Dear NTA Members –

It is an honor and a pleasure to have been chosen by the membership to serve as the President of the National Tax Association. I have fond memories of my days as a graduate student at Syracuse University when I became a member of the NTA and received my first copy of the National Tax Journal. Never did I imagine that one day I would help lead the association. The NTA and its membership have been very good to me. I have learned a great deal by attending our conferences and interacting with a truly stellar group of friends and colleagues from around the world. (There have also been some wonderful meals along the way.)

By all accounts Jon Bakija and Jane Gravelle put together a smash hit with the 104th Annual Conference on Taxation that was held in New Orleans in November. The program was exceptional and attendance was nothing less than fantastic. (And yes, there were some great meals in New Orleans as well!) The kickoff event was a superb general session focused on tax reform organized by Jane Gravelle and moderated by Mark Mazur. The panel included four stars, Bill Gale, Diane Lim Rogers, Charles McLure and Donald Marron - a great way to start the Annual Conference.

Scott Cowen, President of Tulane University, was the luncheon speaker on the first day of the conference. President Cowen offered an inspiring presentation that highlighted facets of his career and the challenges he faced in helping to rebuild Tulane University and New Orleans itself in the aftermath of hurricane disaster. Peter Diamond, whose name is familiar to all of us, was the luncheon speaker on Friday. Given that Peter won the Nobel Prize in economics in 2010, he could have wowed the audience with discussion of almost any topic in economics. He focused his remarks on the policy response to the Great Recession and the pressing need to deal with widespread unemployment caused by the sharp decline in economic activity.

The conference offered some other special presentations of note. Alan Auerbach was honored for his receipt of the 2011 Holland Award and spoke to the membership about some of his career accomplishments. He received a combination of praise and some tasteful roasting from Larry Kotlikoff, Jim Poterba and the witty duo that included Rosanne Altshuler and Jim Hines. (An important lesson here is to make sure you guard carefully the family photos from your younger days!) Len Burman’s Presidential address was on the subject of Dumpster Diving for Data, which certainly set a new bar for presidential addresses! Len’s witty and tongue-in-cheek remarks were balanced against his passionate plea for more and better quality data from public agencies to support the policy analysis process.

Andy Reschovsky was recognized by the NTA for his receipt of the prestigious 2011 Steven D. Gold Award. The Gold Award is jointly administered by the National Tax Association, the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) and the National Confer-
The 104th Annual Conference received financial support from the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, the Murphy Institute at Tulane University, Vanguard, the Pew Charitable Trust and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University. If you have a chance to thank folks affiliated with these institutions, please do so. Thanks also go to the ever-capable Peter Brady who has been leading the NTA fundraising committee. Another thanks goes to the American Tax Policy Institute for their significant financial support for the spring symposium.

At the November Board of Directors meeting I formed a special ad hoc committee on membership that will include myself, along with Len Burman, Diane Lim Rogers and Tom Neubig. While the Association needs to work hard to manage the budget and diversify revenue sources, in the end we are a membership organization that needs to be sustained by the membership. I hope to be able to provide an update of this committee’s work at the Spring Board meeting.

There are some exciting upcoming events (and of course related eating opportunities) that you should put on your calendar. The annual Spring Symposium will be held at the Holiday Inn Capitol on May 17-18. The first day and a half will focus on federal tax policy while the final component of the program will once again be the popular State and Local Tax Program. Janet McCubbin is chairing the federal component of the program while John Anderson is taking the lead with the state and local program. The 105th Annual Conference on Taxation will be held in Providence, Rhode Island on November 15-17. This will be the first time in NTA history that a major conference will be held in Rhode Island. Brian Knight and Mark Skidmore are co-chairs for the Providence conference. Thanks to Janet, John, Brian and Mark. The 42nd Annual Wichita Program (aka “Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation for Communications, Energy and Transportation Properties”) will be held on July 29-August 2. And never too early to be thinking about Tampa in 2013!

-Matthew Murray
Current NTA President Matt Murray takes over the reigns from 2011 President Len Burman

Gold award winner Andrew Reschovsky

Luncheon Speaker Peter Diamond

Dissertation award winner Marika Cabral, flanked by runners-up Neal Mahoney and Mark Phillips
Alan Auerbach Receives 2011 Dan Holland Medal

The NTA established the Daniel M. Holland Medal in 1993 to honor the long-time editor of the National Tax Journal and MIT Professor, Dan Holland. It is awarded each year for outstanding contributions to the study and practice of Public Finance. The 2011 Dan Holland Award Committee, co-chaired by Rosanne Altshuler and Jim Hines, awarded the medal to Alan J. Auerbach.

Auerbach is the Robert D. Burch Professor of Economics and Law and Director of the Burch Center for Tax Policy and Public Finance at the University of California at Berkeley, as well as a Research Associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research. He has chaired the Economics Departments at UC Berkeley and the University of Pennsylvania, served on the Harvard faculty, and was Deputy Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation of the U.S. Congress in 1992. The following description of some of Auerbach’s major contributions to public finance is culled from remarks by William Gale and a power point presentation by Rosanne Altshuler and Jim Hines at the NTA’s November 2011 Annual Conference on Taxation. More complete descriptions will appear in the Papers and Proceedings for that conference.

Auerbach’s early work, at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s looked at the efficient design of investment incentives, inflation-proof depreciation of assets, accelerated depreciation, leasing, and the transferability of tax incentives. He also looked at the impact of corporate tax reform on investment, tax revenues, mergers and acquisitions, growth, leverage, and the timing of investments of tax loss carryforward and carry-backs, basis step-up and acquisition limits, and interest deductibility, and anticipated tax rate changes.

With co-author Kevin Hassett, Auerbach examined empirical evidence regarding the role of dividends in corporate finance, with implications for the effects of dividend taxation on economic growth. His work with Larry Kotlikoff and others on the efficiency gains of dynamic tax reform has changed the way public economists evaluate tax reforms and has informed the public debate. The same is true of his work on generational accounting and the fiscal gap. Since 2000, Auerbach and Gale have published “shadow” budget projections every year, showing the possibility of increasingly alarming growth in long-term deficits under continuation of current fiscal policy (which, in contrast to current law, generally assumes that current tax rates will continue indefinitely, as opposed to sunsetting as stipulated in current legislation).

While much of his research focuses on issues of long-term fiscal policy, Auerbach has also examined short-term fiscal policy. Working with Daniel Feenberg, he found that the tax system played a fairly consistent role as an automatic stabilizer from the early 1960s through 1995, despite numerous changes in tax rates over that period. In a later update, he found that in more recent years taxes have become less effective as stabilizers. With Bill Gale, Auerbach documented what is known about the effectiveness of fiscal policy and how its use has evolved over time. While more recently in two papers with Yuriy Gorodnichenko, he has provided new evidence on when fiscal policy is more or less likely to be effective.

Bill Gale summarizes Auerbach’s strength in all of these areas: “One of Alan’s defining traits is his ability to think comprehensively – he sees connections where others do not, he can create a coherent framework where others have failed. (Another defining trait is his dry sense of humor.) If, for example, your null hypothesis is that Alan walks around with a dynamic, overlapping generations, multisector, open economy model with transversality conditions all in his head, the evidence would not let you reject the null...For example, during tax policy discussions leading to the 2001 tax cut, Alan emphasized that one could not discuss the effects of a permanent tax cut without specifying the financing. Obviously, this notion comes out of serious consideration of the government’s budget constraint. However at the time, it was not obvious to many participants, especially in the policy sphere. Although there is a standard analytical dichotomy between revenue-neutral structural tax reform and changing the level of revenues collected by the government, Alan has persistently emphasized that the issues are not separate. Indeed, structural tax reform is all the more important as we consider raising revenue levels because deadweight loss rises as a function of the marginal tax rate and equity and simplicity issues become even more important as the tax system grows in size.

These types of connections see past the narrow, and often arbitrary, confines of seemingly well-defined issues and established common wisdom. Alan’s strength in making these connections has been a great contribution to both the research world and the public policy debate.”

For a little tax geek humor - see the next page for a few highlights from the Altshuler/Hines power point at the Fall Conference:
Here we have Alan’s reaction on first learning that corporations using LIFO for tax purposes are required also to use LIFO for financial accounting purposes.

Experienced Auerbach-watchers are aware that he sometimes sports bow ties, but may not know that he first did so when, very early in his career, he was preparing to testify before the Senate Finance Committee for the first time... Alan occasionally wears bow ties in casual settings even now, because the ladies, in particular, like them so.

Here we have a photo of newlyweds Alan and Gay, in which Alan is explaining to Gay the optimal response to the introduction of the child tax credit. And sure enough, in late December 1980, Ethan Auerbach was born... In the photo, Ethan is saying, "Aren’t you proud? I arrived just before the end of the tax year."

Here we see Alan’s proud parents congratulating him after sailing through the Harvard Ph.D. program in four years, publishing numerous papers, and landing an assistant professorship at Harvard on graduating. Alan is just as proud of them for netting $820,000 more in lifetime social security and Medicare benefits than they paid in taxes.

At the pinnacle - Alan wearing the Dan Holland medal

Here we see Alan’s proud parents congratulating him after sailing through the Harvard Ph.D. program in four years, publishing numerous papers, and landing an assistant professorship at Harvard on graduating. Alan is just as proud of them for netting $820,000 more in lifetime social security and Medicare benefits than they paid in taxes.
Mark your calendar for the 42nd Annual Spring Symposium and 10th State-Local Program

General Program

The 42nd Annual Spring Symposium and 10th State-Local Program will be held on Thursday, May 17 and Friday, May 18, 2012 at the Holiday Inn Capitol in Washington D.C. We are pleased to co-sponsor the Spring Symposium again this year with the American Tax Policy Institute (ATPI).

The theme of this year’s Symposium, organized by Janet McCubbin of the Department of Treasury and a committee of NTA and ATPI members, is “Moving Forward with Tax Reform—What Do We Know, What Do We Need to Know?”

As we did the last time the Symposium coincided with a presidential election year, we will kick off the program with a panel discussion surveying the policymaking horizon. This year the panelists will include Congressional staff and former Administration officials, in addition to representatives from the presidential campaigns. The discussion will reflect not only what policymakers propose to do, but also what more they need to know from tax policy professionals in order to move forward with fundamental tax reform.

Thursday’s program will continue with sessions on the distribution of income and taxes, taxation and the modern family, and the taxation of capital income. Bruce Bartlett, former government official, New York Times columnist, and author of the recent book, “The Benefit and The Burden: Tax Reform—Why We Need It and What It Will Take,” will deliver the luncheon address.

The Symposium will conclude Friday with two sessions organized by ATPI. The first will illuminate the role of the regulatory process in tax policymaking and the second will consider the implications of financial and tax reporting for corporate tax policy.

While tax reform is a perennial topic, the committee hopes that by identifying what we already agree upon and what we still need to learn, the Spring Symposium will move the policy debate forward and generate new energy and ideas for future research that will ultimately lead to sound tax policy changes.

-Janet McCubbin

State and Local Program

The state and local portion of the Spring Symposium will be held Friday afternoon, May 18. The theme of this year’s State and Local Program, organized by John Anderson of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, is “Competiveness—What Does It Mean for State and Local Governments?” There is a great deal of interest among policymakers at all levels of government in the issue of competitiveness, yet there are many aspects of what competitiveness may mean and what policies state and local governments may be able to implement to enhance competitiveness.

We will explore these issues in two sessions. The first afternoon session will address the topic of tax competition in a federal setting. Papers will be presented that examine the concept of tax competition and its effects, what state tax rankings tell us (and do not tell us) about competitiveness, and how states compete with their business taxes. The second session will consider competitive impacts and policy responses, with papers on rethinking property tax incentives for business, state sales taxes and their employment effects measured across borders, state tax breaks for the elderly and the policy diffusion of those breaks across states, and the ability of states to redistribute income via their income tax systems.

- John Anderson
Impressions of the 2011 NTA Conference

For the fourth year, the NTA Board surveyed annual conference attendees to evaluate the success of the conference. The Board also surveyed NTA members who did not attend the conference to learn what influenced that decision. The information gathered from the survey will influence the planning for future NTA events.

Shortly after the conference, we e-mailed a link of an online survey to a total of 1,172 NTA members and conference attendees. After seven weeks, 112 of the 335 conference attendees and 28 non-attendees had completed the survey, for a response rate of 33% of attendees and an overall response rate of 12%.

The survey included 18 questions, with the answer to the first ("Did you attend the 103rd Annual Conference of the National Tax Association?") directing respondents to separate sets of questions for attendees and non-attendees. Both groups were asked about themselves and their general preferences for the NTA conference. Attendees were also asked to evaluate the 2011 conference. Two open-ended questions asked for additional comments on the 2011 conference and suggestions for the 2012 conference. We report the most salient results from the survey below.

To learn about the respondents, the survey asked about professional fields, employers, and attendance at previous NTA annual conferences. Most respondents (76%) named economics as their primary professional field, with ten respondents each choosing accounting and public affairs/policy. Fewer than ten respondents chose law, journalism, political science, or tax preparation.

Most respondents (53%) reported being employed by a college or university. The next largest employers were the federal government (20%), student (8%), state or local government (7%), and nonprofit organizations (6%).

Among non-attendee respondents, the largest share (44%) last attended the conference 2-5 years ago, 28% last attended more than five years ago, and 16% attended in 2010. Only three respondents have never attended the conference. For 27% of attendee respondents, 2011 marked their first NTA conference. That share is up from 15% in both 2009 and 2010.

The annual conference offers attendees a variety of opportunities, and the Board wanted to know how important those reasons are to both those who attend the conference and those who do not. We asked respondents to rate several opportunities provided by the conference on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from unimportant (1) to very important (5). Over all respondents, the highest rated opportunities (with their average ratings reported in parentheses) were: meeting and talking with people with similar research interests (4.48), catching up on the latest research (4.47), and getting feedback on and exposure for my own research (4.11). Close behind were: reconnecting with friends and colleagues (4.03), and learning things that I can use in my job (3.92). The relative rankings varied little between attendees and non-attendees.

Continued...
A number of variables can influence the decision to attend the annual conference in a particular year. Attendees ranked two factors as most important: the appeal of the preliminary conference program and whether attendees participate in the program. The most important considerations in the decision to attend (using the same five-point scale) were having a paper on the program (3.86) and presentations on the preliminary program that are closely linked to my interests (3.85). Third place went to presentations on the preliminary program that I expect will be of high quality (3.79), followed by being on the program as a discussant or moderator (2.79).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Did attend</th>
<th>Did not attend</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reconnecting with friends and colleagues</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting with potential employers</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting with potential employees</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting feedback on and exposure for my own research</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catching up on the latest research</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiting an appealing location</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting and talking with people with similar research interests</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering information and ideas for media stories</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning things that I can use in my job</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year, how important were the following in your decision to attend the annual conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>having a paper on the program</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being on the program as a discussant or moderator</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference registration fee</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel and hotel cost</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location of the conference</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentations on the preliminary program that I expect will be of high quality</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentations on the preliminary program that are closely linked to my interests</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also asked respondents who did not attend the conference about their deciding factors. This year, costs dominated the decision not to attend the NTA conference: the most important considerations for non-attendees (using the same five-point scale) were travel and hotel costs (3.05) and the conference registration fee (2.68). Not having a paper on the program (2.64) and not being on the program as a discussant or moderator (2.09) followed. Non-attendees rated both of the preliminary program factors as not important or of little importance.

Non-attendee respondents were asked to share any other information about their decision not to attend the conference. Of nine who offered additional information, eight cited conflicts with their other obligations.

We asked respondents who attended the 2011 Annual Conference to rate aspects of the conference program on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from very poor (1) to excellent (5). This year, all of the program elements received ratings between good and excellent, with the following receiving the top scores: the Holland Medal session (4.68), the concurrent sessions (4.56), and the luncheon featuring Peter Diamond (4.51).

We also asked attendee respondents to rate the conference facilities on the same five-point scale. With a rating of four translating to good, all of the facilities were rated good or excellent. The highest ratings went to the city of New Orleans as the conference location (4.51) and the hotel location within the city (4.54). Among respondents who shared additional comments about the facilities, the most common complaint was the lack of wi-fi Internet access in the conference area and guest rooms.

In planning the conference program, there is always a trade-off among the goals of including the largest number of high-quality papers possible, ensuring adequate time for presentations and discussion, and incorporating discussion panels. To help with program planning, we asked conference attendees about the mix of four-paper, three-paper, and panel discussion sessions. A majority of respondents (63%) thought the mix of sessions at the 2011 conference was about right. Forty-two percent would prefer more three-paper sessions, and 21% would prefer more four-paper sessions. (Responses total more than 100% because respondents were allowed to check multiple boxes.)

-Laura Kalambokidis
Announcements

Call for Papers

“A Fiscal Trilemma?” A Conference Hosted by Tulane University’s Murphy Institute and Department of Economics

Today we need a tax system that will provide sufficient revenue to deal with long-run budget challenges, that will promote long-run economic growth, and that will provide progressivity in the face of increasing inequality. However, do we face a "fiscal trilemma": Can we only meet two of these goals and not the third? For example, must a progressive tax system that meets our revenue needs hamper economic growth? Do pro-growth systems that generate needed revenues come at the expense of progressivity? Would a progressive income tax system that encouraged growth provide insufficient revenues? Is there an unsolvable tension between the traditional Haig-Simons notion of a “good” tax (e.g., a broad-based income tax base with few if any exclusions or deductions), which emerges from a largely static view of the tax system, and the more growth-oriented notions that emerge from a more dynamic analysis (e.g., a consumption tax to encourage growth)?

The tensions between these three goals of tax policy are not fully understood or quantified. The Murphy Institute and the Department of Economics at Tulane University are sponsoring a conference that will explore these tensions. The conference aims at bringing together researchers working on these issues to explore recent advances in the field and to increase awareness of the subject.

The conference will highlight the tensions between these three goals of tax policy. Papers should focus on at least one of these goals and should ideally explore trade-offs with other goals. Alternative approaches to analyzing these issues are welcome. Papers presented at the conference will be published in a special issue of Public Finance Review, subject to the normal refereeing process.

Researchers working in these areas are invited to submit papers or 2-page abstracts via email attachment to: James Alm at jalm@tulane.edu or Steven Sheffrin at smsheffrin@tulane.edu. The submission deadline for papers and abstracts is May 1, 2012. Acceptance for presentation will be communicated no later than June 1, 2012. The conference will be held at Tulane University in New Orleans, LA on Friday, October 26, 2012.

The Murphy Institute will pay an honorarium of $1,000, and will cover normal travel expenses.

Murphy Institute Program Manager: Ruth Carter (racarter@tulane.edu)
Economics Department Manager: Paul Watson (pwatson@tulane.edu)

Recent Writings

Economic Commentary Municipal Finance in the Face of Falling Property Values
Thomas J. Fitzpatrick IV and Mary Zenker
Implications of Different Bases for a VAT, Eric Toder, Jim Nunns, Joseph Rosenberg, Tax Policy Center, Feb 06, 2012
Minimum Wages and Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities among Teens, Scott Adams, Mckinley Blackburn, D. Chad Cotti, Manuscript on CiteSee

A new edition of John Anderson’s textbook, Public Finance, has recently been published by Cengage Learning. The text treats both expenditure and tax theory with an emphasis on policy analysis. Federal, state, and local governments all receive attention and numerous international topics are included as well (such consideration of the European Union as a federation of states, OECD tax comparisons, and coverage of the value-added tax). The text is aimed at upper division undergraduate students, but can also be used for masters level students with the inclusion of advanced topics and appendix material. A key change in the second edition is a new chapter on social insurance programs that covers social security, Medicare, and Medicaid programs along with disaster relief and other topics using a unified risk-insurance framework.

In Memoriam
Bruce Wallin
Associate Professor of Political Science
Northeastern University
Welcome New Members

Adj, Artidiatun, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Albrecht, Kiel, Ithaca, NY
Allen, Eric, Berkeley, CA
Aligul, Magnus, Ministry of Finance, Stockholm, Sweden
Altig, David E., Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Andrus, Joe, OECD, Paris, France
Aziz, Mohammad Yahya, AX Account Tax, Valley Stream, NY
Bagchi, Sutirha, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
Berry, Christopher, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Besfamile, Martin, University of Torcuato di Tella, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Black, Scott, Herf Jones, Indianapolis, IN
Boskin, Michael J., Stanford University, Stanford, CA
Bossard, Jennifer, Doane College, Crete, Nebraska
Bourdeaux, Carolyn, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Brooks, Jr., John R, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, DC
Burns, Sara, Lexington, KY
Cabral, Marika, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX
Carrillo, Paul, George Washington University, Washington, DC
Cheung, Jaeho, Korea Institute of Public Finance, Seoul, Korea
Chrietz, Michael J., Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Cohen, Natalie, Wells Fargo Securities, New York, NY
Compton, Jessica, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC
Cunningham, Tom, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Cunningham, Chris, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Cyran, Musharraf R., Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Davis-Nozemack, Katie, Atlanta, GA
Del Busto, Juan, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Miami Branch, Miami, FL
deMouji, Rudolf, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC
Doerner, William, Tallahassee, FL
Drnevich, Dawn, University of Alabama, Birmingham, AL
Duquette, Nicolas, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
Edwards, Claudia, Ministry of Finance and Public Service, Kingston, Jamaica
Egan, Patricia, San Francisco, CA
Engelhardt, Gary, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY
Eyal-Cohen, Miri, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, Pittsburgh, PA
Fitzpatrick, Katie, US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC
Fletcher, Jason, Yale University, New Haven, CT
Francis, Norton, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Washington, DC
Gaelber, Thomas, Seafood, NY
Garand, James C., Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA
Gardner, Matthew, Institute on Taxation & Economic Policy, Washington, DC
Gillitzer, Christian, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
Gleason, Christi A., University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
Greenhalgh-Stanley, Nadia, Kent State University, Kent, OH
Gulati, Sumeet, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC
Guzman, Tatyana, Bloomberg, IN
Hamml, Michael, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Holmgren, R. David, Washington, DC
Huckfeldt, Peter, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA
Isen, Adam, Philadelphia PA
Jackson, Osborne, Northeastern University, Boston, MA
Jacoby, William G., Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
Jimenez, Carlos, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX
Johnson, Barry, Internal Revenue Service, SOI, Washington, DC
Johnson, Erik, Quinnipiac University, Hamden, CT
Jones, Lee C., Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Nashville Branch, Nashville, TN
Katsalap, Valentyna, TX
Kim, Hyunseok, Korea Institute of Public Finance, Seoul, South Korea
Kim, Seonghoon, Columbus, OH
Kitchen, John, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC
Klassen, Ken, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario
Klier, Thomas, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Kling, Jeffrey, Congressional Budget Office, Washington, DC
Kornhauser, Marjorie, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ
Kowamoto, Atsuhi, Syracuse, NY
Kroft, Kory, Yale University, New Haven, CT
Krupa, Olha, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
Kueng, Lorenz, University of California, Berkeley, CA
Kuziemko, Ilyana, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
Larson, Marla, Montana Department of Revenue, Helena, MT
Lawsky, Sarah, UC Irvine School of Law, Irvine, CA
Lay, Tain Lai, Taipei City, Taiwan
Leibel, Kara, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, DC
Leiser, Stephanie, Brier, WA
Lifson, Mitchell, Highland Park, IL
Lightner, Teresa, University of North Texas, Denton TX
Lim, Katherine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
Lindsey, Brad, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC
Lisowsky, Petro, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL
Liu, Li, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
Liu, Yongzheng, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Lockwood, Lee, NBER, Cambridge, MA
Luby, Martin, Chicago, IL
Lusich, Stephen, Phoenix, AZ
MacDonald, Christy, Toronto, Ontario
Mahoney, Neal, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
Masken, Karen, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, DC
McCleure, Leslie, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
McGown, Michelle, Oregon Department of Revenue, Salem, OR
Messerings, David, Stevens and Messerings, PC, Irvington, VA
Mok, Shannon, Congressional Budget Office, Washington, DC
Musso, Robert J., Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, New Orleans Branch, New Orleans, LA
Nowaczezki, Liliana, Kalamazoo, MI
Oakley, Christopher, Federal Bank of Atlanta, Jacksonville Branch, Jacksonville, FL
Olken, Benjamin, MIT, Cambridge, MA
Osfosky, Leigh, University of Miami, Miami, FL
Pape, Andreas, SUNY Binghamton, Binghamton, NY
Parikh, Sagars,ustin, CA
Patel, Shalini, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Pierce, Eric, Washington, DC
Poe, Janie, Lawrence, KS
Power, Laura, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC
Powers, Michael, Arlington, VA
Prophet, Geoffrey, George Washington University, Washington, DC
Ramnath, Shanthi, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC
Ro, Youngho, Korea Institute of Public Finance, Seoul, South Korea
Ross, Amanda, Morgantown, WV
Rothschild, Casey, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
Sandberg, Bo, Copenhagen, Denmark
Santore, Rudy, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN
Schab, Casey, Athens, GA
Showalter, Mark, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT
Shropshire, Phil, TIGTA, Doylestown, PA
Silverstein, Gerald, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC
Simovic, Hrvoje, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia
Smart, Michael, Toronto, Canada
Smith, Matthew, Montclair, NJ
Song, Eunjoo, Korea Institute of Public Finance, Seoul, South Korea
Sullivan, Ryan, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA

Continued...
New Members (cont)

Thoene, Michael, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany
Thornock, Jake, University of Washington, WA
Tkac, Paula, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Tong, Patricia, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC
Tovar, Jorge, Universidad de los Andes, Bogota, Columbia
Tunnell, Larry, Las Cruces, NM
Turner, Tracy, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS
Vanderhei, Jack, EBRI, Washington, DC
Varner, Charles, Brooklyn, NY
Vidangos, Ivan, Federal Reserve Board of Governors, Washington, DC
Wakary, Albert, Department of Finance Canada, Ottawa
Wang, James, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR
Watrin, Christoph, UNC Chapel Hill, NC
Whimp, Kathleen Anne, The World Bank, Nairobi, Kenya
White, Morgan, Hunters Run Property Owners Association, Palm Beach, FL
Wilde, Jaron, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
Zamperini, Brian, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC
Zelenak, Lawrence, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
Ziliak, James, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY

At the New Orleans Conference...

Rosemary Marcus and Therese McGuire
Scott Cowan and Ranjana Madhusudhan

Conference hotel

Diane Lim Rogers and Mark Mazur
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