

## Questions Posed By the Outlook Workgroup

1. Our preliminary assumption is that there will effectively be two outlooks: one using the revenue forecast and another assuming annual revenue growth of at least 4.5% (for fiscal years 2016 and 2017).

Would the council instead prefer only one outlook (using either the revenue forecast or the 4.5% assumptions)?

2. Our preliminary assumption is that potential policy level items will not be included in the display. Alternatively, selected items (things like implementation of HB 2776/McCleary, keeping State Need Grant funding indexed to tuition, salary and benefit changes, etc.) could be displayed at the bottom of the outlook.

Would the council like these policy items included or not? If so, which ones using what assumptions? (Note: The January outlook will incorporate the Governor's policy items for 2013-15).

3. Our preliminary assumption is that the Budget Stabilization Account balance will be included in the display (even though this is not required by statute).

Would the council like this information included or not? If so, would the council prefer: a) GFS and BSA on separate rows; or b) GFS and BSA on separate rows but with a subtotal showing total reserves?

4. Are there any other items included in the methodology document where the council would like us to make different assumptions?

5. While a final format has not been finalized, it is likely to be somewhat similar to what OFM released in August. Are there any other format related issues the council would like to see addressed in the final product?