

# Visualizing the Statewide Impact of a Revenue-Neutral Carbon Tax

**Justin Bare**  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA, USA  
jbare@cs.washington.edu

**Nandita Anand**  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA, USA  
email@email.email

**Aditya Kaul**  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA, USA  
email@email.email

**Richard Li**  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA, USA  
email@email.email

## ABSTRACT

Abstract goes here

## Author Keywords

Value Sensitive Design; politics

## INTRODUCTION

Intro goes here

The Carbon Washington revenue-neutral carbon tax proposal is composed of four main parts:

1. reducing the state sales tax,
2. funding a tax rebate for low income households,
3. eliminating a business tax for manufacturers,
4. and instituting a tax on fossil fuels.

“Revenue-neutral” means that the total amount that the Washington state government raises from taxes every year will not change significantly as a result of this policy. The revenue reductions (1 and 3 above) and the additional spending (2) will be balanced by the new revenue source of the tax on fossil fuels (4).

## RELATED WORK

Related work goes here

## Subsection

## METHODS

Methods goes here

## RESULTS

Results goes here

Paste the appropriate copyright statement here. ACM now supports three different copyright statements:

- ACM copyright: ACM holds the copyright on the work. This is the historical approach.
- License: The author(s) retain copyright, but ACM receives an exclusive publication license.
- Open Access: The author(s) wish to pay for the work to be open access. The additional fee must be paid to ACM.

This text field is large enough to hold the appropriate release statement assuming it is single spaced.

Every submission will be assigned their own unique DOI string to be included here.

## DISCUSSION

Discussion goes here

## FUTURE WORK

Future work goes here

- A
- B
- C

## Empirical Investigation

Describe evaluation process

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-1256082.

## REFERENCES

1. Earley, D., and Billig, A. The Pro-Money Court: How the Roberts Supreme Court Dismantled Campaign Finance Law, April 2014. <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/pro-money-supreme-court>.
2. Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G., and Welch, E. W. Developing and Testing a Theoretical Framework for Computer-Mediated Transparency of Local Governments. *Public Administration Review* 72, 4 (2012), 562.
3. Impartiality, April 2011. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/impartiality/>.
4. Mill, J. S. Utilitarianism. In *On Liberty and Utilitarianism*, vol. 81 of *Everyman's Library*. Knopf, 1992 [1861].
5. Moser, C. How Open is “Open as Possible”? Three Different Approaches to Transparency and Openness in Regulating Access to EU Documents. *Political Science Series*, 80 (2001).
6. Mulgan, R. Accountability: An Ever-Expanding Concept? *Public Administration* 78, 3 (2000), 555.




Figure 1. Tooltip that explains how a user's sales tax is estimated from their income in order to support the value of transparency.

7. Sinclair, A. THE CHAMELEON OF ACCOUNTABILITY: FORMS AND DISCOURSES. *Accounting, Organizations & Society* 20, 2 (1995).

8. Total Outside Spending by Election Cycle, Excluding Party Committees. [http://www.opensecrets.org/outsidespending/cycle\\_tots.php](http://www.opensecrets.org/outsidespending/cycle_tots.php).