due a month earlier increases the likelihood that there will be deficits – not dramatically, but enough that I think our proposal makes a little more sense.

I would also point out that next Friday (Feb. 15th) is when the BEA will update its revenue forecast for FY 2013-14. So far, the House has been working with the same numbers we were given back in November. With the unamended H. 3340, the House would still be stuck at the Ways and Means subcommittee level with the November forecast, and would then pivot mid-process to the new February number. If the session began at the beginning of March, then Ways and Means could work with the new February figure from Day 1.

The second, and significantly less important, reason to start two months later instead of chopping a month off of both ends is that it makes for a shorter Constitutional amendment...and therefore, a shorter ballot question and explanatory statement for the voters to interpret. It's easier to explain and understand, because now you wouldn't be modifying the end date at all – just the start date.

From: Soura, Christian
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2013 3:47 PM
To: Veldran, Katherine
Subject: Session Shortener - H 3340

I've heard the Senate has some other bill they're working on this afternoon, but do you mind running this by Sen. Martin at some point? It's a potential amendment to Rep. Bannister's session shortener. The amendment does the following:

- Pushes the beginning of session from early February to early March (vs. early January today, obviously)
- Deletes the language that inserts a firm sine die adjournment date in early May
- Has the same effect of knocking two months off of session...we just do it by delaying the start by two months instead of starting a month later and ending a month earlier...we'd leave the end date where it is, but not put

it in the Constitution

I didn't mess with the language that would allow for committee meetings and local session after the second Tuesday in January, but if he has another approach he'd like to see, I'm sure we can work something out. I'm just trying to figure out if there's a version of H.3340 that we could put together that Sen. Martin would be comfortable with. Thanks.

CLS

Christian L. Soura
Deputy Chief of Staff

(803) 543-0792
ChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov